

The Foreign Language Materials Program, operating in West Haven, purchases materials in foreign languages appropriate to the needs of this community.

The LEAP Program, operated through the Southern Connecticut Library Council in Hamden, which brings the latest computer technology to the region for the purpose of facilitating the location of library materials for use in interlibrary loans.

Mr. Speaker, from the above list of special projects in Connecticut's Third District, it is clear that libraries are moving into areas beyond their traditional boundaries. This trend is to be applauded. We in Congress must do all that we can to ensure that it continues, and that the more traditional programs of the library, which are so important to the education and enrichment of our population of all ages, flourish. We must hold to the belief that national defense means more than military security; it means an educated, well-read population with the resources to expand its horizons as well. ●

● Ms. KAPTUR. Mr Speaker, over 30 years ago, the renowned nuclear scientist, J. Robert Oppenheimer, said:

The open society, the unrestricted access to knowledge . . . these are what make a vast, complex, evermore specialized, technological world, nevertheless, a human community.

Our Nation's libraries play a major role in providing that unlimited access to knowledge which creates our human community. And libraries serve as important cornerstones of democracy in building critical thought and freedom of inquiry.

In my district alone, there are 30 libraries serving schools, universities, and the general public. Eight of these libraries participate in a regional program providing reference assistance, books, and audio-visual materials to citizens of several counties. Last year, Toledo, OH, was deemed to be the fourth best read city in the Nation based on use of public libraries as listed in "The Book of American City Rankings." All of us in Ohio's Ninth District are proud of our libraries and the many services they provide to our citizens.

But in today's budgetary climate, libraries are threatened with the elimination of vital Federal funds. This will severely limit their ability to serve as public sources of information, knowledge, and understanding of our world. Among the fiscal year 1986 budget recommendations are proposals to eliminate funding for the fourth year of the Library Services and Construction Act—even though Congress reauthorized the LSCA for 5 years last fall. Library grant programs under title II of the Higher Education Act have also been targeted for removal. The proposed elimination of postal subsidies will increase the costs to libraries that mail books and materials to the blind and physically disabled. For Ohio,

these devastating reductions would amount to over \$11 million in lost services to the illiterate, the disadvantaged and older Americans, funds for construction and renovation of libraries, support for resource sharing and postal service for materials to the blind and handicapped.

Thomas Jefferson, who recognized the importance of libraries by donating his collection to the Nation after the British burned the Library of Congress in 1814, said, "Enlighten the people generally, and tyranny and oppressions of body and mind will vanish like evil spirits at dawn of day." Let us be thankful for our libraries which enable the light of knowledge to be shed for all. ●

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the subject of my special order today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

□ 1550

The SPEAKER [Mr. BOUCHER]. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ECKERT] is recognized for 60 minutes.

[Mr. ECKERT of New York addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAYDOS], is recognized for 30 minutes.

[Mr. GAYDOS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. COATS] is recognized for 60 minutes.

[Mr. COATS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] and I be allowed to switch our positions in the roster today, and that I be allowed to proceed with my special order at this time and that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] may take my place on the roster.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY INCONSISTENCIES

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Speaker, I want to express my appreciation to my colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ], for allowing me to proceed at this point, and he will proceed a little bit later on.

Another gentleman from Texas [Mr. LELAND] and I have jointly requested this special order because we are very troubled by a very fundamental inconsistency in American foreign policy. We have a situation in the world in which the administration tells us we must, as a matter of high national policy, continue to finance a body of revolutionaries in Nicaragua.

People on both sides are being killed. I am not here to talk particularly about atrocities by one side or the other because the relevant point is that that sort of atrocity, the killing of people who volunteer to fight, the killing of innocent people, the destruction of property, and the wounding of small children, is unfortunately in our modern age inevitable when people resort to war. That is not an argument for pacifism. It is an argument for, not easily but for purely political reasons, precipitating a war or financing a war. So we have to look, I think, very carefully at what the justification is for this country continuing to finance a war in Nicaragua in which people get killed.

Well, the administration tells us that that war has got to continue until the Nicaraguan Government, in the elegant diplomatic phrase that our President chose to use—no doubt borrowed from Metternich or one of the 19th century diplomats—as the President said, must "cry uncle." Well, on what must they "cry uncle"? What must they concede to our President to get him to agree that it is not a sensible use of American tax dollars for us to continue to fight this revolution or to finance it?

Well, he says, they must be democratic, they must have free elections, they must treat their people in a civilized fashion. They are told that "if you don't treat your people in a civilized fashion, you can't presumably expect America not to make war on you."

Here is what we have from the President on July 18, 1984; these were the remarks of a participant of the White House outreach group, and the President said:

If the Sandinistas want cooperation and friendship from the civilized world, then they can start by treating their own citizens in a civilized manner. A substantial part of the justification for making war in Nicaragua is that the people of Nicaragua are not given full democratic liberties.

That is what the President said. He has set several conditions which he says they have to agree to if we are to stop financing a war against them: First, they have to stop being a surrogate for the Soviet Union and Cuba;

second, they must reduce their armed forces, which are now 100,000, they must reduce to a level comparable to those of their neighbors. The current imbalance, we are told, is incompatible with regional stability; third, they must stop support for insurgents and terrorists in other countries nearby; and fourth, the Sandinistas must live up to their commitment to democratic pluralism made to the OAS in 1979. The internal opposition is entitled to participate in the political process of the country.

All right, there are four conditions. First, they have to stop being a surrogate for the Soviet Union and Cuba, but that is really an overstatement for the other three. Then they must not have an armed force which is disproportionate to others in the region; they must stop supporting terrorists and armed insurgents elsewhere in their region; and they must treat their country's people democratically. If not, the President says, we will make war on them; we will use American tax dollars to finance this very bloody killing on both sides.

Well, I looked at these conditions, Mr. Speaker. They had a certain familiarity to them. Let us think about another country which has an armed force very disproportionate to anybody else in its region, larger than almost anybody else in the region combined. Let us look at one which has troops in fact in other countries and which is actively supporting armed insurgencies against other internationally recognized governments, and let us look at one that is as repressive to the majority of its people as any government in the world—South Africa. One would have naively thought, looking at the Reagan administration's criterion for one where we finance revolutions, that South Africa would have been high on the list. By almost every criterion given here about Nicaragua, the South Africans are far worse.

Does anybody think that I am disappointed in and critical of the Sandinista regime's failure to live up to promises that were made for full democratic rights for their people? Unfortunately, many governments in the world fall short of that. The problem is, what is the best way to respond to that?

Now, with regard to South Africa—and let me say, having said that I wish the Sandinistas had lived up to democratic principles better than they did—no one could seriously contend the absolute denial of basic humanity, which is the lot of the majority of the people of South Africa, the black majority, and no one could deny that they are treated by their government in a far more repressive fashion and a far less democratic fashion than the people in Nicaragua. It is simply hypocrisy to argue that we are so offended by the censorship of *La Prensa* in Managua—and I deplore that censorship—that we must finance a revolution against the government that censors it, but we can

be the best friend in the world to the Government of South Africa. Because that is what we are.

There is a glaring inconsistency in the policies of the administration regarding Nicaragua and South Africa. To be South Africa's best friend, to preach constructive engagement, to support South Africa at the United Nations against others who would condemn it, to be even more than our Western allies the friend of South Africa makes it very difficult to have anyone believe that this administration is really motivated by a concern over democracy within Nicaragua.

Here is what he said in July, 1984:

If the Sandinistas want cooperation and friendship from the civilized world, then they can start by treating their own citizens in a civilized manner.

What are we told about South Africa? Well, here is what we are told about South Africa by Assistant Secretary of State Elliott Abrams. He is the human rights specialist of this administration. They do not like what South Africa does, but he said, in September of 1984, and I begin to quote:

But we must recognize we are dealing with another sovereign nation and, by no means, the only country in the world to abuse human rights. We cannot dictate to that nation's leaders how to conduct their internal affairs, but we certainly can and do offer our own reactions to what we see.

To the brutal regime of South Africa, repressing its black majority as badly as any human beings on this Earth are mistreated, we must remember that we are dealing with a sovereign nation and we cannot dictate to them how to conduct their internal affairs. To the people of Nicaragua, we can say to them, "We will make war on you until you have elections we like," because that is one of the conditions, and as I read the President's proposal for which he wants to get our approval, all of them have to be satisfied. The Nicaraguan Government has to cancel the elections they had and have new elections, and that is a condition. That is a condition for us. We are not talking now, by the way, about giving aid to Nicaragua. We are not talking about any form of cooperation.

Secretary Shultz says we will continue to pay people to shoot people in Nicaragua until they have elections that we think are fully OK, but with regard to the absolute repression in South Africa, well, that is a sovereign nation, and we cannot interfere.

The hypocrisy is overwhelming, and we are here—and I am about to yield to my friend, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LELAND]—to drive that home. We cannot consistently talk about the sorts of policies that this administration has in Nicaragua and South Africa and make any sense of them.

