

DRA GROUP MESSAGE

KABUL, July 18.—The Peace Solidarity and Friendship Organization of the DRA (PSFO) has issued a message on the occasion of July 19, the international day of solidarity with the people of Nicaragua which coincides with the sixth anniversary of the Sandinist revolution. The message reads that the peace-loving mankind including the Afghan people mark this occasion at a time when the U.S. imperialism and its regional accomplices are feverishly preparing to launch an all-out armed onslaught against Nicaragua. The incessant reconnaissance flights carried out by the U.S. aircraft on the air space of Nicaragua, mining the latter's frontiers, terrorizing the Sandinist leaders, and banning the Nicaraguan diplomatic corps in the U.S. to enjoy diplomatic immunities and imposing economic blockade on Nicaragua are but a few of the clear manifestations of the hostile U.S. policy against the people and revolution of Nicaragua.

The PSFO, voicing the sentiment of the peace-loving Afghan people, expresses its full support to the just struggle of the Nicaraguan people to defend their independence, national sovereignty and territorial integrity vis-a-vis the plots and conspiracies hatched by the imperialist forces. ●

CONTINUING THE ANTI-APARTHEID STRUGGLE

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 26, 1985

● Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commend the efforts to TransAfrica in initiating the free South Africa movement. In particular, I would like to thank Randall Robinson for his leadership.

International sentiment against apartheid is steadily increasing. France's decision to recall its ambassador to protest Pretoria's security crackdown is very encouraging. Political and economic persuasion is a powerful tool, and France's precedent may signal the beginning of South Africa's isolation in the Western community.

And yet, it is the United States which can best rally the world community by example. White South Africans need the West, and they especially need United States markets and investment. A withdrawal of this support just might bring the whites of that country to their collective senses.

Randall Robinson and TransAfrica are indeed educating the American public and government about what our role should be in the antiapartheid movement. He has been remarkably successful thus far, and will in all likelihood turn the full moral weight of public opinion against constructive engagement. I wish him the best of luck in this important work.

I would like to submit the following article for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

[From the Washington Post, July 24, 1985]
PICKETING HELPS PROD CONGRESS INTO VOTING

(By Barry Sussman)

Current congressional moves toward economic sanctions against South Africa offer evidence of what a band of dedicated activists can accomplish when it knows how to attract and rally public opinion.

On July 11, the Senate voted 80 to 12 for a bill banning new bank loans and exports of nuclear technology to South Africa, and requiring American companies with interests in South Africa to take an active role in opposing its apartheid policy of racial segregation.

The legislation is seen by many as sending a strong message to Pretoria and to the Reagan administration, which continues to oppose sanctions while adhering to a policy of "constructive engagement" with the South African government.

In June, the House voted 295 to 127 for a tougher measure that also would halt importation of krugerrands into the United States. Last year \$600 million worth of those South African gold coins were sold to Americans, more than half the total exported. One-third of the Republicans joined almost all the Democrats in the House vote.

The bills are now in Senate-House conference, and what will emerge is not certain. But what does seem apparent is that there would have been no action at all except for the work over the past eight months of a group known as the "Free South Africa Movement."

The group began picketing near the South African Embassy in Washington last November, protesting the jailing of a number of labor leaders. The protests drew a good bit of television coverage, and similar protests sprang up in other cities.

After 16 days, the labor leaders were released but the picketing continued, shifting focus to the larger problem of apartheid. Emerging as a spokesman for the movement was Randall Robinson, the executive director of a foreign policy lobby, TransAfrica.

By last week, 2,000 people had been arrested in Washington and more than 4,000 at demonstrations at 26 other cities or college campuses.

So far, 22 members of Congress have chosen to be arrested and so have a number of mayors, and union and religious leaders. The most recent celebrity arrest was that of Coretta Scott King, widow of a slain civil right leader. The picketing takes place every weekday, and Robinson is not yet short of picketers. On holidays like Mother's Day, there has been Sunday protesting as well.

Herbert Beukes, South Africa's ambassador to the United States, contends that his government will not be intimidated by protests "half a world away," and says the motives of Robinson's group are domestic, political ones.

Whether or not that is true, the activists' domestic success is beyond dispute. Aside from the large number of arrests and congressional action, evidence gathered from two Washington Post-ABC News opinion polls shows growing support for the protests.

In January, when the protests were two months old, the Post-ABC News poll asked a random sample of Americans if they had heard about the picketing in Washington and elsewhere. About half (52 percent) said they had. Among them, 46 percent said they approved of the protests and 21 percent said they opposed them.

In mid-June, the Post-ABC News poll found a 10-point increase in the number of people aware of the protests, up to 62 percent. Among that larger group, virtually the

same proportion as in the earlier survey—46 to 22 percent this time—said they approved.

In June the survey also showed a strong relationship between support for what Congress was doing and awareness of the protests.

