

of work; by the news that there are fewer applicants for food stamps because people are becoming self-sufficient.

Again understand, we make no pretense of ripping away the social safety net, but welfare reform helps prevent that safety net from turning into a hammock. That is what we have accomplished on both sides of the aisle. And that spirit, that example, should serve us well as we deal with this very difficult question of Social Security reform. How do we best save it? How do we maximize opportunities for all of our citizens, regardless of their age or their station in life?

Mr. SCHAFFER. In our remaining few minutes, I want to really talk about the importance of communicating with Members of Congress. The four of us who are here tonight I think are very representative of the Republican majority Members who serve in the House of Representatives. We rely heavily on the letters and phone calls from constituents, those who show up at the town meetings and find ways to communicate with their Members of Congress directly.

Those kinds of letters, phone calls and communications from constituents really arm us, as Members, with the real-life examples that are necessary to take on the party of the large bureaucracy, take on the White House and those who believe that, in a year like this, that higher taxes, for example, is a good idea. It is letters from constituents that tell us and remind us every day that bigger government is a thing of the past.

Let me use one more example from my district. This is under the letterhead of Tri-City Sprinkler and Landscape. It is from Loveland, Colorado. It says, Dear Representative Schaffer, I am your constituent from Loveland. As a business owner and grandparent, I am very concerned about the serious economic problems facing our country. I feel our current income tax structure is having a very negative impact by taxing production, savings and investment, the very things which can make our economy strong. Therefore, I support replacing the income tax and the IRS with a national consumption tax such as suggested in H.R. 2001, the National Retail Sales Tax Act. I urge you and your staff to look into it and co-sponsor it. Please let me know where you stand on this important matter.

I will write back to the constituent and give her my opinions and thoughts on that. I mention this letter and others that we have gone through tonight just to let the American people know that this government does not belong to the President. This government does not belong to any single Member of Congress. It does not belong to the Supreme Court. It belongs to the people just like the woman who wrote this letter, just like the people who write all of these other letters, and we really do rely on their advice and their assistance and their help in helping make

the case on behalf of individual Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON) the remaining few minutes that we have left.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHAFFER. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. DUNCAN. I would like to mention when the gentleman talks about the issue of tax reform and going to a simpler and fairer tax system, Newsweek Magazine a few months ago on its cover had a story, a cover story about the IRS; and it said, The IRS: Lawless, Abusive, Out of Control.

When any major department or agency of the Federal Government can be described by a mainstream magazine like Newsweek as lawless, abusive and out of control, things have gotten to a pretty sad state. It is especially sad when an agency as intrusive as the Internal Revenue Service can be accurately described in that way. So I think we basically should just take the Internal Revenue Code that we have now and junk it and start over again. I think about 85 or 90 percent of the American people feel that way.

Mr. SCHAFFER. On the matter of constituent input, how helpful do you find that representing your district in Tennessee?

Mr. DUNCAN. I find it very helpful. For those who think that we have cut taxes too much, a few years ago we had a \$90 billion tax cut spread over 5 years because that was the most we could get through at that time. Some of the more liberal Members kicked and screamed about that, but that was spread over 5 years.

That was a tax cut of slightly less than 1 percent of Federal revenues over that 5-year period. Now the average person pays about 40 percent of his or her income in taxes and another 10 percent in government regulatory costs, at a minimum. So today you have one spouse working to support the government while the other spouse works to support the family.

I know the President said in Buffalo that he could not support a tax decrease because the American people would not spend it wisely. I can say I think they would spend it much more wisely than this wasteful, inefficient Federal Government that we have today.

Mr. KINGSTON. Following up on the comments of the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN), it is amazing that the President would say that the hard-working people who earn the money cannot spend it as well as some of the people here in Washington, maybe including the four of us. But I can say one thing. I believe people can spend their money better than we can spend their money.

The tax cut that you alluded to last year, it was an \$18 billion tax cut for one year; \$18 billion out of a \$1.7 trillion budget. It was just a slither of a slither in this huge \$1.7 trillion pot, and it was killed by the Senate.

