

district for 35 years—Operation Youth. Operation Youth is a week-long conference during which young men and women learn about our Government. This nationally recognized summer program has won 28 awards from the Freedoms Foundation at Valley Forge. It uniquely combines learning and activity to give students a greater understanding of the American way of life.

This year's conference was held June 7-14 at Xavier University in Cincinnati. More than 100 area high school students participated. The theme this year was "An Understanding and Appreciation of America's Basic Freedoms." The program featured presentations by leaders from the areas of Government, education, and law on topics such as "Freedom and Economics," and "The Future of the American Political System." Forums were then set up for the students to discuss these topics and other current issues. The students formed political parties and elected officials to a mock municipal government.

Mr. Speaker, I am extremely proud to recognize those who were elected to office as well as those who participated in other aspects of this program. They are as follows:

Mayor: Tim Burress of Goshen High School; vice mayor: Marci Rouse of St. Ursula Academy; city manager: Sean Halter of Turpin High School; clerk of the council: Jim O'Brien of Northwest High School; and city council members: Sara F. Andrews of Paulding High School, Anne Cunningham of Defiance High School, Amy Gaietto of Lima Central Catholic High School, Tara O'Neill of Toledo Notre Dame Academy, Todd Sams of Princeton High School, Susan Weaver of Tuscarawas Central Catholic High School, and Jenny Wenz of Mother of Mercy High School.

Also participating in the conference were:

Pam R. Alkire, Scott A. Anderson, Keith Arnold, Leslie Askern, Ann Marie Auer, Michelle Rene Barber, Kimberly S. Batsche, Jody Bigelow, Laura Bischoff, Diane Bohman, Tricia Bond, Beth Buerger, April Burger, Debbie Bye, Shelly Cappel, Stephen P. Carney, Cathryn Chislaghi, Jeff Christman, Karla Cooper, Kevin R. Corken, Christine Deel, tim Dennison, Megan Anne Dillon, James M. Driehaus, Alan Duning, Robert D. Eilerman, Kelly Ann Eldridge, Eric W. Enneking, James C. Evans, Tracy Evans, Claudia Eyer, George Fisher, Thomas A. Forbes, Jim Fortman, Margaret Fuller, Wendy Gay, Neal F. Giere, Suzamme M. Giesken, David Gullette, Brian Haigis, Bob Halderman, Geoffrey Hart, Chris Hill, Amy M. Hoepf, Brigid A. Horne, Terri A. Ille, Daniel Jeffers, Sean Kelley, John T. Kennedy, Tricia Kirkwood, Andrew F. Kossen, Jim Kramer, Julie M. Landis, Greg Leahy, Richard J. Mack, Heath W. McCarthy, Julia McCarthy, Joy McVay, Erin Miller, Patrick Moeves, Mike Mullinger, Robert Murphy, Mark Napier, Cindy North, Rick Ohmer, Michelle A. Otten, Jill Palmer, Jeff S. Pawlow, Brian Philipps, Jacqueline Pyles, Sarah M. Rose, Amy C. Sauer, Constance L. Sauer, Theresa Schaeffer, Joan Schmidl, Laura Schroeder, Tim Shawley, Thomas Sherman, Matthew Siegel, Rob Siegel, Jackie Slatzer, Thomas Smith, Kelly Sowder, Bill Spoor, Erica Sprengel, Eric Stevenson, Craig Stiefel, Karen A. Streng, Daniel Stroup, Edward Sweeney, Denise L. Tangney, Theresa Ungruhe, Rick Vonderbrink, Jeffery N. Wople, Scott Warman, Gary S. Warshauer, Jennifer A. Weaver, Terri

Weckenbrock, Jennifer Wegman, William A. Weis, and Joseph Wiehe.

I would especially like to honor William E. Smith, director of Operation Youth, and professor of accounting and finance at Xavier University. His dedication in insuring the success of the programs has been unsurpassed. His efforts, as well as those of the staff, enabled over 100 young citizens to gain new insight into the workings of democracy. The staff included:

Mr. Michael Vorbroker, program director; Ms. Marsha Telles, chief-of-staff; senior staff members; Brenda Green, Denise Heckman, Paul Darwish, Michelle Spaeth, and junior staff members; Tony France, Kathy Meinhardt, Ronald Murphy, Joseph Roesel, Joel Reginelli, and Nancy S. Thiele.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to pay tribute to this outstanding and worthwhile program.

