

S 16864

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

October 19, 1988

Whereas Ronald L. Tammen has earned the utmost respect of his colleagues in this institution: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That Ronald L. Tammen is hereby commended for his unfailing and exemplary service to his country, the State of Wisconsin and to the United States Senate.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished majority leader for his assistance. These two resolutions concern two remarkable staff members on the Senate Banking Committee who have served this Senator and the Senate so ably.

Mr. BYRD. I thank the Senator.

REFERRING S. 1964 TO THE CHIEF JUDGE OF THE U.S. CLAIMS COURT FOR A REPORT THEREON

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, on behalf of Senators EXON and KARNES, I send a resolution to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 507) to refer S. 1964 entitled "For the Relief of Nebraska Aluminum Casting, Inc., of Hastings, Nebraska" to the Chief Judge of the United States Claims Court for a report thereon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 507) was agreed to, as follows:

S. RES. 507

Resolved, That the bill S. 1964 entitled "For the Relief of Nebraska Aluminum Casting, Inc., of Hastings, Nebraska" now pending in the Senate, together with all the accompanying papers, is referred to the Chief Judge of the United States Claims Court. The Chief Judge shall proceed with the same in accordance with the provisions of sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28, United States Code, and report thereon to the Senate, at the earliest practicable date, giving such findings of fact and conclusions thereon as shall be sufficient to inform the Congress of the nature and character of the demand as a claim, legal or equitable, against the United States or a gratuity and the amount, if any legally or equitably due to the claimant from the United States.

RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING CERTAIN APPOINTMENTS

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I send a resolution to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 508) authorizing certain appointments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 508) was agreed to, as follows:

S. RES. 508

Resolved, That notwithstanding the sine die adjournment of the present session of the Congress, the President of the Senate, the President of the Senate pro tempore, the Majority Leader of the Senate, and the Minority Leader of the Senate be, and they are hereby, authorized to make appointments to commissions, committees, boards, conferences, or interparliamentary conferences authorized by law, by concurrent action of the two Houses, or by order of the Senate.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators may be permitted to speak in morning business for not to exceed 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROCKEFELLER). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

SANCTIONS AGAINST THE REPUGNANT APARTHEID REGIME IN SOUTH AFRICA

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, for the past several weeks a number of Democratic Senators have been pressing for action on S. 2756, the South Africa sanctions bill which I am sponsoring together with Senators KENNEDY, SIMON, BENTSEN, WECKER, ADAMS, MOYNIHAN, BRADLEY, DODD, and LEVIN.

It has become clear that due to the refusal of virtually all members of the Republican side of the aisle to cooperate, we will not be able to achieve a bipartisan agreement to bring this bill to final passage.

I've counted this apartheid issue with great care. A clear majority of the Senate supports the bill—more than 50 Senators. But only two of the certain supporters are Republicans. All the rest are Democrats.

Unfortunately, there are only 54 Democratic Senators. An overwhelming majority of them support sanctions. But it takes 60 votes to stop a debate. So we could not end the debate without the help of a few more Republicans. We haven't had that help.

Given the certainty of a Republican filibuster that was certain to succeed because we lacked the 60 votes it takes to end debate by voting cloture, and given the press of other business—drugs and tax corrections, to cite two examples—the leadership quite properly concluded it would be pointless to bring up the measure. We'd already

been frustrated by Republican filibusters against minimum wage, child care, and parental leave. The Republicans talked, talked, talked, and kept all three issues from coming to a vote.

I deeply regret that Republican Senators have blocked bipartisan support for action on this vital legislation.

As the principal sponsor of this measure, I regret that the Senate will not act on final passage this year.

But this is not the end of the battle. We'll be right back early in 1989. And then, relieved of the time pressures that closed in on us this year, we will do our utmost to bring the matter to a successful vote.

We will surely get a cloture vote. Senators will have to stand up on the issue and be counted publicly, as I have counted them privately.

Mr. President, this is by no means a new proposal. A version of this bill has been before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee for more than 16 months. Eight separate committees of the House and Senate have reviewed it. The full House has passed it. And in an historic Senate Foreign Relations Committee vote last month, that distinguished panel has endorsed the comprehensive sanctions bill. Progress, in many respects, has been remarkable.

