

and for the Middle Eastern peace process. The time is right for Israel's leaders to take a fresh look at how best to secure their northern border.

Israeli forces have been on Lebanese territory since March 1978, when they consolidated a security zone nominally administered by a Christian Lebanese officer. The purpose of the zone was twofold: to place Israeli territory beyond the reach of Palestinian gunners, and to place on the table a strong Israeli card in the high-stakes game of determining Lebanon's political future.

In June 1982 Israel moved decisively to destroy the Palestinian military presence in southern Lebanon and rearrange the Lebanese political scene to its advantage. The first objective was achieved as Palestinian forces were driven back to Beirut and eventually evacuated from Lebanon. The second was frustrated by Lebanese political disunity and skillful Syrian subversion. By 1984 Israeli forces were essentially back within the security zone, with a new and more potent opponent—one enjoying the support of Iran and Syria.

In a 1984 study of security and water disputes in the Galilean region, I noted that "In the long run, unless Israel is willing to assume complete responsibility for the economic and political aspirations of the volatile Lebanese Shi'a community in the south, there will be no peace for Galilee without a real government for Lebanon." Lebanon is still—in the south—without a real government, and over the past decade Israel's occupation of southern Lebanon has acted as a magnet for Syrian-supported Hizbullah attacks on Israeli forces, Israel's surrogates, and Israel itself.

It may well be that 25 years of cross-border violence has rendered a "solution" to the current impasse impossible. There may be no one in Israel still interested in embracing the Lebanese "tar baby," but how to let it go is the issue. Is there a way Israel might extricate itself from Lebanon and, at the same time, enhance the security of its citizens? Must such an extrication await a formal peace treaty with Lebanon, or might its unilateral implementation help break the logjam blocking the Israel-Syria-Lebanon track?

One hypothesis worth testing is that neither Hizbullah nor Syria will have any compelling reason to attack Israeli territory from Lebanon if the occupation ends and Israeli forces withdraw to Israel's side of the international boundary. The fighters of Hizbulla claim to be motivated by a desire to end Israel's occupation. A unilateral Israeli withdrawal might suit them fine. Having "Liberated" southern Lebanon, would it make sense for them to press the attack into Israel proper?

It can be argued, no doubt convincingly, that no Israeli government could permit Hizbullah to claim "victory" in this manner and that nothing could "guarantee" in this manner and that nothing could "guarantee" the security of Israel's northern towns. A corollary to this argument is that neither Hizbullah nor Syria is to be "trusted," and a unilateral withdrawal would convey to Israel's enemies a sense of "weakness" sure to be exploited.

If, however, it is just possible that Israel's security would be enhanced as a result of evacuation, it is worth asking anew whether the cost of trying it would be prohibitive. In view of the fact that Israel makes no claim on Lebanese territory, is there any issue except the security of Israeli citizens worth considering in a withdrawal scenario? How might the government of Israel proceed in a manner defensible both in terms of internal Israeli politics and the safety of Israeli citizens?

The government of Israel could consider declaring unilaterally its intention to withdraw all of its forces from Lebanese territory within 90 days. It could request that the UN Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL) convene, as soon as possible, a meeting of Israeli and Lebanese military officers to work out the details of a professional handover. Israel could make it clear at the outset that its forces will be gone in 90 days and that no amount of stalling, hand wringing, or haggling would alter the timetable.

Coupled with this declaration should be another statement designed to fix, once and for all, the responsibility of Israel's neighbors to respect the inviolability of Israel's borders. Israel could declare that it will hold the governments of Lebanon and Syria fully responsible for ensuring that no party in Lebanon, to include all of Syria's Palestinian and Lebanese surrogates, violates Israeli sovereignty in any way. Israel could make it especially clear that it will make no return of territory to Syria unless the border with Lebanon becomes as quiet as the cease-fire line on the Golan Heights. Indeed, the willingness of Syria and its Lebanese proxies to act responsibly in Southern Lebanon before, during, and after the evacuation of Israeli forces will instruct the Israeli people as to the advisability of a territorial settlement with Syria.

In the manner the liability presented by southern Lebanon can be converted to an asset in the hands of those sincerely interested in a comprehensive Arab-Israeli peace settlement. Should new attacks on Israeli territory be mounted from Lebanon, direct retaliation by Israeli forces on those responsible for maintaining law and order in Lebanon would be warranted. Instead of creating massive flows or embittered refugees, Israel would be striking at the actual malefactors. Who, under such circumstances, could blame Israel?

Israel's occupation of southern Lebanon helps perpetuate an ambiguity that does not exist on the Golan Heights, arguably the most peaceful spot on earth for over 20 years. Syria has exploited this ambiguity to strike indirectly at Israel by encouraging fighters who claim to be waging a war of national liberation. Israel alone can remove this ambiguity by withdrawing and forcing its neighbors to accept full responsibility for their actions. Such an action could hardly be characterized as a defeat.