DIVESTMENT LEGISLATION APPROVED BY HOUSE VOTE

HON. MICKEY LELAND

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 24, 1986

Mr. LELAND. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to share with my colleagues the following articles on our friend and colleague from California, RON DELLUMS, which appeared in the Washington Post and New York Times last week.

The articles detail Mr. DELLUMS' 16 year struggle to win House approval of divestment legislation. Last Wednesday's passage of his legislation by voice vote was a tribute to one man's commitment and unwaivering efforts to place the United States on the side of justice in South Africa. Mr. DELLUMS' persistence and commitment raised the veil and made the world view the atrocity and inhumanity that results from South Africa's apartheid policy.

Mr. Speaker, human dignity, morality, and freedom are not issues of compromise. Mr. DELLUMS recognized that reality. Last week's action by this body demonstrates that ideological purity does play a vital role in politics.

I urge my colleagues to read the following articles:

[From the Washington Post, June 20, 1986]

DELLUMS: EXONERATION IS HIS—PASSAGE OF ANTI-PRETORIA SANCTIONS MARKS MILESTONE FOR HILL VETERAN

(By James R. Dickenson)

To Rep. Ronald V. Dellums (D-Calif.), the House passage Wednesday of his stringent economic sanctions against South Africa was "a shot heard 'round the world." But he also views it as personal "exoneration" from the judgment that he is a moral gadfly and maverick who is out of the mainstream of power in the House.

The House astonished itself and many observers by passing Dellums' bill calling for a trade embargo and complete divestment by U.S. companies and citizens of their holdings in South Africa. It was the first time that divestment legislation has been passed by either house, and Dellums' version was far more stringent than the bill most observers expected to be passed.

In an interview yesterday, Dellums described the action as a major blow to apartheid that can't be undone or turned back. He also views it as a refutation of the belief of many—which is "personally painful" to him—that he is just another flaky politician from Berkeley.

"Berserkely," a lot of them call it," he said, smiling ruefully.

"Yesterday's action was the shot heard 'round the world, that was heard in Pretoria," he continued. "We haven't simply altered the debate on apartheid, we've changed the environment. Whatever the dynamics of that moment, its effect can't be changed.

"Whatever comes out of the Senate and conference has to be stronger. We've opened new possibilities because we've moved the fear barrier back. We politicians live with a multiplicity of fears."

This view was shared on both sides of the aisle in the House.

"Yesterday, the House went to Ron Dellums; Ron Dellums didn't go to the House," said Rep. Jim Leach (R-Iowa). "Bill Gray went to the House, but the House went to Dellums."

Leach was referring to a more moderate sanctions bill sponsored by Rep. William H. Gray III (D-Pa), chairman of the House Budget Committee and one of the House's most influential insiders. It was expected to pass but was never voted on because of the surprise call-up and passage of Dellums' bill, which was the designated substitute for Gray's.

Passage of his bill was a personal milestone for Dellums, 50, a veteran of nearly 16 years in the House.

"This is the highest point of my political life, the most significant and personally rewarding," he said. "It's been a long journey to this moment."

His next most satisfying moment was his presentation of the alternate military budget in 1982, which proposed reducing spending by more than \$50 billion and canceling several nuclear missile programs. It got only 55 votes, about a third from the Black Caucus.

In many ways, Dellums is a paradox.

He is still the outspoken liberal he has always been, but his colleagues now see him as one of the most gentlemanly, considerate, even courtly members on Capitol Hill. They also value him as a "moral force for reordering priorities," in Leach's words, but think he's "too liberal to be in the mainstream."

Dellums, however, finds that the role of moral-outsider-gadfly leaves a lot to be desired.

I came here not to project my personality but to project ideas, to lift the level of debate above rancor and personal attack," he said. "We're talking war and peace, life and death, man, and if you carry controversial ideas in a controversial personality, how can you ever get anything done?"

The problem, he contends is that he came to Congress during the counterculture revolution of the 1960s and the anti-Vietnam war protest and became the personification of Berkeley and all it symbolizes.