The poll put this question to the public: "Congress is working to take economic action aimed at forcing South Africa to end or reduce racial segregation. Reagan opposes such economic action, saying it would not help the situation there. Whom do you tend to side with, Congress or Reagan?"

Overall, the public was about evenly divided, with 46 percent siding with Congress, 44 percent with Reagan and 10 percent undecided.

Among the 38 percent who had not heard of the protests, 49 percent supported Reagan's view, 40 percent Congress'.

Among the 62 percent who had heard of the protests, 50 percent sided with Congress, 41 percent with Reagan, 9 percent were undecided.

Robinson sees three factors that have propelled the economic sanctions to the threshold of congressional enactment. Together, they serve as a model for any activist movement.

First is consistency. "The people involved are prepared to go on as many months or years as necessary," Robinson said.

Second is what Robinson called a consumable message. "We felt that if we could put the message before the American people, they would make the right decision. The issue is what is fair and what is unfair."

Third is hard lobbying from within," he said, and the protests and "other kinds of public pressures are needed to make them more responsive."

Asked whether there would have been any legislation at all if not for the embassy protests, Senate Majority Leader Robert J. Dole (R-Kan.) said, "Well, it focused on the problem. And I think from that standpoint, those who had the responsibility, [Senate Foreign Relations Committee] Chairman [Richard G.] Lugar [R-Ind.] and others at the hearings, made modifications.

"... Not only the focus, not being arrested and all that, but the fact that they were very actively visiting the different people on the Hill. Let's face it: Some see it as a big civil rights issue that's important down the road. . . . All that has an impact." ●

ACID RAIN DEBATE CHANGING

HON. EDWARD R. MADIGAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 26, 1985

● Mr. MADIGAN. Mr. Speaker, I recently read with great interest a column written by the editor of Environmental Forum, Bud Ward. In his "Reflections" column for the June issue of the magazine, Mr. Ward has identified a significant change in the attitude of environmental scientists toward the acid rain debate. Many of us have argued that controls on Midwest utilities are not a panacea for solving the problems associated with acid deposition in the Northeast. In response, Congress has prudently resisted acid rain control legislation, deciding instead to commit our resources to seeking a scientific consensus. A consensus to move the debate away from

**AUTHORIZING SPECIAL PRIVATE
CALENDAR DAY ON TUESDAY,
JULY 30, 1985**

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that there be a special Private Calendar day on Tuesday next, July 30, 1985.

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

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. NIELSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained and missed rollcall vote No. 263.

Mr. Speaker, had I been present I would have voted "no."

THEFT OF THE AMERICAN FLAG

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced legislation which makes it a Federal offense to steal the flag of the United States of America. As we all know, it is a Federal offense to desecrate our flag.

Currently, the theft of an American flag is treated under State laws pertaining to thefts generally. This bill would establish this theft as a misdemeanor under Federal law. Persons found guilty of the offense would be subject to a fine not more than \$1,000 and imprisonment for not more than 1 year or both. The penalty is the same penalty under the Federal desecration statute. The Federal district court will have jurisdiction over cases brought under this statute.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that my colleagues will join in supporting and co-sponsoring this small but important piece of legislation.

**A DEFICIT OUT OF CONTROL IS
LIKE A TRAIN HEADING FULL
STEAM OVER A CLIFF**

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

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I cannot help but look on with dismay as the budget process collapses into a mire of partisan spending feuds. It would seem as though we have abandoned the single most important goal for which we were sent to Congress last November. The deficit is out of control. This continued irresponsible spending is swiftly and tirelessly rotting the fabric of the American economy.

Yet we have gone beyond losing our self-control. Congress even seems to be willing to abuse its legislative powers and flaunt the very laws under which it operates in order to break all previous records for budget deficits. A day rarely goes by when we do not pass a rule waiving points of order against the illegal appropriation of funds in

the absence of a budget. If the laws of this land cannot restrain our spending, I ask you: What sort of coercion will ever produce a balanced budget?

On Tuesday, the House passed the Water Quality Renewal Act, which contained an appropriation 77 percent above last year's levels in defiance of our commitment to reduce the deficit. The bill also contained \$2 million needed for sewage treatment in Naco, AZ, a town in my district. I am committed to helping my constituents in Arizona, but their primary concern is for a balanced budget, and so I voted against the act. I could not justify impaling our efforts to balance the budget in order to win this funding for my district.

We're all on a train heading full steam over a cliff. And I'm ashamed of the passengers on the train who are unwilling to cast aside a little of their personal baggage, their pet projects, in order to stop the train and reverse its perilous course. Will we be able to tell our children that we have done everything in our power to protect their future if none of us is willing to make a sacrifice to build our economy on solid ground?