Two years ago, the Foreign Relations Committee worked together in a bipartisan fashion to craft modest South Africa sanctions legislation.

The Senate made a pledge in passing that bill; we made a promise in adopting a mild compromise measure.

We made a solemn commitment in the 1986 legislation to revisit the issue 12 months later and to enact stronger sanctions if the situation had not improved.

The situation in South Africa has, in fact, grown far worse.

More than 30,000 people have been arrested for resisting apartheid in the last 2 years.

Thousands of children have been arrested.

Many of those children have been tortured by the regime's police.

And in recent weeks the machinery of the apartheid state has turned on the churches.

Virtually all groups opposed to apartheid have been outlawed.

A legal case is being prepared by the apartheid regime against Bishop Tutu.

And the offices of the South African Council of Churches have been devastated by bomb blasts.

The South African night is growing darker—and alternatives to violence and civil war are being extinguished daily.

We in this Chamber have a very limited ability to influence these grim developments.

But we have, I believe, a moral obligation to act, to use the modest power we have to help those who have none.

And we promised in 1986 that we would act again.

October 19, 1988

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

S 16865

I therefore find unacceptable the position of virtually all Republican Senators that we do nothing. That is what the Republican Senators have said to us by refusing to work with us to craft a bipartisan bill: "Even though the situation has gotten worse, do nothing about apartheid."

The United States is not a pitiful, helpless giant. We can provide leadership, we can fulfill our commitments.

In the face of the horrors which have accelerated over the past few weeks in South Africa, we in the United States should not sit on our hands just because it is an election year at home.

I therefore regret the position taken by most Republican Members of this body.

We on the majority side have sought to be accommodating. We have sought to reach an agreement that would serve U.S. national interests and move this bill forward. It was in that spirit that I accepted the only modification proposed by any Republican Senator in the Foreign Relations Committee—to delete the provision of my bill governing access to future oil leases in the United States by firms involved in South Africa. So we have been responsive.

The United States have a vital interest in making clear our commitment to freedom for the people of South Africa. This is a moral obligation, to be sure. But it is a strategic imperative as well. For some day liberty will come to the oppressed millions in South Africa. It is in the interests of the United States to have stood with them in their struggle for freedom.

Mr. President, I am disappointed that my bill, S. 2756, has not received support from more Senators on the other side of the aisle. I believe the time has come for us to stand up and be counted on the question of doing business with the apartheid regime. I call upon all my colleagues to support sanctions legislation. And I pledge that I will afford them that opportunity anew by pressing antiapartheid legislation early in the new Congress. I hope that we will then enjoy bipartisan cooperation to end United States trade with South Africa and to withdraw American investments in the apartheid system.

Mr. President, I note that seated on the floor is a Senator who has been a leader in the battle against apartheid, the Senator from Illinois, PAUL SIMON, who recently went to South Africa because of his concern about what is happening there and about what is not happening here. I am delighted that he will now speak to the Senate on his first-hand observations in that beleaguered, unfortunate country.

Mr. SIMON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. SIMON. First, I commend my colleague, Senator CRANSTON, for his leadership. I also commend Senator

WEICKER and Senator KENNEDY for their leadership.

I did have, as Senator CRANSTON just mentioned, the experience just a few weeks ago of being in South Africa. South Africa is a time bomb. I cannot tell you whether that time bomb is going to explode 6 days from now or 6 months from now or 6 years from now. But explode it will. That explosion is going to be heard in a variety of ways all over the globe, in ways I cannot predict, nor can anyone else. Apartheid is going to go. The only question is whether it is going to go after massive violence or before massive violence. There will be meaningful negotiations between the white leadership of South Africa and the real black leadership. The only question is, does it come before massive violence or after massive violence. There is no guarantee the sanctions legislation is going to work, but there is a guarantee that if we simply mouth pious tirades and say "naughty-naughty," that is not going to work. That has been the history.

I remind everyone—and I do not need to remind the Senator from California, who is probably the only living American who was ever sued by Adolf Hitler because he wanted to get the original Mein Kampf printed in the United States—in the United States half a century ago, when Hitler was doing what he did to the Jews, we were saying, "Oh, this isn't right," but we were not putting any economic muscle to it.