Now, the Senate and the White House ganged up on the House to kill the Marriage Tax Penalty Relief Act, and I think that it is ridiculous to have that kind of obstruction to doing something that is common sense for the tax system. I hope this year that if we pass it that the other body will find their senses and quit siding with the liberal White House on everything and act like conservatives and pass tax reductions.

Mr. SCHAFFER. In the remaining minute, I would ask the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH), is there anything he can do to dramatize the difference between the Democrats and the White House and what they stand for and the Republican majority in Congress and what we stand for?

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, it is funny my colleague from Colorado should ask me that question. Because, just as our good friend from Tennessee pointed out in paraphrasing the words of our President, Mr. Speaker, these are the words of the President, if memory serves, one day, probably less than 12 hours, after he outlined 80 new programs involving close to 80 new taxes. Mr. Speaker, he said in Buffalo, New York, and I quote, speaking of the budget surplus, "We could give it all back to you and hope you spend it right but," closed quote. There, Mr. Speaker, therein lies a major difference. It comes down to a question of who do you trust? The President thinks you ought to trust him to spend your money for you.

We say, if there is ever a choice between Washington bureaucrats and the American people, Mr. Speaker, then we side with the American people, because, Mr. Speaker, Americans know best how to save, spend and invest for themselves and their families. Therein lies a difference, a difference of freedom and a real contrast between the politics of fear from those who make outrageous claims about Social Security and our budgetary process and the true policies of hope that we embrace with lower taxes, stronger schools, a stronger military and a real plan to save Social Security and Medicare.

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my Republican colleagues who joined me here on the floor tonight to talk about our Republican vision for America. I want to thank the thousands of constituents who write to our offices individually virtually on a weekly basis. Their voice does matter. We are here tonight to assure them that the Republican majority is listening. It is important for the American people to express their thoughts and sentiments on whether the government should continue to grow as the President would propose or whether the government should be constrained in its growth as the Republican Party proposes.

---

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. OSE). The Chair reminds all Members

that it is not in order to cast reflections on the Senate.

#### RITALIN AND THE ROLE IT PLAYS IN THE LIVES OF STUDENTS IN NORTHEAST OHIO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mrs. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. OSE), I am glad to see the gentleman standing up there. He looks wonderful.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in this great Chamber to talk about a report recently aired on my local NBC affiliate, News Channel 3. The report highlighted ritalin and the role this drug now plays in the lives of students in northeast Ohio. The report raised such concern that the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH) and I met with Department of Education officials today to direct their attention to this problem and request an investigation into the indiscriminate promotion and use of this drug and the potential harmful effects.

The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH) and I believe the decision to prescribe ritalin to a child should rest with that child's physician and their parents.

Oftentimes, ritalin is prescribed to address attention deficit disorder or attention deficit hyperactivity disorder. It is widely accepted as the remedy of choice for people who suffer from this brain disorder. Unfortunately, the medical community has not been able to develop a definitive test to properly diagnose ADD or ADHD related behavior. This oftentimes leads to a misdiagnosis.

The report has highlighted many examples. One, for example, is of Pam Edwards whose son Romeal attended a Catholic school in my district and was instructed to have her son use ritalin to address his behavior problem. In the alternative, her son would not be allowed to return to the school the next year if she did not. She refused to put him on this drug because she knew the root of her son's problems resulted from outside factors instead of an ill-diagnosed case of ADD.

□ 1800

I am happy to report that Romeal is doing fine in a new school and he did not need Ritalin. This is a success story, but there are many more Romeals out there whose parents might not have the insight to seek alternatives to Ritalin.

ADD or ADHD is a multiple symptom disorder coupled with the fact that many children exhibit a wide range of behavior that might be attributed to ADD or ADHD. In actuality it may or may not be that. Kids in fact will be kids.

ADD or ADHD is defined as a persistent pattern of inattention or hyper-

activity that occurs at four times more frequently in boys than girls.

When a person has been properly diagnosed with ADD or ADHD and Ritalin is prescribed, it has a remarkable track record of success. Oftentimes the drug is viewed as a godsend by parents and teachers alike because its effect is dramatic once prescribed to people who are hyperactive or easily distracted as a way to focus their minds, calm down and improve their attention spans.

