

the drug issue. But listen to a number of these categories, and then I will relate it to our package and why this is not a tax break for the rich and the type of tired rhetoric we will hear but, in actuality, an opportunity for all Americans.

He talked about learning, creating better opportunities for all children to learn by breaking the stranglehold of the teachers' unions and giving urban parents a financial opportunity to choose public, private or parochial schools, as millions of black Americans are reaching out to the private Christian schools and building their communities and wanting the choices that other Americans have. That is part of the point of the \$500 personal credit, so people can choose the school that is best for their children.

He says on small business that we should have the goal of tripling the number of minority-owned small businesses by eliminating the barriers and providing the tax opportunities.

He talks about 100 renewal communities, and low income scholarships, savings accounts, brownfields cleanup. He talks about economic growth and expanding economic opportunities.

Well, listen to some of the different things in this package. In addition to the tax credit for children, we have a deduction for undergraduate tuition, scholarship tax credits, credit up to 50 percent of \$3,000 out-of-pocket tuition expenses phased out at \$40,000 to \$50,000 singles, \$80,000 to \$100,000 joint; expanded IRAs that people can not only take out for education but for first time home buying. We have education investment savings opportunities.

And then the businesses that most need the capital gains changes are businesses that are just starting. Many of these minority businesses that start up in an inner city actually increase the property values all around them. Then, when they go to move to the next block, they get punished because they have raised the value of their lands and the area around them. That is the point of capital gains, not to benefit the most wealthy but to get those starting out to move to the next size, to the next size, to the next size.

The inheritance tax reform that will eventually, over a number of years, get up to \$1 million. When we have minority businesses and people just starting, many Americans have made it, but millions of Americans have not made it. They want their kids to have the opportunities that my great grandpa worked to get to my grandpa, that gave to my dad and his brother so that I could have the opportunity. That is not done by taking away the family farm, by taking away the small businesses; it is by giving enough exemption that we can pass it through and build it into a little bit.

A person starts with a dry cleaner, builds it a little bit bigger, a little bit bigger. A retail operation may move to another business. My great grandfather set up my grandfather as a harness

maker. He moved and bought the building next to him and the building next to him, and we now have a building we lease out to 60 different antique dealers. It is something that came bit by bit. That is what the capital gains means. That is how economic growth occurs, that and inheritance tax.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, and the fact is he has already shown through his leadership that when we talk about innovation and entrepreneurship, that that is what America is all about. And under this new tax proposal, new businesses will be emerging.

We will have people who have a great idea getting a chance through capital gains tax reduction, through a balanced budget, a real opportunity in the Federal Government to make sure their money goes far and their family has a chance to have a piece of the rock.

#### ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. NEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

#### THE COST OF EXCESSIVE REGULATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. NEY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. NEY. Mr. Speaker, this is a great discussion tonight because we are talking about the American people being able to keep more of their hard-earned money. That is why we came here.

Some of the Members sitting here tonight from the 104th, now in the 105th, and we actually are so close to that goal and that reality, and I hate to even mention what I want to say tonight to put a damper on this, but I think it is important that we at least communicate a little on this issue. That is the fact that while we here in Congress are trying to do this, we have an unelected bureaucrat, Carol Browner, the head of the United States EPA, what she is attempting to do is to put a new wave of requirements on us, on ozone, and once again shut down some jobs.

Somebody in an unelected position, who will not come here to the floor to debate this, is trying to stifle the growth of the American people, is trying to take away their money. And if it did something to help people, I guess it would be a different story we could talk about. But these new regulations, we have lived with them in the Ohio Valley and across the country, and they have really been hurting us.

We have tried to comply. We have tried to do coal bonds in Ohio, about

\$100 million worth. We have tried to do everything we can do, but, once again, she does not want to be reasonable. Just this week we became aware of some reports in the press about maybe she is cutting deals with a few districts across the country and to let them out of it but the rest of us will pay.

We all have to support a clean environment. We want that, but we surely want a reasonable discussion on it. I think the bigger picture on this too, and it is a frame of mind I guess that this whole government can get into, but the idea that veterans fought so we could have a democracy, so we could have a great energetic give-and-take on public debate, but the veterans did not fight so unelected bureaucrats could make a decision no matter what side of the issue we are on.

So tonight I think we really need to talk about what we are doing for tax relief for the average American, but also we have to be aware that down the street there is someone that is trying to once again dip into the wallet of the working people. And that is why we are here, to protect the wallets of the working people. Because it is what that worker puts into the wallet and what the government tries to take out, and once again we are trying to give them more of their take home and somebody down the street is trying to take a little more back.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, If the gentleman will yield, I want to commend the gentleman for raising this. It is basically the same subject. Our goal here is to try to help people who are working hard be able to keep their money and advance without Washington standing as big brother and squishing them, either through spending in incredible ways and without their approval, or through regulations in EPA.

Just like Ohio, in Indiana we make, in my district, pickup trucks, axles, tires. These are hard working Americans, multi-generational Americans, who want clean air, they want a healthy society, but they also want to work. And they are proud of what they do. And the idea that somebody in Washington, for not even any proven scientific gain, by the time we get done with this, in fact, I have heard that, for example, by changing the plastic covers on some of the gas tanks we could change some of this, but what gas stations are not in compliance now? Often they are the ones in the inner cities or in the rural areas where they are marginal.

