

the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DORNAN of California. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to see so many Members getting up this morning and talking about the Berlin Wall. I think probably the advent of instant communication, like cable network news and others who photograph, with sight, sound, and color, some incident around the world at the moment of its happening, might have been able to prevent 25 years ago the building of that wall.

A young German in his early twenties named Peter Fechter tried to come across one day as the wall was being built. The German name for doctor is very similar to English. It sounds the same phonetically, doktor. He laid out there in the middle of the brandnew no man's land near Check Point Charlie, bleeding to death for over an hour, with one arm raised in the air, waving it back and forth saying, "Doktor, doktor," and nobody moved forward to help him. Unfortunately, the commander of our post at Check Point Charlie was away, and a brandnew second lieutenant was in charge and did not know what to do.

Just last year this happened again near that site. On March 25, 1985 an American Army major, Arthur B. Nicholson, was shot to death, and the Soviet soldiers around him, after they had mortally wounded him, refused to allow anybody to bring him medical aid. This is criminal. Since its insidious construction at least 72 people have been killed attempting to cross the wall.

Over these 25 years people have gone over that wall in balloons, tunneled under it, jumped from windows breaking their legs and crawling over. These brave people have even gone over on tight ropes, and driven under the gates in small sports cars with the windshields removed. I even know of individuals who have strangled attack dogs to get over as well as one woman who was shot in the back of the head while swimming across the river which is also part of the wall.

The spirit and love for freedom is indomitable and will never be crushed. God forbid that that ugly concrete symbol of evil remain another quarter of a century on this planet.

#### THE DEBT LIMIT

(Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, there may well be questions on the deficit or the constitutionality of allowing the Office of Management and Budget to make what would be ministerial cuts as the other body sends over the debt limit package with an addition to put enforcement teeth back into Gramm-Rudman-Hollings-Kennedy.

But may I remind the Members of this House that if there is no enforcement mechanism, it again relies on the Members of Congress to do what they are supposed to do. I hate to be the one to remind us that in this body, so far, every single appropriations bill, if you look to funding it over a 12-month period and if you include in it what must be funded by law, is over the outlay numbers in the budget. This House, by a huge majority, passed such bills. I just would point out that depending upon the responsibility of the House of Representatives to lower the budget deficit is like depending on an alcoholic to watch over the scotch distillery.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

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

#### URGING THE SOUTH AFRICAN GOVERNMENT TO NEGOTIATE

Mr. WOLPE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 373) to urge the Government of South Africa to indicate its willingness to engage in meaningful political negotiations with that country's black majority, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### H. RES. 373

Whereas since September 1984, a mounting unrest against racial oppression in the Republic of South Africa has led to the violent death of more than 1,000 individuals, most of them black, the detention without charge of thousands more, and a declared state of emergency in several areas of that country;

Whereas a peaceful resolution to this violence and conflict in the Republic of South Africa is unlikely unless the Government of that country moves to end its abhorrent system of apartheid which denies the country's black majority the right to vote, the right to own land, and the right to freedom of movement;

Whereas the Government of the United States, the United Nations, and virtually every country in the world has condemned the practice of apartheid by the Government of South Africa and its enactment of the repressive measures that have led to the current violence;

Whereas the Government of the United States has sought to use its influence and leverage to promote peace and peaceful change through diplomatic appeals and the imposition of limited economic sanctions;

Whereas the 98th Congress adopted the "Mandela Freedom Resolution," calling for the unconditional release of Nelson Mandela, the black South African leader who has been imprisoned for 23 years, and his wife, Winnie Mandela, who has been a

"banned" person in South Africa for the past 21 years;

Whereas the President has called for the South African Government to end its practice of detention without trial and lengthy imprisonment of black leaders, in addition to calling for the establishment of a government based on the consent of the governed;

Whereas the Secretary of State has urged the release of Nelson Mandela and indicated the need for the South African Government to meet with leaders of the black majority, including Mandela and the outlawed African National Congress;

Whereas the African National Congress, which was banned in 1960, is today the oldest and most prominent of the organizations of resistance against the apartheid system of South Africa and is highly regarded by that country's black majority;

Whereas representatives of the South African business community, clergy, and university student organizations have met or attempted to meet with officials of the African National Congress to establish lines of communications for future discussions on the problems of their country;

Whereas Nelson Mandela, who has been in South African prisons since 1962 and who is still considered the leader of the banned African National Congress, is regarded by many black South Africans as one of the most respected symbols of resistance against apartheid;

Whereas it is evident that an end to South Africa's racial turmoil is impossible if the Government of that country does not begin a meaningful dialogue with the leaders of the black majority;

Whereas the continued turmoil and unrest in the Republic of South Africa threaten the peace, security, and stability of the other nations of Southern Africa and has led to crossborder violence in the region; and

Whereas the urgent moment has arrived for the Government of South Africa to initiate bold steps to end apartheid and the current unrest and to achieve peace and peaceful change: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that the President should use his good offices to urge the Government of the Republic of South Africa to indicate its willingness to engage in meaningful political negotiations with that country's black majority—

(1) by immediately granting unconditional freedom to Nelson Mandela and other political prisoners;

(2) by recognizing the African National Congress as a legitimate representative for the country's black majority; and

(3) by establishing the framework for the political talks with the African National Congress and other representative organizations which hopefully could lead to a negotiated settlement with the black majority.

□ 1050

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Lowry of Washington). Is a second demanded?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, a second is considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLPE] will be recognized for 20 minutes and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, a correction: The ranking Republican on the Subcommittee on Africa, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SILJANDER], is here, and he should control the time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SILJANDER] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

There was no objection.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLPE].

Mr. WOLPE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. WOLPE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WOLPE. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 373, introduced by Congressman CROCKETT of Michigan with 108 cosponsors, requests that the President use his good offices to urge the South African Government to indicate its willingness to engage in meaningful political negotiations with that country's black majority by: First, immediately releasing Nelson Mandela and other political prisoners; second, by recognizing the African National Congress as a legitimate representative for the country's black majority; and third, by establishing the framework for talks with the ANC and other representative organizations which hopefully could lead to a negotiated settlement with the black majority.

House Resolution 373 enjoys broad bipartisan cosponsorship and support. On June 24, 1986, the Subcommittee on Africa of the Foreign Affairs Committee held a hearing and markup on the legislation. Two additional amendments were added to clarify the intent of the resolution. The resolution was then passed by an overwhelming majority of the House Foreign Affairs Committee. We bring this measure to the floor today because we feel that the sense-of-Congress resolution is one of the most appropriate means we have to signal the President that he should become more actively involved in pressuring the South African Government to begin the process of negotiations with the African National Congress and other representative leaders of the black majority in order to end the escalating violence.

Mr. Speaker, this sense-of-Congress resolution is consistent with the expressed policy of the administration which has urged the South African Government to release the ANC's long-imprisoned leader, Nelson Mandela, and to open with him and representative organizations of the black majority a broad political negotiation. Secretary of State George Shultz told the New York Times on October 4, 1985, that South Africa could signal its willingness to search for a political compromise by freeing Nelson Mandela and negotiating with him and the ANC. As recently as July 23, 1986, at the Senate Foreign Relations hearing on South Africa, Secretary Shultz

stated that the administration continues to urge the South African Government to communicate with all parties, including—among others—the African National Congress. This policy recognizes, as noted by Secretary Shultz that, and I quote, "the ANC has emerged as an important part of the South African political equation."

Further, the key components of this resolution have also been supported by the European Community [EC], the British Commonwealth's Eminent Persons Group on Southern Africa, and the Organization of African Unity [OAU], as well as leading black and white South Africans.

