

bill provides for the training and maintenance of strike teams located around the United States to respond quickly to oil spills. Finally, it would require all oil tankers and barges in the United States to be fitted with a double hull. In the event of a spill, the double-hull requirement could significantly reduce the amount of oil leaked from the vessel. The Coast Guard estimates that the Exxon *Valdez* would have lost 60-percent less oil if it had had a double hull.

Despite this pressing need, the legislation continues to languish in conference. As we noted in the letter to Speaker FOLEY:

The conferees have already had four months to complete action on this most important bill. In this time, the conferees have not been discussing ways to implement the double hull provision, instead they have been trading proposals to weaken it.

To their credit, Coast Guard officials have launched an inquiry into the causes of the spills in the New York area. That question and answer session should be completed within the week. I look forward to hearing about the results of the inquiry, as I know all involved are deeply concerned and eager to provide remedies.

Although welcome, the Coast Guard's inquiry is no solution for the problem of oil spills in this country. How many more disasters—like the rash of spills in the New York Harbor Area—must take place before we act the necessary legislation to protect our environment?

We must find a better balance between the energy needs of the New York and New Jersey area and the protection of the surrounding environment. The oil spill bill helps strike that balance. So what are we waiting for?

**SANCTIONS: STILL WORKING,
STILL NEEDED**

HON. RONALD V. DELLUMS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 21, 1990

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, we have heard a great deal about reforms of the South African system of apartheid that have been undertaken by that country's President, F.W. DeKlerk. President DeKlerk's actions to date are certainly worthy of praise, however, there is a long road ahead before the conditions set forth by the Congress in the Anti-Apartheid Act will have been met. Indeed, the status of the situation is best described with the words used by my friend Lindiwe Mabuza, the chief U.S. representative of the African National Congress, to headline the editorial which appears below—"Apartheid: Far From Over." Please give your careful consideration to the update on the progress of peaceful change which she has written. I find her observations factually correct and her views to be eminently reasonable.

APARTHEID: FAR FROM OVER
(By Lindiwe Mabuza)

WASHINGTON.—Nelson Mandela is visiting the U.S. to pay tribute to the long and arduous struggle of so many Americans who supported him and to urge all Americans committed to democracy, justice, freedom and equality to continue sanctions against Pretoria.

News of the Free South Africa Movement reached Mr. Mandela even inside his prison walls, and helped sustain him and his fellow prisoners. He heard about students building shantytowns on their campuses in support of divestment, about longshoremen who refused to unload goods created by apartheid, about city councils that voted to withdraw pension funds from companies doing business in South Africa. He heard that the anti-apartheid struggle involved even schoolchildren.

This was a phenomenal constituency, built at a time when U.S. policy was more aligned to apartheid than to the aspirations for democracy of millions of oppressed people. Thus, we are all the more grateful for the sacrifices and commitment of the many Americans who persevered. And we certainly made some gains. Mr. Mandela is out of prison because you wanted him released. But our people are not free to vote, to elect our representatives, to decide the destiny of our country.

Mr. Mandela is free, but there are still more than 3,000 political prisoners in South African jails. He is alive, but the South African police are still maiming and killing his fellow citizens for their political convictions.

The state of emergency has been partly lifted. But the Government still has many of the same powers it had under the emergency decree. The Government can outlaw any organization, ban any publication or place any person under house arrest.

Yesterday, Parliament voted to repeal the Separate Amenities Act, which segregated public facilities. Yet, under the Internal Security Act, the police can still detain a political activist and hold that person incommunicado for a substantial period of time.

African National Congress members are still being arrested. Political trials are still occurring at the same pace as last year. Government soldiers continue to occupy black townships. Anti-apartheid demonstrations can still be disrupted at the whim of the police.

And the state of emergency has not been lifted in Natal Province, where its continuation exacerbates violence.

In other words, the anti-apartheid struggle is still far from over. We have taken only the first steps on a long and difficult road. We welcome and applaud the efforts of President F.W. DeKlerk, but our goal of a unified, democratic and nonracial South Africa is still a faraway vision.

We are gratified that President Bush is said to favor continued sanctions against Pretoria. Nevertheless, we are amazed and shocked that certain governments are calling impatiently for the lifting of sanctions. All we have accomplished at this point is removal of some of the obstacles to negotiating the eradication of apartheid.

Any country lifting, or intending to lift, sanctions is undermining the efforts of the international community. Moreover, it is acting in a manner considered hostile by the majority of the oppressed people of South Africa. The call for lifting sanctions is a dangerous trend, an affront to the South Africans who have given their lives or languished in prison and to the many Americans who have sacrificed on their behalf.

In 1959, the A.N.C. called upon the world to impose sanctions because apartheid was terrorizing South Africans. We, and many of you, struggled until 1988 when the U.S. Congress—overriding a Presidential veto—finally approved sanctions.

Sanctions must not be lifted until the changes in South Africa are profound and irreversible. This is defined as completion of a constitution, following elections based on the universally accepted proposition of one person, one vote. That is the litmus test of

whether apartheid exists, of whether sanctions should be lifted.

Statistics give some idea of apartheid's effects: 87 percent of South Africa's land belongs—by law—to the five million whites, who also own 95 percent of the nation's industry. South Africa spends five times as much on education and health care for its white citizens as for its black. The infant mortality rate for white babies is nine per thousand births; for black babies, it is 109. The average life expectancy for a white South African is 72 years; for a black, 59.

But statistics cannot convey fully what it means to live in a country where you're not just born a baby, you're born a black, a colored, an Indian or a white baby—and that label profoundly affects every aspect of your life.

We believe in a peaceful transition to a just and democratic South Africa. Like your extraordinary visionary, the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, we too have a dream of a country where white children and black children can sit down together at the table of sisterhood and brotherhood. That is the dream that sustained Nelson Mandela for 27 years in prison, the dream to which he has dedicated his life and for which we are prepared to die.

The only way to make that dream a reality is to continue sanctions and other international pressure against the South African Government. We hope that the American public and its policymakers will not be blinded by the much welcomed, but only preliminary, changes in South Africa.

Lindiwe Mabuza is chief representative of the African National Congress in the United States.

FATHER DENIS O'KEEFFE CELEBRATES THE GOLDEN JUBILEE OF HIS ORDINATION TO THE PRIESTHOOD

HON. THOMAS J. MANTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 21, 1990

Mr. MANTON. Mr. Speaker, on June 24, 1990, Father Denis O'Keeffe of St. Sebastian's Church in Woodside, NY, will celebrate the golden jubilee of his ordination to the priesthood. The people of the Ninth Congressional District of New York have been blessed with the services of Father O'Keeffe since 1972 when he was assigned to St. Raphael's parish in Long Island City, NY. In 1979, Father O'Keeffe was transferred to St. Sebastian's Church in Woodside. Over the past 11 years, Father O'Keeffe has touched the lives of many people in Woodside. His faithful visits to the sick, the elderly, and the homebound give inspiration to those who are often without hope. He also makes a special effort to spend time with the young children of the parish school. Father O'Keeffe has celebrated hundreds of weddings and baptisms. He has also given special comfort to those who have lost a friend or a family member. I am honored and deeply grateful that Father O'Keeffe was the celebrant at my father's funeral mass earlier this year.

Mr. Speaker, like my parents, Father O'Keeffe was born and raised in Ireland. Denis O'Keeffe was born in Meensiovane, County Kerry, Ireland in 1913. He graduated from Blackrock College, Dublin, Ireland, in 1933, and soon thereafter entered the Holy