

Jerrold Nadler, Barbara Cubin, David E. Skaggs, Sheila Jackson-Lee, Matt Salmon, Jennifer Dunn, Bennie G. Thompson, Barbara B. Kennelly, John Conyers, Jr., Charles E. Schumer, Sonny Bono, Constance A. Morella, James L. Oberstar, John M. Spratt, Jr., Alcee L. Hastings, Michael Bilirakis, Peter G. Torkildsen, Blanche Lambert Lincoln, Bob Filner, Rick Lazio, Wayne T. Gilchrest, Gene Green, Victor O. Frazer, Jim Ramstad, Karen L. Thurman, Joseph P. Kennedy II, Gil Gutknecht, Doug Bereuter, Wayne Alford, Bill K. Brewster, Gerald Kleczka, Jim Bunn, Eliot Engel, Anna Eshoo, Jon D. Fox, Harold L. Volkmer, Ken Calvert, Jerry Lewis.¹

¹ Signed letter after delivery to conferee.

LEGISLATION TO SUPPORT THE
UNITED STATES' VALUABLE
ALLY—SOUTH KOREA

HON. JAY KIM

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 2, 1995

Mr. KIM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask all of my colleagues to support my efforts to further enhance and solidify our commitment to one of the United States' most valuable allies—South Korea. Today I have introduced legislation which will have a positive economic impact in the United States—especially in the tourism industry. My legislation calls upon the inclusion of South Korea in the Visa Waiver Pilot Program [VWPP]. Specifically, it waives the requirements of section 217 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, allowing South Korea to be included in the VWPP for a 1-year trial basis after which the Secretary of State and Attorney General will have the authority to determine the continued participation of South Korea in this program.

My reasons for introducing this legislation are twofold: First, the current situation at the U.S. Embassy's Consular Affairs office in Seoul is embarrassing and unacceptable. This problem stems from two counter-acting forces—the lack of sufficient space and personnel in the Consular's Office and the ever increasing number of South Korean's request of nonimmigrant, visitor visas.

Currently, the Consular's Affairs office in Seoul is under-staffed, over-worked and unable to meet the demands of reviewing over 2,000 visa applications per day. This unfortunate situation has resulted in extremely long lines of potential tourists and businessmen to the United States who are growing more and more impatient, annoyed and disheartened with the way they are being treated. While these long lines may not be something new for consular affairs offices throughout the world, the inhumane treatment of the people in those lines is.

During a recent trip to South Korea, I personally witnessed the most shameful treatment of human beings. One potential tourist, in search of a visa as part of his honeymoon plans, told me that he had been waiting in line for 3 days. Three days. He had come all the way from the southern end of South Korea, since the United States does not have any other consular affairs offices in Korea. Another woman, who appeared to be in her thirties, explained her frustration at having to stand out-

side during a thunderstorm because there is no shelter from the elements available. I was personally ashamed, as I suspect many of colleagues would have been by these tales of inhumane treatment.

These are but two examples of the growing frustration and disappointment many South Koreans are vocalizing, which has resulted in a growing sentiment of discontent with the United States. They rightly point out that this is no way for friends to treat friends. If we are to retain our place in the hearts of the Korean people we must do something to reverse this trend. In that regard, I feel it is important that we begin to treat the South Korean people with more respect by extending to them our trust and support through their inclusion in the VWPP.

My second reason for introducing this legislation is pure economics. Currently, South Korea is the sixth largest trading partner with the United States. This has resulted in total U.S. exports equaling over \$14 billion with a cumulative direct investment of over \$1 billion by United States companies in South Korea. This ever growing market has allowed for a continued growth in personal incomes for the South Korean people. The net result has been an increased demand by Korean tourists to visit the United States.

