

brutal killings. Cary Stayner said he beheaded one victim. Cary Stayner then said he had killed the mother and her 15-year-old daughter. Cary Stayner then said he killed their 16-year-old friend as well. Then Cary Stayner apologized. My colleagues, Cary Stayner said, "I'm sorry."

Beam me up, Mr. Speaker. I say it is time for a jury to tell Cary Stayner, Goodnight, sweet Prince. It is time to meet the devil.

An America that tolerates murderers like Cary Stayner is an America that will have more murderers like Cary Stayner.

I yield back the record number of victims laid to rest in cemeteries all over America.

THREE CORNERSTONES OF REPUBLICAN BUDGET PROPOSAL

(Mr. PITTS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, the Republican budget proposal contains three important provisions, some of which our friends on the other side appear to be ignoring.

First, it contains a Social Security and Medicare lockbox requirement which locks away 100 percent, every dime of the money collected from FICA taxes and requires that it all goes towards Social Security, Medicare.

Secondly, it provides for substantial debt reduction. Debt held by the public would be reduced by over \$2 trillion over the next 10 years.

And third, it provides for tax relief they are debating.

Social Security and Medicare, debt reduction, and tax relief. Those are the three cornerstones of our budget proposal. It seems that Social Security and Medicare and debt reduction are being forgotten in all of the debate about tax relief.

But to ignore our plan to strengthen Social Security and Medicare, to ignore the \$2 trillion in debt reduction that our plan calls for simply does not do it justice.

Our plan is fair, balanced, and responsible. It protects seniors, begins paying down the national debt, and gives taxpayers a break.

MASSIVE REPUBLICAN TAX BREAK IS OUTRAGEOUS AND EXCESSIVE

(Mr. CROWLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, the massive House Republican tax break is outrageous and excessive, threatening opportunities to strengthen Social Security, Medicare, and education.

Just listen to Republican analyst Kevin Phillips in comments made today: "We can fairly call the House legislation the most outrageous tax package of the last 50 years. It is worse

than the 1981 excesses. You have to go back to 1948, when the Republican 80th Congress sent a kindred bill to President Harry Truman. Harry Truman vetoed it, calling the Republicans 'blood-suckers with offices in Wall Street.' Not only did he win reelection, but the Democrats recaptured Congress."

House Republicans have also proved that they are more concerned about big tax cuts for the wealthy than providing relief for America's school districts by failing to take a prime opportunity to include a real school construction initiative.

The tunnel vision by Republicans on a big tax break for the rich senselessly blocks commonsense tax incentives that would provide crucial aid to America's schools.

Republican priorities put wealthy Americans over the needs of our children. Mr. Speaker, we must put our children before the wealthy in this country.

AMERICANS SHOULD HOLD ON TO MORE OF THEIR HARD-EARNED MONEY

(Mr. HAYWORTH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, it is very interesting to come to the well of this Chamber; and we can always depend on something. It is as predictable as the swallows returning to San Juan Capistrano and the buzzards going back to Hinckley, Ohio. We always hear from my liberal friends every excuse in the book as to why the American people should not keep more of their hard-earned money.

I appreciate my good friend from New York and his lesson in revisionist history. It is always interesting to hear the rationale of those doomed to defeat because they fail to recognize that, if given a choice, we believe Americans should hold on to more of their hard-earned money instead of sending it to Washington bureaucrats to waste.

While we are on the subject and talking about children, I am curious as to why my liberal friends think that those working Americans who earn \$40,000 a year are somehow rich. Because it turns out those who make \$40,000 a year pay nearly four times as much in taxes as those who earn \$20,000 a year.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I point this out: It is real simple what we want to do with the surplus, the overcharge. We want to take \$2 of that surplus and put it away, lock it away for Social Security and Medicare. And then with the other dollar that remains, we want to give it back to the American people because it is their money and in that way we will secure America's future and the majority in this Chamber.