Maybe—we cannot rerun history—if we had had some kind of economic sanctions against Germany at that time the German people would have changed; we would not have had the massive bloodshed we had. We cannot rerun that but we can learn from history.

I know there are some who say sanctions is not the answer. I had whites in South Africa tell me that. Incidentally, among the whites overwhelmingly they were opposed to sanctions; among the blacks, the leadership overwhelmingly for it. And to those who say, "Well, the blacks in South Africa are opposed to sanctions." I simply point out you basically have three major labor union groups where they have nonwhite leadership now, one of the signs of progress, and there are some signs of progress in South Africa. But those labor union leaders say we want sanctions.

Shortly before I was there, in the one group which met, 870 unions unanimously supported sanctions because they recognized sanctions are the alternative to violence.

I visited three of the black townships. Township is a kind of a pleasant-sounding name to what is there. We have townships in Illinois. You may have townships in West Virginia. I do not know. Townships in South Africa are racially segregated, restricted areas where people have to live, several hundred thousands of them,

blacks living there, with no water, no sewers, miserable schools, and all the rest that you can imagine.

I remember particularly visiting with one man. When I said, "The leaders of your Government tell me that sanctions will hurt blacks," he said, "I am 50 years old. I have three children. I have been suffering for 50 years. If I can suffer a little more and get freedom for my three children, I am eager to do it."

That is frankly the attitude of the majority of blacks who are sensitive to this issue.

Chief Buthelezi, the head of Zulus, was out of the country. I had lunch with his deputy. They are opposed to sanctions. It has to be added that he occupies his position with the approval of the Government, and blacks in key positions who are there at the sufferance of the Government have taken the attitude that sanctions will not work.

There is debate here about the impact of sanctions. There is no debate in South Africa about the impact of sanctions. They feel it. They feel it very, very severely. They feel it in loss of trade. They feel it in interest rates in South Africa. That is a major way they are feeling it.

Some people say sanctions by the United States alone is not the answer, and they are correct. We need to have multilateral sanctions, and here let me say particularly to our friends in Japan, do not try to undercut the United States in its attempt to see that justice comes to South Africa by moving in and getting the trade. That, in the long run, is not going to help Japan, it is not going to help the United States, and it is not going to help South Africa.

We should be having a multilateral approach. We should be leading in the United Nations instead of vetoing the legislation there.

I cannot overstress the fact that this is a time bomb.

Let me give you one example. I visited a hostel. A hostel is a kind of pleasant-sounding word in the United States. It is not that in South Africa. Hostels are where men live who cannot bring their families to the places they work. Eight men live in tiny, little rooms.

I visited with one man who has a wife and five children. He visits his wife and five children once a year. Let me tell you that if somebody hands that man a stick of dynamite and says "Tomorrow we are going to rebel against this system," he is ready.

We have to show him that change can come about peacefully.

One of the discouraging signs is among the whites generally and obviously there are exceptions. When I talk about whites and blacks there are exceptions on both sides. But whites in general have viewed someone like Bishop Tutu as an extremist. Young blacks, the radical, young blacks, view

S 16866

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

October 19, 1988

him as an Uncle Tom, as someone who believes you can bring about change peacefully, and they do not believe him.

To the extent that the Government in South Africa resists any change, to that extent, they are inviting the very violence that they say they oppose.

There are signs of hope. One is that in the unions I mentioned there is progress. Another is more and more banks are going to the universities and in the universities clearly the students, white and black, understand the change that is going to have to be part of the future. And if we could wait 40 years that would evolve naturally, but we cannot wait 40 years.

A third sign of progress is on the religious front. The religious communities, the leadership, clearly are on the right side.

Archbishop Hurley, the Roman Catholic, Bishop Tutu I mentioned, Reverend Bosack who is with the Reform Church, the Council of Churches.

I had a marvelous visit with Professor Heyns. Professor Heyns is the former moderator of the Dutch Reform Church which is the big church in South Africa. He and some others have issued a document saying "Our previous scriptural defense of apartheid is wrong" and spelling out why it is wrong.

There are signs of progress. But in the Government there, there is a rigidity. There are those in Government who will whisper to you "We have to change." But they have not come forward. We need a Sadat frankly in South Africa.

