

financial contribution by a government, or any other public payment which confers a benefit. All three of these elements must be satisfied in order for a subsidy to exist.

The scope of the negotiations at the Seattle Round discussions of the WTO was specified during the Uruguay Round, however some countries, and this is the danger, are seeking to circumvent the agreed list of negotiating topics and reopen the debate over the WTO's antidumping and antisubsidy rules.

These rules have scarcely been tested since their enactment and certainly have not proven defective. Accordingly, avoiding another series of divisive fights over these rules is the best way to promote progress on the other issues facing the WTO.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, it is essential that negotiations on these antidumping and antisubsidy matters not be reopened at the Seattle Round of discussions of the WTO.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 298 simply says we have a system, let it work. To reopen these rules at the Seattle Round is not only dangerous to the United States, but most importantly, it is dangerous to the working men and women of the United States who are trying to feed their families and support their communities and educate their children and take care of their loved ones.

It is basic to the nature of our country to be able to have a job. So we are not asking for anything special. We are simply asking for fair treatment. That is why it is essential that we speak out today and I congratulate again and thank my colleagues who have put in so much time on this issue and thank all of those across the United States, Mr. Speaker, that in fact have written letters and made phone calls and supported measures to simply give the American workers a fair chance.

#### FREE BUT FAIR TRADE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 19, 1999, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT) is recognized during morning hour debates for 4 minutes.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, the author of H. Res. 298, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKEY) has worked tirelessly here, along with the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA) and many others to try and do something about this dumping and subsidy of foreign products that, in fact, have damaged American workers, American goods, and in my opinion our future economy. Even though right now it makes it look like our prices are low and our economy is helped and buoyed by this action.

The gentleman from Indiana will be here, he being the greatest Notre Dame fan in the Congress and being totally

elated by the fighting Irish's comeback victory over Southern Cal. So being an old Pitt guy, I am not going to be all that ecstatic about it, but the gentleman from Indiana is still out there cheering on the Irish.

Mr. Speaker, the very first steel mill that closed in America, we called it Black Monday back then, was in Youngstown, Ohio. 11,000 steelworkers got a notice one morning that their plant was closing and their job was gone. Congress has done a bunch of things since then to give plant closing notices, but frankly I do not even understand why we have to be doing something like this with the administration that in my opinion should know better. I think every administration should know a little better.

We are getting ripped off big time. People keep hearing about dumping. I do not know if the American people know what dumping means. It is not all that sophisticated. It is not rocket science here. Dumping is when a product costs \$20 to make but they sell it in America for \$15, \$5 below what it costs them to make the product themselves. What does that do? There are those purists that say that is great. They are subsidizing the American economy. They are doing us a favor at \$5 a product.

But, Mr. Speaker, the bottom line is the American producers now cannot meet the competition. Little by little the American competition dwindles and before long there is a vacuum. No American company produces the product and that product that looked so juicy at \$15 is now coming in here at \$35.

The final result of this is we cannot have dumping, we cannot have subsidies, if in fact they are going to play by a different set of rules. That is what frosts my pumpkin here.

I think with the dumping of illegal steel Congress did not do what they had to do. Congress should have passed a ban. Send it to the President and let these presidents that fire up all these union workers every election veto the bill and show what they are standing for.

Mr. Speaker, we should not be managing illegal trade; we should be banning illegal trade.

So I particularly feel our program is all wet. I think we have allowed these administrations to use an awful lot of rhetoric and politicking around election time and maintain a program that is anti-American, so help me God. But I want to credit the efforts at least we are trying to take. What we are doing is recommending that the administration does not allow any more of this chicanery on illegal trade. Wow. I hope that works. But in any regard, I think it is better than what we are doing.