LILLIAN HOFFMAN'S LETTER TO RAOUL WALLENBERG—A HERO TO FOUR GENERATIONS

HON. TOM LANTOS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 2, 1995

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, today, on the occasion of the dedication of the bust of Raoul Wallenberg in the Rotunda of the U.S. Capitol, two tributes stood out as singularly accurate reflections upon the extraordinary acts of this Swedish-American hero.

The first, a letter to Raoul Wallenberg by my granddaughter, Chelsea Lantos-Swett, read at the dedication of the Holocaust Memorial Museum and again at today's ceremony has already appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The second, which I ask be placed in today's RECORD, is a letter to Wallenberg from Ms. Lillian Hoffman, who donated the bust which we unveiled today in the Capitol Rotunda.

These two letters, which span four generations, are testimony to the endurance of Raoul Wallenberg's legacy and lessons. He was an inspiration to Lillian Hoffman, of the World War II generation, and, four generations later, he is an inspiration to Chelsea. I am confident that, four generations from now, our great-grandchildren will look upon Raoul Wallenberg's image in the U.S. Capitol, and reflect upon the strength of the individual human spirit and the ability of each and every one of us to make the world a better place.

Mr. Speaker, I invite my colleagues to take a moment to read Lillian Hoffman's letter and to pause by the bust of Raoul Wallenberg:

AN OPEN LETTER TO OUR DEAR FRIEND,
RAOUL WALLENBERG
(By Lillian Hoffman)

Dear Raoul:

No, you are not "the forgotten hero." Wherever you are, we are gathered here to celebrate your unique historic valor. We know that somewhere you are out there and very much aware of the great love and indebtedness we Americans feel for you.

It is with considerable humility and emotion that we write to you to express our gratitude and admiration for your remarkable feat. The brilliant imagination, daring and compassion that you exerted to rescue over 100,000 Jewish souls was breathtaking and monumental. In the heart of every Jew there is a special memory of this accomplishment.

You have long deserved this special commemoration for your contribution to all freedom-loving people everywhere.

Here we stand under the historic roof of the Congress of these United States amidst our nation's leaders and friends. The echoes of the heartbeats of American heroes, whose busts are encircling us, remind us of what an exceptional privilege it is to place your bust among these heroes.

My children and I are filled with immense pride to donate Mirri Margolin's bust of you to the U.S. Congress. Finally, you are being recognized and lauded for your great spirit and exceptional courage. Only in the United States could descendants of immigrants join with our nation's leaders to herald the life of a leader like you.

Thank you, Raoul; thank you for showing the world what one determined individual can achieve in a daring battle against the forces of evil; thank you for restoring to so many of us our faith in mankind—the faith which is the first prerequisite, the strongest stimulant, and the greatest asset for all who seek to build a better world.

With great admiration,

LILLIAN HOFFMAN,
Denver, CO.

TRIBUTE TO NATALIE HELENE JACOBS CAVE

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 2, 1995

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Natalie Helen Jacobs retired after 50 years of exemplary Federal service to America's veterans on September 30, 1995. This daughter of a Baptist minister—Rev. Frank Walter Jacobs—and a school teacher—Mrs. Natalie Taylor Jacobs—was born in Norfolk, VA. She received her early education at the Alabama State Teachers College Laboratory in the public schools of Bridgeport, CT. In 1943 Natalie received her degree, with honors from Bennett

College in Greensboro, NC. And in 1944 Mrs. Cave received her graduate degree in social work from Atlanta University.

For 50 years Natalie practiced social work in a variety of capacities, including a stint as a case worker at the Veterans Administration Hospital in Tuskegee, AL. She met her husband, Dr. Vernal Cave while working in Alabama. They subsequently transferred to Brooklyn, NY where they still reside.

Mrs. Cave holds numerous memberships in various professional organizations, including the Auxiliary of the National Medical Association, of which she is a former national president. Her other memberships include the Advisory Board of the Public Affairs Committee, the Brooklyn Chapter of Links, Inc., the YWCA, the NAACP, and the Kings County Medical Society Auxiliary. Additionally, she is an active archaousa of the Sigma Phi Pi Fraternity, and a trustee of the Brooklyn Botanic Garden.

Mrs. Cave has traveled extensively, including six countries in Africa, and a trip around the world.

In administering to the needs of our Nation's veterans and those of the society at large, this gracious and empathetic lady has contributed greatly to making this a better world. I am immensely proud of one of Brooklyn's best and dedicated citizens.

MESSINGER AND MESSAGE DO
NOT MEET STANDARDS

HON. MIKE WARD

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 2, 1995

Mr. WARD. Mr. Speaker, every day when the House meets for morning hour, we begin with an invocation that is designed to acknowledge this country's belief in God and our dedication to our moral beliefs and to our duties that we are about to execute. I am afraid, however, that this morning's invocation did not adhere to this tradition. Instead of inspiration, we were greeted with a message and a messenger who does not meet the standards of this respected institution. The Reverend Lou Sheldon of the Traditional Values Coalition has consistently expressed a message that is exclusive rather than inclusive. With the challenges that face this body every day, I believe that the invocation should be a positive and uplifting message which cannot come from someone who has dedicated his life to a message of hate and divisiveness. I call on you, Mr. Speaker, to review the policies regarding guest chaplains and ensure that they adhere to the high standard that the U.S. House of Representatives deserves.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. XAVIER BECERRA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 2, 1995

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, on November 1, 1995, I was unavoidably detained during rollcall vote No. 756, the vote on final passage on H.R. 1833, the so-called Partial-Birth Abortion Ban Act of 1995.

