

which antidumping rules are a part of the negotiation agenda. Further, it will insist that he refrain from submitting for congressional approval any agreements that require changes to the current antidumping and countervailing duty laws and enforcement policies of the United States, and that our government must vigorously enforce these laws in all pending and future cases. This is the type of direction that we must insist upon.

Mr. Speaker, I represent a district from western Pennsylvania. It is the heart of steel country. In fact, I was born and raised there, so believe me I know that area pretty well. Because of that, I have been very involved in attempting to mitigate our ongoing steel crisis, and I am sure some people might see me speaking here this morning and think that this is just another steel issue again. Nothing could be further from the truth though. This is not just about steel. Instead, as I stated earlier in my remarks, it is about all American industry production and workers.

It could be agricultural products ranging from raspberries to rice to chilled Atlantic salmon, or industrial products like dry-cleaning machinery, brake rotors, or roofing nails, manufacturing materials such as silicon metal or uranium, or even electronic products like color television receivers or cellular telephones. All of these products and hundreds more are protected by the antidumping and countervailing duty laws.

This is why we need everyone to join with us and insist that our administration hold firm on this issue when those talks kick off in Seattle.

We have an obligation to protect our American workers and producers from unfair foreign trade practices. It is an old line but it still rings true: We can have free trade, but only if it is fair trade. For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I add my voice to urging the House leadership to bring the MUST law resolution to the floor as soon as possible.

H. RES. 298: A VALUABLE TOOL TO PROTECT AMERICAN WORKERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 19, 1999, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ADERHOLT) is recognized during morning hour debates for 2 minutes.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Speaker, I and over 200 of my colleagues are cosponsors of House Resolution 298. The Seattle discussions on international trade will begin on November 30. Unfortunately, some nations wish to circumvent the agreed upon list of topics and reopen the very contentious issue of World Trade Organization rules against dumping and against subsidies.

In the U.S. we already make our workers compete against foreign workers whose governments do not enforce

the same standards on wages, on environmental protection, safety laws, and legal protections. Furthermore, we have flung open the doors of the American market. Let us not kid ourselves. Foreign governments will respect the U.S. worker only to the extent that the U.S. Government forces them to.

In these trade talks there is nothing left to give away except competitive, productive American jobs and that is unacceptable. Some in this body would define free trade by actions that amount to unilateral economic disarmament. Yet I would point out that every Member of Congress whose State benefits from a manufacturing plant built by a foreign company and employing U.S. workers owes a debt to President Ronald Reagan who knew how to get tough on trade when necessary.

If a foreign trade negotiator in Seattle proposes weakening U.S. laws, our administration officials need to say we will discuss nothing until they put that proposal back in their folder.

The passage of this resolution will be a valuable tool for the administration to protect American workers at these talks. I urge the House leadership to put H. Res. 298 on the schedule as soon as possible.

IN SUPPORT OF H. RES. 298, THE "MUST" LAW

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

Mr. MASCARA. Mr. Speaker, in November, representatives from across the globe arrive in Seattle to negotiate changes in the international trade agreements of the World Trade Organization, the WTO.

Trade has worked well for our country. We sell 30 percent of our agricultural products to foreign trading partners. In fact in Pennsylvania, my home State, \$16 billion of farm products are exported annually.

Our country relies on its ability to trade. And while I generally support free trade, I also insist upon fair trade. If other countries can produce products cheaper than we can without abusing its workers and without breaking international trade laws, so be it. They have every right to access our markets. But a successful global economy depends upon a level playing field. Everyone must play by the same rules: Rules against illegal subsidies, rules against illegal dumping, and rules against discrimination.

Unfortunately, there have been a number of recent trade violations that our country has had to respond to. They include illegal steel dumping, bans on U.S. beef and bananas and other products. Our airlines and avia-

tion manufacturers have been discriminated against and the Congress continues to deal with these inequities and justifiably so. Fortunately, we can respond to these violations because we have strong American antidumping and antisubsidy laws. These laws conform to the WTO laws and provide our only means to fight this illegal trade. They are our trading Bill of Rights. Without them we would be defenseless.

Yet, the WTO agenda in Seattle includes an item that might strip away these very rights. That is, denying our ability to deal with these illegal trade activities.

Mr. Speaker for this reason, the House must bring House Resolution 298 to the floor. We must let the world know that we will not stand for foreign interference with our trade laws. Our country is the bedrock of global trade. We should not permit our trading partners to strip away our rights to free trade. We must insist that the WTO provide language that protects us against unfair trade and illegal dumping.

Mr. Speaker, I support the Visclosky-Ney resolution, House Resolution 298.

THE COUP IN PAKISTAN AND THE IMPORTANCE OF MAINTAINING THE PRESSLER AMENDMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 19, 1999, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized during morning hour debates for 3 minutes.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced legislation to prevent the administration from waiving the Pressler amendment, a provision of law which prohibits U.S. military assistance to Pakistan. I would like to take this opportunity to urge my colleagues to join me in this initiative. While I have offered this legislation as a free-standing bill, I am also looking into other legislative vehicles that my proposal could be attached to.

Mr. Speaker, the fiscal year 2000 Defense Appropriations Conference Report approved by the House last week contains provisions giving the President broad waiver authority over several sanctions against India and Pakistan, including the Pressler amendment. There are indications that the President will veto this bill, although for unrelated reasons.

The intent of my legislation is essentially to return to the status quo on the Pressler amendment. It is my hope that last week's military coup in Pakistan, which certainly is very regrettable, may help to refocus congressional attention to the danger of the giving military aid to Pakistan and result in renewed congressional support for retaining the Pressler amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I have long supported lifting the economic sanctions against