**STATE OF EMERGENCY IM-
POSED BY GOVERNMENT OF
SOUTH AFRICA—THE LEADER
OF THE FREE WORLD DOES
NOTHING**

(Mr. FORD of Tennessee asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FORD of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I am extremely distressed by the current state of affairs in South Africa. The imposition of a state of emergency by the South African Government provides the police with unlimited authority to do what they please with any person or organization who dares to speak out against the repugnant practice of apartheid. Whatever remnants of free speech remaining in South Africa has now disappeared. When will the Reagan Administration finally disassociate itself from this repressive regime? Why must the leader of the free world do nothing when there are others, namely the French, who are willing to denounce apartheid, and back their words by freezing new investment in that nation.

This latest action by the Botha government will only lead to new heights of violence in South Africa. Over 400 lives have already been lost this year, 400 black lives who were guilty of not being born white. The Botha government says they would like to engage the black leaders of that nation in dialog, however, they place all the black leaders in prison without formal charges.

As evidenced by these latest actions, those in power in South Africa have absolutely no intention of dismantling

the system of apartheid. Unfortunately, that decision is going to cost thousands of lives, both black and white.

The current state of affairs in South Africa are a direct result of the administration's policy of constructive engagement. As long as the administration advocates such a policy, the Botha government does not feel compelled to change. Recently, at a conference on Africa at the United Nations, Dr. Nthato Motlana (ne-tha-to-mot-la-na), chairman of the Soweto Civic Association, conveyed a message that black South Africans felt that the United States has taken sides on this matter. South Africans believe we are powerful enough to do something about apartheid, and cannot understand why nothing is done.

Mr. Speaker, it is sad when the United States is no longer looked upon as the primary defender of world rights and liberty. It is unconscionable that the administration might reject congressionally passed sanctions against apartheid. Worse yet, the inability of the administration to speak out against the Botha government leads many organizations in South Africa to resort to violence to bring about change.

Mr. Speaker, Dr. Motlana was correct, the United States does have the power to help bring about change. I appeal to the administration; how many more must die in South Africa before they make it known to the Botha government in the strongest terms that apartheid is not longer acceptable? I ask that an editorial from the Memphis Commercial Appeal of July 25, echoing these sentiments, be included in the RECORD.

THE COMING FIGHT

For decades the white minority government in South Africa has been attempting the impossible; to maintain in the same country a democracy for whites and a police state for the black majority.

From the official start of apartheid almost 40 years ago, thoughtful South Africans told the ruling Afrikaners their "separate but unequal" policy would fail, that the poison of racism and repression would infect whites' civil rights.

That prediction came true over the weekend, when President P.W. Botha declared a state of emergency in 36 cities and towns and gave the police vast new powers to quell opposition to white supremacy.

The police, who already have a well-deserved reputation for brutality, are empowered to impose curfews, ban travel, arrest persons without warrants and detain them indefinitely, not publish the names of detainees, keep journalists out of emergency zones and censor the press.

In addition, the police have full immunity from civil and criminal liability for actions taken under the emergency. Given their record, that is a license to maim and kill.

Botha hopes that his version of martial law will end the violence that has convulsed black townships, claiming some 500 lives in the past 10 months. He probably is wrong, since South Africa seems to have fallen into a prerevolutionary stage.

For too long the Afrikaners have tried to decapitate black nationalism by jailing or exiling responsible leaders or by allowing

them to die "by accident" in police custody. Now, under the emergency, hundreds of clergymen, unionists, opposition politicians and anti-apartheid activists, including whites, are being arrested.

But this leaves the regime with nobody to talk to. Police and soldiers control the black townships by day. At night radicalized youths form mobs to murder black councilmen and policemen as collaborators with white rule.

The young blacks have flexed their economic muscles too, enforcing a two-month boycott of white-owned stores that has devastated business in Port Elizabeth. If they continue their tactics, much of South Africa may become untenable, politically and economically.

Botha and associates have ignored too many warnings, offered no meaningful reforms, while black moderation turned to extremism. Thus, barring a miracle of biracial accommodation, South Africa's future, the fate of 4.5 million whites and 20 million blacks, will be decided by violence.

□ 1450

FISCAL YEAR 1985 FOREIGN AID BILL AND POPULATION ASSISTANCE

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

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, late last night the House-Senate conference dropped all language in the foreign aid bill to relevant to population aid.

The conference addressed two main issues: First, whether or not the Congress should preserve or reverse the administration's policy announced at Mexico City last year to deny funding to nongovernment organizations that perform or promote abortion and second, the conference dealt with House and Senate passed language dealing with coerced abortion and infanticide in the People's Republic of China.

The conferees were in deadlock. The Senate felt obliged to stick with their provisions reversing the so-called Mexico City policy and tough anticoercion language; the House stood firm, in defending what was essentially my two amendments.