My humanity got lost in the process," he said. "It has been personally painful to be considered just a gadfly, a maverick, a strong speaker, but outside the mainstream of power. What yesterday was about is that people have to see me in a serious way. This has been an exonerating factor."

He denies that he has just been an "off-the-wall voice."

"I introduced the first divestment bill 16 years ago," he recalled. "Did I come to the country or did the country come to me?"

When he first came to the Congress, Dellums seemed to be challenging its very legitimacy and that of the leadership, holding unofficial "hearings" on Vietnam war atrocities and racism in the military. Over the years, however, he's mellowed.

His seniority entitled him in 1983 to become chairman of the military construc-

tion subcommittee, and he surprised his colleagues by his considerate dealings with them and his skill at managing legislation.

Dellums said that on Wednesday, he could sense momentum for his bill building during the day.

"Members, including Republicans, would come up to me and say, 'Ron I wasn't with you last year but I am this time.' I could also tell from the spectrum of people who were asking for time to speak on its behalf, including a greater number of Republicans. I knew we were gaining but not necessarily that we'd win."

As floor manager of the bill, Dellums had 30 minutes of debate time to mete out to his supporters.

"I don't like to give a colleague just a minute or 30 seconds to speak," he said. "But there were so many I had no choice. When [Rep. Charles E.] Bennett [D-Fla.] got up to speak, I had to fight back tears because I knew where he was coming from."

After the voice vote by which the measure passed, Dellums expected its opponents to call for a recorded vote.

"I sure wasn't going to ask for it but I was astonished that no one else did," he said. "I guess it was because they realized that if they did they'd have to account for their votes."

A staff aide speculated that conservatives who oppose the sanctions wanted a bill so tough that the Republican-controlled Senate would balk at it. He also contended that the House leadership didn't want to chance defeating Dellums' measure because that would look like the House was backing down.

"They blundered into principle," he said.

[From the New York Times, June 19, 1986]
HOUSE VOTES BILL TO CUT OFF INVESTMENT IN SOUTH AFRICA; STRIKES BY BLACKS MULTIPLY

(By Neil A. Lewis)

WASHINGTON, June 18.—The House, in a surprise development, approved and sent to the Senate today a measure imposing a trade embargo and requiring complete divestment by American companies and citizens of their holdings in South Africa.

The measure, approved by voice vote, would require the severing of all economic ties with South Africa and would oblige the approximately 280 American companies doing business there to shut operations within 180 days if the bill were signed into law. It would impose a full embargo on trade, allowing only the import of certain materials if the President certified that they were of strategic importance.

The vote is certain to increase political pressure, not only on the Pretoria Government, but also on the Reagan Administration, which has vigorously opposed further economic penalties against South Africa.

POSSIBILITY OF CONFRONTATION

The measure is unusual in that sanctions against foreign governments are usually initiated by the President, as was the case when he ordered oil companies to halt operations in Libya, using his emergency powers. If the bill became law the President would be charged with enforcing the sanctions, but as Mr. Reagan opposes such moves he could decline to carry out the measure, leading to a possible confrontation with Congress.

At the United Nations today, the United States and Britain vetoed a Security Council resolution that would have imposed limited economic sanctions against South Africa. [Page A10.]

Edward P. Djerejian, a deputy White House press secretary, said the House vote

would have no impact on the President's opposition to tougher economic sanctions.

SANCTIONS ADAMANTLY OPPOSED

"Our position on that remains the same," he said. "We are adamantly opposed to punitive economic sanctions."

The architect of the measure was Representative Ronald V. Dellums, Democrat of California.

"What we did today is going to give a tremendous boost to the momentum of the anti-apartheid movement in this country," he said. "I'm still shocked it happened."

After the vote, Representative William H. Gray 3d said, "This demonstrates the House and the American people wanted the strongest possible sanctions against South Africa." The Pennsylvania Democrat was the sponsor of a less severe sanctions measure that the House debated throughout the day and was anticipating voting on.