In recent months, at least eight white South African businessmen representing some of the largest concerns have called for Mr. Mandela's release and the unbanning of the ANC. In a July 29, 1986, New York Times op-ed, Mr. A. H. Bloom, chairman of the Premier Group, one of South Africa's largest industrial companies, states that businessmen recognize that to avoid continued head-on conflict, the South Africa Government must: First, state unequivocally that every vestige of statutory racial discrimination will be abolished, and, second, open negotiations with credible black leaders. The prerequisite, he states, "is the unbanning of black political organizations, including the ANC and the release of Nelson Mandela and other political prisoners."

In the recent weeks, we have witnessed a growing sense of urgency concerning the need to begin the process of negotiations in South Africa. Only a few weeks ago, Sir Geoffrey Howe, British Foreign Secretary, on behalf of the 12 member states of the European Community, stated that the purpose of his recent trip to South Africa was to achieve the unconditional release of Nelson Mandela but that "by itself, is not enough because he has to be liberated in the context that enables him and his colleagues to take part in the discussion and dialog." It was his feeling that "this dialog cannot take place as long as recognized leaders of the black community are detained and their organizations are proscribed."

The unconditional release of Nelson Mandela and other political prisoners and the unbanning of the ANC are necessary and crucial steps toward any settlement in South Africa. Mr. Mandela, according to all the evidence, is a unifying, commanding, and popular leader who, along with others, is a key to any hope of a peaceful resolution of the conflict. Clearly, negotiations cannot take place in the absence of authentic leaders, and this dialog cannot begin to take place as long as recognized leaders are detained and their organizations are banned.

Mr. Speaker, a couple of our colleagues have questioned why we should single out the ANC among the many South African groups. First, let me emphasize that this resolution

does not regard the ANC as the sole legitimate representative of the South African people nor does it suggest that the ANC should be the only party to negotiations. The reason for specifically identifying the ANC is that it is the only major group with a large following that the Government has ruled out of future negotiations and legally banned. Public opinion polls have consistently shown that the ANC and its imprisoned leader, Nelson Mandela, have the largest following among the overwhelming majority black population. As the Eminent Persons Group stated in its recent report,

There can be no negotiated settlement in South Africa without the ANC; the breadth of its support is incontestable; and this support is growing. Among the many striking figures whom we met in the course of our work, Nelson Mandela and Oliver Tambo stand out. Their reasonableness, absence of rancor and readiness to find negotiated solutions which, while creating genuine democratic structures, would still give the whites the feeling of security and participation, impressed us deeply. If the government finds itself unable to talk with men like Mandela and Tambo, then the future of South Africa is bleak indeed.

There are a few who continue to ask the ANC to renounce violence before the South African Government is asked to remove its banning order. To this, I will only respond that if violence is truly our concern, then we will be far more on target if we focus on the violence of South Africa's apartheid regime.

Let us be absolutely clear on this point: The South African white minority government is inherently violent. It sustains itself in power by coercion—by the power of its guns. Twenty six million people do not willingly acquire to their subjugation. The core of the violence in South Africa is a white minority who is determined to maintain itself in power by the exercise of violence.

As for the ANC, it practiced nonviolence for 48 years and its restraint over this period was met only with continuing repression and violence of the South African Government. Moreover, Mr. Mandela and other ANC leaders recently indicated to the Eminent Persons Group that it would suspend violence if the white minority government would enter into good-faith negotiations. That is the purpose of this resolution. It is designed to move the process of negotiations forward, in the final analysis; it is negotiations that offer that the only alternative to continuing violence and a terrible blood-letting.

The other argument that is something made in opposition to this call for the unbanning of the African National Congress is that it is a Communist-dominated organization under the sphere of Soviet influence. In fact, however, there is no basis whatsoever for this claim. It is true that the ANC does contain members of the South African Communist Party, but there is

no evidence whatsoever that the ANC is subject to Communist or Soviet control and direction.

Moreover, key ANC leaders, in the persons of both Tambo and Manela, are clearly non-Communist and have repeatedly expressed their commitment to democratic values and the creation of a nonracial political system. Ironically, documents recently put out by the South African Government itself indicate that the South African Communist Party has real problems with the ANC's moderate approach to white businessmen and others.

Most importantly, to continue to rule the ANC out of the negotiation process because of our concern about Communist influence within the organization will be to create our own self-fulfilling prophecy. If we do not want those who are struggling for their freedom in South Africa to turn to the Soviet Union and to fall prey to Communist ideologues in South Africa, we had better be certain that the rest is identified clearly with their struggle for social justice and political freedom in South Africa.

It is clear to independent experts and to the South African businessmen, clerics, and students who have recently met with ANC leaders that the ANC's eventual political stance remains to be determined. The quicker the ANC's legality can be restored, so that it can peacefully and openly compete for the allegiance of the various internal forces including unions, civic associations, business groups, churches and so forth, and can have the potential of working with these other overwhelmingly non-Communist forces, the more chance there is of a democratic ANC and a democratic South Africa. However, if we fail to support the unbanning of the ANC and the ANC's involvement in negotiations, then we surely will see an expanded war, increased skepticism about Western intentions, and a likely hardening and expansion of Communist and militant influence in both the external ANC and its internal following.

This resolution, which aims to pressure the government to bring the ANC into the negotiating process, is one means by which we can encourage the emergence of a nonracial, democratic South Africa. I hope this resolution will enjoy the overwhelming bipartisan support of this Chamber.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SILJANDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH.]

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, I am frankly very concerned by this resolution, because it repeats a common pattern of American behavior toward popular front organizations.

In 1978 and 1979, there were warnings that the Sandinistas were a Communist front. In 1978 and 1979, there were warnings that Maurice Bishop's party in Grenada was a Communist front.

The left reassured us that these were not Communist fronts. Our friends on the left said over and over that Grenada's government was not Communist. They said over and over that the Sandinistas were not Communist. Yet the fact is, if you study the writings of Lenin, if you listen to the lessons of the defectors who have come to the West, or if you simply read the Grenada documents which we know now are historically accurate; the Grenadian Communists systematically deceived, manipulated, and laughed at the American left because it was so gullible.

The fact is they were Communist fronts deliberately because they knew our friends on the left would fall for them.

Now, the gentleman from Michigan repeats: Yes, there are Communists, but, well, in fact, that is the base of Lenin's writing; that Western moderates would always say, "Let's explain away the next Communist front. Let's understand the next Communist infiltration."

I am deeply opposed to apartheid. I am deeply opposed to all tyranny, including the Soviet Union. I favor freedom. Shifting Iran from the Shah to Khomeini did not improve human rights in Iran. Shifting Nicaragua from Somoza to a Communist dictatorship did not improve human rights in Nicaragua. Shifting South Africa from a white dictatorship to a black pro-Communist dictatorship will not improve human rights in South Africa.

This resolution is potentially a step toward a Communist dictatorship in South Africa. It highlights and singles out an organization which even the sponsor of the resolution admits has Communists in the executive committee.

□ 1100

It is an incredible act of ignoring the history of our generation to stand here on this floor, reject all the lessons of the last 10 years, and propose that we endorse an organization which has been infiltrated in its executive committee by Communists and which may well be a Communist front.

Mr. SILJANDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON].

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, in committee it was debated how we should approach the problems of negotiation in South Africa and if this resolution had urged President Botha to negotiate with moderate blacks like Tutu and Buthelezi and Boesak, I think it would have passed overwhelmingly.

But the African National Congress is a Communist-dominated organization and as such should not be singled out for recognition which this resolution does. Let us look at the ANC, and see what it consists of exactly. Nineteen of the 30 members of the ANC are known members of the South African Com-

munist Party and we believe as many as 28. When the South African Sanctions bill came up, we voted 369 to 49 not to allow United States taxpayers dollars to go to the ANC until they purged themselves of the Communist leadership in that organization.

