

he continued writing visas on the train platform. His wife remembers: "Even as the train started going, he continued writing, leaning out of the window. Finally, he said 'Forgive me. I cannot write any more. I pray for your good luck.' People started to run alongside the train, and one of them shouted, 'Sugihara, we will not forget about you. We are going to see you again.'"

It was not until 1968, however, before this would happen. After the war, he was fired from his post with the Foreign Ministry, and worked at odd jobs before working in Moscow for a Japanese trading company. Finally, he was tracked down by one of the refugees whose life he had saved. Finally, nearly 30 years later, he was honored in Israel as a righteous gentile, an honor bestowed upon those who had worked to save Jews from the Holocaust. Though Sugihara died in 1986, his wife, Yukiko, has been honored in Japan by Jewish-Americans who benefitted from his visas, as well as by surviving members of the famed Japanese-American combat battalions who liberated Dachau and, finally, by the Japanese Government. On Sunday, January 22, Yukiko Sugihara will be honored in San Francisco for the bravery, compassion, and humanity exhibited by her and her husband.

Mr. Speaker, it is difficult to truly express the legacy of the Sugiharas. But the best legacy cannot be expressed in words, but seen in their good works: the lives of the people they saved. Their continued presence, and their families' presence, gives inspiration and hope to future generations of humanity.

AMENDING HOUSE RULES TO PERMIT CHAIRMEN TO SCHEDULE COMMITTEE HEARINGS

HON. GERALD B.H. SOLOMON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 23, 1995

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a change in House rules designed to restore what has been the practice in this House for as long as I have been here, and that is to allow committee, and by implication, subcommittee, chairmen to schedule hearings of their committees and subcommittees.

Clause 2(g)(3) of House rule XI requires each committee to announce hearings a week in advance unless the committee determines there is good cause to schedule a hearing sooner. While it has been the standing practice of committees to defer to the discretion of their chairmen to make this decision in setting hearings, according to the Parliamentarian's Office, committee should mean committee. Under clause 2(g)(5) of rule XI, if a point of order is made against any improper hearing procedure in a timely manner in committee, and is improperly overruled or not considered, then it may be renewed on the floor against consideration of the bill that was the subject of the improper hearing.

Such an instance has arisen already in this Congress, and, as far as we can determine, is the first time that a chairman's authority to schedule hearings has been challenged. As a result, we will have to waive that point of order to consider the bill in question.

Mr. Speaker, in checking on the legislative history behind this rule, there is no explanation as to why the word "committee" is used re-

garding the announcement of hearings as opposed to "chairman." The fact is that clause 2(c)(1) of rule XI already authorizes committee chairmen to call committee meetings without any prescribed advance notice. Certainly committee meetings, at which bills are marked-up and reported, are far more important than hearings.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I would think that Members would want to encourage chairmen to hold hearings as opposed to not doing so for fear of inviting points of order; or, in the alternative, of having to convene a committee meeting with a quorum present to first authorize any hearing.

It would be my expectation that committee chairmen would not abuse this new rule by calling spur of the moment hearings under their authority to give less than a week's notice, and that this will only be done in the most urgent of circumstances.

But I do think it is important that we allow committees to proceed with hearings on measures whenever possible, and that we not put obstacles in the way of chairmen who want to hold hearings prior to marking-up and reporting legislation.

I intend to hold a markup on this rule change later this week so that we can proceed in an orderly fashion with hearings in this Congress.

The text of the resolution follows:

H. RES. 43

That, in rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, clause 2(g)(3) is amended clause to read as follows:

"(3) The chairman of each committee of the House (except the Committee on Rules) shall make public announcement of the date, place and subject matter of any committee hearing at least one week before the commencement of the hearing. If the chairman of the committee determines that there is good cause to begin the hearing sooner, the chairman shall make the announcement at the earliest possible date. Any announcement made under this subparagraph shall be promptly published in the Daily Digest and promptly entered into the committee scheduling service of the House Information Systems."

THE STAFF PROTECTION ACT OF 1995

HON. STEPHEN HORN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 23, 1995

Mr. HORN. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced, on behalf of myself and 18 of my colleagues from both sides of the aisle, the Staff Protection Act of 1995, H.R. 628.

This title speaks directly to the nature of this legislation. Currently, under the United States Criminal Code, our staff members are not protected from assault, threats, or violence caused to them while performing their official duties.