But in a move that stunned both supporters and opponents, the measure suggested by Mr. Dellums requiring a full trade embargo and complete economic disinvestment was adopted as a substitute by voice vote. Republican opponents hurriedly conferred on strategy and decided not to call for a roll-call vote. The measure itself was then quickly passed by voice vote.

"I was very surprised by what happened," said Representative Robert J. Walker, a Pennsylvania Republican who was a principal opponent. But Mr. Walker said the measure approved is so strict that it will be easier for President Reagan to veto it and more difficult for supporters to override a veto.

"Sanctions are dead," said Representative Mark Siljander, a Michigan Republican and a vocal opponent of sanctions. "We lost the battle but won the war."

The severe sanctions approved today could also make it less likely that it will be approved in the Senate, which has yet to take up the matter.

Mr. Djerejian said it was unclear if Mr. Reagan would actively fight to block the Senate measure.

Supporters of increasing economic pressure on the Pretoria Government were exultant at today's turn of events.

Representative Stephen J. Solarz, Democrat of Brooklyn, described the vote as "the American answer" to the state of emergency imposed in South Africa last week by President P. W. Botha. "It sends the strongest signal possible," he said.

The House had spent the day debating a more modest measure that was approved last week by the House Foreign Affairs Committee. That measure would have imposed economic penalties in two stages, the first requiring an end to all new loans and investments as well as banning the import of coal, uranium and steel from South Africa. In a year's time, if certain conditions including the release of the imprisoned anti-apartheid leader, Nelson Mandela, had not been met, the sanctions would be increased.

The measure approved today in its place would impose within 180 days of enactment a total embargo on trade with South Africa, except for the import of minerals if the President certifies they are of strategic importance. The 280 American companies that would have to cease operations employ about 66,000 people, according to the House Foreign Affairs Committee staff and do about \$1.8 billion in business annually.

In addition, landing rights for South African Airways in this country would be suspended, thus ending the five-times-a-week flight from Johannesburg to New York.

Many American companies have already begun to draw down their investments in South Africa without any Government pressure to do so.

In today's debate, Mr. Siljander said he was opposed to apartheid, but did not believe crippling the South African economy was the answer. "Will the sanctions in this bill stop the killings there?" he asked.

THE SMELL OF BLOOD

Representative Lynn Martin, an Illinois Republican, said she would support sanctions because "I believe in South Africa today, there is a smell of blood and I believe there comes a time when we must stand up as a nation and be counted."

The consideration of increased penalties against South Africa comes 10 months after Mr. Reagan reluctantly imposed a series of limited economic penalties against South Africa by executive order. Both the House and Senate last year passed versions of a sanctions bill. Mr. Reagan, who had threatened to veto any such measure, abruptly reversed himself and issued the executive order when it became apparent that some form of legislation would be enacted over his veto.

His sudden change of position deflated the opposition and the Republican leadership was able to shelve the issue, sparing the President the likely political embarrassment of having his veto overridden.

The sanctions imposed by the President prohibited most new loans to the South African Government and banned the import of Kruggerands, the South African gold coins.

There are currently five countries for which there is a virtual ban on trade: Libya, Cuba, Cambodia, North Korea, and Vietnam. In those instances, the President would have to certify he was suspending trade under various acts that grant him emergency powers due to national security considerations.

SUPPORT OF S. 1073, THE JAPANESE TECHNICAL LITERATURE ACT OF 1985

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 24, 1986

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of S. 1073, The Japanese Technical Literature Act of 1985, which the House passed yesterday. The purpose of this bill is to enhance the Federal role in ensuring the availability of Japanese scientific, technical, and economic information to the scientists, engineers, and entrepreneurs of the United States.

This country must regain its status at the forefront of scientific and technical innovation in the development of products, services, and economic and societal advances. Our native entrepreneurial acumen, evidenced so often in the past, will allow us to convert innovative developments into that economic activity which will permit us to be, once again, preeminent in world trade.

Our position in world trade, compared to the Japanese, has changed dramatically in Japan's favor in recent years. As Mr. WALGREN's subcommittee indicated in its report on this bill:

The dramatic change in their competitive position in high technology is indicated by their expanding balance in trade with the United States. In 1985, the U.S. trade deficit with Japan totaled \$50 billion. On a worldwide basis, Japan had a \$45.6 billion trade