Now, they have advocated terrorism, there is no question about that. Sechaba, their newspaper, the official organ of the African National Congress, has a picture on the front page of it that in February 1986 of a person being burned to death by using "necklacing." That is where they put a tire around a person's neck, fill it with kerosene or another flammable liquid, and they cut off the person's hands, and they burn them to death. They many times let their families stand there and watch it, and when the families get overwrought they try to tear the tire from the person's neck they get burned as well. This necklacing has been advocated by the African National Congress. That is a terrorist act.

Winnie Mandela in one of her speeches said that necklacing is a tool that should be used by the ANC to "liberate their people."

Now, that is terrorism. Do we believe in supporting terrorism? I wonder how many Members know about the intimate ties between the ANC and the Palestine Liberation Organization, the PLO. I recommend my colleagues read two recent articles, one in the Anti-Defamation League Bulletin of May 1986, and the other in the Washington Jewish Week of July 10, 1986. I will submit both for the RECORD, but I would like to read some excerpts from the Jewish Week into this RECORD right now.

And I quote:

The PLO is stepping up its support for the African National Congress—according to both Israeli and South African intelligence sources. The PLO smells blood in South Africa; an Israeli expert on the country said—Israeli officials are reluctant to criticize the ANC publicly for fear of appearing pro-apartheid privately, however, they freely share their growing concern over the prospect of an ANC takeover. It's one thing to be opposed to apartheid, which is anti-democratic, unjust, unworkable and altogether doomed; explained an Israeli official. But it is quite another to be in favor of replacing the existing government with an anti-democratic anti-Western, and, I must say, anti-Israeli regime.

The article goes on to state that Israeli officials would not say exactly how much aid the PLO had given to the ANC but that it was "in the millions". According to the article.

Now, some of my colleagues have talked about Mr. Tambo being one of the leaders in South Africa and one who is a responsible black leader, one we should respect and admire and one we should support. Oliver Tambo said on August 24, 1985 on Radio Maputo: "The great October socialist revolution"—he is talking about the Communist revolution in the Soviet Union—"introduced and unleashed new forces in the world. The ANC was to enrich

itself from the experience of the people who carried the banner of that revolution." That is a direct compliment to the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union has given the military arm of the ANC millions of dollars, \$8 million last year. The Communist leader of the ANC military wing is Joe Slovo, a Communist who is believed to be an official of the KGB working in South Africa. The ANC is tied to the Communists inextricably, and we should not give legitimacy to that organization by passing this resolution.

Mr. WOLPE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CROCKETT], the sponsor of the resolution.

(Mr. CROCKETT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CROCKETT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of House Resolution 373, which addresses the serious and immediate concerns of this body with regard to South Africa.

I am very pleased that this resolution has gathered bipartisan support. It now has 108 cosponsors, from both sides of the aisle, and includes 19 members of the Foreign Affairs Committee, which favorably reported it last week on a voice vote.

Mr. Speaker, 2 years ago, the House and the Senate both passed a resolution calling on President Reagan to urge the Government of South Africa to free Nelson Mandela, the renowned and respected leader of the African National Congress who has been imprisoned for more than 20 years, and to "unban" his wife, Winnie Mandela. Those resolutions passed with overwhelming bipartisan support, and were forwarded to President Reagan.

Today, the situation in South Africa has worsened considerably. The "state of emergency" called by President Botha and the continuing repression of the non-white majority have escalated the level of violence to the breaking point.

Meanwhile, around the world, the call for strong condemnation and sanctions against South Africa grows—from all corners of the globe, politicians and businessmen, religious leaders and people of conscience are calling for fundamental change now in South Africa.

It is time for this body to speak out again on this issue. We voted earlier this year on a package of sanctions against South Africa—which, hopefully, will be acted on this week in the Senate. Now we need to address the fundamental need for negotiations between the South African Government and its majority population.

This resolution is not radical—it echoes the sentiments publicly stated by President Reagan, Secretary of State Shultz and other government leaders that Nelson Mandela should be freed; it echoes the call from the Eminent Persons Group that South Africa recognize the ANC and begin negotia-

tions with it and other representative organizations of the non-white population; and it echoes the desire of the South African people themselves for a peaceful and just resolution of the conflict that threatens to engulf them.

Two questions were raised in our committee consideration of this resolution that I think should be addressed as we consider it today.

First, the concern was brought up that in naming the African National Congress specifically in the resolution, we were somehow "dictating" to the South African people who should represent them at the bargaining table.

Such an argument is easily dismissed. It is not we who have chosen the African National Congress as one of the legitimate representatives of the non-white people of South Africa. It is the people themselves.

There are obviously no public opinion polls taken of South African blacks. But by public demonstrations, rallies of support, banned writings and other expressions, they have made known their support of the ANC and its validity as the representative for a large number of South African blacks.

While the majority of ANC's membership is black, the organization is multiracial and includes Indians, Coloureds and whites within its membership ranks.

The ANC was created in 1912—1 year after the founding of the Government of South Africa—with the objective of seeking change in South Africa's segregated system through non-violent means.

Throughout most of its history, the Congress sought to achieve this goal through negotiations with the white minority government. Its efforts suffered repeated setbacks.

South Africa's first Constitution raised the color bar; legislation in 1913 and 1916 limited blacks' ownership of property and defined where they could live; strikes by blacks for better living conditions and wages were brutally suppressed, and in 1948, the election of the National Party made apartheid official government policy. That action led the ANC to become more militant but it still basically remained a nonviolent organization.

However, its peaceful protests, boycotts and demonstrations against apartheid were met with mass arrests and detentions, repressive police action and oppressive laws to control dissent. Despite this, the ANC continued to urge peaceful resistance to the government's system of segregation.

And in 1955, members of the ANC, working with Indian, coloured and white organizations, adopted the Freedom Charter which declared that "South Africa belongs to all who live in it. . . . The rights of the people shall be the same, regardless of race, color, or sex."

The South African Government finally moved directly against the organization in March 1960, when the Congress announced its plans to stage a

nationwide protest against the repressive pass laws. An incident occurred at Sharpeville and the police lost control, shooting to death 69 blacks. When the ANC called for a day of mourning on March 28, 1960, the Government introduced legislation to ban the Congress and declared a state of emergency.

The ANC went underground, where it has continued its fight against apartheid during the past 26 years.

Today, the Congress enjoys wide support in black townships across South Africa. It is commonplace for thousands of blacks at rallies and at funerals to unfurl the black, green and gold ANC flag, sing ANC freedom songs and even distribute ANC leaflets—all in open defiance of the Government. It is as if the people in ghettos like Alexandria and Soweto have already "unbanned" the organization.

And the resolution before us today does not say that the South African Government must negotiate with the ANC alone. It calls for the establishment of a "framework for the political talks with the ANC and other representative Black organizations" which, hopefully, could lead to a negotiated settlement.

The second concern that was raised involves the fact that there are "Communist" elements in the ANC.

Although personally I would find it incredible if there were not elements of other influences—especially given the history of United States' support for the apartheid system—I can understand some Members' reluctance in asking the South African Government to talk with "Communists."

But the ANC is not a Communist puppet, as some would believe. It is a nationalist liberation organization, with support from many sources. One of the largest contributions to the ANC comes from Sweden, hardly what one would call a hotbed of communism.

The ANC has always been willing to work with, and accept help from, any source that supports and identifies with its freedom struggle; and it has asked for aid from the West—specifically, from Canada, Europe, India, and the United States.

The Freedom Charter, the basic document of the ANC, is not and never has been considered a Marxist writing. It espouses human rights, and is not anti-capitalist.

Even if the ANC were controlled by those who supported so-called "Communist" ideals, the reality of the current situation dictates that South Africa include them in any meaningful negotiations. There is only one other alternative to talking with the ANC and the other organizations representing blacks in South Africa—and that alternative will be bloody, destructive and ultimately harmful to the United States.

