

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. VISCLOSKY) 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