

that should be supported. At the same time, I must emphasize that some of the bill's projects and programmatic proposals raise serious questions and, in some circles, strong opposition. I look forward to working closely with my colleagues and the administration to ensure that a WRDA 98 can move swiftly through the Congress and become law before the year's end

IN RECOGNITION OF FOOD
ALLERGY AWARENESS WEEK

HON. NITA M. LOWEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 1998

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize Food Allergy Awareness Week.

My colleagues, 5 to 8 million Americans suffer from food allergies. Five percent of all children are food allergic and hundreds of Americans die every year from food allergies.

And the number of food allergy sufferers is increasing. Indeed among children, allergy to nuts has skyrocketed in just the last twenty years alone.

Indeed, I have spoken to many constituents—young and old alike—who have shared with me their terrible experiences with allergies. I will never forget hearing the harrowing tale of a five year old rushed to the hospital in anaphylactic shock after inadvertently eating a nut.

Tragically, there is no cure for food allergies. That is why it is so critical that we invest more resources in allergy research and prevention programs.

As a member of the Appropriations subcommittee that funds the National Institutes of Health, I will be working hard with my colleagues this year to increase funding for biomedical research so that we can find a cure for food allergies. We must also invest more in public awareness and prevention programs at the CDC and FDA so that restaurants and food processors become more sensitive to the health needs of their consumers and customers.

I look forward to working with my colleagues to address this serious health problem so that we can find a cure for allergies in our lifetimes.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. LAMAR S. SMITH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 1998

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, yesterday during Roll Call Vote 146, I voted aye believing that I was supporting Congresswoman Roukema's amendment #19 when in fact the vote was on Congressman Leach's amendment that I opposed. Please let the record reflect that I intended to vote no on Congressman Leach's amendment (Roll Call Vote 146), and aye on Congresswoman Roukema's amendment #19 (Roll Call Vote 147).

TEACHER INVESTMENT AND
ENHANCEMENT ACT

HON. ELTON GALLEGLY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 1998

Mr. GALLEGLY. Mr. Speaker, today I will introduce the Teacher Investment and Enhancement Act (TIE Act) along with my colleagues Steve Horn, Zoe Lofgren and Ron Paul to encourage secondary teachers to go back and take college courses in their fields of teaching.

While it is important to know how to teach, it is equally if not more important to know what you are teaching. This was proven, unfortunately, with the disappointing outcome of U.S. 12th graders in the Third International Math and Science Study (TIMSS). Our 12th graders out-performed only two countries—Cyprus and South Africa—out of 21 countries in math and science. Education Secretary Richard Riley attributed this to the fact that "too many science and math teachers are teaching out-of-field."

The TIE Act would increase the Lifetime Learning Tax Credit for tuition expenses for the continuing education of secondary teachers in their fields of teaching.

We need to ensure teachers are well-educated. How can we expect our children to learn a subject if their teachers are not knowledgeable in the subjects themselves? We simply cannot. Offering more education opportunities for our teachers is an investment in our children and one we cannot afford not to take. I strongly encourage my colleagues to cosponsor this important piece of legislation and work for its passage.

RATIFY THE COMPREHENSIVE
TEST BAN TREATY

HON. ELIZABETH FURSE

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 1998

Ms. FURSE. Mr. Speaker, in light of the appalling underground nuclear testing in India, I submit the following editorial "What did We Tell You" written by former Senator Mark O. Hatfield and former Representative Mike Kopetski. I would like to join my former colleagues in urging the Senate to ratify the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty.

WHAT DID WE TELL YOU?

INDIA'S TESTS OF NUCLEAR BOMBS PROVE THE
NEED FOR TEST BAN TREATY

(By Mark O. Hatfield and Michael J.
Kopetski)

The U.S. Senate has an historic opportunity to help shut the door on the most threatening menace to Americans: the risk of a renewed nuclear weapons arms race with Russia and China, and the proliferation of nuclear weapons. This lingering danger was dramatically illustrated on Monday when India conducted three nuclear tests at its Pokhra test site.

These tests are certain to alarm neighboring Pakistan and China, both of whom possess nuclear weapons of their own, and heighten tensions in this volatile region of the world. In order to reduce these risks, the Senate has the responsibility to promptly consider and ratify the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty.

Forty years ago this month, President Dwight D. Eisenhower recognized the value of stopping nuclear testing by initiating formal discussions with the Soviets for a "discontinuance of all nuclear weapons tests." His effort, unfortunately, fell short; but with the end of the Cold War, new opportunities and even stronger reasons for the test ban have emerged.

The collapse of America's old rival created the possibility of dramatically reducing the risk of a conflict involving nuclear weapons—a possibility that still threatens each and every American. In 1991, Presidents George Bush and Mikhail Gorbachev decided to seize the opportunity to reduce the nuclear danger. They signed a new strategic nuclear arms reduction agreement. President Bush took our nuclear-armed bombers off alert and withdrew most U.S. tactical nuclear weapons. President Gorbachev instituted a temporary halt to Soviet nuclear weapons testing.

While serving the people of Oregon as members of Congress, the two of us responded by introducing legislation to match the Soviet nuclear test moratorium with a one-year U.S. testing halt. We believed that it was—and still is—vital that the United States, as the world's pre-eminent power, set an example so that we can persuade other nations to refrain from acquiring nuclear weapons, and avoid giving any nuclear power reason to resume testing.

Later, in 1992, our legislation gained broad support and was strengthened to require the initiation of negotiations on a global ban on nuclear weapon test explosions. In 1993, President Clinton extended the U.S. moratorium on nuclear testing. In 1996, negotiations on the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty were completed. It has been signed by 149 nations, including all five nuclear weapon states. In September 1997, the president sent the treaty to the U.S. Senator for its approval.

The questions debated in 1992 are similar to the questions about the treaty in 1998: Can we verify the reliability of our nuclear arsenal without testing? Can we enforce a global ban on nuclear tests? What happens if America fails to act or approve the test ban?

The answer is the same as it was in 1992: A nuclear test ban is clearly in America's national security interest.

The U.S. nuclear weapons arsenal is well-tested. We have conducted 2,046 nuclear tests—more than 1,000 in the atmosphere. The United States possesses the most advanced, accurate and deadly nuclear arsenal in the world. Since the nuclear test moratorium of 1992, our nuclear weapons laboratories have maintained the safety and reliability of the U.S. nuclear Weapons without nuclear testing. The directors of the three national nuclear weapons laboratories, as well as leading independent nuclear weapon scientists, have determined that the remaining arsenal can be maintained through non-nuclear tests and evaluations.

Given the overwhelming nuclear capability of the United States, the Test Ban Treaty is clearly in our national interest. It would make it much more difficult for other countries with advanced nuclear weapons to produce new and even more threatening ones. It also would help stop nuclear proliferation by deterring, if not preventing, any nation from developing sophisticated nuclear weapons that can be delivered by ballistic missiles. With the Test Ban Treaty in place, no would-be violator could be confident that a test nuclear explosion could escape detection.

Failure to act on the Test Ban Treaty this year would severely undermine U.S. leadership efforts to stop the spread of nuclear weapons. In 1995, the United States and other