If we fail to recognize the need now to pressure South Africa to begin ne-

gotiations to end apartheid; if we continue to stand with the minority regime in its last-ditch effort to retain exclusive power; if we lost the opportunity to align ourselves with those who demand a peaceful and just settlement; then we play into the hands of those who want a violent end to apartheid and we diminish our influence in any future South African interracial government and in the entire region for decades to come.

Mr. Speaker, I urge you to support House Resolution 373, and to strengthen the United States' long-term interests in southern Africa by calling for the release of Mandela and for a negotiated settlement with all segments of the South African population—including the African National Congress.

Mr. SILJANDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE].

(Mr. HYDE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I am not going to support this resolution. It is well-intentioned. I think the Government of the Republic of South Africa does have to engage in serious dialog with responsible black leaders with the purpose of moving away from apartheid and for full participation of everyone who lives in South Africa. But the mistake in this resolution, in my judgment, is the emphasis, the overemphasis on the African National Congress.

The African National Congress may have some usefulness in this dialog. I am not saying it does not. But right now it gets most of its funding from the Soviet Union. Every key position in the organization of the African National Congress or virtually every key position is occupied by a member of the Communist Party. The military wing is headed a white Communist, Joe Slovo, and the resolution mentions the African National Congress not once, not four times, but six times. That is overkill.

There are other responsible organizations, moderate black leaders, progressive black leaders that are not mentioned. They are collectivized in the phrase "other groups." What about the South African Council of Churches? What about labor unions? What about Bishop Tutu? What about Chief Buthelezi and his political organization, Inkatha?

He represents 6 million people. They are all just capsulized in the phrase "and other organizations," and the African National Congress with a substantial Communist influence is mentioned six times. So this is a lopsided resolution and because of that reason and not because of that reason and not because of what it seeks to do, which is correct and necessary; namely, to urge a meaningful dialog with black leaders who are influential, but for the way it is phrased and the

emphasis on the ANC, I cannot support it.

Mr. WOLPE. Mr. Speaker, how much time remains on both sides?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LOWRY of Washington). The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLPE] has 7 minutes remaining and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SILJANDER] has 12 minutes remaining.

Mr. WOLPE. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SILJANDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER].

(Mr. HUNTER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HUNTER. My friends, it is my understanding that with regard to South Africa, the United States wants not only to end the situation that exists right now where there is nonrepresentation for the black majority but to build a model that will work in the future after the present system no longer exists. The question that I would ask is how we are going to give any future to young African blacks who want to go to the ballot box, who want to participate in a democracy, if we lead off by elevating an institution where, as I understand it, a majority of the members being Communist, they advocate a system that is totalitarian?

□ 1115

Are we doing any good for the people who will vote in the 1990's and beyond by advocating a system that is going to be dominated by people who advocate totalitarianism?

The Communist system does not embrace ballot boxes. It does not embrace rule by the majority. It embraces rule by a very small minority. I thought that is what we were trying to get away from. I thought we were absolutely against rule by minority. Yet, a majority of the members of the African National Congress, as I understand from reports that have come out of the Intelligence Committee in the other body and the proclamations of those members themselves, a majority of them advocate Marxism. That is not a move to democracy.

This Nation for a long time has had a foreign policy that in a two-step process takes only the first step that inevitably leads people we are trying to help into a chasm. We are good at destroying things. We were good at destroying the system that existed in Iran because we thought that it was a bad system and we needed to replace it. The only problem is we did not realize we were replacing it with one of the most repressive regimes in the history of the world under Mr. Khomeini.

So as I understand this resolution, and I think there are good things in this resolution, the emphasis on the African National Congress would move us toward replacing a repressive system with a system that would be dominated by people who believe in to-

talitarianism. That is not the way we should be going. We should build a model of democracy, and we should elevate people who embrace democracy in South Africa to be the people who participate in these very important meetings and dialogs we are speaking of.

Mr. WOLPE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

(Mr. GILMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 373, which calls upon President Reagan to urge South Africa's Government to indicate its willingness to begin meaningful political negotiations with South Africa's black community to free Nelson Mandela and other political prisoners and to urge talks with and the withdrawal of bans on the African National Congress and other representative black organizations, and I underscore the words "and other representative black organizations."

I am pleased to be 1 of 108 cosponsors of this resolution, and to have voted for it when we considered it in our Foreign Affairs Committee. This resolution sets forth a proposed policy which is a sound approach to conciliation and compromise in South Africa, where those qualities have been sadly lacking in most political discourse. With violence on all sides reaching a fevered pitch, dialog is clearly what is needed in this troubled environment.

I commend the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CROCKETT] for his untiring leadership on this and other issues relating to the struggle to end apartheid. I also commend the House Foreign Affairs subcommittee and committee leadership in providing for the timely consideration of this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution was amended in committee to make it clear that the African National Congress is but one of many representative organizations which should be engaged in discussions with the South African Government, and that Nelson Mandela, symbol though he is, is but one of the South African political prisoners who should be freed to participate in those discussions with the South African Government in the interest of reconciling the people of South Africa. Accordingly, this resolution deserves our support.

I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this measure.

Mr. SILJANDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RUDD].

(Mr. RUDD asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RUDD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know of anyone in this body or anyone in America who is really in favor of apartheid or racial discrimination. But this resolution, despite the high-sounding purposes that have been related here on the floor this morning, does not really say that.

I am going to read from the resolution itself that wants the President to establish a meaningful political negotiation by the South African Government for these purposes, and they are going to do it in this way. It says:

(1) by immediately granting unconditional freedom to Nelson Mandela;

(2) by recognizing the African National Congress as a legitimate representative for the country's black majority; and

(3) by establishing the framework for the political talks which hopefully could lead to a negotiated settlement with the black majority.

But this does not say anything about all of the other organizations, the black organizations, that are in South Africa, organizations such as the Inkatha, which has a membership of over a million and bitterly opposes the ANC.

This leaves it to one minority group within a majority group to be the negotiating catalyst for all of these good things.

I have to tell you that it is well documented in public source material: the Arizona Republic, the largest newspaper in Arizona, for example, on July 25; Senate hearing committees; and with the State Department's Service Broadcast Service.

But these are some of the things that take place. The ANC is a minority organization. It is agreed here on the floor that it is heavily infiltrated with members of the Communist Party. The Senate hearing committee even brought out the fact that the armed wing of the ANC is led by Joe Slova, whose name was previously mentioned, from Lithuania and had joined the Communist Party in 1940, and other ranking members within the ANC have been identified as members of the Communist Party. And the Soviet Union's 27th Communist Party Congress earlier this year, the ANC delegation was accorded the same status as a Communist Party representative from other nations.

In its publication, *Sechaba*, I think it has been stated that the African Communist Party goes equally with the ANC to establish two pillars of the revolution that is going on there.

The point of the matter is that we, as citizens of this country and Members of this august body, are guardians of America and America's freedom and future for not only ourselves but our posterity, and I do not see how this can possibly help that.

But aside from that, this important piece of legislation, which could raise havoc and cause violence in South Africa, would be no good. This resolu-

tion should not be debated in this way. It should have a chance for proper debate, brought to the floor for total debate, and we could do it in that way; but not on suspension.

Mr. WOLPE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS].

(Mr. OWENS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, this resolution should be supported by all who want a peaceful solution to the South African problem. We must work harder to carry forward the process of peacefully accomplishing a transition from minority rule in South Africa to majority rule.

We have a situation where 24 million blacks are being held hostage by a minority of 4 million whites. That is a desperate situation. In order to maintain that situation, the whites have resorted to brutality on a scale which is approaching Nazi Germany's oppression of the minorities in Germany.

