

HIS EXCELLENCY THE MOST REVEREND ANTHONY SABLAN APURON, ARCHBISHOP OF AGANA

HON. BEN GARRIDO BLAZ

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 7, 1986

Mr. BLAZ. Mr. Speaker, on May 11, 1986, the people of Guam, the Northern Mariana Islands and Micronesia as well as Catholics throughout the Western Pacific will celebrate the joyous occasion of the installation of the Most Reverend Anthony Sablan Apuron, OFM-Cap. as Archbishop of Agana. The elevation of Bishop Apuron to archbishop marks the second time that His Holiness, Pope John Paul II, has selected a native son of Guam as archbishop.

The rise of His Excellency from a humble beginning as a Capuchin friar in 1972, to auxiliary bishop in 1983 and to archbishop in less than 3 years at age 40 is unprecedented in the history of the Catholic Church in the Pacific Basin. It is indeed a record of great achievement, success, and recognition.

This auspicious occasion is but the latest recognition by the church of our proud American Territory of Guam. In a relatively short period of time—the last 5 years—the following events have brought recognition and honor to our community:

His Holiness, Pope John Paul II, visited Guam on February 22-23, 1981;

Pope John Paul II. appointed Father Anthony S. Apuron auxiliary bishop to Bishop Felixberto C. Flores, D.D., Bishop of Agana on December 8, 1983;

On January 13, 1985, the Most Reverend Tomas A. Camacho of Saipan was consecrated Bishop of Chalan Kanoa;

On September 9, 1985, the Cathedral of Dulce Nombre De Maria in Agana was designated Cathedral-Basilica; and

On October 6, 1985, Blessed Diego Luis San Vitores was beatified in St. Peter's Basilica in Rome.

Bishop Apuron is replacing the man who ordained him as a priest—the late and beloved Archbishop Felixberto C. Flores. When Archbishop Flores' health failed and he selected Father Apuron to be his trusted assistant; and ultimately, Father Apuron became auxiliary bishop and successor.

The rise of Bishop Apuron in the hierarchy of the church and his elevation to archbishop come as no surprise to our people. He is admired and respected for his eloquence, for his dynamic and charismatic personality, and for his deep pastoral love for his people. He is a true leader of the people of Guam.

When Bishop Apuron assumes his new post this Sunday, he will also assume many challenges as well as opportunities in this developing region of the Western Pacific. Like the region he represents, he is young, determined and healthy and the future beckons for his strong spiritual and pastoral leadership.

The motto: "Servus Tuus" ("your servant") on Bishop Apuron's Coat of Arms perhaps best describes the quality and dignity of this future archbishop. It stands not only for his 11 years of pastoral and community services as a priest in Guam and the Northern Marianas, but also for his pledge of future service to the people of the archdiocese in the teachings of the Savior Jesus Christ.

The 40-year-old bishop was born in Agana, Guam, on November 1, 1945, the son of Manuel Tajito Apuron and Ana Santos Sablan (deceased). His paternal ancestors are from Ilocos Sur, a northern Luzon province in the Philippines; his maternal ancestors are from Guam.

Bishop Apuron comes with a rich educational background. He completed his high school education at Father Duenas Memorial School and thereafter attended the Capuchin Franciscan Novitiates and St. Lawrence Friary in Milton, MA. His academic degrees include a bachelor of arts degree in scholastic philosophy from St. Anthony Capuchin College, Hudson, NH; a masters in theology from Maryknoll School of Theology in Ossining, NY; and a masters of arts in Liturgical Studies from the University of Notre Dame, South Bend, IN.