We are told, with regard to South Africa, "constructive engagement." Let me read one more suggestion, the next time you hear the President say that Nicaragua must "cry uncle."

Among the things they must "cry uncle," they must live up to our version of democracy. I wish they did. I wish that every country in the world did, the Philippines, South Korea, and the People's Republic of China.

I think the President is right to have a rapprochement with the People's Republic of China, but let us not confuse the Chinese Politburo with the American Civil Liberties Union or even the Republican National Committee. This is no great "gang of democrats," but it is OK with the People's Republic of China. It is hypocrisy to pretend that internal democracy or its lack in Nicaragua has anything to do with it.

Here is what the President said about South Africa. This was in December of 1984.

If you are practicing quiet diplomacy, you cannot talk about it or it won't be quiet anymore.

There is a brilliance here we have not fully appreciated in this man's subtlety.

And then he says:

I have always believed that it is counterproductive for one country to splash itself all over the headlines demanding that another government do something because that other government is then put in an almost impossible political position.

He thinks it is tactically unwise to demand that the South African Government stop shooting down innocent black South Africans who are protesting their repression, but he can insist that the Nicaraguan Government "cry uncle" about internal democratic proceedings or else we will pay people to go and make war on them.

Mr. Speaker, I will now yield to my friend, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LELAND].

□ 1600

Mr. LELAND. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding. I also want to say I truly appreciate the gentleman's wisdom as well as his leadership on this matter. The gentleman and I discussed just the other day the contradictions and hypocrisy that the Reagan administration has espoused. We are truly disturbed by those contradictions.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday Secretary of State George Shultz said of U.S. policy toward South Africa, "We must not stand by and throw American matches on the emotional tinder of the region."

Earlier, he had stated:

The only course consistent with American values is to engage ourselves as a force for constructive peaceful change. It is not our business to cheer on, from the sidelines, the forces of polarization that could erupt in a race war; it is not our job to exacerbate hardship, which could lead to the same result.

Yet, the Reagan administration has chosen to do just that—throw American matches on the emotional tinder—in its Central American policy.

The blitz and hype surrounding the President's request for aid for the Contras in Nicaragua and his call for

the continuation of the worthless policy of constructive engagement for South Africa highlight the inconsistency and hypocrisy which the President has time and time again demonstrated in his foreign policy.

The President has equated the Contras in Nicaragua to our great Nation's Founding Fathers—true democrats. He continually refers to them as freedom fighters, as opposed to Contras, and is earnestly setting out to convince the American public and Congress that these "freedom fighters" are groups of peasants, farmers, small businessmen and others disillusioned with the Sandanista Government who desperately seek a free and democratic Nicaragua.

I cannot understand how the President can justify calling a band of men and women whose hallmarks are rape, pillage, kidnaping, and murder freedom fighters. How did the President come to the conclusion that the Contras are made up primarily of humble Nicaraguans disillusioned with the revolution? It is a known fact that the largest group of Contras is made up of former national guardsmen from the Brutal Somoza regime. The brutalities executed by the guardsmen under Somoza caused Nicaraguans en masse to rise against the government. How can then can President Reagan claim that the majority of Nicaraguans now support these same people who inflicted such atrocities on them earlier?

The President continues to claim that we have a moral obligation to help these terrorists in the name of democracy.

Let's turn to another region now, South Africa. The conflict in South Africa has received almost as much publicity as the conflict in Nicaragua lately. And the conflicts in both countries do have some similarities.

President Reagan is highly critical of the Sandinista government because of what he perceives as questionable elections and repressions of government opponents, freedom of the press, and the private business sector.

But what of the Botha government in South Africa? The overwhelming majority of South Africans have no political voice, let alone a vote. Those who oppose the government are jailed, mysteriously disappear, or are murdered. And what greater repression of the private business sector than keeping a majority of a nation's people restricted to certain areas and in such destitution that the thought of owning a business is not even a fantasy?

Yet the Reagan policy regarding South Africa is "quiet diplomacy." In no way does the President want to offend Botha. But Reagan appears to have no qualms about offending the Sandanista government. He continually attempts to intimidate them by sending troops to train in neighboring Honduras and urging support of the contras. Reagan has chosen confrontational politics in Nicaragua and silent politics in South Africa.

In South Africa, as in Nicaragua, there are factions who do not agree with the government, who have never had illusions about democratic treatment from the government. The overwhelming majority who oppose the South Africa's apartheid system are the humble of South Africa. I do not deny that some in South Africa have taken a more strident approach to ending the abuses of democracy and human rights in South Africa, like the African National Congress.

President Reagan, however, does not acknowledge the people fighting for freedom and democracy in South Africa as freedom fighters.

Based on President Reagan's statements that we "have an obligation to be of help where we can to freedom fighters and lovers of freedom and democracy" and that we should stand in strong support of those who have had "tyranny imposed on them by force, deception, and fraud" I would think that the President would seek consistency in his foreign policies.

Therefore, shouldn't President Reagan recognize and aid all freedom fighters who strive for democracy and justice? I've drafted a resolution calling on the President to be consistent in his foreign policy. If he insists on calling the Contras in Nicaragua freedom fighters and aiding them then he should also recognize members of the African National Congress in South Africa as freedom fighters and secure aid for them as well.

But while the President may find it perfectly justifiable to intimidate and confront the Sandinista government in order to enforce Reagan approved politics, he becomes defensive when asked why the United States is not doing more to bring about change in South Africa. He tries to explain that quiet diplomacy is the only policy that will bring change in South Africa. His policy in South Africa seems to be a one of wishful thinking—if he wishes long and hard enough maybe apartheid will go away. If this is the case, President Reagan isn't wishing enough, because apartheid is still present in South Africa and only cosmetic change has occurred.

In dealing with Nicaragua, Reagan has chosen to do more than wish away the problems there. He has been so eager to bring about change that he has allowed for the flagrant abuse of laws.

The Boland amendment—which President Reagan himself signed into law—prohibits the use of funds for the overthrow of the Nicaraguan Government. Yet the Reagan administration has violated this law several times, from the CIA approved manual on overthrowing the Sandinista Government to Reagan's approval before the American people for the removal of the Sandinista government unless the Sandinistas cry "uncle."

An earlier spending cap of \$24 million for direct and indirect aid to the Contras was repeatedly violated. The

New York Times reported that the CIA charged some of the costs of rebel programs to accounts other than those covered by the \$24 million cap.

The Times further reported that the living expenses of some rebel leaders' families and salaries of some CIA employees sent to Honduras, as well as the cost of CIA manuals, had been charged elsewhere.

And when the United States was prohibited from funding the Contras, President Reagan appealed to friendly allies to aid the Contras.

Time and time again Congress has come to learn of actions taken in regards to Nicaragua after the fact, a clear violation of the Intelligence Oversight Act.

America's Watch has concluded that the Contras "have attacked civilians indiscriminantly; they have tortured and mutilated prisoners; they have murdered those placed hors der combat by their wounds; they have taken hostages; and they have committed outrages against personal dignity."

Yet, these are the people the President has dubbed freedom fighters. A group Ronald Reagan, as our Nation's leader, has chosen to be the recipient of U.S. support and aid.

I am reminded of the saying, "If we allow an immoral government to speak for us then we are responsible for its acts." I do not believe the "silent majority" (as Reagan likes to call the public) wants to be responsible for the atrocities being supported by the Reagan administration. I am speaking out and I urge all concerned Americans to do the same.

□ 1610

Mr. FRANK. I thank the gentleman from Texas for his great leadership.

Mr. RITTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRANK. And I will yield to my friend in 1 second. I just want to summarize a couple of points and then we will open it up.

The point that we want to focus on is much of the justification for the President's request for \$14 million, but \$14 million is only a small part, for continuing substantial sums from America to finance a revolution against the Nicaraguan Government, to finance the Contra attack, is the lack of democracy within Nicaragua. There were other justifications as well, but I reread again Secretary Schultz's speech in February at the Commonwealth Club in San Francisco. There are four points; all of them have to be satisfied before a war America is financing could be called off and one of them is they must live up to their commitment to democratic pluralism. They must be allowing the opposition to participate in the political processes of the country.

It is simply bizarre for South Africa's great friends to say that one of our conditions for stopping armed at-

tacks on the Nicaraguan Government is that they let the people of Nicaragua have more rights when they support a South African Government that totally represses them.

The government, yes, talked about the business sector. Well, if you are black in South Africa you cannot even be an employee in much of your own country. You cannot be in certain businesses.

Yes; progress is coming. They are now about to say, we are told, that if two people of different race make the mistake of feeling an affection for each other, and want through some church to regularize that and become married to each other, that may no longer be a crime. That is the degree of moral barbarism we are dealing with and that we support in many ways by economic relations.

