

year, they would not have to file FICA, the Social Security mandated provisions. What my legislation does is to take it a step further and to say that those who are earning \$1,000 or less, and most of those people would be found in the category of these election workers, if they earn \$1,000 or less not only would they not have to comply with Social Security as is already the law, but now they would not have to file the W-4's in response to the W-2's and that the local election officials would not have to bother with that if they are reasonably certain that the people they are employing for these 1- or 2-day-a-year jobs would not be earning more than the \$1,000 that would qualify them for the Social Security in the first place.

This is a problem for every single Member of the House and of the Senate. The election workers are the people who make our system work. The less we bother them with details that are meaningless, the better off we are and the better off they are. They will be more easily recruited for these positions on the election precinct basis and we can be certain that the free elections of which we are so proud can be guaranteed.

So I am offering the legislation. I have the cosponsorship of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FROST], who is well aware of the program that we are trying to inject into the system. Now I invite the cosponsorship of others. It is a simple in my judgment technical amendment to conform to another technical amendment that already is on the books that would exempt our senior citizen election officials from the FICA portions, now we want to exclude them from all the paperwork that has been so burdensome to them and to the county officials who have to implement the election laws.

#### INTRODUCTION OF INTERNATIONAL TOBACCO RESPONSIBILITY ACT OF 1997

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 21, 1997, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOGGETT] is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, this week I am introducing the International Tobacco Responsibility Act. To some, this title will itself appear contradictory, for clearly the tobacco lobby has never been known to accept responsibility for the death and disease that its products cause. But now, under the terms of the proposed tobacco settlement, American companies have agreed to impose more meaningful labeling and warning requirements on their products and on their advertisements. Under this settlement's terms, for the first time cigarette packs will carry warnings such as "Smoking Kills," which it obviously does; "Smoking is Addictive"; and "Smoking Causes Cancer, Heart Disease and

Emphysema." Yet while the settlement requires these warnings on tobacco sold here at home, it makes no effort to curb the export of death.

As noted in a recent front page article in the New York Times entitled "Fenced in at Home, Marlboro Man Looks Abroad":

If there is a heaven for beleaguered cigarette manufacturers of the West, it is the developing markets of eastern Europe, Asia and the Middle East, half a world away from . . . assertive regulators. . . .

□ 1245

Indeed, in agreeing to settle the lawsuits brought against them here in America, the corporate nicotine dealers made sure that they retained full authority to promote a nicotine fix that hooks kids around the world with their deadly products, and they are doing that just as fast as they can.

Since 1990, Philip Morris, for example, has had its sales go up by 4.7 percent here in the United States but abroad, it has grown 80 percent. The world's children, the children are the newest target of Big Tobacco's continued addiction itself to making money at the expense of human lives. Joe Camel and the Marlboro cowboy, they have not gone away; they are just taking a trip overseas where they will appear on a billboard next to someone else's school and on the pages of a youth-oriented magazine in another language.

Big Tobacco knows that it can pay any penalties that we impose in America with profits earned at the expense of someone else's children. That is wrong. If America is to call itself a world leader, it must also lead in the battle to save the lives of young children from nicotine addiction, and that leadership means more than just saving lives in my home State of Texas or in Ohio; it means being concerned about the lives of young children in Poland or in Korea.

The tragic consequences of nicotine addiction do not know any national boundaries. Tobacco does not discriminate. It kills people regardless of race, creed, color or national origin, and American tobacco companies should have the responsibility to warn smokers everywhere across this world of the ghastly health effects of their products.

The International Tobacco Act of 1997 would take three important steps toward addressing this worldwide health menace.

First, it would require that American tobacco companies apply the same warning labels to their products sold overseas and their advertisements as they are required to do in the United States. While current United States law requires labels on domestic cigarette packs, it specifically exempts exported cigarettes. This bill would repeal that loophole and require labels on tobacco products produced here or wherever their ultimate destination.

Second, the International Tobacco Responsibility Act would prohibit the

existing subsidy, yes subsidy, by American taxpayers for promoting overseas tobacco sales. Too often in the past Federal officials in our own Government have been accomplices to exporting death and disease throughout the world. Employees of our Government, paid with our tax money, have promoted tobacco abroad and brought down advertising restrictions in other countries that were designed to prevent addicting children and others overseas from the very way that they have been exploited here at home.

