

their favorite or most popular nationally syndicated columnist. I would like to read most of the column that he wrote concerning this, because it expresses a lot of views that I think need to be expressed and people need to think about.

Mr. Reese wrote this: "The comic book raid on Elian Gonzalez's Miami family is a new low, even for the Federal Government. Pointing machine guns and screaming obscenities seem to be standard operating procedure for Federal law enforcement officers, even when the only people to scream at and point guns at are unarmed Christian men and women and small children.

"The truth is that two unarmed female officers could have gone to that home during any normal hour and removed Elian Gonzalez without any danger to the child, to themselves or to bystanders. That Miami family has never once said it would resist. It has always tried to follow the law, which I should point out is not the same as Attorney General Janet Reno's whim. Instead, the feds chose to act as if they were raiding the hideout of Colombian drug dealers.

"The U.S. action was disgraceful. You don't transfer children at gunpoint. And I, for one American," Mr. Reese continues, "I, for one American, am getting tired of Federal cops screaming profanity, pointing guns, and shoving around people who have not been convicted of any crime. This is not how a free society operates. It is how dictatorships and authoritarian governments act.

"The real message of this raid is how estranged the Federal Government is from the American people. The government apparently fears the people, and people who are feared are soon hated. The Federal Government has increasingly acted as if it has merely to speak, and all of us must lock heels and shout 'Sieg Heil.' Horse manure.

"Sovereignty in this country resides with the people. The government is our servant, not our master. The American people had better pull their heads out of that place where they cannot see and reassert their sovereignty before it is too late. There aren't any trends in Washington moving toward respect for the law and liberty. The trends are moving toward arbitrary and authoritarian government."

Mr. Reese continues in this great column and says this:

"Reno's poor decision-making notwithstanding, the issue of custody is not as clear-cut as she makes it out to be. One of the points to be settled by the Appeals Court is can someone else speak for a child when the child's interest and that of the parent is in conflict?

"The heel-clickers are now pointing to pictures of Elian as if that proves their point. It doesn't. Nobody in Miami has tried to estrange Elian from

his father. Their concern all along has been to keep Elian from being forcibly returned to Cuba without having his day in court, which Reno tried to deny him.

"It is the boy's father who has refused to go to Miami, refused to meet with the boy and family at any neutral site. Whether that is his decision or his instructions from the Cuban or American or both governments, I don't know. But I do know that nobody in Miami ever suggested that Elian would not be happy to see his father. They had talked several times on the telephone while Elian was in Miami.

"Once more the Clinton administration has shown its contempt for the law and contempt for the American people, especially conservative Americans. It has, from day one, taken exactly the same position as the communist dictator Fidel Castro. Those who think that Castro really cares about Elian should ask the old greybeard why he ordered his goons to drown more than a dozen children and their parents when they tried to escape Cuba in 1994.

"This administration has slapped in the face and insulted one of the finest groups of Americans within the United States, the Cuban exile community."

I commend this column by Mr. Reese. I will place it in full in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I say again that we should be very concerned when the Justice Department takes its law into its own hands and ignores very strong criticism from Federal courts of appeal.

Mr. Speaker, I include the article for the RECORD.

SHOW OF FORCE WASN'T NECESSARY

(By Charley Reese)

MAY 1.—I had thought that there was nothing Bill Clinton could do that would make me think less of him than I already do. That was a mistake on my part.

The comic book raid on Elian Gonzalez's Miami family is a new low, even for the federal government. Pointing machine guns and screaming obscenities seem to be standard operating procedure for federal law-enforcement officers—even when the only people to scream at and point guns at are unarmed Christian men and women and small children.

The truth is that two unarmed female officers could have gone to that home during any normal hour and removed Elian Gonzalez without any danger to the child, to themselves or to bystanders. That Miami family has never once said it would resist. It has always tried to follow the law, which, I should point out, is not the same as Attorney General Janet Reno's whim. Instead, the feds chose to act as if they were raiding the hideout of Colombian drug dealers.