I had some fine visits with leaders of Government, had a 1-hour meeting scheduled with Pik Botha, the Foreign Minister, which turned out to be 1 hour and 45-minute visit, a very good, frank exchange.

There are leaders in South Africa who if the right circumstances were there could move forward, but I think we have to create those circumstances here. We have to send a signal to the business community that change has to come.

Now there are business leaders who are moving in the right direction, including the two principal business leaders in South Africa.

But there is a temerity also and they are frightened by the Government. You have to remember this Government has more political prisoners perhaps than any government on the face of the Earth, certainly one of the top three. It just can take people arbitrarily and put them in prison. So there is some concern.

I am a little older than the Presiding Officer here, and I go back to the days of the civil rights struggle here. I was involved in that. I could remember when the Birmingham Chamber of Commerce adopted a resolution saying, "Let's do away with segregation in the South." It was like a

church bell tolling at midnight. We knew the change was going to come.

That signal from the business community has to be there is South Africa.

There is a willingness on the part of the business community to go along. There is at this point not the leadership that there has to be, and that has to come.

We have to remember that blacks in South Africa cannot vote. There is no trial by jury. There is not a single black judge in all of South Africa.

I visited one trial where 18 members of the United Democratic Front were up for advocating change. There they were before the white judge—18 blacks. There was clearly not a felling on their part that they can get justice.

There is this feeling of hopelessness and despair on the part of the blacks, a feeling of fear on the part of whites, and an awesomely small amount of communication, real communication between the two.

We have to lead. There is no other government on the face of the Earth that has the power to lead that this Nation has. We are one-fifth of the world's economy. We have to use that power responsibly, and we do it not with a pious "we have solved all our problems," because we have not. You know that and I know that.

But we have also made great progress in this country. I do not mind saying I am proud to be an American, proud of the fact that we can now go no matter what your background, no matter what your race, you can go anywhere in the country, eat in a restaurant, stay in a motel, go to school.

That is great progress in my lifetime.

South Africa can make progress, too. South Africa has the potential to be the industrial center of all Africa, but South Africa has to get rid of this cancer of apartheid they have and we have to send the message. I hope in the next session of this Congress we do that.

I point out this system of apartheid requires repression on the part of the people there. While I was in South Africa, Newsweek magazine came out, and the Presiding Officer can see that and I do not know if anyone else can, but in every issue of Newsweek they had Nelson Mandela's picture. There someone in the Government took a long time to cut off Nelson Mandela's picture out of every Newsweek magazine.

That system has to change and to the South Africans who say, "Well, blacks cannot govern themselves," go right next door to Botswana, where there is a free system, greatest economic growth of any developing country on the face of the Earth, multiple-party system, complete freedom of the press and everything else.

South Africa can have the same. Whites, blacks, coloreds and Asians the divisions they have there, can

work together to develop that country into a great country.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I believe that it is time to call a halt to "business as usual" with South Africa. It is time for Americans to stop sending profits to apartheid, and it is time for American corporations to stop paying taxes to Pretoria. That is why I support S. 2756, and that is why I will work for its passage during the 101st Congress.

This year, this legislation was passed by the House of Representatives and approved, with minor modifications, by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Before the House took action on this legislation, we in the Senate worked long and hard to build the same kind of bipartisan coalition on South Africa that had been so successful in 1986. We were unsuccessful in that effort, and I fear that the politics of 1988 intruded. Whatever the reason, our counterparts on the other side of the aisle were unwilling to engage in the kind of dialog necessary to resurrect the partnership that had been so successful 2 years ago, and this legislation regrettably came to the floor of the Senate on the basis of party-line votes.

I believe that an effective American policy against apartheid can only be sustained if it has strong bipartisan support. For this reason, I plan to work closely with Senators on the other side of the aisle and with the new President to draft new legislation that will follow-up on and strengthen the landmark legislation of 1986.