Third, the International Tobacco Responsibility Act would call on the United States of America to exercise some moral leadership on this vital issue. If we can achieve an international accord to restrict the trade in ivory to protect elephant herds around the world, surely we can seek accords to restrict the marketing of lethal tobacco products to the world's children.

This bill would urge the President to seek, through the United Nations, an international conference to implement measures such as those in the proposed settlement agreement to reduce nicotine consumption worldwide. In Japan, one warning label modestly suggests "let us carefully observe smoking manners." Clearly it would be the ultimate hypocrisy to continue to promote death abroad at the same time we address the needs of our own children here at home.

As we move toward consideration of the proposed tobacco settlement, we must not default on our obligation as a world leader. We should seize this unique opportunity to act responsibly ourselves, while seeking concerted international action to limit trafficking in a highly addictive drug that kills more people worldwide than any other.

#### PRESERVE FUNDING FOR THE ARTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PETRI). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 21, 1997, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCGOVERN] is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, some of my colleagues have been arguing that the Federal Government should bear no responsibility for funding the arts. They claim that the National Endowment for the Arts is a shameful bureaucracy, out of touch with the American people; that it is a bastion of elitism; that Americans would be better off without it.

Mr. Speaker, those colleagues are wrong, and I rise today to set the record straight.

I was in my hometown of Worcester, MA, for the Fourth of July festivities. Before the fireworks took to the sky, I sat with 30,000 of my constituents as we were collectively awed by the Central Massachusetts Symphony Orchestra performance. It was a breathtaking experience. The concert was free to the

public; the music, a gift to everyone who gathered at East Park. The Central Massachusetts Symphony Orchestra is a beneficiary of grants from the Worcester Cultural Commission and the Massachusetts Cultural Council which receives funding from the National Endowment for the Arts.

The NEA is not the exclusive funding source for arts in America. The lion's share of their funding comes from private individuals and corporations, and eliminating the NEA will not eliminate the arts; but it will curb average Americans' abilities to access them, to learn and grow from them and to enrich their children with them.

If the NEA is eliminated, the arts will become a private enterprise, the exclusive domain of the wealthy and well connected. The work of the American theater troops, musicians, painters, writers, and photographers belong to every American, not just those who can afford season tickets, private passes, and A-list invitations. As the arts preserve, reinvent and create our national heritage, they serve each of us. Their creations should be available for all of us to see, hear, feel and experience. The NEA helps make this happen.

The growth of museums, dance and opera companies, symphony orchestras and presenting groups is the direct result of NEA resources. Without the NEA, States like Massachusetts will become a tale of two cities. Larger cities like Boston will always find the resources to preserve the cultural centers. It is medium-sized and small cities, it is rural communities like those in my district that will suffer without Federal arts funding.

One glorious example of the NEA's handiwork is the Worcester Art Museum. Because of a \$15,000 NEA grant, the Worcester Art Museum was able to open the landmark exhibition entitled *Grant Wood: An American master revealed*. Over 57,000 men, women, and children throughout the area marveled at this exhibition. Free tours were given to over 3,800 students and a family day with hands-on art activities drew close to 2,000 people. Worcester Art Museum is expecting tens of thousands more people from Massachusetts and throughout New England to attend exhibitions planned for this coming year, and each of them is being made possible through NEA funding.

The NEA has done much to fund and recognize the educational value of the arts. Arts in the classroom have been proven to increase student attendance, bolster self-esteem, broaden vocabulary and boost overall academic progress. By teaching about the arts in our schools we not only enrich our students' cultural education, we actually help them learn. I have long been committed to reining in wasteful Government spending; but to target the NEA as the source of that waste demonstrates a fundamental misunderstanding of the Federal budget. Sadly, as this Congress seeks to eliminate the

modest Federal funding for museums, symphony orchestras, and theater groups across this Nation in the name of deficit reduction, it has succeeded in pouring billions and billions of dollars more into B-2 bombers that even the Pentagon says it does not need and does not want. It is absurd.

