built in this country. It is time that we stop fooling ourselves that a renaissance in U.S. ship-building is just around the corner.

Because of the Jones Act, U.S. agricultural producers today do not have access to domestic deep-sea transportation options available to their foreign competitors. There are no bulk carriers operating on either coast of the United States, in the Great Lakes, nor out to Guam, Alaska, Puerto Rico, or Hawaii. This puts American producers at a competitive disadvantage because foreign producers are able to ship their products to American markets at competitive international rates whereas U.S. producers are not.

American agricultural producers also need access to deep-sea transportation options because other modes of transportation are saturated. Last year's rail woes would have been averted if just 2% of domestic agricultural production could have traveled by ocean-going vessel. With an expected record harvest on the way, the bottlenecks and congestion of last year will in all likelihood be revisited. Burlington and Union Pacific have already notified agricultural shippers to expect delays. This raises rail rates to artificially high levels at a time when commodity prices are already depressed—directly impacting farm income.

The Shipping Relief for Agricultural Act will eliminate the U.S. build requirement for deepwater dry bulk vessels for the carriage of agricultural products, dry bulk cargo, and forest products. All vessels would still be required to obey all U.S. law, including environmental, safety, labor, and tax regulations. This bill brings more ships to the U.S. fleet, allows U.S. Agricultural shippers access to ships, and will also provide much needed jobs for the American Merchant Marine.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JUANITA MILLENDER-McDONALD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES Friday, July 24, 1998

Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, July 17, and Monday, July 20, 1998, I filed an official leave of absence and was not available to cast votes on either of those days. However, had I been present on Friday, July 17, I would have voted "aye" on rollcall vote 295, and "nay" on rollcall vote

Had I been present on Monday, July 20, I would have voted "aye" on rollcall votes 297, 298, 299, 300, 301, 303, 304, 305, and "nay" on rollcall votes 302, 306, 307, 308.

TRIBUTE TO SUSAN GAIL YOACHUM

HON. ANNA G. ESHOO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 24, 1998

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Susan Gail Yoachum, a magnificent human being and extraordinary journalist of the San Francisco Bay Area who passed away on June 22, 1998. She was the devoted wife of Mike Carlson, the daughter of Betty and the late Charles G. Yoachum, and the sis-

ter and relative of Charles Yoachum and his family of Dallas.

Susan Yoachum was a star from the moment she was born in Dallas, Texas on May 12, 1955. Her passion for writing emerged early in her life as she became the National Spelling Champion in 1969. She pursued her talent at Southern Methodist University in Dallas, from which she graduated in 1975 with Bachelor of Arts degrees in journalism and political science.

She was a reporter for the Dallas Morning News, the Independent Journal in Marin County, the San Jose Mercury News, and the San Francisco Chronicle, covering some of the largest political stories of her era. Her talent for seeking out and delivering breaking stories went unmatched in political journalism. This talent was recognized in 1990, when she was part of a team that won a Pulitzer Prize for breaking news, and again in 1994, when she was honored as Journalist of the Year by the Northern California chapter of the Society of Professional Journalists. She earned a reputation amongst her peers and those about whom she wrote as a tenacious, witty, and sophisticated reporter, armed always with a penetrating question and a warm smile. Since 1990, she had covered national, state, and local politics for the San Francisco Chronicle, where she was promoted to Political Editor in 1994. As a popular political analyst, she was often a guest on TV and radio programs, from CNN's 'Inside Politics" to a myriad of Bay Area radio shows.

In 1991, Susan Yoachum was diagnosed with metastatic breast cancer. During her seven-year struggle with breast cancer, she not only continued to produce brilliant work, but she also became a breast cancer activist. In an effort to raise awareness about this horrible disease, she frequently spoke to women's organizations, political groups, and fellow victims. In 1997, she courageously wrote about her own battle with cancer, announcing that after being in remission since 1992, her cancer had returned. She strove to humanize the statistic that 180,000 women get breast cancer every year, personalizing the cold facts with her own face.

Mr. Speaker, Susan Yoachum was an inspiration to us all. She educated us with her sharp journalistic talent, she personalized and publicized what breast cancer is about, she fought for a cure, and she made lasting contributions to our community and our country.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in paying tribute to a woman who lived a remarkable yet all too brief life. We extend our deepest sympathy to Mike Carlson and the entire Yoachum family. Susan Yoachum's life was an example of the strength of the human spirit, and because of her, hope lives on.

A SALUTE TO COLONEL JOSEPH A. HAIG (U.S. ARMY, RET.)