Escalation is going to go forward, and we are going to see more and more uncivilized acts committed unless we work as hard to create a climate where a peaceful process can be set in motion as we would be forced to do if war would break out.

Freeing Nelson Mandela is an important step in this process. We cannot choose their leaders for them. The South African blacks have chosen Nelson Mandela. We did not have outside forces choose George Washington.

□ 1125

We cannot choose anyone for them. I am sure the Continental Army did not meet the approval of the British monarchy either. I am sure they said terrible things about them. I am sure that George Washington did not want to resort to violence.

But here is a situation where freedom is at stake for 24 million people. For too long we have sat by and done nothing about the situation. Now a process is possible, a peaceful process is possible, a peaceful transition is possible. But while we dally and while we refuse to give the impetus and support to people like Nelson Mandela and allow him to take a major role in making this transition peacefully, the forces of violence are getting in place and we are going to have a situation which will be completely out of control, there will be a bloodbath, and we can all blame ourselves partially. This Nation can blame itself partially for not doing more, for not being more passionate about peace and not working harder to promote a peaceful transition and a peaceful process.

Mr. SILJANDER. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time each side has remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GRAY of Illinois). The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SILJANDER] has 6½ minutes remaining and the gentleman

from Michigan [Mr. WOLPE] has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. SILJANDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN].

Mr. DORNAN of California. Mr. Speaker, much of this resolution I could support. I could support 80 to 90 percent of it, including releasing Nelson Mandela. My hangup is with the ANC because of its Communist membership and because of its acceptance of violence.

Let us get some facts on the record. If Nelson Mandela were in Uganda, he would be dead; if he were in Equatorial Guinea, he would be dead; if he were in the Central African Republic, he would be dead; if he were in Ethiopia, he would be dead, he would not be in prison all these years, as horrible as that is. The opposition in any of these other countries, if they did not like his style, would probably have tortured him to death.

I was in Ethiopia last year. I was in the camps of Ansokia and Ibnet. I saw 100,000 people right in front of my eyes there, alive on one site, and 10,000 of them were killed by that government by forcing them out of that camp. In the matter of a month, I saw 10,000 human beings alive who were dead 30 days later. More people are dying in Ethiopia right now.

The reason we get so exercised over this issue, most of it proper, is because there is a court system in South Africa, because there is a free press, and because there are white people who are guilt-ridden. Every conservative and liberal of conscience, particularly if they lay claim to religious beliefs, knows that the apartheid system is what it is called in this resolution, abhorrent and what the President called it last night, repugnant.

Mr. Speaker, give us a resolution without the ANC in it, and I can support it.

Mr. WOLPE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to my esteemed colleague, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN].

(Mr. DURBIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, I believe it is offensive and misleading to hear the opponents of this resolution suggest that those black leaders who oppose apartheid in South Africa are somehow the pawns of Moscow and the PLO.

The issue before this House is crystal clear. If this Congress does not establish a sound, forceful policy against apartheid, the United States runs the very real risk of forever forfeiting a position of moral leadership in South Africa and developing countries across the world.

I am certain that the opponents of this resolution believe that the issue of opposing apartheid can be obfuscated by veiled and open references to communist infiltration. But the fact remains that the official policy of the

Reagan administration toward South Africa is an embarrassment to this Nation and the ideals we espouse and to our freedom-loving allies around the world.

I am proud of the principles we stand for. I believe the United States can overcome communism in a toe-to-toe contest anywhere in the world. But the reluctance of the opponents of this resolution to make a clear statement against apartheid betrays a commitment to those democratic principles.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this resolution calling for a peaceful resolution of the conflict in South Africa.

Mr. COLEMAN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DURBIN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

(Mr. COLEMAN of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COLEMAN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN].

Mr. SILJANDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 4 minutes.

(Mr. SILJANDER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

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

Mr. SILJANDER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HUNTER. I thank my friend for yielding.

I think we just have to make the point that we have not said that the black representatives in South Africa who are against apartheid are pawns of Moscow. We said that the one organization that is elevated in this resolution, the African National Congress, is dominated by—19 of the members according to our intelligence organizations and their own proclamations—and believe in totalitarianism and communism. We are against that.

Mr. Speaker, if we could excise that elevation of the African National Congress from this resolution, we could support it.

Mr. SILJANDER. Mr. Speaker, 20 minutes on each side, that is what we have had to debate this paramount resolution recognizing the very controversial African National Congress, under suspension of the rules with no opportunity for amendments. Whether one is for or against this legislation, the issue is fairness of play.

Indeed, over the last 24 months there has been a marked increase in the level and frequency of violence in South Africa. Thousands of people have been killed in wanton brutality and violence. The goal of the ANC, as stated over and over and over again by their proclamations, by their literature, by their leaders, and by their members, is a violent overthrow of the government, to take power by force.

The cosponsors of the resolution, I am sure, are after a peaceful change in

South Africa. May I remind those same cosponsors, many of whom oppose aid to the Contras in Nicaragua, that they emphatically support a peaceful resolution through the Contadora process, as this gentleman does as well. It is not a little double-tongued and double-minded to suggest that on one hand we want to work for the Contadora process and not work through the Contras to supply military aid but yet we endorse, recognize and support the ANC which has vowed the violent overthrow of that government?

This resolution calls on the President of the United States, without question, to recognize the ANC. It also calls for the unconditional release of Nelson Mandela. I support the release of Nelson Mandela, and President Reagan supports the release of Nelson Mandela. But he himself said he would not renounce violence, and he is their figurehead leader.

It is the endorsement of the ANC and their tactics in this resolution that offends me. I am certain the intentions of the cosponsors of the resolution are not to promote a Marxist-Leninist organization. I am sure their intentions are for peaceful change. If that is true, this is the wrong measure, it is the wrong approach.

Indeed it has been argued that many of the African countries support and negotiate with the ANC, but so do Arab countries with the PLO. The PLO has advocated in its doctrine the violent overthrow of Israel. That is precisely why we do not recognize the PLO. That is precisely why we do not negotiate with them, but indeed we negotiate with Arabs, their friends and fellow supporters of peaceful resolution in the Middle East. As we should with all black organizations and all blacks in South Africa, we should encourage peaceful negotiations for a peaceful resolution.

This resolution in essence endorses Marxism, because nearly 23 of its 30 executive committee members are known Marxist-Leninists. There is no doubt that Nelson Mandela has been imprisoned too long and it is time for his release, but for the U.S. Congress to demand that another country do something could be counterproductive, as it was with the Italian President, Aldo Moro. We passed a resolution for his release, and he was brutally beaten and killed.

Oftentimes resolutions are helpful in the process of peace and encouraging other countries, as they have been with Soviet Jewry. I feel that passing resolutions in the context and in other situations with the Soviet Union has been very helpful.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SILJANDER] has expired.

Mr. SILJANDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 20 additional seconds.

So, Mr. Speaker, this resolution is not only ill-timed because of its being considered under suspension, but it is

also ill-timed in terms of its real goals and objectives. We should work through the process for a peaceful transition, and recognizing at this time the African National Congress would be a serious, serious mistake.

Mr. Speaker, I yield my remaining time to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] is recognized for 1 minute and 10 seconds.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding his remaining time to me.

One of my colleagues said that the ANC was a peaceful organization. Peaceful? Sechaba has a picture of a person being necklaced to death on the front page. This was published in Communist East Germany.

□ 1135

The ANC advocates this kind of terrorism and violence. The ANC was once an organization that had noble objectives, but they are now controlled by Communists and are tools of the Soviet Union.

President Reagan said in his speech that the South African Government is under no obligation to negotiate the future of the country with any organization that proclaims a goal of creating a Communist state and uses terrorists tactics to achieve it.

