

healthy. They should follow the lead of the President and get the private sector to go where it has never gone before, making the free enterprise system accountable for providing livable wages for all of America's families.

AGAINST LATEST TAX INCREASE PROPOSAL

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

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, throughout the long march of history, the story of civilization is replete with examples of how individuals have been burdened by an overbearing Government whose onerous tax systems have destroyed individuals, communities and, indeed, entire civilizations.

□ 1245

Yet in the midst of such oppression, individuals have fought back to defend their right to keep a significant portion of what they earned by their own toil.

We know about the peasants' revolts in the Middle Ages, where peasants revolted against a system that required them to give one-third of what they raised in the fields to their landlords. Of course all Americans know about the Boston Tea Party, where American revolutionaries said no taxation without representation. That led to a glorious American Revolution led by such men as THOMAS Jefferson and George Washington, who talked about the power of the individual over the power of the State.

Indeed, for the entire 20th century, this battle has continued. It has continued against those that believe in the free enterprise system and those that believe that the scourge of socialism should sweep across the world. It is a battle that America has been fighting and a battle that we thought we won. But unfortunately we turn around to find out, in 1997, that we may not have been as successful as we thought. For while the peasants were revolting against paying one-third of everything they earned to their landlords, we turn around and find out, in 1997, from the National Taxpayers Union and other independent groups, that the average American pays 50.2 percent of everything they earn to the Government.

Mr. Speaker, that is obscene and that is as un-American as anything that I have ever heard. Yet the same radicals that stormed the streets in the 1960s advocating that America lurks toward socialism, attacked those of us who came in 1994 from their positions of authority when we tried to pass tax relief on to the American people. They called it, in classic class warfare, socialistic lingo, tax cuts for the rich. But that was OK. This Congress passed tax cuts, 90 percent of which would go to American families earning less than \$70,000.

Ninety percent. I was proud to be part of an institution, proud to be part of a party that would stand up against the march of socialism in America and say enough is enough, let Americans keep more of what they earn. Yet when I returned to Washington yesterday, I found out regrettably that this very Congress who had the courage 2 years ago to stand up against the big taxers in Washington, DC, are actually trying to pass a \$3 billion tax increase on to the American people, and it is wrong.

Americans are already paying 50.2 percent to the Government. That means, when you go to work on Monday morning, you are going to work for the Government, and everything you earn on Monday goes to the Federal Government. And when you work on Tuesday, the same thing occurs. You work all day Tuesday, and all of your earnings go to the Government. In fact, it is not until you return from work on Wednesday each workweek that you can start putting aside money for yourself, for your family, for your children's education, for your own retirement, and possibly even for your own mortgage payment. So how we can justify another \$3 billion tax increase is beyond me.

It is not tax cuts for the rich that we were advocating. It was tax cuts for middle-class Americans. And how shocking it is for me to hear some of the very same Democrats who 2 years ago were calling our tax cuts tax cuts for the rich, now coming up and discussing tax cuts for middle-class Americans for the issue of education, when these tax cuts go roughly to the same people that they called the rich 2 years ago.

I will oppose the tax increase that we are supposed to vote on tomorrow because a lot of my fellow conservative friends and people like the National Taxpayers Union and Citizens Against Government Waste call it a tax increase plain and simple. So I ask other Members to go to the Republican leadership and say no to this tax increase.

INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION ESTABLISHING NATIONAL COMMISSION ON ALCOHOLISM

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

Mr. RAMSTAD. Mr. Speaker, since first coming to Congress, I have worked closely with our former colleagues Bill Emerson and former Senator Harold Hughes and many other current Members to address the epidemic of alcoholism and substance addiction in our country.

During the last session of Congress, I introduced legislation, which actually was prepared by former Senator Hughes and our colleague Bill Emerson, to establish a National Commission on Alcoholism to develop a prag-

matic, comprehensive and effective strategy to deal with this fatal and insidious disease. That effort continues this year, although as our colleagues all know, Bill Emerson went to be with his higher power, as did former Senator Hughes last year, but I know that those two great men are smiling down from heaven on us as we continue this very, very important effort.

Next week I will introduce a bill to establish this National Commission on Alcoholism, a volunteer 2-year commission, to be narrowly focused, to streamline and better coordinate existing Government programs, treatment programs, prevention programs and education programs, to increase public and private sector cooperation, to evaluate the cost-effectiveness of treatment, and to improve alcoholism research and medical school training on this pressing public health epidemic.

Instead of trying to find one big picture solution to alcoholism, Mr. Speaker, like we have done in the past, this commission will develop specific cost-effective and practical recommendations and then disband in 2 years. So unlike Federal commissions of the past that have met periodically to hold sparsely attended meetings and have given us reports that nobody reads, this commission on alcoholism will meet for a finite period, consist exclusively of volunteers, and will submit a final report to the President and the Congress of their recommendations.

As policymakers at the Federal level, Mr. Speaker, we must address alcoholism as a possible health issue. On the average, untreated alcoholics incur health care costs that are 100 percent higher than nonalcoholics. At the same time there are no Federal and few, if any, State requirements to even study alcoholism in our medical schools.

Members of this commission, Mr. Speaker, as I said, all volunteers, will include treatment and other health care professionals, educators, NIH officials, academics and also recovering people to give this commission and to give us in Congress a real-world perspective.

We must address alcoholism as a public safety issue as well. According to the Justice Department, 36 percent of convicted murderers were under the influence of alcohol at the time of their homicide, while 13 percent used alcohol with another drug.

Mr. Speaker, in addition, and I say this as a grateful recovering alcoholic myself of some 15½ years, I know that alcoholism must be addressed as the painful private struggle it is, with the staggering public cost. Last year alone, alcoholism killed more Americans than all illegal drugs combined, ripped apart families across this land, and the financial cost, Mr. Speaker, of alcoholism last year alone, 1996, 1 year, the financial cost, \$85.8 billion.