Four years ago, I had lunch with Bishop Desmond Tutu and Reverend Allen Boesak in my office. The purpose of that meeting was to discuss the situation inside South Africa. They were concerned because the United States was in the midst of a Presidential campaign, but no one seemed concerned about United States policy toward South Africa. Bishop Tutu and Reverend Boesak told me about the brutality of the violence that was going on inside South Africa at that time, and they were unhappy about the fact that the Government of South Africa had been so successful in its efforts to persuade world opinion—including the Reagan administration—that apartheid was a thing of the past and that fundamental reform was underway inside South Africa. They were particularly concerned about the silence from America in the face of such violence against black people in South Africa. They told me that America's policy of "constructive engagement" was viewed as proapartheid by most South Africans and had prompted profound anti-Americanism among the majority of the people inside South Africa. It was four years ago that they invited me to come to South Africa to see for myself.

During that trip, I saw first-hand the suffering caused by apartheid, and

October 19, 1988

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

S 16867

I felt first-hand the anger and disappointment with America.

Since that lunch four years ago and since my trip to South Africa in January 1985, 2,500 people have been killed, 30,000 more have been detained, and countless thousands have been tortured and beaten in South African jails—many of them children. Today no one can deny the truth. Apartheid is alive and well in South Africa, and millions of people still live in bondage.

But, beginning in 1985, the American people rose up to demand a change in our policy toward South Africa. The Congress took action, first in 1985 then again in 1986, to make it absolutely clear where the American people stood on the issue of apartheid. And one of the reasons that Congress passed the sanctions legislation in 1986 was to reject "constructive engagement," to show all the people of South Africa that the American people were on the side of freedom in that country, and that we would no longer be passive or silent or complicitous in Pretoria's policy of apartheid.

But since we passed that legislation, this administration's policies have continued without interruption. Despite that legislation's demand that the American Government work with other countries to develop a cooperative and coordinated policy against apartheid, this administration has—on at least two occasions since 1986—vetoed antiapartheid resolutions in the Security Council. Despite that legislation's demand that the American Government recommend new sanctions if there has been no progress in dismantling apartheid inside South Africa, this administration continues its steadfast opposition to new sanctions. In fact, "constructive engagement" is alive and well in the halls of the White House and in the back rooms of the State Department.

Now it is time to send another message. Now it is time for the Congress to take action again. Now it is time for America to terminate its ties to apartheid.

With this legislation, we will say once again that America still cares. With this legislation, we will act once again to show that we are willing to lead. With this legislation, we will try once again to overcome.

There are those who say that sanctions do not work and will not work. I say that they have never been tried.

There are those who say that sanctions will hurt those who we are trying to help. I say that the South African people are willing to sacrifice because the suffering of apartheid is far worse than any suffering that will be caused by these sanctions.

There are those who say that the road to freedom in South Africa is through economic growth, and that "black empowerment" cannot be achieved by restricting black economic opportunity. I say that "black empowerment" has not been achieved despite 40 years of economic growth

and will never be accomplished so long as the political chains of apartheid remain intact.

There are those who say that sanctions will only make matters worse inside South Africa, that there is a white backlash in that country which will only strengthen apartheid's hold on that land. I say that the backlash began long before America adopted sanctions, and that today America should respond to the pleas of the black majority, not to the appeals of would-be reformers. Apartheid must be eradicated, not reformed.

To the architects of apartheid in Pretoria, this legislation will say:

"America is still here. The American people still care. So long as you pursue the policy of apartheid, we will be your adversary—in every forum, in every country, on every continent of our common planet.

To those white and black South Africans who still work to end apartheid, this legislation will say:

We are with you now as we have been with you in the past, as we will be with you in the future. Working together, we will one day prevail over racism and injustice in South Africa.

To our friends and allies throughout the world, this legislation will send a message:

Join us in the struggle. You too have a stake in freedom for the people of South Africa. You too are involved. You too can make a difference. But we must work together if we are to succeed.

With this legislation, the Senate will end America's complicity with apartheid. With this legislation, the Senate will establish America's place in history as a real and proven champion of human freedom—not only in Europe, Asia and Latin America but in Africa as well. With this legislation, the Senate will inspire millions of freedom-loving people throughout the globe to carry on the struggle.

I pledge to do what I can to make certain that this legislation gets early consideration on the floor when the 101st Congress returns to Washington, DC in January.

Mr. WEICKER. Mr. President, I rise today to express regret that time will not allow action on the Anti-Apartheid Act Amendments of 1988, S. 2756.

