

President. In light of our constitutional principles, it is just not right.

More than 115 of my colleagues have joined me in cosponsoring House Joint Resolution 217, calling for a constitutional amendment to extend the Presidential vote to our citizens in the territories.

I'm calling on my other colleagues, especially on this 200th anniversary, to join us in extending this precious voting right to our citizens in the Pacific and the Caribbean.

TEXTILE AND APPAREL IMPORTS FROM IRAN AND SOUTH AFRICA

(Mr. HAYES of Illinois asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HAYES of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, last week I received a letter from the U.S. Trade Representative telling me of the administration's opposition to H.R. 1154, the Textile and Apparel Trade Act of 1987. It says that "the administration has already done an enormous amount in recent months to assist U.S. textile and apparel industries."

Well, as proof of their assistance, I would like to relay the following information. Thus far in 1987, we have imported over 600,000 square yards of fabric from Iran, compared to the 215,000 square yards we imported all of last year.

From December 1986, to the end of June 1987 over 10.6 million square yards of textile and apparel exports from South Africa, worth \$6.6 million, have been admitted for consumption into the United States.

The Commerce Department estimates that 10 million square yards is roughly equivalent to 10,000 jobs. By this calculation, 10,000 American workers can now look forward to the agony of unemployment, thanks to South African textile imports. But they will not be alone, they will join the nearly 700,000 lost American job opportunities attributable to textile and apparel imports since 1981.

Unless we move to limit import growth and to protect American industry, the administration may offer even more such assistance. Assistance which American textile workers cannot afford to receive. When H.R. 1154 comes to the House floor for action, I strongly urge my colleagues to give it their full support.

PROPOSED ACCORD ON CERTAIN NUCLEAR WEAPONS

(Mr. WEISS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, the Reagan administration is poised to conclude a treaty to eliminate short- and medium-range nuclear missiles. Foreign Minister Shevardnadze's visit

to Washington is the latest sign that remaining differences may soon be resolved, leading to a summit meeting this fall.

The proposed accord offers us the opportunity to eliminate two entire classes of weapons from the superpower arsenals. We must not squander this opportunity, which is in the best interests of both nations and the entire world.

The Reagan administration is to be commended for bringing the treaty this far, and we must all unite to ensure that it is favorably concluded and ratified. But we must also remember that a treaty on short- and intermediate-range weapons is not enough.

The American breakout from the SALT II Treaty and the efforts of the Reagan administration to unilaterally reinterpret the ABM Treaty raise the specter of a consuming all-out competition in strategic arms and space weapons.

We must not trade short- and medium-range weapons for a reckless new arms race in other weapons. Instead, we must use the momentum of the coming arms agreement to resolve our differences on strategic and space weapons, which continue to threaten the world with nuclear annihilation.

THE APARTHEID PROFITS DISINCENTIVE ACT

(Mr. LELAND asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LELAND. Mr. Speaker, during the August recess I was appalled by the inhuman working conditions in South Africa which caused 340,000 black mine workers to hold a 3-week nationwide strike.

The mining industry is the pillar of the South African economy and rests on cheap labor and apartheid's migrant-labor system.

When we passed the Anti-Apartheid Act in the last Congress, we struck a blow against apartheid. Today, however, I am deeply troubled about what appears to be a critical loophole in the act. It appears that South African businesses are reacting to the political and economic instability in their country by investing in more stable business environments such as the United States.

According to the Africa Fund, the largest foreign investor in the United States in 1981 was the South African Anglo American Corp., the biggest of the six mining companies struck by the black miners in August.

Very recently, I have become aware that there is a disturbing link between Anglo American and Newmont Mining Corp., a U.S. company which is the largest producer of gold in this country. It appears that Anglo American exercises de facto control over Newmont through a complex web of interlocking directorships and cross minority interests which span the globe.

The purpose of the Anti-Apartheid Act was to create economic disincentives for the continuation of the apartheid system. This purpose is thwarted if companies such as Anglo American can invest profits in capital markets in the United States. Therefore, I intend to introduce legislation which would prohibit the South African mining interests, which benefit from the apartheid system, from investing in United States corporations. I am calling for congressional hearings to determine the extent to which South African mining interests invest in United States companies and the extent to which profits generated in the United States are being invested in South African companies which benefit from the apartheid system.

By prohibiting South African mining interests from investing in United States companies we can strike yet another blow at the very root of the apartheid system. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join in the spirit of my initiative.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALEXANDER). Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5 of rule I, the Chair announces that he will postpone further proceedings today on both motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote is objected to under clause 4 of rule XV.

Such rollcall votes, of postponed, will be taken after debate has been concluded on both motions to suspend the rules.

FREEDOM OF RELIGION IN LITHUANIA

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 192) concerning the denial of freedom of religion and other human rights in Soviet-occupied Lithuania.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. Res. 192

Whereas 1987 marks the 600th anniversary of the Christianization of Lithuania, when the Lithuanian nation embraced Roman Catholicism;

Whereas freedom of religion is a fundamental human right which is explicitly guaranteed by the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the International Covenants on Human Rights, and the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe;

Whereas the Soviet Union has violated the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the International Covenants on Human Rights, and the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe by engaging in the ongoing denial of religious liberty and other human rights in Soviet-occupied Lithuania and elsewhere;

Whereas Lithuanian children are legally prohibited from attending church without their parents and from participating in church activities, parents are actively discouraged from teaching their faith to their