I would say parenthetically that I applaud Chairman FASCELL's leadership and integrity in defending the House position.

Having been permitted to debate the issue at the conference, I concurred with Chairman FASCELL on dropping all language in the bill. By doing this, we achieved two significant objectives.

First, we effectively preserved the administration policy of denying funding to nongovernment organizations that perform or promote abortion, that is, the International Planned Parenthood Federation of London.

Second, we eliminated the earmark for the United Nation's Fund for Population Activities [UNFPA] which thus affords the administration the ability to determine what level of funding, if any UNFPA will receive in

light of its comanagement of the coercion in the People's Republic of China.

Mr. Speaker, let me just say that it would be a gross misreading of the convictions of the conferees—and the Congress—for the government of the People's Republic of China to assume any diminution of our outrage over coerced abortion, sterilization, and infanticide in the People's Republic of China.

This House, I would remind them voted 289 to 130 to condemn these atrocities as "crimes against humanity." We therefore are solidly on record in recognizing and condemning these repugnant practices.

Absent sweeping reforms in the PRC, the authorities in Beijing should be on notice that the Congress has really just begun to address this issue and will persist with diligence in focusing on these human rights abuses. We will take whatever action necessary to end these heinous crimes.

LEGISLATION TO REVITALIZE THE AMERICAN INDUSTRIAL STEEL EFFORT

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

Mr. KOLTER. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to introduce legislation that seeks to revitalize the American industrial steel effort.

Throughout the world, nations subsidize research and development, while the United States, does nothing.

In the United States, many of our industries have neither the resources, nor the will to implement modernization in their plants. The legislation I am introducing today, will strive to overcome the imbalance that currently exists, while accelerating the pace, and utilization of technology in American steelmaking.

LTV recently announced the closing of the J&L Aliquippa works, in a national advertising campaign, by saying, "One of the most disheartening tasks for a company is to announce the idling of a plant. It's not a question of bricks and mortar—we are talking about people's lives." I could not agree more. Many proud and harworking people have devoted their lives to the producing of steel, but faced with policies and decisions beyond their control, they have been forced out of their jobs and must now live on hand-outs.

Mr. Speaker, I humbly ask that each of my colleagues review this essential piece of legislation that will enable America to once again stand firm in its commitment to our basic industries, and the millions of lives that flourish when they produce.

THE HUMANITARIAN GESTURE MADE BY ST. MARK'S HOSPITAL OF SALT LAKE CITY

(Mr. MONSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MONSON. Mr. Speaker, St. Mark's Hospital, which is located in the district I represent, recently donated services and aid to two young Afghans who had been wounded seriously as a result of the war against Soviet oppression of their homeland. I feel that this humanitarian gesture should receive the appropriate applause it deserves. An editorial from the Salt Lake Tribune describes this generous gesture and I include it at this point in the RECORD so that all might see what is being done by these good-hearted Americans.

(From the Salt Lake Tribune, May 22, 1985)

ST. MARK'S AID TO AFGHANS IS GENEROUS GESTURE

The local donation of medical aid and other services to two young Afghans stands out both as a generous humanitarian gesture and a tangible show of support for a cause close to the hearts of most Americans.

The board and staff of St. Mark's Hospital deserve whatever positive publicity and local assistance their contributions generate.

At the suggestion of Dr. John Ream, who spent some time as a volunteer medical teacher in Afghanistan a decade ago, St. Mark's Hospital responded to a plea from the Washington-based Committee for a Free Afghanistan to help heal refugees injured by communist soldiers and inadequately served by medical teams in Pakistan.

The Utah hospital became one of the first private American hospitals to participate in the project last week, when it admitted Hazarat Kahn, an 8 year old whose legs were crushed when Soviets bombed his village 15 months ago, and Saidullah Shedmir Kahn, a 19-year-old freedom fighter still suffering from a 2-year-old leg wound.

St. Mark's strategy has been to build the refugees' strength for orthopedic surgery and to house them locally during convalescence.

This is at least one kind of assistance American citizens can provide in a tragic, complex situation the U.S. government has been unable to control.

If Committee for a Free Afghanistan estimates are correct, 1.5 million Afghans—10 percent of the population—have died since the Soviet invasion five years ago. More than 3 million Afghans have fled to Pakistan, and French, Pakistani and American physicians have been unable to keep up with casualties since the Soviets killed most Afghan doctors.

Because direct intervention in a political struggle so close to the Soviet Union could touch off an even more devastating, international crisis, the United States must approach Afghanistan with extreme caution. Diplomatic, medical and monetary military aid seem the safest official measures at the moment. But they won't soon stop the carnage.

Therefore, individuals who value human life and freedom must step in as Good Samaritans to ease the suffering of Afghans cut down in the battle for self determination. St. Mark's Hospital and several Utah physicians have risen to the occasion. May their spirit spread.