The former Governor of New York, Mario Cuomo, spoke eloquently about the current state of our society. He said that it is simply a tragedy that so many of our Nation's children will hear the sounds of gunfire before they hear the sounds of a symphony.

It is not simply a matter of resources, Mr. Speaker, it is a matter of priorities. Each taxpayer contributes less than 70 cents per year to the NEA, and I think that is a small price to pay to protect our heritage and preserve our culture. If anything, the NEA actually helps balance the budget. The NEA's investment in the Nation's arts acts as a catalyst for over \$3.4 billion in Federal tax revenue. It stimulates local economies and urban renewal. In my district, cities, and towns from Worcester to Fall River have witnessed the benefits of increased tourism and economic growth as a result of the NEA.

What message will we be sending to the Nation if the National Endowment for the Arts is eliminated? To cut the NEA is to reduce our national commitment to cultural activity. It is to decrease national visibility for cultural education, and it may prompt the States and local governments to cut the funding for the arts as well.

The arts bring people together, heal communities, and provide us with a common language. Supporting the arts is central both to our understanding of past civilizations and to constructing a shared vision for the future.

In conclusion, if we care that historical monuments will continue to be treasured and experienced by all, if we care that traveling exhibitions will make it beyond our Nation's largest cities, if we care that our children will be able to open the doors to America's culture and history, if we believe that music, drama and visual works, these flowers of our national experience must be made available to all, then we must support the National Endowment for the Arts.

#### GAY AND LESBIAN PRIDE CELEBRATION 1997

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 21, 1997, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK] is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, during the month of June, gay and lesbian people throughout this country celebrated our presence in this country. That is a tradition that has now gone on for more than 20 years, but this year there was one difference. As Herb and I prepared to go to New

York to participate in the New York celebration, I carried with me a statement from the President of the United States in which he welcomed the gay and lesbian pride celebrations and reaffirmed his commitment, the President's commitment, to fighting anti-gay and lesbian prejudice.

Bill Clinton is the first President in our history to confront this prejudice. Unfortunately, by the norms of American political discourse, you generally today get criticized by people when they are unhappy and ignored when you have done something that they should be applauding.

President Clinton is entitled to a good deal of praise for his willingness to confront one of the enduring prejudices that has blighted our ability as a nation to fully realize our constitutional ideals. I believe Mr. Speaker, given the historic nature of this proclamation which I was pleased to get a copy of from Richard Socarides, a very able aid at the White House who worked on these issues, I think it is appropriate that the President's statement on Gay and Lesbian Pride Celebration 1997 be shared here in this Chamber. So I will now, with unanimous consent, proceed to read the President's celebration:

Warm greetings to all those participating in the 1997 Gay and Lesbian Pride Celebration.

Throughout America's history, we have overcome tremendous challenges by drawing strength from our great diversity. We must never believe that our diversity is a weakness. The talents, contributions and goodwill of people from so many different backgrounds have enriched our national life and have enabled us to fulfill our common hopes and dreams. As we stand at the dawn of a new century, we must all rededicate ourselves to reaching the vital goals of acceptance and inclusion. America's continued success will depend on our ability to understand, appreciate, and care for one another.

We're not there yet, and that is why our efforts to end discrimination against lesbians and gays are so important. Like each of you, I remain dedicated to ending discrimination and preserving the civil rights of every citizen in our society. We have begun to wage an all-out campaign against hate crimes in America, crimes that are often viciously directed at gay men and lesbians. I have also endorsed and fought for civil rights legislation that would protect gay and lesbian Americans from discrimination. The Employment Nondiscrimination Act now being considered in Congress would put an end to discrimination against gay men and lesbians in the workplace, discrimination that is currently legal in 39 States. These efforts reflect our belief in the right of every American to be judged on his or her merits and ability, and to be allowed to contribute to society without facing discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation. And they reflect our ongoing fight against bigotry and intolerance in our country and in our hearts.

My Administration's record of inclusiveness is a strong one, but it is a record to build on. I am proud of the many openly gay men and lesbians who serve with distinction in my Administration, and their impact will