The ANC received \$8 million from the Soviet Union last year. The head of the ANC military wing is Joe Slovo, a Communist. People are being trained by the PLO in Communist countries.

As I said, Sechaba advocates terrorism and is a Communist publication. The PLO has been training terrorists for the ANC and the ANC is Communist controlled. There is no doubt about it.

Have we not learned anything from history? Give the Communists an inch and they will take a whole country.

Mr. WOLPE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the final 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, during the course of this debate several speakers have indicated that if this resolution were to call for negotiations with such moderate blacks as Bishop Tutu, Reverend Boesak, or Chief Buthelezi, it would not receive their opposition.

Perhaps the speakers are unaware that all three of the individuals they have cited, Bishop Tutu, Reverend Boesak, and Chief Buthelezi, have all called for the freeing of Nelson Mandela and other political prisoners, for the unbanning of the African National Congress, and for the direct involvement of the African National Congress in negotiations with the South African Government.

Chief Buthelezi has gone so far as to declare that Mr. Mandela would be his own leader.

I want to make this point, because the moderate blacks whose position we are attempting to bolster within the

South African framework, are themselves insistent that the precondition to negotiations, the precondition to an end to the violence and to the development of a negotiated solution to South Africa's crisis, is the direct involvement of the African National Congress and the freeing of Nelson Mandela and other political prisoners.

This resolution, and I want to emphasize this in closing, accords no recognition to the ANC as the full representative of the South African people. It makes no claim whatsoever that other organizations and groups within South Africa should not be involved in the negotiations. In fact, the resolution was specifically amended by the Foreign Affairs Committee to make reference to other political prisoners beyond Mr. Mandela and to indicate that the call is for a framework of political talks with the African National Congress and other representative organizations, which hopefully could lead to a negotiated settlement with the black majority.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution does nothing more than make a call for negotiations which are the only alternative to a deepening conflict in South Africa and to a terrible blood bath. It deserves the overwhelming bipartisan support of this Chamber.

Mr. DE LUGO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLPE. I yield to the gentleman from the Virgin Islands.

(Mr. DE LUGO asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DE LUGO. Mr. Speaker, as an original cosponsor I rise in support of House Joint Resolution 373, which calls on the President of the United States to urge the Government of South Africa to indicate its willingness to engage in meaningful negotiations with that country's black majority.

We, in the United States and the rest of the democratic world condemn the abhorrent system of apartheid. We maintain that it is evil, that we are opposed to it and that we will do what we can to bring about a peaceful demise of this system.

But there can be no peaceful resolution until members of the South African minority government and representatives of the black majority can sit down at the negotiating table as equals.

According to Malcolm Fraser, the former Prime Minister of Australia, who served as co-chairman of the British Commonwealth Eminent Persons Group on Southern Africa, in the absence of peaceful negotiation, "the black South Africans will take irreversible decisions to fight for political participation and freedom, \* \* \* they will go for more guns and violence, which will lead to a full-scale guerrilla contest."

That is why it is imperative for this Government to use its considerable influence to avert the almost inevitable bloodbath. The Government of South Africa must be made to understand that no meaningful negotiations can take place until Nelson Mandela is free, until it recognizes the African National Congress [ANC] as a legitimate representative of the country's black majority, and until it estab-

lishes a framework for talks with the ANC and other representative organizations.

The time has come for the United States Government to insist that the South African Government show good faith toward resolving the growing conflict in that country by unconditionally freeing Nelson Mandela and meeting with the legitimate representatives of the people. If South Africa is to emerge from its internal conflicts, intact as a democratic country then its current leaders must begin to operate on basic democratic principles by allowing the legitimate representatives of the people to speak on their behalf.

On June 18, 1986, this House passed a bill calling for strong economic sanctions against the South African Government. The administration says that it cannot live with the bill because it would cause more suffering for the black majority in South Africa and could hurt our economic interest. The administration continues to argue that we must remain in South Africa and use our influence to bring about peaceful changes. Well, today we call on the administration to prove to the American people whether constructive engagement can work and to begin by urging in the strongest possible way that the South African Government free Nelson Mandela and begin negotiations with the legitimate representatives of the South African people.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of House Concurrent Resolution 373, a bill which urges the President to call upon the South African Government to enter into meaningful negotiations with its black citizens.

Perhaps the key to peace in South Africa is the status of freedom fighter Nelson Mandela. Mr. Mandela, now 68 years old, is recognized by the vast majority of blacks as the father-figure of the freedom movement. He is not, as Presidents Reagan and Botha constantly tell us, a hardened Marxist revolutionary. Rather, he is a quintessential freedom fighter. At a time when President Reagan calls the Contras freedom fighters and the moral equivalent of our Founding Fathers, he seems content to allow a truly valiant man to languish in prison.

At the same time, Botha and Reagan seem to have entered into a conspiracy of disinformation about the African National Congress. Again, they raise the specter of a Soviet bear pulling the strings of their puppets in South Africa. This could not be further from the truth. The ANC is a coalition of groups which run the gamut of ideological and religious beliefs. The black majority either actively or tacitly supports their goals, and even the Zulus, who listen to their chief before they listen to anyone, do not oppose the ANC.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I call upon my colleagues to give their strongest support for this resolution. It is a good bill, one which warrants our approval. The President's own party is calling for the sanctions which he so vigorously opposes.

Let us call upon the Pretoria government to come to its senses before it is too late.

Mr. LIGHTFOOT. Mr. Speaker, I understand the frustration the sponsors of this resolution are experiencing with the present situation in South Africa. I have no doubt that they introduced this legislation in good faith in hopes of helping to ease the tension and violence associated with the apartheid policies of the South African Government. In fact, judging by the bill's title alone, "Urging the South African Government To Indicate Its Willingness To

Engage in Meaningful Negotiations," it would appear to be something I, too, would support.

However, after closely reading the text of House Resolution 373, I found a provision that greatly concerns me. That is, the bill endorses the African National Congress [ANC] as a "legitimate representative" of the black majority. At this time I want to be certain that my colleagues understand exactly whom the African National Congress actually represents.

The African National Congress is, indeed, a major part of the political spectrum in South Africa. It is one of the major apartheid resistance organizations. However, no matter how strongly we agree with the ANC's goals with regard to apartheid, we cannot turn our backs on the fact that the ANC is a violence prone, Communist-controlled organization. In fact, the ANC does not even bother to conceal its support from and for the Soviet Union and its alliance with the South African Communist Party. The Soviet Union has already spent hundreds of millions of dollars supporting the ANC.

The African National Congress also promises to kill our hopes for a peaceful transition away from apartheid in South Africa. Their idea of diplomacy is reflected in their endorsement of the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan. In short, the ANC prefers, as the Secretary of State put it, "Violence and intimidation rather than dialog with its opponents."

If we take a look back at other organizations that tried to work with Communists, we could learn from their experience that when their goals conflict Moscow's concerns override all others. We witnessed this in Vietnam, Cambodia, Ethiopia, and Angola. Even though the majority of ANC members and supporters are non-Communists, as is often the case, they have given their allegiance to those whose lead will be dictated by the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union's abhorrent record on respect for human rights speaks for itself.

I want to point out that this is not necessarily a choice between communism and apartheid. Rather, it is a choice between our putting faith in a Communist organization or a South African apartheid resistance organization that has a genuine concern for blacks. By no means does our not supporting the ANC mean that we are giving up the fight against apartheid. Quite to the contrary, it is important that we not work against the black opposition by granting legitimacy to this Communist front. There are many other democratic non-Communist apartheid resistance organizations more worthy of our support.

Mr. Speaker, I again want to express my full support for constructive approaches to the fight against apartheid in South Africa. This resolution clearly supports communism in South Africa at the expense of legitimate black apartheid resistance organizations. I urge my colleagues to vote against House Resolution 373 as long as it contains provisions which grant legitimacy to the African National Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GRAY of Illinois). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLPE] that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 373), as amended.