DO NOT VOTE TO CONDEMN UNTIL WE KNOW WHAT IT IS

(Mr. STRICKLAND asked and was given permission to address the House

for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STRICKLAND. Mr. Speaker, it troubles me that sometimes in this Chamber we stand and say things that we ought not to say. We criticize people that we have no right to criticize.

We recently voted to condemn a scientific study and an organization, an organization that has done as much as any organization in this country to fight child abuse.

I wonder how many of us read the study before we were willing to vote to say that the methodology was flawed. I wonder how many of us were technically competent to make that decision.

I believe that we ought to observe the Ten Commandments. One of those Commandments says, you ought not to bear false witness against your neighbor.

When we say things about an organization or about an individual scientist that are untrue or unsubstantiated, in my judgment, we have violated that Commandment.

We ought to have the decency not to vote to condemn something until we know what it is we are voting to condemn.

GOVERNMENT SHOULD NOT KEEP TAXPAYERS' HARD-EARNED MONEY

(Mr. CHABOT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, Republicans are proposing a tax cut. In fact, we passed it in the House of Representatives here just last week. Democrats criticized it, and now they say they want to target a tax cut. But there is a big difference. Republicans are targeting all taxpayers. If they pay taxes, they get a tax cut. To liberal Democrats that is not fair. To their way of thinking only if the government decides whether they are worthy of some social engineering should they get a tax cut. And if they are carrying most of the tax burden, they are the last persons the liberal Democrats here in the House want to give a tax cut to. For most taxpayers, when a liberal wants to give a targeted tax cut, well, this is a euphemism for "you are not getting one."

Let me say again what the Republican approach to tax cuts is, if one is a taxpayer, one gets to keep some of one's hard-earned money. It is not the Government's money. It belongs to the people who had labored and worked hard to earn it in the first place.

Yes, it is a question of fairness and it sends an important signal to the American people that hard work will be rewarded.

REPUBLICAN BUDGET BETTER AT DEBT REDUCTION THAN DEMOCRAT PROPOSALS

(Mr. BALLENGER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, I want to reiterate. The Republican budget contains \$200 billion more in debt reduction than does the Democrat proposals. You heard that right. Our budget is better on debt reduction than the Democrat budget is according to the Congressional Budget Office.

□ 1015

But one would never know it from listening to some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, many of whom seem to be positively incapable of describing our tax cut proposal accurately.

Republicans call for both tax relief and debt reduction in our proposal. Indeed, our plan would reduce the debt held by the public by slightly over \$2 trillion over the next 10 years. To call that irresponsible is reckless or a bit odd. We have a balanced and fair plan that not only provides for debt reduction and tax relief, but insists on a Social Security and Medicare lockbox provision for the first time. One hundred percent of the retirement surplus would go to Social Security and Medicare.

In other words, all FICA taxes would actually go towards the programs they were designed to go towards, Social Security and Medicare.

Do Democrats really think that is reckless?

PORKER OF THE WEEK AWARD

(Mr. HEFLEY asked and was given permission to address the House.)

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Speaker, to prevent potential catastrophic nationwide computer meltdown, the Securities and Exchange Commission, or the SEC, is fighting brokers and firms to ensure that their computers actually read "00" as of January 1 of 2000.

Recently an 87-year-old broker who has spent 50 years in the investment business was fined \$5,000 for not being Y2K compliant. There is only one problem. This particular gentleman does not own a computer. His operation is so small, he does not actually sell them mutual funds; he just gives advice. He never touches any money at all.

Mr. Speaker, that has not stopped the SEC from demanding a yearly audit of his firm which costs him another \$5,000. He went ahead, and he paid the original Y2K fine because he could not afford the money to fight the bureaucracy.

He will not be without a computer for long, however. New SEC regulations insist that all brokers have a computer so they can receive e-mail notices from the agencies.

Here we have a legitimate business-man being harassed and intimidated by his own government agency paid for by his own tax dollars. Outrageous. It is inexcusable and a waste of taxpayers' time and money.

The Securities and Exchange Commission gets my porker of the week award and my disgust.