According to the Travel and Tourism Administration, South Korean arrivals are expected to reach over 600,000 in 1995, up an astonishing 900 percent from the 1987 levels. Of the over 400,000 South Korean travelers who came to the United States in 1993, 35 percent came for vacations or holidays with another 35 percent coming to visit friends or relatives. Most of such travel has been to California, New York, Hawaii, Arizona, and Florida. With an estimated \$1 billion in potential tourism dollars to spend, it is easy to see the importance of promoting easier access to the U.S. tourist market which has experienced considerable losses over the past few years. Simply put, more Korean tourists equals more business and jobs in the United States.

My home State of California is a perfect example of how important tourism is to the United States. According to the California Division of Tourism, California's travel and tourism industry generates \$55.7 billion annually, which is 6.5 percent of the gross State product. Overall, California would rank eighth in terms of international tourism as a separate nation, ahead of Switzerland, Singapore, Mexico, Canada, and Japan.

On a more national front, travel and tourism is the third largest employer in the Nation after business and health services. In fact, travel exceeds the combined payrolls of the U.S. steel and motor vehicles manufacturing industries. Between 1983 and 1993, travel-related employment and payroll has steadily increased—with payrolls nearly doubling and the number of jobs rising 38 percent. These kinds of numbers only further the argument that travel and tourism will double in size over the next decade, resulting in more job opportunities for people throughout the world. The United States must work to ensure its place in the travel and tourism industry by opening our doors to an economy which has been growing continuously over the past decade—South Korea. America has always been the first choice of destination for almost all Koreans.

However, under the current situation of long lines and endless delays, many Koreans are

fed up with waiting and are going instead to Canada—which has a waiver policy toward Korea—Europe or Australia. We stand to lose millions of dollars and thousands of American jobs because of our broken visa system.

As the Tourism Promotion Conference convenes this week in Washington, I understand that the issue of reforming the United States visa issuance process for South Korea will be raised and discussed. I welcome the input of the United States tourism industry and look forward to examining their recommendations as to how we can best achieve a larger place in the tourism market, especially with respect to South Korea.

In the interim, however, I believe that in an effort to ward off a serious decline in South Korean support for United States policy while increasing the ability of South Koreans to visit the United States, this legislation should be seriously considered as a solution to this embarrassing situation. In fact, I believe that if we reduce the bureaucratic barriers to the South Korean people, we will achieve greater compliance with our own immigration laws and promote good relations with a valuable ally. Therefore, I call upon all of my colleagues to support this 1 year, trial basis legislation which is so important to the South Korean people and to our foreign policy in Asia. After all, 25 countries are already in the visa waiver program.

ISRAEL COULD GAIN GROUND BY
EXITING SOUTH LEBANON

HON. NICK J. RAHALL II

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 2, 1995

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I bring to the attention of my colleagues in the House an op-ed piece which appeared in the October 23 edition of the Christian Science Monitor written by Frederic C. Hof, a former U.S. Army officer and State Department official and currently a partner in Armitage Associates. Mr. Hof illustrated, in my opinion, a solution for Israeli withdrawal from southern Lebanon, thereby preventing further attacks on Israeli soldiers by Hizbullah which so poison the Israeli-Syrian peace negotiations.

Mr. Speaker, I traveled to Lebanon in August, including southern Lebanon, the home of my grandfathers. After discussions with people, political, religious, educational, and military leaders most importantly Gen. Emile Lahoud the very capable commander-in-chief of the Lebanon Army, there is no doubt whatsoever that given the political go-ahead the Lebanon Army can control every inch of Lebanese territory and prevent cross-border attacks upon Israel. This is confirmed by our U.S. Embassy.

Mr. Hof's op-ed follows:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Oct. 23, 1995]

ISRAEL COULD GAIN GROUND BY EXITING
SOUTH LEBANON

(By Frederic C. Hof)

The recent deaths of Israeli soldiers patrolling the "security zone" in southern Lebanon grimly illustrate an inescapable fact: that Israel's continued occupation of Lebanese territory is a liability both for Israel

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