The question was taken.

Mr. SILJANDER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 5 of rule I, and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WOLPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the resolution just considered.

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

There was no objection.

#### FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Hallen, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed the following resolution:

S. RES. 476

*Resolved*, That on August 14, 1986, the Senate, sitting as a court of impeachment, shall proceed to the consideration of the articles of impeachment which have been exhibited against Judge Harry E. Claiborne.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Senate shall so notify the House of Representatives.

The following communication accompanied the message:

U.S. SENATE,  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,  
Washington, DC, August 13, 1986.  
HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.,  
Speaker, House of Representatives, Wash-  
ington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: In accordance with the attached copy of the Senate Resolution 476, I have the honor to inform you that on Thursday, August 14, 1986, the Senate, sitting as a court of impeachment, shall resume its consideration of the articles of impeachment which have been exhibited against Harry E. Claiborne, a Judge of the United States District Court for the District of Nevada.

In order that the oath may be administered conveniently to the entire membership of the Senate, it is our intention to consider this matter immediately following a roll call vote when all members will be present. A time for that vote has not yet been determined, but you may be assured we will notify you as soon as that time is known in order to provide the House Managers with as much advance notice as possible.

Respectfully,

JO-ANNE L. COE,  
Secretary.

#### FOREST ECOSYSTEMS AND ATMOSPHERIC POLLUTION RESEARCH ACT OF 1986

Mr. WHITLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2631) to provide for study and research on the decline in United States forest productivity and to determine the effects of atmospheric pollutants on forest environments, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2631

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Forest Ecosystems and Atmospheric Pollution Research Act of 1986".

#### SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that—

(1) the health and productivity of forests in certain regions of the United States are declining;

(2) existing research indicates that atmospheric pollution, including ozone, acidic deposition, and heavy metals, may contribute to this decline;

(3) there is an urgent need to expand and better coordinate existing Federal, State, and private research, including research by private industry, to determine the cause of changes in the health and productivity of domestic forest ecosystems and to monitor and evaluate the effects of atmospheric pollutants on such ecosystems; and

(4) such research and monitoring should not impede efforts to control atmospheric pollutants.

#### SEC. 3. ESTABLISHMENT OF RESEARCH PROGRAM.

Section 3 of the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Research Act of 1978 (16 U.S.C. 1642) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(c)(1) The Secretary, acting through the United States Forest Service, shall establish not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this subsection a 10-year program (hereinafter in this subsection referred to as the 'Program') to—

"(A) increase the frequency of forest inventories in matters that relate to atmospheric pollution and conduct such surveys as are necessary to monitor long-term trends in the health and productivity of domestic forest ecosystems;

"(B) determine the scope of the decline in the health and productivity of domestic forest ecosystems;

"(C) accelerate and expand existing research efforts (including basic forest ecosystem research) to evaluate the effects of atmospheric pollutants on forest ecosystems and their role in the decline in domestic forest health and productivity;

"(D) study the relationship between atmospheric pollution and other climatological, chemical, physical, and biological factors that may affect the health and productivity of domestic forest ecosystems;

"(E) develop recommendations for solving or mitigating problems related to the effects of atmospheric pollution on the health and productivity of domestic forest ecosystems;

"(F) foster cooperation among Federal, State, and private researchers and encourage the exchange of scientific information on the effects of atmospheric pollutants on forest ecosystems among the United States, Canada, European nations, and other nations; and

"(G) support the long-term funding of research programs and related efforts to determine the causes of declines in the health and productivity of domestic forest ecosystems and the effects of atmospheric pollutants on the health and productivity of domestic forest ecosystems.

"(2) The Secretary shall establish a committee to advise the Secretary in developing the Program, which shall be composed of scientists with training and experience in various disciplines, including atmospheric, ecological, and biological sciences. Such scientists shall be selected from among individuals who are actively performing research for Federal or State agencies or for private industries, institutions, or organizations.

"(3) The Secretary shall coordinate the Program with existing research efforts of Federal and State agencies and private industries, institutions, or organizations.

"(4) The Secretary shall submit to the President and to Congress the following reports:

"(A) Not less than 30 days before establishing the Program, the Secretary shall submit an initial program report—

"(i) discussing existing information about declining health and productivity of forest ecosystems on public and private lands in North America and Europe;

"(ii) outlining the findings and status of all current research and monitoring efforts in North America and Europe on the causes and effects of atmospheric pollution on the health and productivity of forest ecosystems;

"(iii) describing the Program; and

"(iv) estimating the cost of implementing the Program for each fiscal year of its duration.

"(B) Not later than January 15 of each year during which the Program is in operation following the year in which the initial program report is submitted, the Secretary shall submit an annual report—

"(i) updating information about declining health and productivity of forest ecosystems on public and private lands in North America and Europe;

"(ii) updating the findings and status of all current research and monitoring efforts in North America and Europe on the causes and effects of atmospheric pollution on the health and productivity of forest ecosystems, including efforts conducted under the Program;

"(iii) recommending additional research and monitoring efforts to be undertaken under the Program to determine the effects of atmospheric pollution on the health and productivity of domestic forest ecosystems; and

"(iv) recommending methods for solving or mitigating problems stemming from the effects of atmospheric pollution on the health and productivity of domestic forest ecosystems.

"(C) Not later than 10 years after the date on which the initial program report is submitted, the Secretary shall submit a final report—

"(i) reviewing existing information about declining health and productivity of forest ecosystems on public and private lands in North America and Europe;

"(ii) reviewing the nature and findings of all research and monitoring efforts conducted under the Program and any other relevant research and monitoring efforts related to the effects of atmospheric pollution on forest ecosystems; and

"(iii) making final recommendations for solving or mitigating problems stemming from the effects of atmospheric pollution on the health and productivity of domestic forest ecosystems."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a second demanded?

Mr. MORRISON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WHITLEY] will be recognized for 20 minutes and the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MORRISON] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

[Roll No. 332]

YEAS—245

Ackerman	Garcia	Owens
Akaka	Gaydos	Panetta
Alexander	Gejdenson	Pease
Anderson	Gephardt	Penny
Andrews	Gibbons	Pepper
Annunzio	Gillman	Perkins
Anthony	Glickman	Petri
Applegate	Gonzalez	Pickle
Aspin	Gordon	Price
Atkins	Gray (IL)	Pursell
AuCoin	Gray (PA)	Rahall
Barnes	Green	Rangel
Bates	Guarini	Ray
Bedell	Gunderson	Reid
Bellenson	Hall (OH)	Richardson
Bereuter	Hamilton	Ridge
Berman	Hawkins	Rinaldo
Bevill	Hayes	Rodino
Biaggi	Heffner	Roe
Bliley	Henry	Roemer
Boggs	Hertel	Rose
Boland	Horton	Rostenkowski
Boner (TN)	Howard	Roybal
Bonior (MI)	Hoyer	Sabo
Borski	Huckaby	Savage
Bosco	Hughes	Saxton
Boucher	Jacobs	Scheuer
Boxer	Jeffords	Schneider
Breaux	Jones (NC)	Schroeder
Brooks	Jones (TN)	Schuette
Brown (CA)	Kanjorski	Schulze
Bruce	Kaptur	Schumer
Bryant	Kastenmeyer	Seiberling
Bustamante	Kennelly	Sensenbrenner
Carper	Kildee	Sharp
Carr	Kleczka	Shelby
Clay	Kolter	Sikorski
Clinger	Kostmayer	Sisisky
Coelho	LaFalce	Slattery
Coleman (TX)	Lantos	Smith (FL)
Collins	Leach (IA)	Smith (IA)
Conte	Leath (TN)	Snowe
Conyers	Lehman (CA)	Solarz
Cooper	Lehman (FL)	Spratt
Coyne	Leland	St Germain
Crockett	Levin (MI)	Staggers
Daschle	Levine (CA)	Stark
Davis	Lloyd	Stokes
de la Garza	Long	Studds
Dellums	Lowry (WA)	Swift
Dicks	Luken	Synar
Dingell	Lundine	Tallon
DiGuardi	MacKay	Tauzin
Dixon	Manton	Torres
Donnelly	Markey	Torricelli
Dornan (ND)	Martinez	Towns
Downey	Matsui	Trafficant
Durbin	Mavroules	Traxler
Dwyer	Mazzoli	Udall
Dymally	McCloskey	Valentine
Early	McCurdy	Vento
Edwards (OH)	McDade	Visclosky
Edwards (CA)	McHugh	Walden
English	McKernan	Walgren
Evans (IA)	McKinney	Waxman
Evans (IL)	Mikulski	Weaver
Fawell	Miller (CA)	Weiss
Fazio	Mineta	Wheat
Feighan	Mitchell	Whitley
Fish	Moakley	Whitten
Florio	Mollohan	Williams
Foglietta	Moody	Wilson
Foley	Murphy	Wirth
Ford (MD)	Murtha	Wise
Ford (TN)	Natcher	Wolpe
Frank	Neal	Wright
Franklin	Nowak	Wyden
Frost	Oakar	Yates
Gandy	Oberstar	Yatron
	Obey	Young (MO)
	Om	Zschau
	Ortiz	