As a member of the House Judiciary Committee, I voted against H.R. 1833 when it was heard in our committee earlier this year. Had I been present for yesterday's floor vote, I would have voted "no."

SEAL BEACH SAYS NO THANKS TO
1993 CRIME BILL

HON. DANA ROHRBACHER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 2, 1995

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, during 1993 and 1994 Congress debated H.R. 3355 of the 103d Congress. Many of us believed that the amount of assistance that this bill was to provide to fight crime was being greatly oversold. None of the provisions were more oversold than the number of additional local police that would be paid for by the so-called "free" Federal money provided in the bill.

This was because there was a catch to the "free" money for additional police. The catch is that after 4 years the local community has to continue to pay the full cost of these "free" policemen or the citizens and towns would have to return the grant funds.

The Seal Beach, CA City Council in my district has taken a close look at what the real cost of this program will be to them in the out-years. After consideration they voted unanimously not to apply for this "free" assistance.

I am inserting at this point in the RECORD a copy of the minutes of the Seal Beach City Council meeting where they unanimously said, "No thanks."

GRANT APPLICATION—COPS AHEAD GRANT

The Interim City Manager reported that the City has been informed of a second round of the COPS Program, the City having previously received authorization for one Police Officer under the COPS FAST Program, this item simply authorization to submit the grant application for the second program.

The Manager expressed concern with the future ability to fund the officer if the application were approved, noting that the first three years would be of benefit to the City, the costs would be minimal in terms of cost benefit, however the City would assume all costs upon the fourth year, and if the grant is accepted the City must agree to pay its share of the total cost for the grant period as well as make a good faith effort to keep that position in the budget thereafter with an assurance to the Department of Justice that keeping that position will not eliminate another.

He pointed out that the officer obtained through the COPS FAST Program will cover the downtown/pier/beach area and it is understood that the City committed to retaining that officer at the end of the grant period. The Manager asked for direction from the Council as to the desire to file the application, if granted a determination can then be made as to whether or not to accept, or the application could be filed with a notation that the City may not accept for a period of time however that would likely jeopardize any approval.

Councilman Brown inquired if the officer acquired through the grant program could be retained as a replacement should another officer resign for one reason or another, or does the personnel contingent need to be maintained. The Manager responded that the requirement is not to keep the individual rather to keep the position, as an example, if

there are twenty patrol officers and a twenty-first is obtained through the grant, at the end of the three years the agency must make a good faith effort to keep the twenty-first position. Councilman Laszlo posed questions with regard to the City's costs relative to the grant officer(s).

The Manager advised that costs borne by the City under the first grant will be \$180,000 for the period of three years which includes salary, benefits, hard costs, there are other costs that are not included in the grant however they are relatively minor, in turn the grant pays \$75,000 of that, thus the cost over three years will be \$105,000, pointing out that \$35,000 was included in this year's budget for that officer with the assumption that the officer would be employed by the first of July, however, in actuality will not be employed until about September 22nd or 23rd.

As to a second officer should this application be approved the Manager once again expressed concern as to the source of funding after the three year grant period, and with regard to the first officer, the position will be part of the budget process next spring and should there be inadequate revenues the Council will need to make some priority choices. Councilman Laszlo expressed concern as a result of the County losses as well.

He offered that the City has good police officers however said they are the second lowest paid in the County, and expressed his opinion that this action could take money away from raises that they are deserving of. The Mayor said it is likely that if the City could not fund the position in the future the officer would probably be cut and the City would need to refund the grant.

Hastings moved, second by Forsythe, to not authorize the grant application for a second police officer under the COPS AHEAD Program.

PARTIAL-BIRTH ABORTION BAN
ACT OF 1995

HON. RON PACKARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 2, 1995

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I applaud all my colleagues who voted yesterday to protect the lives of the most vulnerable of Americans—the unborn. The House stood up and said no to the radical left and their militant agenda in promoting this brutal and inhumane procedure.

Even though the American Medical Association took no official position on the bill, it was backed by the AMA's council on legislation who voted unanimously to recommend that the AMA board of trustees endorse the bill outlawing this grotesque procedure. Sadly, the bill was not supported by the radical pro-abortion movement who showed their true colors by calling the attempt to outlaw the procedure "extreme." Opposition to the bill is extremism. Physicians are trained to save lives, not take them in this abhorrent procedure.

Mr. Speaker, in passing the Partial-Birth Abortion Ban Act by a vote of 288 to 139, this House has declared to the whole world that this form of elective infanticide has no place in our society and it will not be tolerated.