How little it costs us to speak out against apartheid. How great a price paid by the people of South Africa. Inconvenience on our part; imprisonment and death on theirs.

Two years ago, the United States ended long years of silent complicity which had masqueraded under a colossal misnomer: "constructive engagement." As we suspected all along, there was nothing constructive about it. Two years ago, we imposed sanctions on South Africa and, to a modest extent, our allies followed suit. We did so with the full understanding that those sanctions amounted to no more than a first step in dismantling apartheid. They were a foundation on which to build.

The time has long since come to add new brick and mortar to that foundation. A GAO study commissioned by Senator KENNEDY and myself found that South Africa has lost more than \$400 million in trade with the United States because of sanctions. However, along with five of our major allies, we still accounted for 81 percent of South Africa's imports and 78 percent of its exports in 1987. And, while there are only half as many United States companies in South Africa today as in 1984, the value of United States direct investment has risen owing to reinvestment of earnings.

In August, the House of Representatives took the necessary next step by voting to put new restrictions on loans to and investment in South Africa and to widen our trade ban to include crude oil, other petroleum products, and most other commodities. In September similar legislation which I co-sponsored was introduced in the Senate, but election-year politics, being what they are, killed it for this year.

Meanwhile, apartheid is alive and uglier than ever, if not as visible to the American people, owing to press censorship which worsens with each passing week. If there is one point on which supporters and opponents of sanctions agree, it is that the situation in South Africa is deteriorating. The two largest antiapartheid newspapers, the *New Nation* and *South*, have been shut down. Others have been threatened with like treatment. Some 30,000 individuals have been detained without charge. As many as 10,000 are children. These detentions routinely involve physical abuse and torture.

Almost all antiapartheid organizations, including the United Democratic Front, have been outlawed. Men in boots carrying banners with swastika-like emblems can freely march in the name of racism and repression, while peacekeepers in clerical robes are thrown in jail for speaking of liberty.

People of conscience, here in the United States as elsewhere, have an obligation to act, and to act now. Yes, it is an election year but that should be reason for speaking out even louder and demanding that candidates do the same.

In September, the Senate took note of the fact that November 9, will mark the 50th anniversary of Kristallnacht, the Night of the Broken Glass. Acting on orders that stemmed from Hitler and his henchmen, storm troopers and other Nazi sympathizers staged spontaneous demonstrations against Jews all across Germany—bashing in the windows of homes, businesses, and synagogues, setting fire to them, and shooting men, women, and children as they tried to escape the flames. Thirty-thousand men were rounded up and sent to Dachau, Buchenwald, and Sachsenhausen.

Many Senators spoke out against the atrocities committed that night in

S 16868

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

October 19, 1988

1938. Would that as many were as vocal about the atrocities committed daily in South Africa, 1988.

It makes some people nervous, others indignant, when you mention Nazi Germany and South Africa in the same breath. But the parallels are there in fact, not merely in rhetoric. In South Africa as in Nazi Germany, the law is used to subjugate an entire category of human beings. After walking the streets of Soweto, Holocaust survivor Elie Wiesel wrote:

Without comparing apartheid to Nazism and its "final solution"—for that defies all comparison—one cannot but assign the two systems, in their supposed legality, to the same camp.

We have a duty to denounce—and disassociate ourselves from—the dehumanizing practice of apartheid. All of us—Congress, the President, American business, and the American people. We must stop doing business with apartheid and, at the same time, do whatever we can to strengthen the front-line nations of southern Africa. They, too, have suffered because of Pretoria's policies.

Nelson Mandela must be freed. So must the many thousands whose names we do not know. Freedom of speech and of the press must be restored. And the race laws must go in favor, as the Freedom Charter of 1955 put it, of a "South Africa that belongs to all who live in it, black and white."

If we do not work toward these ends, then 5, 10, or 50 years from now, our children will look back on our generation as we look back on the era of the 1930's and ask: "How could you be silent?" "How could you stand by and do nothing?" The children of South Africa are asking these questions today.

"The struggle is my life," Nelson Mandela once wrote. We must put our political freedom to work, such that this struggle becomes the centerpiece of our South Africa policy. I am here to put my colleagues on notice that this struggle will continue in the Senate next year.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I rise to ally myself with the insightful comments of my friend and colleague from California.