HON. THOMAS M. BARRETT

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 24, 1998

Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, today I am pleased to recognize a patriot and honorable American from Milwaukee, Wisconsin. As family and friends gather today to honor Colonel Joseph A. Haig on the occasion

of his 100th birthday, I would like to take a moment to acknowledge Colonel Haig's long-time service to our country.

Joseph A. Haig was born in Milwaukee, Wisconsin on August 24, 1898, and enjoyed a typical turn of the century boyhood. In the summer of 1918, however, with the "war to end all wars" still raging in Europe, Joseph crossed the threshold into manhood, and joined the United States Army, as part of the Officers Candidate School. As one of the "60 day wonders", he received his commission when he was only twenty years old.

After the war, Joseph returned to civilian life, but remained active as a reservist. In 1923, he became a charter member of the Reserve Officers Association. Today, he is the sole surviving charter member.

In the summer of 1940, before the United States officially entered World War II, Joseph was called to active duty as a major. He was made the assistant commanding officer of the Recruit Reception Center at Fort Sheridan, Illinois. During the next three years, he processed nearly a quarter of a million draftees. In 1945, then Major Joseph Haig was assigned to a camp in Pennsylvania as deputy post commander. In that position, he had the pleasant duty of facilitating the discharge of about 400,000 men, until he was discharged from active duty.

Once again, the end of active duty did not mean the end of his military career. Now Colonel Joseph Haig continued on as a reservist and remained involved and prepared to serve his country, when needed, until his mandatory retirement forty years ago.

Colonel Haig still attends the annual Reserve Officers Association meetings. Ten years ago, when he was a mere 90 years old, Colonel Haig was honored at the Association's annual meeting, as hundreds of generals and admirals greeted him with a tremendous standing ovation.

Another source of pride for Colonel Haig is his family, which includes his children Janet, Douglas, and Jerry, along with 20 grand-children and 22 great-grandchildren. Colonel Haig's sons share in their father's sense of service to country and have served in the military. Douglas is a retired Air Force colonel. Jerry is a retired Naval Lieutenant Commander. The Haig family's combined years of military service is a staggering 176 years.

I ask my colleagues in the House of Representatives to join me in extending my appreciation to Colonel Joseph A. Haig for his many years of service to the people of the United States and in offering a hearty congratulations on the occasion of his 100th birthday.

POLITICALLY DRIVEN MANAGED CARE REFORM DEBATE

HON. JAMES L. OBERSTAR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 24, 1998

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my grave concern that the debate today on managed care reform has deteriorated into a politically-driven exercise to serve the narrow and partisan goals of the majority party.

Neither the Republican leadership bill nor the Dingell/Ganske substitute were subjected to the cleansing legislative process, in which the American people expect public hearings, open and full debate, a committee amendment process, and a meaningful opportunity to make specific changes to the legislation.

At each of these normal checkpoints of legislative procedure, the public and their elected representatives were denied the opportunity to participate fully in the legislative process, to offer and debate amendments and vote on them to produce a legislative output that hopefully reflects a solid consensus, or, at least, the end result of a democratic process.

Instead, we are engaged in a debate without the opportunity to make substantive and necessary changes to either piece of legislation through floor amendments, and we will be compelled to vote these competing measures either up or down without meaningful change.

Given the opportunity, I would have preferred that both bills be neutral on the issues of abortion and assisted suicide.

While there has been a good faith attempt in the Dingell/Ganske legislation to address these two matters, I strongly believe that the language on such issues must be so clear as to withstand judicial scutiny that health care plans are not required to provide assisted suicide or abortion services.

Given the opportunity, I would have offered the following language that would achieve this important objective:

Amend Section 108 and 109 of H.R. 3605 by adding the following new subsection (c):

"(c) Nothing in this Act shall be construed as requiring a group health plan or health insurance coverage to provide, pay for, refer for, or ensure the availability of or access to any benefit or service, including the use of facilities, related to an abortion or any item or service for which use of Federal funds is prohibited under the Assisted Suicide Funding Restriction Act of 1997. Nothing in the preceding sentence shall be construed as allowing a group health plan or health insurance converge to deny any benefit or service related to treatment for medical complications resulting from an abortion."

Amend Section 141 of H.R. 3605 by adding the following new subsection (b)(3):

"(b)(3) Nothing in this Act shall be construed to cause a group health plan or health insurance issuer to violate its ethical, moral or religious benefits."

I have been assured by the distinguished gentleman from Michigan, Mr. DINGELL, the Ranking Democrat of the Commerce Committee, that it is his intent that the legislative history should reflect that his legislation seeks to be neutral on these two issues.