YEAS—177

Baker	Coats
Barnes	Cobey
Barton (IN)	Coble
Bartlett	Coleman (MO)
Berman	Combest
Bishop	Coughlin
Bishop	Courter
Bishop	Craig
Bishop	Crane
Bishop	Daniel
Bishop	Dannemeyer
Bishop	Darden

Daub	Lightfoot	Rowland (GA)
DeLay	Lipinski	Rudd
Derrick	Livingston	Russo
DeWine	Loeffler	Schaefer
Dickinson	Lott	Shaw
Dornan (CA)	Lowery (CA)	Shumway
Dreier	Lujan	Shuster
Duncan	Lungren	Siljander
Dyson	Mack	Skeen
Eckert (NY)	Madigan	Skelton
Edwards (OK)	Marlenee	Slaughter
Emerson	Martin (IL)	Smith (NE)
Evans (IA)	Martin (NY)	Smith (NJ)
Fiedler	McCain	Smith, Denny
Fields	McCandless	(OR)
Frenzel	McCollum	Smith, Robert
Gallo	McEwen	(NH)
Gekas	McGrath	Smith, Robert
Gingrich	McMillan	(OR)
Goodling	Meyers	Snyder
Gradison	Mica	Solomon
Gregg	Michel	Spence
Hall, Ralph	Miller (OH)	Stallings
Hammerschmidt	Miller (WA)	Stangeland
Hansen	Molinari	Stenholm
Hartnett	Monson	Strang
Hatcher	Montgomery	Stratton
Hendon	Moorhead	Stump
Hiler	Morrison (WA)	Sundquist
Holt	Mrazek	Sweeney
Hopkins	Myers	Swindall
Hubbard	Nelson	Tauke
Hunter	Nichols	Taylor
Hutto	Nielson	Thomas (CA)
Hyde	Oxley	Thomas (GA)
Ireland	Packard	Vander Jagt
Jenkins	Parris	Volkmer
Johnson	Pashayan	Vucanovich
Jones (OK)	Porter	Walker
Kasich	Quillen	Watkins
Kemp	Regula	Weber
Kindness	Ritter	Whitehurst
Kolbe	Roberts	Whittaker
Kramer	Robinson	Wolf
Lagomarsino	Rogers	Wortley
Lent	Roth	Wylie
Lewis (CA)	Roukema	Young (AK)
Lewis (FL)	Rowland (CT)	Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—9

Burton (CA)	Fowler	Latta
Campbell	Grotberg	Moore
Flippo	Hillis	Morrison (CT)

□ 1225

Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois, and Messrs. VOLKMER, BADHAM, DERRICK, NELSON, of Florida, BONKER, RUSSO, HUTTO, MICA, LIPINKSI, SKELTON, and BENNETT changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. PETRI changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So (two-thirds not having voted in favor thereof) the motion was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

**ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE**

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GRAY of Illinois). Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5 of rule I, the Chair announces that he will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device may be taken on all the additional motions to suspend the rules on which the Chair postponed further proceedings.

The next vote is a 5-minute vote.

**FOREST ECOSYSTEMS AND ATMOSPHERIC POLLUTION RESEARCH ACT OF 1986**

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 2631, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WHITLEY] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2631, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 416, nays 4, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 333]

YEAS—416

Ackerman	Cooper	Gradison
Akaka	Coughlin	Gray (IL)
Alexander	Courter	Gray (PA)
Anderson	Coyne	Green
Andrews	Craig	Gregg
Annunzio	Crockett	Guarini
Anthony	Daniel	Gunderson
Applegate	Dannemeyer	Hall (OH)
Archer	Darden	Hall, Ralph
Army	Daschle	Hamilton
Aspin	Daub	Hammerschmidt
Atkins	Davis	Hansen
AuCoin	de la Garza	Hartnett
Badham	Dellums	Hatcher
Barnard	Derrick	Hawkins
Barnes	DeWine	Hayes
Bartlett	Dicks	Heffner
Barton	Dingell	Hendon
Bateman	DiGuardi	Henry
Bates	Dixon	Hertel
Bedell	Donnelly	Hiler
Bellenson	Dorgan (ND)	Holt
Bennett	Dornan (CA)	Hopkins
Bentley	Dowdy	Horton
Bereuter	Downey	Howard
Berman	Dreier	Hoyer
Bevill	Duncan	Hubbard
Biaggi	Durbin	Huckaby
Bilirakis	Dwyer	Hughes
Bliley	Dymally	Hunter
Boehlert	Dyson	Hutto
Boggs	Early	Hyde
Boland	Eckart (OH)	Ireland
Boner (TN)	Eckert (NY)	Jacobs
Bonior (MI)	Edgar	Jeffords
Bonker	Edwards (CA)	Jenkins
Borski	Edwards (OK)	Johnson
Bosco	Emerson	Jones (MO)
Boucher	English	Jones (OH)
Boutler	Erdreich	Jones (TN)
Boxer	Evans (IA)	Kanjorski
Breaux	Evans (IL)	Kaptur
Brooks	Fascell	Kasich
Broomfield	Fawell	Kastenmeyer
Brown (CA)	Fazio	Kemp
Brown (CO)	Feighan	Kennelly
Bruce	Fiedler	Kildee
Bryant	Fields	Kindness
Burton (IN)	Fish	Kleczka
Bustamante	Florio	Kolbe
Byron	Foglietta	Kolter
Callahan	Foley	Kostmayer
Carney	Ford (MI)	Kramer
Carper	Ford (TN)	LaFalce
Carr	Frank	Lagomarsino
Chandler	Franklin	Lantos
Chapman	Frenzel	Latta
Chappell	Frost	Leach (IA)
Chapple	Fuqua	Leath (TN)
Cheney	Gallo	Lehman (CA)
Clay	Garcia	Lehman (FL)
Clinger	Gaydos	Leland
Coats	Gejdenson	Lent
Cobey	Gekas	Levin (MD)
Coble	Gephardt	Levine (CA)
Coelho	Gibbons	Lewis (CA)
Coleman (MO)	Gillman	Lewis (FL)
Coleman (TX)	Gingrich	Lightfoot
Collins	Glickman	Lipinski
Combest	Gonzalez	Livingston
Conte	Goodling	Lloyd
Conyers	Gordon	Loeffler