Let me just talk about the strategic question. The administration would genuinely believe, they would have us believe, I guess, that they are opposed equally to what goes on in both places. I would think almost anybody objectively would find South Africa—

Mr. RITTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRANK. I will get to the gentleman in a moment.

At this point I would read into the RECORD some extraneous material from an article by Gregory Nokes of the AP. And he says: "President Reagan says the struggle against the Sandinista Government of Nicaragua is one of the 'greatest moral challenges' since World War II, but critics say the greater challenge, about which Reagan says little, is in South Africa. "The President speaks out forcefully and frequently against Nicaragua, but only seldom criticizes South Africa. Yet there is little disagreement that the mistreatment of South Africa's 22 million blacks by the white minority is much harsher than the human rights abuses of the leftist Sandinistas."

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I include this entire article.

The article referred to follows:

REAGAN SAYS NICARAGUA A "MORAL CHALLENGE" BUT QUIET ON SOUTH AFRICA: AN AP NEWS ANALYSIS

(By R. Gregory Nokes)

WASHINGTON.—President Reagan says the struggle against the Sandinista government of Nicaragua is one of the "greatest moral challenges" since World War II, but critics say the greater challenge, about which Reagan says little, is in South Africa.

The President speaks out forcefully and frequently against Nicaragua, but only seldom criticizes South Africa. Yet there is little disagreement that the mistreatment of South Africa's 22 million blacks by the white minority is much harsher than the human rights abuses of the leftist Sandinistas.

Reagan has accused the Sandinistas of "institutionalized cruelty," alleging brutality toward the Miskito Indian population; suppression, torture and abuse of political opponents, and of using a "scorched earth" policy to force the relocation of tens of thousands of peasants.

Yet South Africa, the only government to make racial discrimination official govern-

ment policy, routinely destroys homes of blacks, and has forced millions to live on reservations known as homelands. Blacks have no vote and no right to protest. Several hundred blacks have been killed in recent months by police who fired on demonstrations, while dozens of black leaders have been jailed on unspecified charges.

Reagan's approach to the two countries reflects his concern that Nicaragua is going Communist, while South Africa is considered an anti-Communist bastion in Africa. But it's a shortsighted policy that will reap its own ill harvest, say critics.

Rep. Howard Wolpe, D-Mich., chairman of the House Subcommittee on Africa, said the administration fails to "understand that South Africa itself is an open invitation to communism."

"Our identification with this kind of regime is actually increasing the dependence of liberation movements in the region on the Soviets and the Cubans," he said.

Randall Robinson, who has organized daily demonstrations outside the South African Embassy here, said the administration errs by focusing exclusively on strategic objectives. "Moral concerns of the deprivation of human rights don't have the slightest consideration," he said.

He said the administration is doing nothing in its policies to head off a possible "blood bath" in South Africa.

But Secretary of State George P. Shultz, speaking at a National Press Club luncheon Tuesday, expressed sharp opposition to a proposal before Congress that would ban new U.S. investment and reduce trade ties. He said the United States "must not throw American matches on the emotional tinder of the region."

He also said conditions are improving, although critics say recent changes are only cosmetic and don't get at the substance of apartheid, which is the denial of any political power to the black majority.

In one of his rare criticisms of South Africa, after 19 black demonstrators were killed by police last month, Reagan said the apartheid practices of the government are "repugnant."

He has said he doesn't criticize South Africa more often because it is "counterproductive for one country to splash itself all over the headlines demanding that another country do something . . . It can't appear to be rolling over at the demands of outsiders."

There is no reluctance to criticize Nicaragua, however, which Reagan said wants "to spread its poison throughout this free and increasingly democratic hemisphere."

"We cannot have the United States walk away from one of the greatest moral challenges in postwar history," he said Monday night in a speech aimed at persuading a reluctant Congress to approve \$14 million in new aid for anti-government guerrillas, known as Contras.

Reagan says the Contras—organized and trained by the Central Intelligence Agency—are freedom fighters worthy of the help that the United States traditionally gives to peoples struggling for freedom. The Contras have received \$80 million from the administration since 1981, but a much older black guerrilla movement in South Africa receives neither Reagan's praise nor American aid.

Wolpe said in an interview that racial attitudes may be a factor in American foreign policy.

"It is hard to escape the possibility that our hang-ups about race in our own society have helped to shape our very different way we respond to the struggle for freedom and dignity in South Africa, in contrast with our easy identification with comparable strug-

gles elsewhere in the world against communist or totalitarian rule," he said.

Chester A. Crocker, the assistant secretary of state for African affairs who helped forge the administration's policy of so-called "constructive engagement," said in an interview it is misleading to compare South Africa with Nicaragua.

"South Africa is not a communist country, for God's sake," he said. "South Africa is not our enemy."

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—R. Gregory Nokes covers diplomatic matters for The Associated Press and has been writing about the administration's policy toward Central America since 1981.)

Mr. FRANK. What is it that keeps them from speaking out against South Africa?

Mr. RITTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRANK. Not at this time. I will yield to the gentleman in a moment.

Mr. RITTER. The gentleman is a great engager in other special orders.

Mr. FRANK. I have not yielded, so I do not know why the gentleman is speaking. I will get to him. We have about 40 minutes left and I promise that I will be glad to let the gentleman speak. I just want to develop the argument.

I want to quote Secretary Shultz. Certainly my friend on the other side would not object to my quoting Secretary Shultz.

Secretary Shultz said yesterday in a quote as to why we cannot fight against South Africa too hard, why we have to be constructively engaged in South Africa: "A society that feels immensely threatened by outside forces is less likely to loosen the controls at home."

Now if you are seriously trying to get the Nicaraguan Government to be more democratic, you do that. Let me put it this way: You make the Nicaraguan Government being more democratic by financing a war against them. But in South Africa, you do not rise your voice too loudly because if they feel threatened by outside forces, they are less likely to loosen the controls at home.

And here is Secretary Shultz again:

We cannot have it both ways. We cannot have influence with people if we treat them as moral lepers, especially when they are themselves beginning to address the agenda of change.

We must not treat the South Africans as moral lepers, but we can shoot the Nicaraguans because that will bring them to change. But we cannot criticize too harshly South Africa. That is the kind of incredible use of language to cause there to be no credibility for the President's program. That is what we wanted to focus on.

Let me read just one last final quote from Chester A. Crocker, the Assistant Secretary of State of African Affairs. This is in January of 1985 that it was printed, but he said it in September. An Assistant Secretary of State over at the State Department talking about how we would like change in South Africa. He says:

Americans reject instinctively scenarios that would have us instigate revolutionary violence and racial strife in that country . . .

Apparently violence without racial strife is OK, but revolutionary violence and racial strife with violence we cannot have.

Our goals can only be reached through a sustained process of peaceful evolutionary change. We remain opposed to the resort to violence from whatever quarter; the fruits of political violence in the world today are bitter reminders of what terrorism and counterterrorism can mean.

This is not coming from Mike Farrell or from opponents of the President's policy or the National Council of Churches. This is the Assistant Secretary of State of the United States of America explaining our policy in South Africa.

We remain opposed to the resort to violence from whatever quarter. [We] reject instinctively scenarios that would have us instigate revolutionary violence and racial strife . . .

. . . the fruits of political violence in the world today are bitter reminders of what terrorism and counterterrorism can mean . . .

As someone who is unhappy with the Sandinistas' lack of democracy, how in the name of anything rational can you say these things and then finance in the name of democracy in part a \$14 million first installment on a war?

Mr. DYMALLY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRANK. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DYMALLY. I thank the gentleman very much for yielding.

I have an appointment with the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee and I trust that I will take this matter up with him, too.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know of any issue that is more pressing in the world today than the question of the racist regime in South Africa. I join with my colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK] and my colleague from Texas [Mr. LELAND] in expressing my indignation over the situation in South Africa and the failure of this administration to move forcibly against the racist regime.

I conclude by saying this: I take very strong exception as an American to the fact that the President referred to the Contras in Nicaragua as freedom fighters but then blame the freedom fighters in South Africa for fighting for their rights and lay the blame on the whole unrest there on the freedom fighters. And as a black, I take strong exception to the Secretary of State referring to these Contras in Nicaragua as brothers. Brother is a term of endearment born out of the civil rights movement for the struggle for justice and democracy, and it seems to me it is a double standard that points out the hypocrisy of this administration's efforts in South Africa.

I commend the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK] and the gen-

tleman from Texas [Mr. LELAND] for calling this special order and I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. FRANK. I thank the gentleman. Mr. RITTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRANK. I now yield to my friend from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RITTER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I think there is some difference between the situation in South Africa and Nicaragua. I am not here in any way to defend apartheid or the policies of the South African Government. But I would like to call my colleague's attention to certain situations that have occurred in the last 15 years around the country, around the world, whereby authoritarian regimes have made the transition to democracy. For example, Greece under the colonels eventually went democratic. We did not sponsor a war of national liberation, of violent upheaval in Greece. We, to some extent, worked with the Greek Government, worked with the traditional forces within the society, traditional forces like the business community, traditional forces like the church, traditional forces engaged in political opposition that was not totally destroyed.