With that statement of legislative intent, I plan to support the Dingell/Ganske substitute.

I want to make it clear on this point that I will seek inclusion of the legislative language that I have just referenced in any further managed care legislation that this Congress may consider.

CHILD NUTRITION AND WIC REAU-THORIZATION AMENDMENTS OF 1998

SPEECH OF

HON. JOSEPH P. KENNEDY II

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 20, 1998

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 3874, the Child Nutrition and WIC Reauthorization Act. This bill gives our states more opportunity to fight against a problem that plagues our nation even in these prosperous times—child hunger.

This bill is linked to almost every issue we struggle with on this House floor. Every year, we discover stronger links between child nutrition and all the indicators of a child's future. Better nutrition means better learning, better test scores, better health, better discipline.

But child hunger is alive and well in America. I've traveled all over my home state of Massachusetts hearing about how and why children go without adequate nutrition. And I've heard about the safety net that keeps many of our kids from going hungry—healthy meals at school, after school, and at summer feeding sites.

We can protect our children from hunger. We can guarantee that every child has an opportunity to get good quality nutrition year round. This bill doesn't do everything I'd like, but it takes big steps in the right direction.

This bill would allow more of our states to experiment with universal free breakfast. In districts that have tried free breakfast—in Philadelphia, Baltimore, and parts of Minnesota—more kids are showing up for breakfast, kids are doing better in school, and kids are behaving better.

This bill allows more sites to participate in the summer feeding service, and makes it easier for the states to administer those programs. It allows more schools to use federal funds to serve meals at after-school programs. And it allows teenage children to get free after-school snacks in low-income communities

Mr. Speaker, this bill not only provides more meals for more children, but it makes it easier for the states to use federal money in their own efforts to fight child hunger. I strongly urge my colleagues to support this bill.

WAXMAN AMENDMENT REMARKS

SPEECH OF

HON. CHARLES E. SCHUMER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 23, 1998

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Waxman amendment.

The Hudson River is drowning and we need to throw it a life jacket.

It is time to put an end to Congress's interference in the cleaning up of our communities and eliminate the alarming language attached to the VA–HUD appropriations report that will suffocate public health and bulldoze environmental protections.

It is time to demand of our federal government that they not kowtow to big companies like General Electric, big companies who need to start taking responsibility for the deleterious effect their factories are having on our society.

The Hudson River is now contaminated with toxic PCBs—one of the most harmful pollutants known, in large part because General Electric and other companies allowed these dangerous poisons to seep into our waterways.

General Electric maintains that the PCBs are entombed under silt—that the river is cleaning itself. Today there is new evidence that the situation is worse than our worst nightmare. PCBs are escaping from the sediments in the Hudson River and are being carried downstream and settling in other parts of the river contaminating more and more fish and more and more people.

The New York regional administrator of the EPA stated today that "the fact that these PCBs are so rapidly reentering the river system is startling. Given what we know about the health risks of eating contaminated fish, this information is even more startling."

Based upon all of the evidence, the EPA is convinced, and so am I, that PCB contamination is a significant threat to public health and the environment.

How much more evidence do we need? How many more experts need to tell us that something needs to be done? How many more New Yorkers need to suffer from immediate and long-term health problems posed by toxic PCB pollution?

Mr. Chairman, we need to dredge the polluted waters of the Hudson and we need to do it now. New York City is built on islands surrounding water, water which cannot be utilized to its fullest potential because of the lethal levels of contaminants. We need to seize this moment and make a last ditch effort to clean up the Hudson River waterfront and make it the jewel it once was.

It is imperative that the Hudson not be sent down the river and New Yorkers not be forced to walk the plank.

Support the Waxman amendment. Eliminate these dangerous riders.

U.N. DUES ARE A LEGAL OBLIGATION

HON. LEE HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 24, 1998

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, some observers have argued that we do not owe to the United Nations the dues we have been assessed by that organization. I would like to set the record straight.

I recently posed a series of questions to the Department of State regarding the nature of our international legal obligations to the United Nations. The reply I received to those questions indicates that while Congress can refuse to pay the bills we owe, that in no way relieves our responsibility to pay those bills.

I ask permission to include in the RECORD my correspondence with the Department of State on this subject, and encourage my colleagues to review it.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE, Washington, DC, July 8, 1998.

Hon. LEE H. HAMILTON

House of Representatives

DEAR MR. HAMILTON: Thank you for your letter of May 15, raising several important