So are we going to close all those gas stations so the people living in the inner cities and out in the rural areas have to drive farther? And that actually pollutes more air. It is not even clear scientifically the solutions solve the problem, except to put a lot of hard working Americans out of work because some bureaucrat decided, an unelected bureaucrat decided that the Midwest should be punished and that we should send these jobs overseas, and that is, bottom line, what happens.

Mr. BOB SCHAFFER of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I am glad the gentleman brings up this concept of the cost of regulation at the same time we talk about the cost of taxation.

There is a very important date coming up just in the next few weeks. July 3rd is the Cost of Government Day. Now many of us will remember back to May 9. We worked up to May 9 to pay off all of the taxes to satisfy the government. We worked up to that point for the government; the rest of the year we work for our family and the things important to us.

But further down the line, way into the 7th month of the year, July 3rd, is Cost of Government Day. That is the date after which we have surpassed all of our obligations to the Federal Government, not just for taxes but also for regulation. More than 50 percent of an average family's income goes to pay for taxes at the State, Federal, local level, and regulations at the State, Federal and local level.

These new air quality standards the gentleman from Ohio mentions are estimated to cost the agriculture industry alone in America anywhere from \$9 to \$12 billion a year. That is the government's estimates. That is Carol Browner's estimates. And the people in the industry suggest that those estimates are far too low.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. EHRLICH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. EHRLICH addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

□ 2230

#### HOME-BASED BUSINESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COOKSEY). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PAPPAS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PAPPAS. Mr. Speaker, we are talking about common sense things here. Just a few months ago, many of my friends here know, in fact, everyone here, save for two, are cosponsors of the bill that I introduced dealing with the home office deduction. And they know who they are.

I am very happy to see that in the new bill that the Committee on Ways and Means has been bringing forward includes, maybe not the exact language, but the concept of the home office deduction is included. So many individuals in our country are starting home-based businesses. Some people are employed in a corporation or maybe another small business. Yet on their own time they are putting their energy, their creativity to work, which is truly a part of the American entrepreneurial spirit in starting a home-based business. I am excited about the support that that has really across the country from all walks of life.

Seventy percent of the new home-based businesses or small businesses that are started are started by women. And as my colleagues know, there are many single-parent families that are headed by women. And being able to have the home-based business with the deductions that other home-based businesses have had, I think, is fair. I am very encouraged to see so much support among my colleagues here tonight, most of them, and, hopefully, by the end of the night, all of them.

I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOX].

Mr. FOX. To enter this discussion as part of this tax reform debate, all of my colleagues have agreed to be part of the Pappas legislation with the home office deduction. But I think that scores the important point about how most small businesses are the engine of the economy. Ninety percent of new jobs come from small businesses. So the Pappas legislation, along with other tax reforms, are what Americans really need. I believe that legislation is going to move forward, and we appreciate the leadership of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PAPPAS] on that issue.

I know the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. KINGSTON] has been working feverishly to make sure that we do get the new package. I believe what the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. THUNE] said earlier is true, the balanced budget together with tax reform is really going to be historic and make a difference in people's lives.

The balanced budget is important because we are going to see reductions in the interest payments for college loans, in the interest payments for the car, and the interest payments for the home mortgage. That is the key to America.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield, I wanted to make sure folks understand that under President Clinton in 1993, we experienced the largest tax increase in the history of the country, which I believe was in the figure of somewhere about \$250 billion. We are talking about only, unfortunately, an \$85 billion decrease in taxes. It does not take us back to the pre-Clinton days, if you will.

Now what is interesting is, as we hear the cries of those that oppose the tax relief, is you would think we are giving away the farm. And it is so important for people to realize it is not our money. The United States Congress does not own money. We, through the force of Government, confiscate money out of people's pocket and we take it.

All we are saying is, hey, let us take less of the middle-class hard earned dollars. That is all we are talking about. And yet people, you would think, are about to give away their first born child the way some of the opponents are fighting this tax relief.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield, I think his point about the home office deduction, as well as the point of the gentleman

from Georgia [Mr. KINGSTON] about the general attitude of many in the other party is very perplexing.

One time one parent had their son tell me what he had been taught was the difference between Republicans and Democrats; and that is that Republicans believe in big people and little government, and Democrats believe in big government and little people.

I think President Clinton and some have moved beyond that, but there are many in this body who are still criticizing that. They do not seem to understand how jobs in America are created, how people can have choices. So many millions of American people through Amway, through Discovery Toys, through the many different things that have branched out, as well as new computer-based businesses at home, give not only mothers now the choice to stay home with their kids or women to be able to start a business, but now many men are working at home in different types of businesses.

If we do not recognize these changes, we kill the engine of economic growth of how jobs are created. They are created not by government but by people looking for creative ways to combine the needs of their life-styles and the needs of capital and the shortage thereof.

With the Internet nowadays and with the ability to use phones and all the different ways, we need to make sure that the home office deduction and things like this reflect the ways of economic growth.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. GUTKNECHT] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. GUTKNECHT addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extension of Remarks.]

#### REGULATION OF SMALL BUSINESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. THUNE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to keep in discussion we have had this evening with respect to regulation. I was sitting in the Committee on Agriculture this morning and we had a number of folks testifying in front of our committee, and it had to do with an issue which is very important in my home State of South Dakota.

We have a tremendous natural resource known as the Black Hills. And interestingly enough, we talk about the heavy hand of Government regulation, as I was listening to the testimony this morning, in 31 cases, the last 31 times, there has been a proposed timber sale in the Black Hills; 31 times that has been appealed.

In every case it has ended up as being a long, protracted fight. In fact, we had what is known as a blow-down in April,