I think the same can be said of Spain under Franco. When Franco died, Spain made a transition to democratic rule.

Recently, in South America, there has been a spate of nations which having formerly been authoritarian made the transition to democratic rule. Argentina recently, not too long ago, was under the dictatorship of the Generals. We did not go into Argentina and support the Montenegro leftist guerrillas. We worked to some extent with a system; we supported those institutions and those traditions within the government.

□ 1620

Mr. FRANK. I will take back my time for just a second in order to ask the gentleman a question: As I understand it he is giving all these instances when we have refrained from financing an armed rebellion against an undemocratic society. Do I take it he is about to announce against funding the Contras? I am just curious.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RITTER. No. I am trying to make the distinction, if the gentleman would continue to yield, and I do appreciate his yielding, I am trying to make a distinction between some of these undesirable authoritarian regimes on the right which have had the seeds of transition to more democratic societies.

For example, we have worked with the Korean Government and strides have been made towards opening up the Korean political system, as recent elections show. They have a long way to go to become a United States-style democracy, there is no doubt about it.

But nobody is interested in foisting a North Korean type of war of national liberation on them.

Brazil, Uruguay have recently made the transition from authorization rightwing regimes to democratic systems.

Mr. FRANK. I am going to take back my time in order to make a point briefly. Let me say to the gentleman I understand and I agree to all that.

Mr. RITTER. Will the gentleman continue to yield?

Mr. FRANK. No, the rules are such that the gentleman may speak when I yield to him. Under the gentleman's special order I may speak when he yields to me. But I simply want to set the ground rules.

The point is simply this. I only have an hour and there are other Members who want to speak.

Mr. RITTER. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. FRANK. I would ask the gentleman, Mr. Speaker, to please abide by the rules. I would be glad to continue to yield if the gentleman would abide by the rules of the House. I do not write the rules of the House, I only vote for them.

Mr. RITTER. Well, may I sum up my point?

Mr. FRANK. No; I will be glad to yield to the gentleman briefly, but I will not if we cannot abide by the rules of the House. I do not think it is possible—

Mr. RITTER. Will the gentleman yield to me briefly?

Mr. FRANK. I will yield in a few minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK] controls the time.

Mr. FRANK. I say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that if he wants to give this list, and I agree with him, and I think it was a wise thing that we did in some cases. When Raul Alfonsin became President of Argentina winning a democratic election, I was very proud that he had Pat Derian who was Assistant Secretary for Human Rights in the Carter administration, to be at his inauguration because he said if it had not been for her and the kind of pressure she had brought on that regime that preceded him, he might have not lived even to run. And I agree that we can do that. My point is that it is not relevant to the issues we are talking about today because we are talking about South Africa.

I would reject the suggestion that there is in this explicitly racist regime of South Africa anything that really resembles what has gone on in Argentina and Greece.

There is, I think, a qualitative difference with the people who say—you see the problem we had with these other nations was this: the Greeks, the Franco regime, they said democracy is no good. We have something in South Africa where they say "Oh, democracy is wonderful." The people who run

South Africa, the white South Africans say democracy is the only legitimate form of government "for us human beings. But for you black people, you don't count and you don't get this." Therefore I am rejecting the gentleman's analogy. The fact that the Greek Government did move, I do not think the South African Government is going to move. On the other hand I would also point out to the gentleman that we are not here arguing and let me make this clear, the gentleman from Texas, myself, the gentleman from California [Mr. DYMALLY], we are not arguing for the Reagan policy of Nicaragua to be transferred to South Africa. We are not here suggesting that not \$14 million but a proportionate amount would be \$50 million or \$60 million, be given to armed resistance by the African National Congress.

We are not here suggesting that you finance armed revolt against the South African Government. We are saying that to finance armed revolt against Nicaraguans and say democracy is one of the reasons, they do not say it is the only one, but to count that at all and then to say "We can't even yell at the South Africans" I think is inconsistent.

So I would say to the gentleman what he said is not relevant to the argument here.

I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RITTER. I appreciate the gentleman's yielding.

First of all we are fighting, that is we are supporting wars of national liberation, in Afghanistan.

Mr. FRANK. Yes.

Mr. RITTER. A wide cross-section of this Congress, the committee at least, has supported aid through Thailand for the San Son resistance in Cambodia. And I think the reason is that there has not been any kind of authoritarian government's transition to a democracy other than in Grenada which was done by force. I think it is a realization that there simply is no movement of Communist totalitarian governments toward more liberal forms of government and that the people who are willing to take up arms on behalf of democratic principles perhaps deserve some support.

Mr. FRANK. Let me take back my time to ask the gentleman a question and I will yield to him. He has not yet said and none of his arguments make any sense unless he is about to tell us that the South African Government is in fact going to move. I do not see any sign that if you follow the Reagan policies of constructive engagement, of not being rude to them, blaming some of the rioters for getting shot as the President did—

Mr. RITTER. I am not supporting that.

Mr. FRANK. Right. I would agree with some of the examples that the gentleman gave but the point is they

are not available to defend the Reagan policy in South Africa.

The point is simply this. The gentleman is making arguments about other countries. We are talking about South Africa. Let me be very explicit: When George Shultz says, "We are so concerned about the censorship of La Prensa, it distresses me so to see a newspaper censored that I am going to finance a revolution against the people who censor it," when he then turns around and says, "but with regard to South Africa if you make someone a moral leper then you can't have any influence." What I am saying is it is not true, the Secretary of State and others who say that, including the President, are speaking an untruth to the American people when they say that the Nicaraguan policy is motivated in part by concern over internal democracy.

The South African example and their own rhetoric belies that. Now yes, there are other countries that have moved. As far as South Africa is concerned, let me say that I have seen more movement in behalf of some far-left countries. Let us take one of the President's best friends right now, the People's Republic of China. He has great relations with them. There have been some movement, more liberalization, more improvement from the Mao days to the Deng Xiaoping days today in China than in South Africa. So while I agree with what the gentleman has said that we have not seen democracy come to any of those Communist countries, we have seen, if you are going to take South Africa, we have seen the lot of a Chinese citizen today is better economically and politically in terms of liberalization than it was under Mao. For the South Africans it has gotten worse. They have even lost the right of living in their own country. The South African Government in the most cosmetic way talks nice and in fact is getting worse and more brutal. I am simply saying that the argument that the gentleman makes while it is historically of great interest, it is irrelevant to the argument here.

I yield to the gentleman from Texas at this time.

Mr. LELAND. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to address myself to Mr. RITTER and some of the observations that he has made.

What I do not understand is the logic of his argument because if you lay out the foundation for the history the gentleman has given then in fact we ought to be supporting the South African liberation fighters or the true freedom fighters there for the liberation of the majority of the people in South Africa, financially and otherwise.

Mr. RITTER. I would like to respond to that.

Mr. LELAND. All we are trying to say in this discussion, if you will, is that if, in fact, President Reagan can

make so many statements that are favorable toward the Contras in Nicaragua, then those statements ought to be truly, in many instances or in most instances I venture to say, those statements ought to be made more so about the people who are struggling for freedom in South Africa.

Mr. FRANK. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RITTER. I think what one can see in South Africa that is similar, for example, to some of the other countries that made the transition, not that South Africa is that close to transition, but there is an independent church, there is an independent business community, there is an independent intellectual community and academic community. These are the seeds that eventually can, if one works with them, make the transition.

Mr. FRANK. I would ask the gentleman this question: for black people?

Mr. RITTER. Just one second, please. The Chinese experience, yes, there is liberalization in China but if anyone thinks the Chinese people have anything regarding any kind of freedom that even existed in Greece under the colonels, I think that is stretching it.

The fact about Nicaragua is that it is on our southern border. The fact about Nicaragua is that it does not—

Mr. FRANK. I have to take back my time for a second because the gentleman said Nicaragua was on our southern border. Has he misplaced a few countries? What happened to like Mexico and Panama, not Panama but the others above it? Nicaragua is not on our southern border.

Mr. RITTER. Nicaragua is very close to the southern border of the United States.

Mr. FRANK. I will give the gentleman "close."

Mr. RITTER. There is no way one can consider it on the southern border, it is not literally on the southern border.

Mr. LELAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRANK. I will let the gentleman from Pennsylvania finish if I may.

□ 1630

Mr. RITTER. I guess my point about Nicaragua is, it is one of these totalitarian communist governments. There are people who are willing to take up arms. If you look at the number, 15,000 in a small country of 2½ million, that is like 1.5 million Americans. They say that with the proper material and supplies, 25,000 people would take up arms.

Mr. FRANK. I have to ask the gentleman a question. I want to take back my time to ask the gentleman a question, and then I will yield to the gentleman from Texas.

