

put together. Mr. Speaker, it is time for this type of thing to stop.

Mr. Speaker, the other unrelated topic I wanted to discuss was this pre-dawn raid of the home where Elian Gonzalez lived in Miami.

All of the polls showed that most of the people thought that this young man should have been with his father. And as a father myself, I certainly can understand that. But regardless of what people thought about the custody, everyone should have been shocked and saddened by that picture of that INS border agent in full riot gear pointing that submachinegun at that little boy. Anyone who was not shocked or saddened by that, I think, does not really appreciate freedom.

I want my colleagues to listen to what three very liberal left-wing people have said about this just recently. A.M. Rosenthal, the very liberal former Executive Editor of The New York Times said "The armed invasion of the home of Elian's relatives in Miami by federal officers combat-ready with the deadliest of military rifles, the shocking abduction of the boy seen around the world, are so unconstitutional and cruel that they keep the hope alive that this time the courts and Congress will not allow the White House to get away with it."

Laurence H. Tribe, the very liberal law professor from Harvard, writing in The New York Times said, "Ms. Reno's decision to take the law as well as the child into her own hands seems worse than a political blunder. Even if well intended, her decision strikes at the heart of constitutional government and shakes the safeguards of liberty."

And the very left wing, Alan Dershowitz, another Harvard law professor writing in the Los Angeles Times said this, "By enforcing its own order, without the judicial imprimatur of a court mandate, the Justice Department has reinforced a precedent that endangers the rights of all American citizens."

Mr. Speaker, I was a Circuit Court judge in Tennessee for 7½ years before coming to Congress, and I believe that the Justice Department has grown so arrogant, abusive, and out of control that, unless we greatly downsize this department and decrease its funding, the freedom of all Americans is in jeopardy.

NAMING OF ORLANDO POST OFFICE AFTER ARTHUR "PAPPY" KENNEDY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Ms. BROWN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to have the opportunity to offer legislation designating the post office located at 440 South Orange Blossom Trail in Orlando as the Arthur "Pappy" Kennedy Post Office Building.

This bill, H.R. 4399, was introduced last Tuesday night. Mr. Kennedy was

Orlando's first African American city commissioner. He was a tireless advocate for the dispossessed and the poor. He died on March 28 and is survived by his children, Arthur Kennedy and Shirley Waters, six granddaughters and three grandsons, 21 great grandchildren, and numerous cousins, close relatives and friends.

Mr. Kennedy was a public servant who worked with many organizations, including the Meals on Wheels, the United Negro College Fund and the NAACP. He was never one to talk about his accomplishments, so I would like to take the opportunity to do so.

As an elected official, his negotiating skills were integral in the building of Hankins Park, and the landscaping of Parramore Street. He organized the Orlando Negro Chamber of Commerce and served on the Jones High School Parent-Teacher Association.

In 1992, the Southwest Orlando Jaycees honored Mr. Kennedy with the Lifetime Achievement Award and named the Prayer Breakfast in his honor. He dedicated his life to serving others, as evidenced by the Preserve African American Society honoring him as their Trailblazer Award.

Mr. Speaker, Orlando has lost a fine public servant as a result of the passing of Mr. Kennedy. Born in River Junction, Florida, in 1913, Pappy Kennedy moved to Orlando at age 10. He was a graduate of Bethune Cookman College and an impressive public servant whose decency will long be remembered by his friends and family.

It is with great pride that I urge my colleagues to help me designate the aforementioned post office in Orlando as the Arthur "Pappy" Kennedy Post Office Building.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make a special note that the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) will be making comments and submitting a statement for the RECORD. I also want to encourage others to join me on Sunday, Mother's Day, to participate in the Mother's Day March. There is no better way to honor mothers than a salute to mothers in support of pending legislation before this body for gun safety and to protect our children.

Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to have the opportunity to offer legislation designating the Post Office located at 440 South Orange Blossom Trail in Orlando as the "Arthur 'Pappy' Kennedy Post Office Building."

This bill, H.R. 4399, was introduced last Tuesday night. Mr. Arthur 'Pappy' Kennedy was Orlando's first African American City Commissioner and he was a tireless advocate for the dispossessed and the poor. He died on March 28 and is survived by his children Arthur Kennedy and Shirley Waters; six granddaughters and three grandsons; twenty-one great grandchildren and numerous cousins, close relatives, friends and acquaintances.

Mr. Kennedy was a public servant who worked with many organizations including Meals on Wheels, the United Negro College Fund, and the NAACP. He was never one to talk about his accomplishments, so I would like to take the opportunity to do so. As an

elected official, his negotiating skills were integral in the building of Hankins Park, and the landscaping of Parramore Street. He organized the Orlando Negro Chamber of Commerce and served on the Jones High School Parents-Teachers Association.