Recently, at the urging of the National Institutes of Health, medical experts from around the country convened a panel discussion with doctors to address how Ritalin is being used in our society.

The use of Ritalin is not only a medical concern but it also is a big business. 1.3 million children take Ritalin regularly and sales of the drug topped \$350 million in 1995.

According to the Drug Enforcement Administration, the number of prescriptions for this drug has increased by over 600 percent in the last 5 years. To address this concern, manufacturers sent letters to doctors and pharmacists warning them to exert greater control over the drug.

No, I am not pointing fingers at the teachers or administrators because I know that they are one of America's greatest treasures. I am not pointing fingers at doctors or psychologists, but there appears to be a trend in my district, and I would guess the 11th Congressional District of Ohio is not unique in the use of Ritalin for behavioral purposes.

Nearly half a million prescriptions were written for controlled substances like Ritalin in 1995 for children between the ages of 3 and 6. The percentage of children with an ADHD diagnosis has jumped from 55 percent in 1989 to 75 percent in 1996. ADHD is estimated to affect 3 percent to 5 percent of children aged 5 to 14 years old, or about 1.9 million youngsters. About 10 million prescriptions were written in 1996. According to the IMS Health Association, 13.9 million prescriptions of stimulants, including Ritalin, were dispensed to children during the last school year, an 81.2 percent increase from 7.7 million 5 years earlier.

There is not a set guideline for diagnosing ADD or ADHD. No studies have been conducted in children younger than 4 years. For example, in Chicago, one of the ways that they have begun to deal with the issue is a public school system will address ADHD by offering teaching techniques.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH) for assisting me and supporting me in this effort.

#### IMPORTANT ISSUES FACING THE NATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. OSE). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN) is recognized for 60 minutes.

#### ON RITALIN PRESCRIPTIONS

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, before I begin with the comments that I came to make tonight, I would like to say that I think the previous speaker has pointed out some very important things about the prescriptions of Ritalin in this country. I remember a few months ago reading in the Knoxville News-Sentinel that a retired DEA official, in fact I think he was second in command of the DEA at one time who now has retired to east Tennessee, he wrote an article pointing out that our medical community was prescribing Ritalin at over six times the rate of any other industrialized nation. I think there is a serious question as to whether or not that very serious drug, that very serious controlled substance has been overprescribed in this country, and I think we need to be very, very careful with that and make sure that it is not being used in cases where particularly small children and particularly small boys might simply be a little more active or rambunctious than some others. I do raise that cautionary note.

#### ADMINISTRATION PROPOSED SPENDING

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I would also like to comment about the last comments of the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH) who mentioned the some 80 new programs that the President proposed in his State of the Union address. The National Taxpayers Union put out a report saying that those programs if all were enacted would cost us \$288.4 billion in the first year. Newsweek had an even more interesting table a few weeks ago and had a chart which showed that if we enacted all of those programs that the President proposed, that it would lead to a \$2.3 trillion shortfall in the first 15 years. We have a good economy now but if we do something like that and allow at least a \$2.3 trillion shortfall to accumulate over these next 15 years, we could not pay the Medicare bills, we could not pay the Social Security bills, we could not do many of the most important things that the people of this country want us to do.

I rise though, Mr. Speaker, today to speak on several unrelated but very important issues facing this Nation right at this time. First, we are bombing Iraq and sending troops to Kosovo without votes by the Congress to do so. We still have troops in Bosnia in 1999 even though the President originally promised that they would stay in Bosnia no longer than the end of 1996. Yes, 1996. A few years ago, as I have mentioned before on this floor, the front page of the Washington Post had a story reporting that our troops in Haiti were picking up garbage and settling domestic disputes. Then about a year ago, I heard another Member of this body say that we had our troops in Bosnia, among other things, giving rabies shots to dogs. Certainly none of us have anything against the Haitians or the Bosnians. We want to try to help them, but I believe, Mr. Speaker, that