In the first place, I did not suggest that China today has freedom. I said there has been more advance for the

Chinese peasant from Mao to Deng—

Mr. RITTER. It is because—

Mr. FRANK. I must remind the gentleman that he has to wait for me to yield. Those are the rules we all live by; the gentleman can take out a special order and I will participate there, but we do have to have rules in the House.

The point is this: I simply said that there has been an improvement for the average Chinese that was greater than the improvement for a black in South Africa. I think there has been slippage in the other direction.

I did not say that they had any of those real freedoms. As a matter of fact, it is the Reagan administration that is the great booster of the People's Republic of China—I do not think I have been quite as enthused as the President about some of these things; in fact, I have been critical of the Reagan administration's failure to allow political asylum-seekers from the People's Republic of China into America. I think the State Department has behaved badly in rejecting the asylum application because of the President's political tie-in there.

But I want to get back to the gentleman when he suggests that there is for black people in South Africa, independent business, and an independent intellectual community.

I have to disagree when the gentleman suggests that black people in South Africa today are allowed those basic freedoms. They are not even allowed in many cases to live in certain parts of their own country.

So the suggestion that the black people of South Africa have that kind of independence, I think, is simply wrong.

Does the gentleman want me to yield to him, or his reinforcement?

Mr. RITTER. I would just like to say, I do not believe that there is the great level of independence of blacks in South Africa, but one also must admit that blacks do migrate into South Africa from other black African ruled nations.

Mr. FRANK. And what is the relevance of that?

Mr. RITTER. Excuse me?

Mr. FRANK. Is that in any way a justification or anything relevant—I must say that disturbs me, that suggestion.

Mr. RITTER. There are certain economic—

Mr. FRANK. I want to get back to the point that I was asking. The gentleman suggested that South Africa today resembles Greece. The gentleman said that Nicaragua is a totalitarian regime, and suggested it for the blacks in South Africa. For the whites in South Africa, it is a great place to live; no heavy lifting, because the blacks do it for you.

But in the situation for black people, I would argue that it is far worse than it was for the people of Nicaragua; there is much less freedom for the

blacks, and I would reject the notion that there is the basis for black people to be at all hopeful about this regime in South Africa.

I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RITTER. What I am trying to say is, there are institutions today in South Africa which do not agree with apartheid. There is an independent church which is diametrically opposed to apartheid. There is a press which is opposed in part, which is opposed to apartheid. There are academic institutions, there are business organizations which have gone several steps to enforce celibate principles within their own confines to oppose the system of apartheid.

Mr. FRANK. Reclaiming my time, I want to respond to the gentleman's I think excessive justification of South Africa.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts has the time.

Mr. FRANK. The gentleman should understand. He talks about an independent church in South Africa. Well, there is an independent church in Nicaragua.

You might say, "Well, the church in Nicaragua faces harassment." The churches in South Africa face persecution and harassment that is far worse.

In South Africa they have indicted white churchmen as well as black churchmen. Roman Catholic churchmen have been indicted in South Africa—I do not think that there have been high ranking Roman Catholic churchmen subjected to the kind of police procedures in Nicaragua that they have been in South Africa.

So the argument that because there is an independent church in Nicaragua, they are better off; the South African Catholic Church has been very shabbily treated and persecuted by this government.

I yield first to the gentleman from Texas and then to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. LELAND. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for yielding to me, and let me direct my comments to the statements made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, and let him know that I have a certain empathy for the people of South Africa, because my roots lie somewhere in the Continent of Africa, and because of the brutality that was committed to the black people who were brought here, in terms of our cutting off our roots, we cannot trace back precisely where we came from.

Let me suggest to you that I am very happy to be an American citizen today, because I can stand here and argue with you on the issue apartheid in South Africa whereas there is not a black person in the parliament of South Africa who can argue for the people they would represent, given the opportunity to get elected.

They cannot get elected, not only because they are disallowed from representation for the people who are in the majority in South Africa, but they cannot even vote. They do not even have a vote.

What kind of persecution is that? You talk very cavalierly about what is going on in South Africa. There is nothing cavalier about the fact that people, black people, are relegated to townships, shanty towns, if you will, because white people do not want them to be a part of their social life or their political or economic life.

They do not gain any benefit from being a South African citizen and now they have gotten this incredible scheme where they would cordon off land for the so-called black workers in South Africa and give them that land and let them call that a township.

They have absolutely no rights to participate in society in South Africa at all. What is done in Nicaragua is not comparable to what has gone on in South Africa. How long has the Sandinista government been in power?

Let us also review the history of Nicaragua. What kind of rights did the people under Somoza have? What kind?

I think that the gentleman must understand that what is happening in South Africa now is that things have, as the gentleman from Massachusetts has suggested, have gotten much, much worse.

Anytime the black people get together in groups now, they are subject to being killed. Not just incarcerated or put under house arrest, but now they are fearful of their lives, just for going to a funeral. Just for peacefully demonstrating.

What kind of situation is that? How can we justify our continued involvement? How can we accept the very pedestrian attitude on the part of the Secretary of State of this country to say that in fact those people in South Africa might get a little shaky, the rulers of South Africa might get a little shaky if we push too hard?

Mr. FRANK. I will reclaim my time for a second. I just want to add to the comments of my friend from Texas. He is perplexed, and he wants to know how we can do that. Let me explain. Let me give him the Reagan doctrine on this. It comes from Secretary for Human Rights Abrams—he is the human rights expert.

He says, he might as well have been listening here and wanted to say this to the gentleman from Texas when he talks about people being shot down at funerals:

We must recognize that we are dealing with another sovereign nation. And by no means the only country in the world to abuse human rights. We cannot dictate to that nation's leaders how to conduct their internal affairs.

That is the justification for nonintervention in South Africa. But with Nicaragua, because they have censored

the press and have not had elections that we fully approve of, we can finance a revolution against them.

I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. WEBER. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I have not been a part of this entire discussion; I watched some of it on television in my office. Let me say, I essentially agree with the gentleman from Texas and the gentleman from Massachusetts about the situation in South Africa.

I specifically agree with the gentleman from Massachusetts about the stupidity of the remarks of the Secretary of State. I do not want to get into that argument, particularly, but it seems to me that what we are—where I will disagree with both of the gentlemen is that the situation in Nicaragua is nowhere comparable to the situation in South Africa.

In my judgment, all the elements of the same kind of oppression, if not in degree, but the same kind of oppression are existent in Sandinista Nicaragua that exist in South Africa. There is oppression of the church by the Sandinista government. The archbishop has had his car destroyed twice; once with him in it by the Tour Bus Divinas organized by the Sandinista government; Father Pina has been stripped and beaten by Sandinista soldiers; the Sandinista government has expelled all the foreign priests working with the traditional church and kept only the priests working with the so-called popular church.

So there are elements of religious repression. Even the elements of the resettlement program that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LELAND] so eloquently pointed out, one of the major human rights violations on the planet which is taking place right now in South Africa, but there is even an element of that in Nicaragua, as 3,000 to 4,000 families in the Montegulpa Province and the other northern areas of the country are being relocated by the Sandinista government, having their families torn apart.

□ 1640

In my judgment, if there is a difference in degree between Nicaragua and South Africa, it is only because the Sandinistas have not had a sufficient amount of time to entrench the totalitarian nature of their state.

Mr. FRANK. I will take my time back now. The gentleman has made his statement. I will take my time back, and I want to make one point clear. We were not here, essentially, arguing that particular point. What we were saying was this: The gentleman said he is willing to concede, I guess, that South Africa, for black people, is maybe a degree or two worse than Nicaragua.

Mr. WEBER. I just said it is worse. I did not say a degree or two. I said it is worse.

Mr. FRANK. All right. The gentleman concedes that South Africa is worse than Nicaragua. Now he thinks if you give Nicaragua time, they may overturn them. The point we are making is this: We are addressing that part of the Reagan administration's justification for making war on Nicaragua which says we are concerned about democracy.

If you want to argue the other point, you can. What I am saying is—

Mr. WEBER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRANK. No; I have not yielded yet, because I want to get back on the point. The point we are making is this—

Mr. WEBER. I am trying to address the point.

Mr. FRANK. Well, then get a special order and address it.

The point is, the administration has said that one of the moral justifications for making war on Nicaragua with American money is their lack of democracy. At the same time it has said with regard to South Africa:

You can't expect the government to change. They are a sovereign nation. If we push too hard, they will rebel against us. That is not the way to do it.

What we are saying is, it is hypocritical for a government to make excuses for not pressing very hard against South Africa. And I admired the letter that the gentleman and others on his side of the aisle sent to the South African Government. I thought it was an important letter. I wish it reflected administration policy.

Let us not lose sight of the fact that the No. 1 defender of apartheid in America today, as I remember him from his statements in the columns he wrote, he is now the Director of Communications, Mr. Buchanan. Mr. Buchanan has basically defended apartheid. He is in the White House. That is the policy we have today.