In 1992, the Southwest Orlando Jaycees honored "Pappy" with the Lifetime Achievement Award and named the Prayer Breakfast in his honor. He dedicated his life to serving others as evidenced by the Preserve African American Society (PAST) honoring him with their Trailblazer Award.

Mr. Speaker, Orlando has lost a fine public servant as a result of the passing of Arthur 'Pappy' Kennedy. Born in River Junction, Florida in 1913, Pappy Kennedy moved to Orlando at age ten. He was a graduate of Bethune Cookman College and an impressive public servant whose decency will long be remembered by his friends and family.

It is with a great deal of pride that I urge my colleagues to help me designate the aforementioned Post Office in Orlando as the "Arthur 'Pappy' Kennedy Post Office Building." Thank you and with that I would like to yield the remainder of the time to the distinguished gentleman from Florida, Congressman HASTINGS.

SAVE OUR SURPLUS FOR DEBT REDUCTION AND TAX REBATE RESOLUTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WELDON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, last week I introduced House Resolution 490, the Save Our Surplus for Debt Reduction and Tax Rebate Resolution of 2000. I am proud of this bill in that it does something that no other bill has ever done, it provides a mid-year tax rebate to the hard-working American people.

This resolution says that Congress will direct any additional on-budget non-Social Security surplus that may be announced as early as this week or next by the Office of Management and Budget be used only for rebates to taxpayers and paying down the national debt.

Specifically, when the President introduced his budget in January, he projected a non-Social Security surplus of \$19 billion for the current year. My bill does not address what should be done with that surplus. In fact, at this time, it is unclear whether that \$19 billion will be used in a supplemental appropriations bill or for debt reduction. What my resolution deals with is any surplus in excess of that \$19 billion.

Specifically, if the OMB announces that the additional non-Social Security surplus is between \$19 billion and \$35 billion, my resolution would dedicate the entire amount over \$19 billion to debt reduction. However, if OMB projects a budget surplus of more than \$35 billion, my resolution would direct \$16 billion be equally divided and returned to the American taxpayers, with the remaining amount being used for debt reduction.

The latest speculation is that the on-budget, non-Social Security surplus will far exceed \$35 billion, meaning that this tax rebate can happen this year. And I urge my colleagues to join me in this pursuit. My plan would result in a rebate of between \$150 and \$200 to each American household. Now, some of my colleagues may not think \$150 is too much money or worth the effort. When dealing with the Federal budget and billions of dollars it might not seem like much money, but I can tell my colleagues that when it comes to the family budget, \$150 is a lot of money.

This is a prudent time to introduce and pass this common sense tax resolution. As the economy continues to grow and expand, and revenues into the U.S. Treasury have increased, we are in a time of legitimate on-budget surplus. There is a constant temptation by legislators to spend the money that comes to Washington. All of our current programs now are paid for. The big question is what to do with the left-over money.

As Ronald Reagan said, "Government does not tax to get the money it needs. Government always finds a need for the money it gets." Mr. Speaker, the money that comes to the U.S. Treasury from the American people is not the government's money. It is still the taxpayers' money, and their change should be returned.

Democrat President Grover Cleveland talked about this in his second inaugural address to the Congress in 1886. President Cleveland said, "When more of the people's substance is exacted through the form of taxation than is necessary to meet the just obligations of the government and the expense of its economical administration, such exaction becomes ruthless extortion and a violation of the fundamental principles of a free government."

In short, Mr. Speaker, the taxpayers have paid the bills in full this year. We have balanced the budget, we have locked up the Social Security surplus, we have strengthened Medicare and, yes, we are paying down the national debt. Now, let us provide the American taxpayer with their needed rebate. Let us give them their change back.

I urge my colleagues to join me along with the majority leader, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY), and the majority whip, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), and several other colleagues as cosponsors of this bill and move it forward this legislative session.

PERMANENT NORMAL TRADE RELATIONS WITH CHINA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise to talk about the decision this Congress must make regarding extending Permanent Normal Trade Relations (PNTR) to China. Over the

last several months I worked the 29th district and talked to people who have varying opinions both for and against granting PNTR to China. These many conversations have reinforced my existing belief that there is no easy way to decide whether a vote in favor or in opposition of expanding trade with China is correct.

Having been to China, I have great respect for the Chinese people, their culture, and their impressive history. The vitality is there, we should encourage it to expand. While I understand that you cannot move 1.2 billion people from communism to a free democracy overnight it appears that China has been moving backwards. Recent actions by China to prohibit the free expression of religion and their unwillingness to open their domestic markets to foreign products is very troubling.