Mr. Speaker, I think there is a lot more that has to be done. And I think it is time to pass some legislation that

says look, play by the same rules we play by because there is one trick word I believe and one magic word that deals with this trade business. It is called reciprocity. I think it is time to treat our trading partners the way they deal with us. We should ideally deal with free trade, but first we should deal with fair trade.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak in favor of House Resolution 298, the Maintain United States Trade Law Resolution. There have been a number of pieces of legislation introduced this Congress aimed at strengthening our trade laws. While some of these bills have been very technical in nature, we have before us today a resolution that is so simple and straightforward that there can be no hidden agenda. It sends forth one basic, yet vital, message from the Congress to the Administration, and that message is this—do not allow the current antidumping and countervailing duty laws to be weakened.

Just over a month from now, the WTO will convene at the Seattle Ministerial to launch a new round of trade talks. An agenda has been set for these negotiations that does not include the antidumping and countervailing duty rules, yet there are a number of countries seeking to expand the agenda in order to debate them. The existing rules were concluded only with great difficulty during the Uruguay Round, and have hardly been tested. In no way have the existing rules been proven to be defective. Therefore, it would be clearly a rash decision to reopen them at this point in time.

Fortunately the Administration seems to have recognized the importance of maintaining these trade laws and has stated on a number of occasions that they will not allow them to be reopened at this next round of talks. Apparently, some Members in this House feel this is enough assurance, but I speak today on behalf of the almost 200 cosponsors of this resolution who know the Congress must vocalize their support for the Administration's stated approach. We must show our trading partners that we wholeheartedly support and endorse our negotiators and their position at the Seattle Ministerial.

On a number of occasions, I have heard people state their concern that there is a growing protectionist tide in the U.S. and around the world. There are even those out there who believe this resolution will help fuel this tide, but nothing could be farther from the truth. Free trade must be synonymous with fair trade, and our antidumping and countervailing duty laws target only illegal imports, not those that are fairly traded. If you really want to see a growing protectionist tide in this country, go down the road of weakening our fair trade laws and just watch what happens. Weakening these laws will lead to a flood of illegal imports like we have never seen, and the result will be scores of American companies out of business and innumerable American workers without jobs. We will then see an unprecedented discontent with foreign manufacturers and, in no time, a movement toward closing our doors to foreign imports, fair and unfair alike. If you're looking for a recipe for protectionism, weakening our existing trade laws is the quick and easy way to get there.

Nothing good can come out of reopening the antidumping and countervailing duty rules,

yet there is a very real possibility that it could happen. There is a Constitutional responsibility for Congress to join with the Administration in a unified approach and let it be known that we will not sit idly by and watch our fair trade laws be bargained away. Supporting this resolution is a way for us to say that we believe American farmers and manufacturers deserve to be on an equal footing with their counterparts around the world.

I mentioned earlier that these trade laws are the backbone of America's open-market policy. Well, it is now time for this Congress and the Administration to show that they have a backbone when it comes to negotiating the future for all Americans. I urge my colleagues to stand with me today in support of the Maintain United States Trade Law Resolution.

#### WTO MINISTERIAL MEETING IN SEATTLE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 19, 1999, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express concerns about the upcoming World Trade Organization ministerial meeting which will be hosted by the United States in Seattle, Washington, from November 30 until December 3.

The purpose of this meeting is to prepare an agenda for a new round of multilateral trade negotiations aimed at expanding and liberalizing world trade in the wake of the Uruguay Round of negotiations which ended in 1994.

As Chairman of the Congressional Steel Caucus, I recently convened two days of briefings by U.S. steel industry executives and the President of the Steelworkers of America. In addition to discussing the continued threat of low-priced imports, the industry and steelworker representatives also provided the caucus with advice on what should and should not be included in the agenda which is being drafted in Seattle.

There is general support for this new round of negotiations because liberalized trade has a great potential benefit for the U.S. economy as long as that liberalized trade is fair, and I emphasize the word "fair," is rules-based and is market economy based. The caucus heard that any future negotiations under the auspices of the World Trade Organization must in no way weaken U.S. trade laws, particularly our antidumping and countervailing duty laws. These laws provide essential remedies against unfair foreign imports.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that we have been repeatedly assured by Ambassador Barshefsky, Secretary Daley and other administration officials that antidumping and countervailing duty statutes will not be reopened in Seattle or in any new round of negotiations to follow. But we have also heard repeatedly from several of our trading part-

ners that they will seek to reopen discussions on these laws.