I wholeheartedly agree with Senator CRANSTON that the critically important issue of working to end the racist apartheid regime in South Africa has been tragically lost in the politically motivated maneuverings of the Presidential season. As far as I understand, there are enough votes in this body—if we were to cast them today—to move S. 2756, the Anti-Apartheid Amendments of 1988, forward to final passage. As you well know, Mr. President, this legislation was reported favorably by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on September 23 and was overwhelmingly passed by the House on August 11.

While my colleagues on the other side of the aisle dawdle about—decrying such precipitous action by the

Senate, the situation in South Africa continues to deteriorate with the nationwide state of emergency still in brute forces, the media virtually blacked out and the courageous foes of apartheid in South Africa suffering under an unprecedented ban on their activity.

Mr. President, this legislation has been with us for over 16 months. In June, the Foreign Relations Committee held 3 days of public hearings on United States policy options toward South Africa and the committee met for 2 days in early September to consider S. 2756. I join my friend from California in regretting—deeply regretting—that our colleagues on the other side of the aisle persist with a policy of "do nothing" and fail to stand up and be counted when it comes to taking a public stand against the horror of apartheid.

As the leading proponent of democracy in the world, the United States can no longer effectively condone apartheid by passively condemning it. We must take a lead in actively and aggressively ending apartheid—before it is too late. It saddens me that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are preventing our Nation from sending a signal of action and resolve toward the Government in South Africa while sending a signal of hope and support to our bretheren struggling for their freedom.

Finally, Mr. President, I join Senator CRANSTON in his conviction to bring this legislation up again in the earliest days of the next Congress. Perhaps then, our Republican colleagues will join their Democratic colleagues and commend to the struggling men and women in South Africa not only words of solidarity, but acts of conviction that, at long last, will make our words unassailable.

Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECESS FOR 1 HOUR

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, while conferences are going on, I think it would be well for the Senate to recess. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess for 1 hour.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 3:59 p.m., recessed until 4:59; whereupon, the Senate reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. PRYOR).

Mr. McCLURE addressed the Chair. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

ATTENTION ATTRACTED TO THE NEED FOR NUCLEAR MATERIALS

Mr. McCLURE. Mr. President, the headlines of the Sunday, October 9, New York Times sounds a warning, "Reactor Shutdown Could Impede Nuclear Deterrent". Suddenly the Nation and the media have become interested. Tuesday, October 11, every major newspaper and television news show made a front page story of what was, for far too long, an issue buried, if reported at all, in small type or with one camera shot.

The attention is appropriate. The Nation's defense complex, which produces the materials for our nuclear deterrent, is in deep trouble. The Sunday, New York Times article, by Keith Schneider, reports that

If the two-month suspension at the Nation's only manufacturer of vital material for nuclear warheads continues for several months, the United States might be forced to start deactivating nuclear warheads to recover radioactive elements for use in higher priority weapons, according to senior Administrative officials.

This warning was given almost exactly a year ago, at a hearing before the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee. At that time, I had grave concerns about the safety problems found at the Savannah River reactors during the National Academy of Sciences review. I feared the threat to our nuclear deterrent if the reactors could not operate because of these problems. Dr. Robert Barker, Assistant to the Secretary of Defense for Atomic Energy, repeated to the New York Times, the ominous words he spoke at our hearing,

To have these reactors not operational is tantamount to unilateral nuclear disarmament.

Mr. President, this warning is one that I and a few others—in Congress and at the Department of Energy and the Department of Defense—have been giving for almost a decade. Until recently, I've wondered, like that haunting phrase from the Broadway play, 1776, "Is anybody there? Does anybody care?"

However, during the past few months, the number of people who do care have been joining the chorus and slowly the critical state of the plants that provide the Nation's sole source of tritium and plutonium has begun to receive the attention it should have had years ago.

At last.

But it took so much to get that attention. It took three aging reactors being shut down for an extensive period of time for safety reasons. It took operating errors and obvious evidence that, in spite of 30-some years of operating, too little was known about these reactors. It took the discovery that there had been 30 significant incidents at the reactors over the years, and more than 500 forced outages. It took DOE safety experts reporting