STOP THE ANTI-MINING GREED

(Mr. GIBBONS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, well, here we go again. The left-leaning, anti-mining zealots want a Federal tax on all mining operations on an estimated, hypothetical, or proposed value of a mine. Moreover, the proposed values that are given to these mines are nothing but sheer guesses that always grossly overexaggerate the worth of the mineral deposit.

For example, some of these mining opponents cite the Stillwater Mine in Montana as a taxpayer giveaway of \$38 billion. Grossly exaggerated, Mr. Speaker. \$38 billion could fund a hostile takeover of the Ford Motor Company. This amount of money could purchase the entire metal mining industry in the United States and Canada.

Some claim that patents to Barrick Gold Mine have a value of \$10 billion. Keep in mind that the supposed 10 billion is wrapped up in a small acreage of desert rock. Using their irrational logic, one could say that the raw land beneath the Washington Post printing plant would be worth several billion dollars itself.

In 1556 Georgious Agricola stated the miners should start mining operations in a district only where it is friendly. This quote still holds true today. Stop the anti-mining greed.

MOURNING THE PASSING OF REV. BOOKER T. SEARS OF SPARTANBURG, SOUTH CAROLINA

(Mr. DEMINT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DEMINT. Mr. Speaker, every community has citizens that strive to improve the way of life for all those around them. They serve others because they want to, not because they have to.

One such man was Reverend Booker T. Sears of Spartanburg, South Carolina. Last week Reverend Sears, a pioneer civil rights leader and respected community leader, passed away at his home. Reverend Sears was pastor of Thompson Street Baptist Church for nearly 50 years. His efforts within the community helped integrate public schools, desegregate public transportation, and develop many community improvement projects.

Reverend Sears will be remembered as a man who truly cared about all those around him. During his career, he was a mentor to young pastors and a servant to everyone in the community.

Reverend Sears is a testimony of one man making a difference in the lives of thousands, Mr. Speaker. We will miss Reverend Sears. It is now our time to carry on his mission off love and service.

LANCE ARMSTRONG: THE REAL MCCOY

(Mr. KASICH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, Sunday afternoon I took the time to sit and really celebrate vicariously, as much as it would be appropriate, as Lance Armstrong pedaled the final 2,300 miles into Paris. What an amazing story for a man who many had given up on. Given less than a 50-50 chance to even survive the cancer that wracked his body, he had incredible steely determination, and he was able to not only overcome cancer, but also to prove so many of the sponsors who had given up on him wrong.

As my colleagues know, this is a time in America when we are all in search of heroes, all in search of the real McCoy. As my colleagues know, I think Lance Armstrong is the real McCoy. When he crossed that victory stripe and he was interviewed by the network, he had not prepared some big braggadocio speech. In fact, it took him 2 or 3 questions to finally get Lance Armstrong to say that with human beings many times we get a second chance, and the second chance may even be better and greater than the first chance.

Lance Armstrong is humble, determined and an inspiration and should be a hero to everyone who lives not just in the boundaries of the United States but around the globe to adults, to our seniors, and to children alike.

God bless you, Lance Armstrong, for your accomplishment.

PRESCRIPTION POLITICS

(Mr. SMITH of Michigan asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the President has proposed that the Medicare program provide free drug prescription. Now anyone with a basic understanding of how markets work knows that the President's proposal will increase demand and ultimately drive up the price of prescription drugs. This in turn will cause insurance rates to rise for everyone who has prescription drug coverage and further worsen the burden of those who do not have drug coverage.

As the price of drugs rise, Medicare's financial position will worsen, and this will lead to higher tax costs for everyone and pressure from the government to put price controls on prescription drugs. This will lead to shortages of prescription drugs and a slowdown in research for new and better drugs. Eventually bureaucrats in Washington will be telling seniors what prescription drugs they are going to be allowed to have.

Now the President is proposing free prescription drugs because at first glance it appears to give seniors something for nothing. But he and his advisers know as well as I do the harm that