My particular concern arises from an addendum to the WTO General Council Chairman Mchumo's draft Ministerial Declaration for the Seattle meeting which he drafted "on his own responsibility." The proposals in this addendum would seriously weaken the U.S. antidumping and countervailing duty laws as they stand today. Although this addendum is not official, it indicates that there will be substantial pressure on the U.S. delegation to include discussions of changes to the antidumping and countervailing duty laws in the new round of negotiations.

The proposed changes would allow the dumping of goods into the United States and would allow goods to be subsidized by foreign governments. These changes in turn would jeopardize United States jobs. I will mention just a few of the 24 changes that have been proposed in the Mchumo addendum.

One, once an antidumping investigation under U.S. law is concluded, no new petition involving the same product could be initiated for at least a year. This means dumping of that product could resume and continue for a year before any remedy could be pursued.

Two, if a penalty duty lower than the calculated margin of dumping were thought to be sufficient to reduce the injury, then that lower duty would be mandatory, even if dumping continues.

Three, countervailing duties would be imposed not in the full amount but only in the amount by which the subsidy exceeds the applicable de minimis level.

Four, developing countries would suddenly be exempted altogether from the present prohibition on export subsidies and import substitution subsidies.

Mr. Speaker, these proposed changes sound technical, but they would have a dramatic impact on U.S. jobs in the manufacturing sector and in other important sensitive sectors. These changes would mean job losses for many Americans and, therefore, these changes must be resisted.

I support the Visclosky-Ney resolution stating that the antidumping and antisubsidies code of the WTO should not be reopened in Seattle. I will be part of a delegation travelling to Seattle in November as part of the Speaker's advisory group on the WTO ministerial. A strong vote in the House and participation by Members in the delegation to Seattle will be essential in backing up, and I say that supporting, the administration's position that the U.S. antidumping and countervailing duty laws should not be weakened in any way during the upcoming multilateral trade negotiations.

#### MUST LAW RESOLUTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of Jan-

uary 19, 1999, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DOYLE) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I am rising here this morning to speak about this very important bill known as the Maintain United States Trade (MUST) Law. First, allow me to thank my colleagues and friends, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKEY) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. NEY) for their work on this issue and for organizing this morning hour today.

I am just one of nearly 200 cosponsors of the MUST law resolution that has drawn its support from both sides of the aisle. There is a reason for that, of course. Quite simply, this issue does not fall along partisan lines. It is no surprise that there are many Democrats and many Republicans that together have recognized the necessity of maintaining our antidumping laws and countervailing duty laws.

It is no surprise because these laws are a concern for all of us, affect all of us, and protect a wide range of products that come from all corners of our great country.

According to the U.S. International Trade Association, as of March 1 of this year, over 290 products from 59 different countries were under antidumping and countervailing duty orders. Throughout our ongoing steel crisis, antidumping and countervailing duty laws have represented one of the only means of relief for American steelworkers and the American steel industry.

My constituents in Pennsylvania and other American producers throughout the country recognize that these laws are important protections affecting countless products throughout the United States. It is imperative that the administration uphold these important trade laws at the upcoming WTO Seattle Round. It is this conference that will launch a new round of trade negotiations. It is said that these talks will focus on reshaping WTO rules regarding agriculture, services and intellectual property. However, the concern of those of us here this morning is that other issues may surface on the agenda.

Mr. Speaker, it is becoming clear that a number of foreign countries are seeking to expand the agenda allowing for debate on WTO's antidumping and countervailing duty laws. This effort must be stopped. This is why the MUST law is so important, because its passage will allow the administration to attend the Seattle negotiations with a unified statement from the Congress declaring that the United States must not agree to reopen negotiations on any of these antidumping and countervailing duty laws.

The MUST law resolution will call upon the President to not participate in any international negotiation in