The U.S. action was disgraceful. You don't transfer children at gunpoint. And I, for one American, am getting tired of federal cops screaming profanity, pointing guns and shoving around people who have not been convicted of any crime. That is not how a free society operates. It's how dictatorships and authoritarian governments act.

The real message of this raid is how estranged the federal government is from the

American people. The government apparently fears the people, and people who are feared are soon hated. The federal government has increasingly acted as if it has merely to speak and all of us must lock heels and shout "Sieg Heil." Horse manure.

Sovereignty in this country resides with the people. The government is our servant, not our master. The American people had better pull their heads out of that place where they can't see and reassert their sovereignty before it's too late. There aren't any trends in Washington moving toward respect for the law and liberty. The trends are moving toward arbitrary and authoritarian government.

Reno's poor decision-making notwithstanding, the issue of custody is not as clear-cut as she makes it out to be. One of the points to be settled by the appeals court is: Can someone else speak for a child when the child's interest and that of the parent is in conflict?

The heel-clickers are now pointing to pictures of Elian with his father as if that proves their point. It doesn't. Nobody in Miami has tried to estrange Elian from his father. Their concern all along has been to keep Elian from being forcibly returned to Cuba without having his day in court, which Reno tried to deny him.

It's the boy's father who has refused to go to Miami, refused to meet with the boy and the family at any neutral site. Whether that's his decision, or his instructions from the Cuban or American or both governments, I don't know. But I do know that nobody in Miami ever suggested that Elian wouldn't be happy to see his father. They had talked several times on the telephone while Elian was in Miami.

Once more the Clinton administration has shown its contempt for the law and contempt for the American people—especially conservative Americans. It has, from day one, taken exactly the same position as the communist dictator Fidel Castro. Those who think that Castro really cares about Elian should ask the old greybeard why he ordered his goons to drown more than a dozen children and their parents when they tried to escape Cuba in 1994.

This administration has slapped in the face and insulted one of the finest group of Americans within the United States, the Cuban exile community. I expect that a lot of Florida Democrats will regret that in November.

REVISIONS TO ALLOCATION FOR HOUSE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

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

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Sec. 314 of the Congressional Budget Act, I hereby submit for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD revisions to the allocation for the House Committee on Appropriations pursuant to House Report 106-617 to reflect \$115,000,000 in additional new budget authority and \$113,000,000 in additional outlays for emergencies. This will change the allocation to the House Committee on Appropriations to \$600,410,000,000 in budget authority and \$625,192,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2001. This will increase the aggregate total to \$1,528,615,000,000 in budget authority and \$1,494,413,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2001.

As reported to the House, H.R. 4461, the bill making fiscal year 2001 appropriations for the Department of Agriculture, includes \$115,000,000 in budget authority and \$113,000,000 in outlays for emergencies.

These adjustments shall apply while the legislation is under consideration and shall take effect upon final enactment of the legislation. Questions may be directed to Dan Kowalski or Jim Bates at 67270.

GRANTING PERMANENT NORMAL TRADE RELATIONS TO CHINA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, as I said during the one-minute speech I delivered just a few minutes ago, I am going to talk about this very important vote that we are going to be facing next week here in the Congress.

I will tell you during my nearly decade-and-a-half as a member of the minority, I often would utilize this special order time to talk about a wide range of issues, but during the past 6 years since we have been in the majority, since we have been very successful at implementing so many of those issues around here, I have not taken a lot of special order sessions to talk about public policy questions. But I think it is very important for us to talk about this one, because, as I have said, the vote that we will face next week that will decide whether or not we grant permanent normal trade relations to the People's Republic of China, which will allow the United States of America to finally gain access to that consumer market of China, is, as I said, at least, at least, the most important vote that we will cast in this session of Congress, and there are many who have come to me and said things, like Leon Panetta, the former White House Chief of Staff, the former Director of the Office of Management and Budget, the former chairman of the House Committee on the Budget, my former California colleague, said to me when I ran into him the other night, "David, I believe this will be the most important vote of the decade."

My colleague the gentleman from California (Mr. MATSUI), with whom I have been working very closely to put together bipartisan support for this vote, said that he believed that this will be probably the most important vote that will be cast during the entire Congressional careers of Members.