What we are saying is, this administration, if they want to persuade us that 3 million poorly organized people in Nicaragua are a threat to this great superpower, let them do it on that basis. But let them not try to invoke democratic principles, because when the gentleman agrees South Africa is, if anything, even worse, even if they are both unfortunate, where do you get any justification for saying, given the South African policy, that one of the reasons we are making war on Nicaragua is democracy?

The speech says there were four conditions. One of the Secretary of State's and President's conditions for calling off the war is the lack of democracy. Well, if we were to go to war against everybody in part on that basis, I think we would be bankrupt.

I yield to my friend from Texas.

Mr. GONZALEZ. I impose on my colleague quite reluctantly, but only because the gentleman that you just yielded to before on the other side has made a grievous misstatement of truth and fact, and I would like at this point

to provide, if the gentleman agrees with this unanimous-consent request, a reply to this question of so-called religious persecution in Nicaragua, by Rev. William Callahan, who is here now in the Washington area but has worked and lived in Nicaragua for many, many years, and I just want to state at this point the categorical answer that he makes to this, in view of the fact that the President had talked quite insincerely, I think, about using the hierarchy as sort of a medium of reconciliation.

"The Roman Catholic bishops, as a whole," in Nicaragua, "have taken a strong adversarial position toward the Sandinista party and toward the newly elected Nicaraguan Government. They are not perceived as impartial either inside Nicaragua or internationally."

"The struggle between the bishops and the Nicaraguan Government is essentially political, not religious; that is, a struggle over 'turfs,' not over religious freedom," which has been one of the long-associated historical dilemmas in the Latin American countries, beginning with Mexico and proceeding on south.

Many religious opponents of the Nicaraguan Government suggest that Nicaragua will become "another Cuba."

Exactly the opposite has happened. The very opposite. In Cuba, the churches were restricted to the churches and the religious practitioners restricted to the churches, they have been closed, to all intents and purposes, religious schools have been closed, the Catholic Church had fought Castro, lost, and has been sharply reduced in scope and influence.

Exactly the opposite is true after 6 years in power of the so-called Sandinista regime. "Churches of all denominations enjoy freedom of worship. The churches are vigorous." The Nicaraguans are a highly religious people, "as witnessed in the public activity of those supporting the revolution and those opposing it. Religious schools are flourishing, and the intrachurch debates are vigorous."

Fourth, "the struggle in Nicaragua is not only between the government and the bishops but within the church community, i.e., between Catholics who oppose the revolution and those powerful segments of the Catholic community that support the revolution."

Mr. FRANK. I will just say to my friend from Texas that unfortunately I only have 5 minutes remaining.

Mr. GONZALEZ. I thought it would be appropriate to put that in.

Mr. FRANK. I appreciate it. I hope it will be inserted. But I did want to have time to yield a little bit to my two friends. Let me go to my friend from Minnesota first and then to my friend from California. I will keep about a minute for myself.

Mr. WEBER. Let me just ask my colleague, the gentleman from Texas had a unanimous consent request. I do not want to interrupt the free flow of debate, but I hope the gentleman is not going to insert at this point in the RECORD massive volumes of materials, because if he is going to do that, I would like to do the same thing to hold out my point of view. I would hope that the gentleman would agree with me that neither of us would go messing up their special order with all sorts of unanimous consent requests at this time.

Mr. FRANK. Well, the gentleman from Minnesota will not be surprised if the gentleman from Texas has his own special order.

Mr. WEBER. I am sure that he does.

Mr. FRANK. And he will put in whatever he thinks is appropriate.

Mr. WEBER. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I will not go into this at any great length. I will just say that in my visit to that part of the world I explored more than any other question the question of the situation of the Catholic Church.

Mr. FRANK. Which part of the world, South Africa or Nicaragua?

Mr. WEBER. Both in El Salvador and in Nicaragua, not in South Africa.

Mr. FRANK. Not in South Africa.

Mr. WEBER. And I disagree with the conclusions of the gentleman from Texas. We were told by Archbishop Obando y Bravo that over 860 priests in Nicaragua remained loyal to the traditional church and only 10 Nicaraguan priests and 40 foreign priests are loyal to the so-called Popular Church.

Furthermore, the Popular Church, which does not attract very large crowds at Sunday mass when we were there at that time, is subsidized heavily by the government. Half a million dollars went to the center which subsidizes the Popular Church and the Sandinista government. Let me just conclude, and then I will give your time back.

Mr. FRANK. I just wanted to ask the gentleman, because that is not basically my point, I wanted to ask him, does he think that the fact that a church is mistreated, which I greatly deplore, is an independent reason for America to finance an armed assault on the government that does it? Because I think the South African Government mistreats its churches as badly and in many cases worse, with indictments and persecutions, as Nicaragua. So I am not here to say that these things do not happen, simply that it is hypocritical for this administration to advance that as an independent reason for attack.

I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. WEBER. One, I am responding to the gentleman from Texas, who took specific issue with my comments. Two, I do not think in and of itself that the nature of religious freedom in any country is reason for us to justify the overthrow of that government.

However, the nature of religious freedom in the country of Nicaragua, to the extent which it exists and the attitude the government takes toward it, together with other facts we know about that government, are substantial evidence of the nature of that government and should be brought to bear in the debate.

Mr. FRANK. I have to take back my time. Yes; they are evidence of the nature of the government. The point the gentleman from Texas and I are making is this: It is hypocritical to be South Africa's best friend—I do not mean the gentleman from Minnesota, who has been very good on this subject of South Africa—it is hypocritical for this administration to be South Africa's friend and say we cannot pressure them politically and then find a lack of democracy as any part of the justification for an assault on Nicaragua. If they want to justify the American people taking scarce dollars to encourage people to kill each other in Nicaragua, they better find some other reason than that they are concerned about democracy, because as South Africa's friend, as Marcos' friend, as the friend of so many other dictators, right and left, the People's Republic of China, when was the last time they pressured them for democracy?

Mr. LELAND. Chile, Mr. Pinochet in Chile.

Mr. FRANK. Chile, which is far more oppressive, right in our own hemisphere. It simply will not wash for them to invoke democracy, and it degrades the debate for them to pretend.

Let me yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HUNTER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

To get back to the gentleman's original point, I think the gentleman has made a good case for inconsistency here manifest in the statements of Mr. Shultz and others in the administration. My question for the gentleman is, because it appeared to me that the gentleman was saying that he agrees that the Sandinistas do pose—at least there is an argument to be made for a military threat and that they are, in many cases, as bad as the South Africans—

Mr. FRANK. No; let me just say to the gentleman that I disagree with their internal policies, I think they are undemocratic; I am not afraid of the Sandinistas because Nicaragua is a small, rather poor country. I would be inclined, as a citizen of Massachusetts, to be more afraid of Connecticut than I am of Nicaragua, because they have a better industrial base. But the point I would make is that I am critical of their lack of democracy, I am not frightened of them. And I am not a big tough guy, this is not a macho act, it is just geopolitics.

I yield back to the gentleman.

Mr. HUNTER. My question is simply this: Does the gentleman feel—because

the Contra vote obviously is coming up, and the gentleman has not indicated how he is going to vote on that. Does the gentleman feel that there is enough of a proxy Soviet presence there in Nicaragua or a potential presence, satellite presence, to be a threat on the magnitude of Cuba?

Mr. FRANK. I will take 1 minute, and then I will yield to the gentleman from Texas.

No; in the first place, if it were a threat of the magnitude of Cuba, I suppose we would have to go and invade Cuba too, and I think that disproves the gentleman's point. If it is a Cuba-type threat, if it is a proxy for Cuba, what do you get by doing away with the proxy when the real thing is still there just a few miles away?

I do not think that America should be the 911 of civil liberties, every time people repress their citizens you dial 911, out comes Bill Casey and \$50 million and a comic book about how to murder people and blow up their toilets. I think that is a great waste. I am not afraid of Nicaragua. I think we can say, as a majority of both parties of this House said, we are prepared to support policies that interdict the shipment of arms elsewhere, but I am not for invading them, and I am for an equivalent policy, I am not for funding the African National Congress, I am not for making war on South Africa, I am for the kinds of economic sanctions in South Africa I think would help.

I will yield, to finish up, to the gentleman from Texas.

□ 1650

Mr. LELAND. I would just like to ask the gentleman if, on the premise that we have involved ourselves and the way that we have as a Government in Nicaragua, should not we attack the Soviet Union right now since in fact we are worried about their involvement? I mean, that is exactly what the parameters of the discussion happen to be. That is what the gentleman is suggesting.

Mr. FRANK. I say to my friend from Texas: Please do not give them any ideas.

● Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my distinguished colleagues, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LELAND] and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK] for reserving this special order on the Reagan administration's "constructive engagement" approach toward the South African Government. The President would have us to believe that this approach is the key to changing the racist system of apartheid in South Africa. That is not the case.

