EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

INTRODUCTION OF THE TEEN TOBACCO USE PREVENTION ACT OF 1998

HON. FRED UPTON

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 1998

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of legislation that I am introducing to address a very serious and growing problem in this country—tobacco use by our youth. I have long been concerned about the increasing number of teens—and increasingly younger teens—who start smoking every year. Every day, 3,000 teens begin smoking. Teenagers typically begin to smoke at 14½ and become daily smokers before age 18. We know that if individuals do not start smoking as teenagers, they will probably never smoke. For many thousands of Americans, discouraging teens from tobacco use and making it much more difficult for them to purchase tobacco products is literally a matter of life and death.

That is why I am introducing the ''Teen Tobacco Use Prevention Act of 1998.'' This legislation amends the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to keep tobacco products out of the hands of our nation's children, strengthen warning labels, and restrict tobacco product advertisements. Specifically, the legislation includes the following provisions:

1. Content and warning labels. Requires more complete product constituent labeling and increases the number, prominence, and strength of tobacco product warning labels on packages and print ads. Includes the requirement that the FDA promulgate a rule governing the testing, reporting, and disclosure of tobacco smoke constituents that the Agency determines the public should be informed of to protect public health. Prohibits the advertising of cigarettes and little cigars on media subject to FCC jurisdiction.

2. Statement of intended use. Requires manufacturers, distributors, and retailer advertising of tobacco products to include, after the product name, a statement of intended use as specified in the bill. For cigarettes, for example, the intended use statement is: ''Cigarettes—A Dangerous Tobacco Product Intended For Use Only By Persons 18 or Older.''

3. Vending machine sales. Prohibits the sale of cigarettes or smokeless tobacco products from vending machines, except in those locations in which the retailer or operator ensures that no person younger than 18 years of age is present or permitted to enter at any time. Includes a provision requiring the FDA to monitor compliance with the vending provisions for two years and to propose additional restrictions if there is evidence that young people are continuing to purchase tobacco products from vending machines.

4. Minimum age. Prohibits the sale or distribution of tobacco products to anyone younger than 18 years of age. Permits states to set a higher age. Requires retailers to verify that purchasers are 18 or older by checking identification that includes the bearer's date of birth and photograph for anyone 26 years of age or younger. Includes civil monetary penalties for the sale of tobacco products to minors. For the first offense, the FDA will send a letter to the violator describing the law, describing the violation, and describing the potential liability facing the retailer for subsequent violations. For the second violation, the penalty shall be $250. For the third, $500. The penalty will double in size for each subsequent violation.

5. Enforcement. States are required to strictly enforce restrictions on sales to minors and report annually on their progress in reducing such sales and the strategies they are or will be using. States are required to conduct random, unannounced inspections to ensure compliance. If states fail to comply, the Secretary is authorized to reduce their Substance Abuse Prevention and Treatment allotments.

6. Individual cigarettes and packages of less than 20. Prohibits sales or distribution of either.

7. Sampling. Prohibits.

8. Distribution through the mail. Prohibits the distribution of tobacco products through the mail, except for mail order sales subject to proof of age requirements. Manufacturers or others who wish to distribute tobacco products through the mail must first file with the Secretary of HHS for approval of the system they will use to ensure that these products will go only to persons 18 years of age or older. The Secretary will review these sales after two years to determine whether minors are obtaining tobacco products through the mail. Imposes the same penalties as those imposed for sales to minors.

9. Tobacco product use reduction targets. Requires the Secretary of HHS to establish a benchmark rate of current tobacco use by children and adolescents, measure youth tobacco product use annually, and report this information to Congress three years from the date of enactment, together with recommendations for additional recommendations if rates are not substantially declining (declining at a rate that would produce a 35 percent or greater reduction in the rate of youth tobacco use five years from the date of enactment; at least 50 percent by the seventh year; and at least 80 percent by the tenth year).

10. Effective Date. January 1, 1999.

Mr. Speaker, I am introducing this legislation because I believe that reducing teens' access to tobacco products and desire to use them must be at the heart of any tobacco initiatives we consider this year. I am very open to suggestions for improvements in the legislation I am introducing today, and I am most interested in working with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to pass meaningful tobacco control and reform legislation in this session of Congress.

CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

HON. RON KIND

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 1998

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, today was to be the day that the House of Representatives was to debate campaign finance reform, but we are not. The leadership of the House has broken another promise to the people of this nation. It is time to allow a vote on this important issue.

In an election this last Tuesday in Nebraska the voters rejected the candidate who run a negative campaign, in support of the candidate who ran a positive issue oriented campaign. Hopefully the voters around the nation will reject these negative campaigns in favor of honest open discussion of the issues. We can help the process by reforming our campaign finance system. That won't happen if we are never allowed a vote on the floor of the House.

I hope that next week the leadership finally keeps it's word and allows a vote on campaign finance reform. The people of this nation are hungry for clean campaigns and clean elections and it is our responsibility to pass campaign finance reform now.

INTRODUCTION OF THE ADMINISTRATION'S WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1998

HON. BUD SHUSTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 1998

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, today I'm pleased to introduce by request the administration's Water Resources Development Act of 1998 (or WRDA 98). The proposed constitutes the Department of the Army's Civil Works legislative program for the Second Session of the 105th Congress.

The Transportation and Infrastructure Committee works very closely with the administration, particularly the Army Corps of Engineers and the office of the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works), to ensure that the Nation's largest water resources program is effective and responsive to current and future needs. The Committee welcomes the transmittal of this proposal to Congress as a sign of good faith and genuine interest in facilitating the enactment of a WRDA 98 before the year's end.

The Committee has held three hearings on proposals for a WRDA 98. We intend to look very closely at the administration's bill, request from our Congressional colleagues, and recommendations from public witnesses and other interested parties. The intent is then to introduce and move through the Committee a bipartisan, widely supported bill.

The administration's bill, which we introduce by request today, has numerous provisions

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 constitutents—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 Stats, 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