I learned of this breach in the law through personal experience. In 1993, I and members of my District office staff, were threatened repeatedly by a person with a record of violence. Several staff members were forced to endure this harassment on a daily basis and became fearful of their physical safety. After making direct threats on the lives of staff members, this person was indicted by the U.S.

attorney and arrested. I was subpoenaed to testify in Federal court in Los Angeles about the threats made against me and members of the staff. Due to my appearance in court, I missed five important votes.

Unfortunately, the only attainable evidence was of this person physically threatening my district director and not me personally. Since the United States Code does not protect members of one's official staff, the judge dismissed the case. As a result, this individual was released, and the staff's safety and peace of mind have continued to be placed in jeopardy.

My staff is not the only one to suffer from this kind of harassment. Many of us know of other offices where violence to the staff has been threatened and/or acted upon. This measure will ensure that congressional staff and their families have the same legal protection afforded to Members of Congress and their families. There is no reason why Federal law should not protect members of our staffs while they are serving in an official capacity.

Mr. Speaker, this proposal has received broad, bipartisan support. It costs nothing to change the law. The benefit is the safety of those who serve this institution and our constituents with immeasurable dedication and loyalty.

I enclose the text of H.R. 628:

H.R. 628

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Staff Protection Act of 1995".

SEC. 2. PROTECTIONS FOR STAFF OF CERTAIN OFFICIALS.

Section 115 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(1)(A), by inserting "a member of the staff or" before "a member of the immediate family";

(2) in subsection (a)(1)(B), by inserting "or a member of the staff of such an official, judge, or law enforcement officer;" after "under such section,";

(3) in the matter following subparagraph (B) in subsection (a)(1), by striking "or law enforcement officer" each place it appears and inserting "law enforcement officer, or member of the staff"; and

(4) in subsection (c)—

(A) by striking "and" at the end of paragraph (3);

(B) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (4) and inserting "; and"; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

"(5) 'member of the staff' includes any person acting in a staff capacity, whether on a paid or unpaid basis."

SAUDI ARABIA'S UNFAIR TREATMENT OF GIBBS & HILL, INC.

HON. ROBERT E. ANDREWS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 23, 1995

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my continued disappointment and frustration with the Government of Saudi Arabia and its ongoing unfair treatment of the American company Gibbs & Hill, Inc. [GHI]. In the late 1970's and 1980's GHI was decimated by financial losses incurred on the design of a desalination project in Saudi Arabia

as a result of the kingdom's failure to honor its contractual obligations. In an effort to bring about a fair and expeditious settlement for GHI and other American companies with claims against Saudi Arabia, Congress established a special claims process following hearings before the House Foreign Affairs Committee. GHI is the last remaining company whose claim has not been paid by the Saudi Arabian Government under this process.

For more than a year, a bipartisan coalition in both the House and Senate, as well as the administration, have worked to fairly resolve the GHI claim. At several points during this process, Saudi Ambassador Bandar and other high-ranking Saudi officials made commitments to Congress and the administration that the GHI claim would be resolved in a fair and expeditious manner and that no effort would be spared in resolving the GHI claim. During this time, Congress and the administration have been lead to believe that the Saudi Government was committed to working toward a fair settlement of the GHI claim. As recent as 3 months ago, Ambassador Bandar met with, and gave assurances to, Senator FRANK LAUTENBERG and GHI's chairman that a shared commitment existed to achieve a prompt and fair resolution of the claim. This was followed by explicit commitments from high-level Saudi officials in both Washington and Riyadh that this claim would be paid. Unfortunately, in a recent communication to GHI, the Saudi Embassy contradicts these explicit commitments.

I am dismayed by the delaying tactics of the Saudi Embassy. It is my belief that what should have been an open and closed issue is beginning to grow into a significant strain on United States-Saudi relations. The Saudi Government's disregard for this American company that has provided services to the kingdom is unacceptable.

The time is now for the Saudi Government to live up to its commitments to me, my colleagues, the administration, and GHI. My colleagues and I require a full and prompt payment of this claim to successfully conclude this important claim issue.

TRIBUTE TO SAM IRMEN

HON. MARCY KAPTUR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 23, 1995

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in tribute to a man who for 46 years has represented the very best traditions of citizenship, corporate involvement, and support for his community.

Sam Irmen began his career at a time when employers and companies were truly involved in their communities and served as a base of support and stability for their communities.

Sam began his career with the Andersons of Maumee, OH, 46 years ago, and rose to the position of vice president and group manager of the grain division. And for those 46 years, he sought to share with his community and advantages his position gave him and the resources that his company could utilize to better his community.