Bishop Apuron's many and varied responsibilities included: associate pastor of Mount Carmel Church, Saipan: June 1975-76; elected first councilor to Capuchin Franciscan Friars: May 1976-79; a pastor of Mount Carmel Church, Agat: June 1976-78; appointed rector of Dulce Nombre de Maria Cathedral: June 1978 to present; appointed auxiliary bishop to Bishop Felixberto C. Flores, DD., Bishop of Agana, by His Holiness Pope John Paul II, December 8, 1983; chairman of Diocesan Liturgical Commission for the Diocese of Agana, 1974 to present; chaplain to Guam Legislature: July 1978 to present; first councilor to Capuchin Franciscan Friars: January 1982-83; elected member of Diocesan Board of Consultors: January 1982 to present; and as master of ceremonies for the diocese during the Papal visit to Guam in February 1981. During the Eucharistic Liturgy Father Apuron assisted His Holiness, Pope John Paul II, in practical and helpful ways.

I join the people of Guam, the Northern Mariana Islands and the Micronesian region in fervent prayers for his success as Archbishop of Agana.

FIGHTING APARTHEID

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 7, 1986

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commend John E. Jacob, president of the National Urban League, for his insightful commentary on the situation in South Africa. His article, which appeared in a recent edition of the *Carib News*, goes to the heart of the problem in South Africa.

As Mr. Jacob points out, the ultimate issue is not whether blacks will be permitted to live in integrated neighborhoods or enjoy integrated facilities. Rather, blacks are now demanding full political empowerment under a system of universal franchise. The young black men and women of South Africa are completely committed to this goal, and it is unlikely that the Pretoria regime's half-hearted reforms will appease their legitimate rage.

One point stressed by Mr. Jacob is that American corporations must understand that black South Africans are beginning to view them as impediments to the anti-apartheid movement. Multinationals which profess to have the best interests of blacks at heart by adoption of the Sullivan Principles are fooling

themselves. Black people view this argument with suspicion, and ask themselves whether the people who use this rationale are really apologists for apartheid.

I would commend the Jacob article to my colleagues, and urge them to read it carefully.

FIGHTING APARTHEID

South Africa is aflame with a spontaneous, grass-roots revolt against a white supremacist system that relegates 85 percent of the population to brutalizing oppression.

The struggle is no longer about segregated facilities or even the visible aspect of apartheid. Today, the struggle is about power.

That realization is prompting many U.S.-based multinational corporations to reconsider their presence in South Africa.

Multinational companies say they have to do business in countries even when they disapprove of the host country's policies. But apartheid isn't just another bad policy—it is a vicious moral outrage.

The only way for U.S.-based companies to continue to operate in South Africa is for apartheid to end. And one way to help end it is for the U.S. government to join the worldwide movement to make South Africa end its racism.

Corporate America can best help this process by lobbying the White House and the State Department to take a pro-active, anti-apartheid South Africa policy stance.

Such a move would not absolve companies with South African operations from their responsibility to fight apartheid in that country, but it would put the basic responsibility for foreign policy where it belongs—on the Administration.

I'm surprised corporate leaders haven't caught on to the bind their governments put them in.

U.S.-based multinationals have been under pressure to withdraw from South Africa and have begun to take a more activist stance, as can be seen by the formation of the U.S. Corporate Council on South Africa, organized to work with South African businesses to end apartheid.

That's fine, as far as it goes, but I'm inclined to think it is not enough. While the message is right, the mailing address may be the wrong one. Along with pressuring Pretoria, those companies would be better advised to put the heat on Washington.

They ought to be complaining to the State Department and the White House that the failure of their government to identify itself with the aspirations of the Black majority in South Africa leaves U.S. business interests high and dry.

It is in America's interest to be on the side of South Africa's future, not its past. Without a drastic shift in U.S. policy, a future Black government of South Africa may adopt anti-U.S. policies that could destroy U.S. corporate interests there.

The Administration is forcing U.S. companies to choose between voluntarily withdrawing from that country now or being expelled from it later.

South Africa is moving dangerously close to a civil war that could sweep away both white and Black moderates and throw the country into prolonged turmoil and ultimate enmity toward the U.S.

The policy of constructive engagement that implicitly endorsed South Africa's racist policies has backfired badly. All it did was to give South Africa's masters the feeling they could get away with their terrible violations of human rights without any pressures from abroad.

There should be maximum U.S. pressure on South Africa, including sanctions, establishing friendly ties with the anti-apartheid