The American news media depicts almost daily the mounting injustices, senseless killings, and horrors that are a part of the everyday life of the 22.7 million black South Africans. Although they comprise the majority of the population, blacks in South Africa,

virtually have no political, economic, or social power. The majority is ruled by the minority—4.7 million white South Africans. White South Africans can vote. Black South Africans cannot. For every \$1 a white employee earns, a black earns 22 cents.

Mr. Speaker, while the United States simply watches, the grand scheme of apartheid to establish satellite black townships where blacks are relegated and robbed of their homeland is in full swing. Institutional discrimination and overt racism are the law of the land. Violence and unjustified killings by government police against unarmed black South Africans are on the increase.

"Constructive engagement" will not change this situation. In fact, the Reagan administration approach may worsen it. Constructive engagement has lulled the white ruling South African Government into actually believing that apartheid can survive.

The Reagan administration's approach is a simplistic response to a complex problem. It is also a comfortable position for the United States. Over 300 American corporations conduct business in South Africa. South Africa's minerals are imported, in large quantities, into the United States. And, South Africa is a major ally of the United States in that part of the globe.

It is a tough decision. But, leaders of this Nation, the self-proclaimed champion of the oppressed around the globe, must take a firm stand on the side of justice in South Africa. Constructive engagement is not the answer. Only swift and effective action by the American Government will push the South African ruling minority government to review and abolish the apartheid system.

Mr. Speaker, the Anti-Apartheid Act, introduced by my distinguished colleague, Congressman BILL GRAY, is a good first step. The bill prohibits American businesses from making new investments in or loans to South Africa. The bill further prohibits the sale in this country of the gold South African kruggerand coin and sets forth steps from the sanctions to be lifted.

The Anti-Apartheid Act is tough action, not meaningless talk like the Reagan administration constructive engagement approach. The American Government must act, decisively, before it is too late in South Africa. ●

● Mr. SOLARZ. Mr. Speaker, I am extremely pleased to sponsor H.R. 1460, the anti-Apartheid Act of 1985, which was introduced on March 7, 1985. For several years now, along with many like-minded colleagues in the House of Representatives, I have sought to enact legislation to limit American economic and political relations with South Africa and to express our commitment to see the policy of apartheid eradicated. Such legislation passed the House of Representatives last year, but unfortunately died in the Senate in the last hours of the session. None-

theless, in the ensuing months advocates of sanctions have been encouraged and renewed by the demonstrations of concern and commitment by thousands of Americans on this issue, and we are pleased to reintroduce the South Africa sanctions bill for passage during the current session of Congress.

Virtually all Americans would agree that South Africa's apartheid system is incompatible with democratic principles and human rights. Any system of government which excludes by definition the overwhelming majority of people who live in that country merely because of the color of their skin is a system of government that we would find fundamentally objectionable. The question we confront in the Congress is not how to assess apartheid, but how to respond to it.

The answer advanced by the Reagan administration is a policy known as a constructive engagement, grounded in the belief, as Assistant Secretary of State Chester Crocker has said, "that it is not our task to choose between black and white." After 4 years, the verdict is in on the constructive engagement approach. It is a flawed and failed policy, a monument to moral myopia and wishful thinking. It has caused South Africa neither to relax its racist repression at home, nor to end its control of Namibia in defiance of international law. Meanwhile, the United States is paying an increasingly heavy price, with the black majority in South Africa, with other African nations, and even with some of our Western allies, for a policy which is often perceived as a reapproachment with racism.

Clearly, it is now time to abandon constructive engagement and bring forward a new approach, one which makes clear in deed as well as word our abhorrence of apartheid. It is time to develop a policy in which we choose not between black and white, but between justice and injustice. In designing and executing such a policy, we should cast aside any illusions that our actions will bring the apartheid system to its knees. In the final analysis, a political resolution of South Africa's problems must come from within South Africa, not from the United States or any other outside nation. At the same time, there are a number of steps we could take which would have a significant symbolic and substantive impact upon events in South Africa. Several of those steps are embodied in the legislation that was introduced on March 7, 1985. The bill has four parts: First, a ban on loans by U.S. banks to the South African Government or its parastatal entities, except for loans made for educational, housing, and health facilities which are available on a totally nondiscriminatory basis in areas open to all population groups; second, no new investment by American companies in South Africa; third, a ban on the importation into the United States of the South African

kruggerand or any other gold coin minted by the South African Government; and fourth, a ban on the sales of computers (which are used to enforce apartheid) to the South African Government.

Critics of the legislation contended that it is wrong to single out South Africa for special condemnation when there are so many other human rights violators around the world. But the fact is that for a variety of reasons the United States has adopted stringent measures against other nations—restrictions which have frequently been more sweeping than those proposed in this bill. For example, in 1978 we enacted a total economic embargo on trade with Uganda. Under the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, the United States maintains an embargo on economic transactions with Cuba, Vietnam, Cambodia, and North Korea and implemented an embargo against Iran during the hostage crisis. Under the United Nations Participation Act, we carried out extensive economic sanctions against the white minority government of Rhodesia for many years. The Export Administration Act contains other provisions under which exports to South Africa and many other nations are controlled or restricted on grounds of short supply, national security, anti-terrorism, human rights, nonproliferation of nuclear weapons, and other foreign policy considerations.

Given the actions we have taken against other human rights violators, I believe our Nation would be more open to a charge of inconsistency and selective indignation in our foreign policy if we failed to enact this legislation. If we believe human rights to be a valid and important consideration in our foreign policy, it would seem to be particularly inappropriate to carry on business as usual with the apartheid regime. While all forms of dictatorship and tyranny are objectionable, there is something especially repulsive about a system of tyranny based on the doctrine of racial exclusion because that idea strikes in a very fundamental and insidious way at the dignity of human beings.

I believe it is now up to the Congress to point us toward a fundamentally different course in our relations with South Africa, a course which serves both our sense of national purpose and our national interest, which is consistent with our own commitment to individual freedom and recognizes the reality of eventual majority rule in that nation. ●

● Mr. LEVINE of California. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have the opportunity to participate in this special order on the lack of firm action by the Reagan administration against the practice of apartheid by the South African Government.

On taking office in 1981, the Reagan administration formulated the policy of constructive engagement to encour-

age peaceful change away from apartheid in South Africa. But treating this odious practice in such a benign manner is like treating terminal cancer with laetrile. It just doesn't work.

The South African Government operates under an entrenched system of institutional racism, in open defiance of any standard of civilized society. Yet the Reagan administration still prefers to adhere to its misguided policy and to reward this inhuman South African Government by making it the United States' largest trading partner and by becoming the second-largest foreign investor in South Africa.

Through apartheid, the South African Government allows a minority of 4.5 million whites to deny 22 million black South Africans their basic human rights. Black South Africans cannot vote. They cannot run for political office to have a voice in their own destiny. The South African Government's homelands policy has resulted in over 9 million black South Africans being stripped of their citizenship in the land of their own birth. The South African Government has increased its oppression of trade unions. Its policies have resulted in the death of blacks fighting for their rights and for their ever-elusive freedom. A virtual police state exists in South Africa.

Mr. Speaker, we must raise our voices loudly and clearly in opposition to the unconscionable practice of apartheid and to the Reagan administration's policy. Constructive engagement is not the answer. Tolerance of apartheid is not the answer. We must remember the oppressed black South Africans longing for their freedom and for the respect they deserve. We must speak for them and to agitate on their behalf. Our national values and interests mandate that we take up the cause of those longing to be free of the shackles of their oppressors. It is our moral responsibility.

We can help break the back of apartheid by breaking the grip of those who foster that obnoxious practice. We must remember the human beings for whom and with whom we fight. We must keep them and their indomitable spirit in our hearts and minds. We can have an effect by opposing administration policy and by passing strong antiapartheid legislation, which I endorse wholeheartedly. We can do that by expressing our views and by pressing unceasingly against the relentless wall of apartheid.

South African bishop, Desmond Tutu, recipient of the 1984 Nobel Prize for Peace, has said that no amount of repression can contain the millions of black South Africans who are determined to be free. Let us join them in their determination and their efforts. We must stand with them, hands joined, in unity of spirit, for a cause that is right. One day they will be

free, and I, for one, want to help hasten that day.●

● Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join with my colleagues in supporting H.R. 1460, the Anti-Apartheid Act of 1985.

South Africa is the only country in the world that practices legally mandated racism. The United States cannot associate itself with a government that oppresses 23 million of its citizens. As the champion of democracy, freedom, and human rights in the world, we must demonstrate our abhorrence and repugnance for apartheid.

The effects of apartheid are devastating. In the past 35 years, 3 million black, 800,000 mix race, and 400 Indian South African citizens have been forcibly removed from their land. As a result of poor sanitary conditions, low standards of nutrition, and the lack of sufficient hospitals and doctors in the so-called homelands, infant mortality among blacks is as high as 200 per 1,000 live births (among whites, it is 15 per 1,000 live births). The poor living conditions also give blacks a life expectancy of 57 years as compared with 70 years for whites.