To Sam and his wife Charlee and their seven children, both his company and his community, Maumee, OH, were there home. Sam never stopped contributing. He served on

the elementary school board, as president of the church's parish council, and as president of the school board at St. John's High School. He also served as a member and past vice president of the Maumee Chamber of Commerce.

Good men and women can contribute endlessly when their companies encourage participation. Over the course of his 46 years with the Andersons, Sam's business participation stretched throughout the business community. He is a member of the board of directors at Mid Am National Bank & Trust Co., a member and past president of the National Grain and Feed Association and past chairman of the Grain Grades and Weights Committee, a member and past international president of the Grain Elevator and Processing Society, and a member of distinction of the Grain Elevator and Processing Society.

In addition to these contributions and responsibilities, Sam has led numerous government and trade task forces, served three terms as president of the Toledo Board of Trade, and was a designated representative of agriculture on Ohio Governor Celeste's 1984 Ohio Trade Mission to the Far East.

Simply put, Sam Irmen's career and contributions to his community deeply reflect the bonds that should join every company to its community.

I would like all my distinguished colleagues to join me in congratulating Sam, his wife Charlee, and their wonderful family for 46 years of service and contributions to his company and his community. My fervent hope is that his career will become a lesson for future employees and their companies. His is an example we should all emulate.

INTRODUCTION OF A JOINT RESOLUTION PROPOSING A BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION

HON. BOB FRANKS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 23, 1995

Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to introduce, with Representatives CONDIT and GILLMOR, a joint resolution proposing a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution. I plan to offer this legislation as an amendment in the nature of a substitute to House Joint Resolution 1, when the House considers that bill later this week.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is substantially similar to House Joint Resolution 1, but with two crucial differences. First, this legislation strikes the three-fifths provision to raise taxes contained in section 2 of House Joint Resolution 1. While I am steadfastly opposed to raising taxes, the controversy surrounding this provision could hamper passage in the Senate and make it more difficult to achieve the requisite two-thirds vote in the House of Representatives.

Second, this legislation includes a provision prohibiting new unfunded Federal mandates. We strongly believe that a ban on unfunded mandates is essential to prevent a future Congress from balancing the Federal budget merely by shifting costs and responsibilities to State and local governments.

The supporters of the other versions of the balanced budget amendment contend that

there are only two ways to balance the budget—either by cutting spending or increasing taxes. But the truth is there's a third, more insidious option where the Congress would mandate expensive Federal programs onto State and local governments and require local taxpayers to pick up the tab. Judging from the past, it is clear that Congress will use any means available to avoid hard budget choices. I believe that closing the unfunded mandates loophole is imperative to preserve the integrity of the balanced budget amendment and ensure protection for local taxpayers.

Mr. Speaker, including an unfunded Federal mandates provision as part of the balanced budget amendment is the only ironclad way to protect local taxpayers. Although I welcome and support efforts to solve the unfunded mandates issue by passing a statute, the sorry fact is that Congress is adept at finding ways to circumvent statutory law in order to escape from fiscal accountability.

Additionally, it is important to note that Republicans and Democratic Governors have rightly expressed their reluctance to encourage their State legislatures to ratify a balanced budget amendment without a provision specifically prohibiting new unfunded Federal mandates. Inclusion of a provision to ban unfunded Federal mandates will markedly improve chances of ratification by the States.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation has the support of the National League of Cities and the National Conference of State Legislatures [NCSL]. The support of NCSL is especially noteworthy, as it is their members who will be ultimately deciding the fate of the balanced budget amendment.

Consideration of the balanced budget amendment presents Congress with a unique and historic opportunity to permanently resolve the issue of unfunded Federal mandates. Moreover, it provides assurance that Congress will not meet its obligations under the balanced budget amendment by imposing unfunded mandates on State and local governments. I urge my colleagues to support the Franks-Condit-Gillmor balanced budget amendment, which I believe represents the version of the balanced budget amendment that will be most enthusiastically ratified by three-fourths of the States.

HONORING THE RETIREMENT OF WILLIAM BEHAN

HON. THOMAS M. DAVIS

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 23, 1995

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to rise today to honor Mr. William (Bill) Behan, a resident of Woodbridge, VA, a dedicated American and outstanding public servant. Mr. Behan has officially announced his retirement from the Federal Aviation Administration, and will retire on February 3, 1995.

Mr. Behan will have accumulated over 33 years of combined Federal service, starting with the U.S. Marine Corps in 1961 and 24 years with the FAA beginning in 1971. In his 24 years with the FAA Mr. Behan has held many different positions in numerous States.