During my tenure in Congress, I have tried to closely examine the various trade measures that the House of Representatives considered. I voted against the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA), but supported the annual extension of Most Favored Nation (MFN) trading status, now called Normal Trade Relations (NTR), to China. The differences in my voting record reflects my concerns about blanket trade agreements that, once signed, will disadvantage the American producer.

As the vote on granting China PNTR looms in two weeks, I want to discuss the criteria used to develop my position on this trade agreement. There were three main components that I felt had to be met before I could support the measure: First, we must safeguard American security against a potential adversary. Second, the legislation should encourage policies allowing greater individual liberty, the rule of law, and religious freedom. And finally, American economic interests should not be harmed.

When I considered China's recent actions toward Taiwan and the possibility of a direct Chinese attack if Taiwan had decided to declare independence, I wondered how granting annual NTR to China in recent years had tempered their belligerent attitudes. This latest bluster by Beijing is comparable to the 1996 Chinese "missile test" over the Taiwan Straits during Taiwan's first democratic elections. Beijing's attempt to intimidate Taiwanese voters failed to deter them from electing President Lee Teng-hui. (Chen)

Taiwan is a vibrant democracy and its people should have every right to elect their leaders. Has granting NTR to China stopped them from taking such an aggressive posture towards Taiwan? I do not believe it has. So, when taken in the context of preserving the security of the United States, the past decisions to grant China greater trading access has not increased our national security. The United States must remain on constant alert and ready to defend Taiwan if China decides to attack. In addition, the willingness of the Chinese government to allow the stoning of our embassy last year after we mistakenly bombed their embassy in Belgrade was of great concern to me. I find it very unsettling when a nation with nuclear weapons uses such tactics to try and intimidate our government. Because of these incidents, I feel China has failed to meet the first criteria of safeguarding American security.

China's continuing problem with religious freedom has frequently caused concern in my district. China's record on religious and work-

ers' rights continues to be disappointing. Take for instance the recent imprisonment of several thousand members of the Falun-Gong spiritual movement. This peaceful organization uses meditation and exercise to promote inner strength and healing. The Chinese government has responded to this movement by systematically imprisoning the leaders of this peaceful group on charges they are attempting to undermine the Communist Party.

I find this continuing lack of tolerance by the Chinese government very disturbing because it simply reinforces the bloody images of the Tiananmen Square massacre in 1989. Cracking down on the Falun-Gong indicates to me that granting NTR, and now possibly PNTR, will have absolutely no effect on improving religious freedom. China wants Permanent Normal Trade Relations with no strings attached. Granting NTR on an annual basis allows us to retain some ability to impact the Chinese government and monitor their international conduct. Unfortunately, in light of recent incidents I now have concerns that granting PNTR will allow China to completely ignore their responsibilities to promote religious and individual freedom. Because of this belief, I feel China has failed to meet the second portion of my criteria dealing with improving religious freedoms and human rights.

Finally, I am concerned that China has yet established a judicial system where the impartial "rule of law" principle is applied. Access to an impartial court system is critical for economic development and individual freedom. Unfortunately, this principle has yet to develop in China. Companies doing business in China have little recourse if their permits to enter the domestic Chinese markets are withheld because of resistance from within the governmental bureaucracy. The Chinese judicial system is still a political tool of the Communist Party. It is not unusual for verdicts to be decided before cases even go to trial. In addition, the Chinese judicial system is responsible for maintaining social order by imprisoning political dissidents.

When I visited China two years ago, I saw a Kodak factory that was built to serve the domestic and foreign markets. During the visit I asked a Kodak representative if they had received permission to market their products in China. They had received permission by contract, but still could not serve the domestic market. Had this situation occurred in this country Kodak could have gone to court to enforce their access rights. Unfortunately, they were in China where access to a fair court hearing is questionable at best.

Mr. Speaker, China wants the foreign investment to build new production facilities that can employ the millions of Chinese workers throughout their country. However, it is becoming quite clear that any new facilities will be strictly for export purposes. The U.S. trade deficit with China has grown from \$6 billion in 1989 to \$70 billion in 1999. This staggering figure does not even include the estimated losses due to piracy of U.S. intellectual property, which in 1998 was \$2.6 billion and totaled \$10 billion from 1995 to 1998, according to the International Intellectual Property Alliance.

By granting China PNTR, we surrender the only effective economic and political voice to effect positive change in China, the annual vote to renew NTR. Growth in this new economy is very important to me, but it is because of freedom and individual initiative, not control.