

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.

There are too many protesters in prison. There are too many religious persecutions. There are too many military threats. Granting China PNTR now might be economically rewarding, but it would be morally wrong. Last year, I supported and spoke in favor of granting a one-year extension of normal trade relations (NTR) with China. I support a comprehensive engagement with China that includes free and fair trade, but only after China has demonstrated a willingness to become a responsible member of the world community. China should move toward more individual freedom not less. More negotiation with Taiwan and not military threats. China historically is a great nation and can and should be part of this global economic success, but it's not accomplished by persecution and threats. I cannot support granting PNTR to China until the government gives up its reliance on threats and intimidation to achieve their international policy goals.

#### MILLION MOM MARCH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, it should not take a million moms to do anything, but that is what we are going to get this coming Sunday, Mother's Day. Actually, it should not have taken the moms whose children died at the Columbine High School youth massacre.

□ 1645

It should not take the moms who are still feeling the reverberations of the Jonesboro, Arkansas, shooting. And it should not have taken what the moms at the Granada Hills Jewish Community Center in Los Angeles went through just last August.

But what has happened with the killing of youth over the past year, and it has been more than a year since Columbine, has caused the mothers of America to take the matter into their own hands, and well they might because this Congress has not taken it into its hands, to do something about it.

These mothers are coming. I do not know if there will be a million, but I know there will be a lot. And this is what they say to us, "We are putting our elected officials on notice that we, the mothers, will not tolerate them putting the gun lobby before the safety of our children any longer. We expect results, and we will hold our elected officials accountable if they do not deliver."

Mr. Speaker, these are some serious women and their families. These are some moms who wanted to test us to see whether if they come they can get the attention that the killings of children throughout the United States have failed to attract.

The moms do not doubt that every Member of this body and of the other body are seriously concerned about the deaths of these and the 80,000 children

who have died from gunfire, accidental, suicidal, and homicidal since 1979. They know we care. They do not know that we have the political will to do what is necessary to stop these killings.

I am grateful that two Members of this body, the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA) and the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MCCARTHY), have introduced a Congressional resolution praising the Million Mom March. They know that this body is full of Members who support gun safety legislation and certainly the gun legislation that is pending before the House at the moment in conference committee. Because that is, by any standards, very modest legislation.

The million moms, of course, are way out in front of us on legislation. Their crusade, and it has taken on the appearance of a mother's crusade, began with a single mother, not with any special interest organization, not with any group of lobbyists sitting around trying to get our attention, but with a single mother who, following the North Valley Jewish Community Center shooting last August, simply could not take it anymore.

One mom started. And if ever there is a meaning to grassroots movement, that is what has happened ever since. It has been 9 months. There must be some symbolic importance of that time since she started this crusade. And it has grown like wildfire in every State of the Union.

It started with suburban, middle class moms. And that is very interesting as far as this Member, who represents a large city, is concerned. Because until the Columbine youth massacre, the real focus had been on the one-on-one shootings, and that is what they mostly were and mostly are, that occur in large cities because kids so easily get ahold of guns.

What has made this a national priority is that mothers and families now see that these guns know no borders and that suburban children are at least as fascinated with guns as anywhere.

So we are going to see hundreds of buses come into this town from Texas and California, to Maine and Michigan. In April they said Pennsylvania was leading in buses. By now I do not know if some other State has overtaken Maine.

Rosie O'Donnell, the television celebrity, who everybody knows is a big opponent of the proliferation of guns, is going to be the MC.

But the fact is, Mr. Speaker, that we will not find many Members of this body speaking because the moms want to speak for themselves. There will be an occasional public official speaking. But, apparently, to qualify to speak, if they happen to be a public official, they have to have been a public official who has suffered gun violence in her own family.

I love it that the march will be open not, as is the usual case, by our mayor, after all, he is not a mom, but by the woman we call Nana Williams, the

mother of the mayor. And then the moms will step forward to tell their stories and to let us know what they want.

Look, everybody else has tried. We begin in quite civil debates on the subject. The media delight in airing the subject. None of that talk has gotten us anywhere on the most modest legislation, the bill pending before us, where we literally are almost at the point of absolute agreement literally with about an inch to go and cannot get that inch accomplished.

That inch, of course, has largely to do with closing the gun show loophole, with most of us agreeing that instant checks would do it but not wanting to let the most dangerous potential owners get through because they will require at least 24 hours.

We hear about the dozen children every day who die from gunshot wounds. These do not always occur in the way, of course, that the terrible tragedy occurred at Columbine. These happen with accidents. They happen with kids playing with guns. These happen with suicides. What they all have in common is the easy availability of guns to kid.

Well, the moms, in all of their literature, insist upon speaking for themselves. Here again is what they say. "Now we moms are mad, and we mean business. We want Congress to create a meaningful gun policy in this country that treats guns like cars."

I have to tell my colleagues that I would save some time if I did not have to get my car checked or the registration renewed. But most of us understand that a car is seen as a dangerous weapon. If that is true about a car that is used normally in a quite benign fashion, I guess the moms have a point when they say they do not understand why guns cannot be treated like cars.

As I contemplated Columbine, which has weighed on my mind for the full year since it took place, I was jolted when a big-city version of the suburban tragedy in Colorado came right here to the Nation's capital at the National Zoo that the House and the Senate established long ago essentially for children.

Seven children were wounded when gunfire broke out on Easter Monday. Thank God none of them were killed. But, Mr. Speaker, one of them lies still gravely wounded in Children's Hospital here.

I, of course, have visited that family. It is a very brave family. They have stayed away from the press. They are very dignified. The family has devoted its energy to prayer and to this 11-year-old child who is fighting for his life.

They call him Pappy because when he was born he looked like a papoose. They delight in talking about him. Because this 11-year-old is no man-child. He is still a child and is still acting like a child, jumping up in his mama's bed, playing with his video games, loving his mom and his dad, and is part of