Some of South Africa's principal exports include diamonds, uranium, metals, metallic ores, and gold. Yet, a black mineworker earns an average of \$136 a month, while his white counterpart earns an average of \$750 a month. The South African Government spends \$7 on each white student's education for every \$1 spent on a black student's education. Since August 1984, over 270 blacks have been killed, and over 4,500 blacks have been arrested.

South Africa's black majority is denied the right to citizenship, the right to national political participation, the right to choose where one will live and work, and the right of free assembly to petition the government for a redress of grievances.

It is quite obvious that the Reagan administration's policy of constructive engagement is not working. The South African Government recently established a new constitution that does not even acknowledge the very existence of black South Africans.

We must make it clear to the South African Government and to the rest of the world that we find apartheid totally unacceptable. We must do more than say we don't like apartheid.

My colleague, Mr. GRAY, of Pennsylvania, has introduced a bill that will impose economic sanctions against the South African Government. H.R. 1460 prohibits loans to the South African Government, prohibits all new investment in South Africa and Namibia, bans the importation of krugerrands into the United States, and prohibits computer sales to the South African Government. These sanctions demonstrate our abhorrence and repugnance for such oppression.

I have joined as a cosponsor of H.R. 1460, and I hope that this body will

take favorable action on this important measure without delay. It is time for the United States to take a strong and clear stand against apartheid.●

● Mr. MINETA. Mr. Speaker, today, I would like to join with my colleagues in bringing attention to the administration's continued support of the racist and brutal policies of the Government of South Africa. In face of the administration's tacit approval of the apartheid policies in South Africa, I believe citizens all across our Nation must make known to their lawmakers that it is unacceptable to continue to have close relations with a country where human rights are denied to 73 percent of the population because of their race. In their own country, South African blacks must carry passes at all times; they cannot vote; they cannot own property in the "white areas" which comprise 87 percent of the country; they are barred from making any economic progress; and many have to live apart from their families.

U.S. citizens must object loudly against our Nation's economic power reinforcing a government that frequently displays brutal violence towards its citizens—shooting and killing innocent people who feel compelled to demonstrate against the injustices of the white-supremacist government of South Africa.

The Reagan administration speaks of the importance of constructive engagement, and is an enthusiastic applauder of South African President Botha's tepid and cosmetic reforms. Our citizens must ask out loud, "What have 4 years of this so-called constructive engagement brought?"

If at the highest level of our Government there is silence and inaction, then our national objection to the policy of apartheid and the Government of South Africa must begin at the grass roots level, for our national patience is fast running out.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to say that the city council of my hometown of San Jose, CA, on April 2, 1985, voted to begin banning investment of city money in South African Government, in corporate securities, and in American firms that have subsidiaries in South Africa. I commend the council for their action for I believe they voted their conscience in passing this measure. I hope my colleagues in the House will follow their example when legislation comes to the floor which seeks to make it the policy of the United States to condemn and seek eradication of the policy of apartheid through specific prohibitions and restrictions on loans, investments and exports to South Africa.●

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER] is recognized for 60 minutes.

[Mr. BEREUTER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

MY ADVICE TO THE PRIVILEGED ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I continue on my advice to the privileged orders, which, as I have said, include first and foremost my colleagues. We happen to find ourselves at a critical moment in our hierarchial, societal position in one of the pinnacle points of privilege. But mostly to those real wielders of power, the real privileged orders, which today in America represent those forces that ensconced in an unaccountable way to the people in basic violation of the basic tenets that gave rise to our form of government under the Constitution that is operative today, are wielding the power of war and peace; the American standard of living; the doom or the extinction of millions of our small business enterprises.

To these privileged orders I address, and continue to address my remarks. I had intended to begin by continuing what I left somewhat unfinished yesterday with respect to this peculiar situation that brings us full circle in America back to the 200-year-ago point and just almost on the eve of our bicentennial celebration of the Government that we enjoy today. So many Americans think that we had a bicentennial in 1976; the truth is that our form of government will not have a 200th birthday until 1989.

There is nothing, I might point out to my colleagues, that vouchsafes the continuity or the permanence of this form of government. We take it for granted, true. But we better start working at it.

I was starting to begin on that premise when I joined, just a few minutes ago, in some of the discussion that the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, who, with his unmatched wit and incisive intellect has so eloquently pointed out and has, I think, removed some of the obscurantism of the current President and his regime in the trappings that they have tried to provide in guise of a policy, but which in effect is no policy at all. I am very grateful to the gentleman from Massachusetts for at least pointing out the incoherency, if not the actual hypocrisy and outright insincerity, in what is being uttered and what is being done.

I wanted to take this point to pick up on that matter having to do with our relations and our present catastrophic course in Central America, specifically. But generally toward those countries that share the destiny south of the border with us, beginning with the Republic of Mexico.

In the first place, we cannot continue to indulge in the misperceptions that still prevail in the minds of the overwhelmingly and preponderant number of Americans in and out of the Congress, in and out of the White House. Also, the reference to the situation or the anomolous position and conflicting position of the administration and its spokesmen with respect to the situation in Central America with specific reference to the Republic of Nicaragua, and the South African country or government or republic.

It reminded me very much, I wanted my colleague from Texas and my distinguished colleague from Massachusetts to hear this because in 1957, as a freshman member of the State Senate of Texas, at a time before the name Martin Luther King was heard, I got up and filibustered, I used the instrumentality that had really been born in the Texas State Senate; not in the U.S. Senate. The unlimited rule of debate and the filibuster, as it got to be called popularly, really had its birth in that great institution known as the Texas State Senate.

We were facing that particular year the massive group of resistance bills that had emanated out of the State of Virginia and had wended its course through the 11 Confederate States. I might say that the record will show that it was only in the Texas Legislature where they were even debated. In the Arkansas Legislature, for example, the 16 basic measures were approved in about 16 minutes. So that when I got up, took the floor, held it continuously without cease and without sitting for a total of some 26½ hours, and then combined with a senior member at that time, but a recent former colleague of ours in the Congress, Mr. Abraham Kazen, we filibustered and tied up the Senate a total of 36 hours, and we ended up in enabling the Senate to approve only 2 of the 16.

But the arguments that were advanced were identical to what you heard here today. Now, I cannot evoke that atmosphere: The sounds, the smells, the hatred, the putredness of outworn prejudices encrusted into the law. I had first seen that on the city council level of San Antonio, where we had the same thing. Astoundedly, I was the one that had a hand in the first so-called Supreme Court decision that was the beginning of the so-called civil rights, and that was the unconstitutionality of restrictive covenants in the alienation of property based on race, color, creed, or nationality.

At that time it was very popular a practice in San Antonio and in Texas generally, but particularly in that part, and more virulently in east Texas, to have in the master deed records with the county clerk, filed these restrictive covenants that read:

"If at any time this property, either through disease or alienation or sale or inheritance or bequeath, should become an ownership in the hands of a Negro or a Mexican," and in some

sporadic instances they also included the word Jew, "then the original title, that is the title to this land, shall revert to the original grantor." That is the one who had originally filed the master deeds when he or she proceeded to develop plats of land or what we call today developments or subdivisions.

□ 1700

So that here we were in the glorious year of our Lord 1947, while in the law school I had studied that very diligently and then after the war, and subsequent to 1946, I read with great interest in a law journal that the black group in St. Louis, MO, had raised the magnificent sum of \$250,000 in order to prosecute the case of restrictive covenants through the judiciary and were headed for the Supreme Court.

Now, in San Antonio, we had had, some of us, the same experiences that were customary and were encrusted into the State statutes known as Jim Crow laws, and the other State constitutional provisions that called for strict segregation up and down the line. We were no different from South Africa. The antimiscegenation laws were criminal culpability in nature, and in the city of San Antonio, lo and behold, I organized what was known as the first, sponsored Mexican-American—even though I hate hyphenated names, I will use this for descriptive purposes—businessmen. These were relatively young men who had somehow or other remained in San Antonio during the war and they were able to profit, and some of them reached the great position of being either millionaires or near-millionaires. So after the war I thought it was time that the people of Mexican origin do more than just sit back and whine and complain about discrimination.

As I say and repeat, in some areas, including San Antonio at that time, and particularly before the war, we faced, and especially those who had a darker texture of their skins, and in my family, as I said once before here, I am the lightest complexioned in the family, so that I shared some experiences that were directed to my brothers and my sister that unfortunately I would be spared because the individual prohibiting entry say to the skating rink on St. Mary Street, or to the swimming pool at San Pedro Park, or further over in New Braunfels, TX, to the Land Apart, and before that, well, later it became a State park so we were able to proscribe that kind of practice, but at that time I had the experience of having these individuals say, "All right, we do not allow Mexicans." Then they would look at me and say, "Well, you are all right because you are Spanish."

This is the reason I do not like this word Hispanic today, even though it offends some of my colleagues of Puerto Rican and Cuban descent who are generally classified as Hispanics. I