I, for that reason, felt it important to take some time to explain why it is that this is such an important vote and to try and clarify some of the very confusing statements and, frankly, some of the inaccurate statements that have been put forward by a number of people who are opponents.

Let me begin by saying that I share the concern that opponents have raised about a wide range of issues. In fact, I would like to say that I will take a back seat to no one when it comes to demonstrating outrage over the human rights policies that we have seen in the People's Republic of China, or anyplace in the world, for that matter.

I am very concerned about the fact that we have an imbalance of trade. I am very concerned about the continued threats that we have observed from Beijing to Taipei, the most recent one having been made today. I am very concerned about religious persecution that exists in China. I am very concerned about the people who are in Tibet and have been mistreated.

So as we go through these issues, it is important for us to realize that this is not, as many have described it, simply a desire on the part of the proponents to line the pocketbooks of the U.S. business sector of our economy and worshipping at the altar of the all-mighty buck. That is an absolutely preposterous claim that the opponents have made.

Those of us who have embraced this policy do so because we recognize that the single most powerful force for positive change in the 5,000 year history of Chinese civilization has been what? Economic reform, reform of the economy which began in 1972 with Deng Xiaoping's embrace of what was known as, following the Shanghai Communique, dramatic economic reforms. Those economic reforms have led to some tremendous changes that are positive in China.

Guess what? Not many people are aware of this. There are more shareholders, more shareholders, in the People's Republic of China today than there are Members of the communist party. There are in fact today in China people who have their own small businesses. So we have private property recognized, we have an entrepreneurial class that is recognized, and we have these very, very bold and dynamic reforms that Premier Zhu Rongji has put into effect which have led towards privatization, decentralization. He has closed down state-owned entities.

These reforms are things that cannot be ignored. And, guess what? These are the kinds of reforms that are based on what we in the United States of America believe in, and that is individual responsibility and initiative, pursuit of the free market, opportunity.

Now, I am not claiming that life is perfect in the People's Republic of China. In fact, life is not that great in the People's Republic of China. We need to address religious persecution, human rights violations, the threats toward Taiwan, the transfer of military weapons and technology to Pakistan and Iran and other spots. Those sorts of threats are very, very important and we need to address them. But

in trying to address those, we should not consider withdrawing the one good thing that exists there, which has been the economic reform.

Now, I am one who has actually sat down and gone through the full intelligence briefing on this issue, on the national security question, and I asked myself, how is it that we can deal with the espionage problem and those other things that are out there? I say, well, suppose we have the opportunity to close off the United States of America, to prevent any opportunity for access to be gained in the United States of America. But, guess what? We live in a free society today, and that is not going to happen. We are not going to see the United States of America close itself off to the rest of the world.

So while we are concerned about things that have taken place in China, what is the best way for us to deal with those concerns? It is to do everything within our power to open it up, to get in there.

Now, what we have before us is a vote which will be coming next week that, for the first time ever, we are going to not say, as we have for the last two decades, simply that China, the People's Republic of China, will be able to gain one way access to the U.S. consumer market by selling their goods and services here at very low tariffs, being able to get into our consumer market. What we are saying is now we have the reverse situation, where we are going to, by seeing China accede to the World Trade Organization, which, of course they will be able to do anyway, so the U.S. worker and U.S. businesses will be able to gain access there, we will be, again, prying open that market, with a population that approaches five times that of the United States of America. We are the third most populous nation on the face of the Earth, behind the People's Republic of China and India, which has just now gone to a billion people. We are the third most populous. Yet the most populous nation is nearly five times the size of ours. So, think about that; the chance we have to open up that market is one which we would be foolish, foolish, to deny.

I see this vote that we are going to face as a win-win-win. It is a win for our first class U.S. workers, and it is a win for our farmers in this country.

□ 1800

Earlier today a news conference was held by members of the Committee on Agriculture in which they were pointing to the fact that an opportunity to export U.S. agricultural products into the People's Republic of China is a very important thing.

The chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, Mr. Combest, last night took some time here on the floor to talk about the importance of that. So it is a win for our workers. It is a win