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 pragmatic, 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.

I am very grateful, Mr. Speaker, for the bipartisan support that this legislation received last year when I introduced it. We tried to lay the groundwork for passage this year. And so now it is my hope that we can pass this into law, get the National Commission on Alcoholism established, develop that comprehensive national strategy to deal with this costly, deadly disease. I urge my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, to join me, join our bipartisan effort in cosponsoring this critically important legislation.

TRIO MUST CONTINUE TO MAKE A DIFFERENCE

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

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, 31 years ago Congress established the TRIO Programs as part of the Higher Education Act. Since that time it has been instrumental in helping millions of students overcome barriers to postsecondary education.

TRIO is effective because it directs resources where they are needed the most. It is based on a Jeffersonian principle that education should be available to those who have an ability to learn rather than an ability to pay. Two-thirds of TRIO students come from families with incomes under $24,000 a year.

My vision for education and for TRIO and for all Americans is TRIO's vision, a commitment to foster the ideals of equal educational opportunity regardless of background.

TRIO is the heir to several successful education programs supported by the Federal Government over the past 200 years. From the Ordinance of 1785, which set aside lands in western territories for schools, to land grant legislation in the 19th century which established State universities, to the G.I. bill after World War II, to legislation creating historically black colleges and universities, the Federal role in education has moved countless Americans into the middle class, making our economy the most dynamic in the world.

In 1983, a Nation At Risk, a report commissioned by the Secretary of Education, sent a wakeup call to the Nation. The condition of our educational system, the report said, was threatening our position as an unrivaled economic, technological and scientific power in the world. The report stated:

> We report to the American people that while we can take justifiable pride in what our schools and colleges have historically accomplished and contributed to the United States and the well-being of its people, the educational foundations of our society are presently being eroded by a rising tide of mediocrity that threatens our very future as a Nation and a people. What was unimaginable a generation ago has begun to occur—others are matching and surpassing our educational achievements.

After this seminal report, which, Mr. Speaker, I would say still has relevance and truth today, the Nation again dedicated itself to improving education. States across the Nation have undertaken ambitious educational reform. Congress passed Goals 2000 and targeted more Federal resources to elementary and secondary education, especially to low income school districts. Congress expanded and improved Federal higher educational assistance, making postsecondary education accessible to many more young people.

Our rededication, Mr. Speaker, to education is working. The Department of Education reports that more students are spending time on their homework than they did in the 1970s. SAT and National Assessment of Education Process scores are increasing.

Mr. Speaker, it is so critical at this juncture in American history that we do not abandon the American student, the American school or the American teacher. Students in the TRIO Upward Bound Program are 4 times more likely to earn an undergraduate degree than their counterparts who did not participate in TRIO.

Postsecondary education, Mr. Speaker, pays off. The Department of Education reports that every year of formal education is associated with a 5 to 15 percent increase in annual earnings later in life.

Passage of welfare reform requires us to provide more education and training opportunities for those who will make the transition from welfare to work. TRIO Programs are well positioned to do this. TRIO can provide the support services to help welfare recipients earn a high school degree and participate in postsecondary education programs.

The President's budget contains a 13.5 percent increase in spending in TRIO over 1996. A 30 percent increase in 1998 will enable TRIO to serve more than 186,000 more young people.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to take a close look at how TRIO is making a difference in their districts and to remember their commitment to the millions of young Americans who will benefit from this successful program.

BURDEN OF AMERICAN TAXPAYER TO INCREASE WITH PASSAGE OF AIRPORT TRUST FUND TAX

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

Mr. HILLEARY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support today of the American taxpayer. There are many of us, and it is a bipartisan feeling up here, there are many of us that feel for those folks back home, those families where both spouses have to work, they both get out there, sometimes they have to work two jobs just to keep up with the tax monster, that 50-point-something percent that our friend from Florida talked about earlier that goes to the government. They get out there and they work hard. These are not folks who are not trying to make ends meet. They are out there obeying the rules and doing what they are supposed to. But we keep on increasing their burden by one more tax here, one more tax there, one more program here, one more program there. We feel for those folks. They are not seeing their wages go up. Wages are probably not going to go up that much for the near term because so many jobs are going overseas and that tends to have a deflationary effect on wages. But what we can do to improve their livelihood and to improve their lives is to let them keep more of what they earn.

This afternoon we are going to debate a bill, H.R. 668, the Airport and Airway Trust Fund tax increase. This is yet another slice out of their livelihood.

When we got out of here last fall, we were asked to vote for billions of dollars in more spending. The liberals knew that we basically had to do that. We were being pounded back home on TV saying we were mean-spirited for doing this and for doing that, and we were stuck here in Washington and could not defend ourselves.

So sometimes you have to take a step backwards before you can take two steps forward, and that is what we did. We voted for increased spending against our wishes to get out of town and defend ourselves, and we won. We lost that battle that day, but we won the battle on election day so we could come back this year and start again.

We have the opportunity to take a step forward today, but it looks like we are going to be asked to take a step backwards. The first substantive act of the 105th Congress, if this happens, will be a $2.7, nearly $3 billion tax increase on people once again. This goes to fund airline safety. Everybody is for airline safety. No one would be against airline safety. There is a trust fund in place that has funds available now and it will have funds available for the rest of the fiscal year. If we do not vote for this tax increase that we are going to be asked to vote for tomorrow, we are going to debate it this afternoon, if we do not vote for this, airplanes are not going to fall out of the sky, the operational safety will still be there.

But let us not vote on this without an offsetting tax cut. No one is against a user fee, which is basically what this is. If you got to have a tax, let us make it a user fee. Let us make the folks who are using that service pay for that service. No one disagrees with that idea. But let us not do it without an offsetting tax cut.

I have dropped a bill today that will do just that. That does not have to be my idea, to have an offsetting tax cut; does not have to be the one I came up with. But the one that I came up with would suspend President Clinton's 4.3-cent-a-gallon tax increase at the gas