Mr. LEACH. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. EMERSON). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LEACH) that the House suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendment to the bill, H.R. 1151.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SENSE OF CONGRESS THAT ELIMINATION OF TRADE RESTRICTIONS ON IMPORTATION OF U.S. AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS SHOULD BE TOP PRIORITY

Mr. CRANE. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 213) expressing the sense of the Congress that the European Union is unfairly restricting the importation of United States agricultural products and the elimination of such restrictions should be a top priority in trade negotiations with the European Union, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 213

Whereas on a level playing field, United States producers are the most competitive suppliers of agricultural products in the world;

Whereas United States agricultural exports reached a level of $57,000,000,000 in 1997, compared to a total United States merchandise trade deficit of $198,000,000,000;

Whereas the future well-being of the Unites States agricultural sector depends, to a large degree, on the elimination of trade barriers and the development of new export opportunities throughout the world;

Whereas increased United States agricultural exports are critical to the future of the agricultural, rural, and overall economy of the United States;

Whereas the opportunities for increased agricultural exports are undermined by unfair subsidies provided by trading partners of the United States, and by various tariff and nontariff trade barriers imposed on highly competitive United States agricultural products;

Whereas the Foreign Agricultural Service estimates that United States agricultural exports are reduced by $4,700,000,000 annually due to the unjustifiable imposition of sanitary and phytosanitary measures that deny or limit market access to United States products;

Whereas Asian markets account for more than 40 percent of United States agricultural exports worldwide, but the financial crisis in Asia has caused a severe drop in demand for U.S. agricultural products and a consequent drop in world commodity prices;

Whereas multilateral trade negotiations under the auspices of the World Trade Organization and the Asia Pacific Economic Cooperation Forum and trade negotiations for a Free Trade Area of the Americas represent significant opportunities to reduce and eliminate tariff and nontariff trade barriers on agricultural products;

Whereas negotiations for country accessions to the World Trade Organization, particularly China, present important opportunities to reduce and eliminate these barriers;

Whereas the United States is currently engaged in a number of outstanding trade disputes regarding agricultural trade;

Whereas disputes with the European Union regarding agriculture matters involve the most intractable issues between the United States and the European Union, including—

(1) the failure to finalize a veterinary equivalency program, which jeopardizes an estimated $3,000,000,000 in trade in livestock products between the United States and the European Union;

(2) the ruling by the World Trade Organization that the European Union has no scientific basis for banning the importation of beef produced in the United States using growth promoting hormones, and that the European Union must remove by May 13, 1999, its import ban on beef produced using growth promoting hormones;

(3) the failure to use science, as in the beef hormone case, which raises concerns about the European Union fulfilling its obligations under the WTO Agreement on the Application of Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures;

(4) the promulgation by the European Union of regulations regarding the use of specified risk materials for livestock products which have a disputed scientific basis and which serve to impede the importation of United States livestock products, despite the fact that no cases of bovine spongisorm encephalopathy (mad cow disease) have been documented in the United States;

(5) the ruling by the World Trade Organization in favor of the United States that the European import regime restricting the importation of bananas violates numerous disciplines established by the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade and the General Agreement on Trade in Services, and that the European Union must be in full compliance with the decision of the World Trade Organization by January 1, 1999;

(6) the hindering of trade in products grown with the benefit of biogenetics through a politicized approval process that is nontransparent and lacks a basis in science; and

(7) continuing disputes regarding European Union subsidies for dairy and canned fruit, and a number of impediments with respect to wine: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that—

(1) many nations, including the European Union, unfairly restrict the importation of United States agricultural products;

(2) the restrictions imposed on United States agricultural exports are among the most vexing problems facing United States exporters;

(3) the elimination of restrictions imposed on United States agricultural exports should be a top priority of any current or future trade negotiation;

(4) the President should develop a trade agenda which actively addresses agricultural trade barriers in multilateral and bilateral trade negotiations and steadfastly pursues full compliance with dispute settlement decisions of the World Trade Organization;

(5) in such negotiations, the United States should seek to obtain competitive opportunities for United States exports of agricultural products in foreign markets substantially equivalent to the competitive opportunities afforded to foreign exports in United States markets, and to achieve fairer and more open conditions of trade;

(6) because of the significance of the issues concerning agricultural trade with the European Union, the United States Trade Representative should not engage in any trade negotiation with the European Union if the Trade Representative determines that such negotiations would undermine the ability of the United States to achieve a successful result in the World Trade Organization negotiations on agriculture set to begin in December 1999; and

(7) the President should consult with the Congress in a meaningful and timely manner concerning trade negotiations in agriculture.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. EMERSON). Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CRANE) and the gentleman from California (Mr. MATSUI) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CRANE).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CRANE. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on House Concurrent Resolution 213, as amended.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRANE. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, as amended by the Committee on Ways and Means, House Concurrent Resolution 213 calls on the President to first develop a trade agenda which actively addresses agricultural trade barriers and trade negotiations; secondly, seek competitive opportunities for U.S. exporters that are substantially equivalent to those opportunities foreign products enjoy in the U.S. market; and finally, aggressively pursue full compliance by our trading partners with dispute settlement decisions of the World Trade Organization.

The United States possesses the most efficient and competitive agriculture sectors in the world. Agricultural goods accounted $93.1 billion in total two-way trade during 1997, up 40 percent or $26.6 billion, from 1992. U.S. agricultural exports alone stood at about $56 billion in 1997. However, this number is projected to fall by about $4 billion in 1998.

My own State of Illinois is the third largest agricultural exporting State, shipping nearly $4 billion in agricultural exports abroad, or 6.7 percent of the U.S. total in 1996. The largest export categories, feed, grain, and soybeans, accounted for over 75 percent of Illinois' agricultural exports in 1996.

The resolution notes that agricultural markets in Asia, accounting for more than 40 percent of U.S. agricultural exports worldwide, have been severely affected in a negative way by the Asian financial crisis. Because of this economic downturn, combined with the fact that domestic food consumption is projected to remain relatively stable, the further elimination of trade barriers and development of new export opportunities is essential to the economic health of U.S. agricultural producers.

The Administration's inaction on the fast track issue means we are missing

opportunities every day to improve the well-being and future security of U.S. farmers and ranchers. House Concurrent Resolution 213 makes the point that disputes regarding agricultural matters involve the most difficult and intractable intractable issues between the U.S. And our largest trade and investment partner, the European union.

For example, Europe continues to maintain an import ban on beef produced using growth-promoting hormones, despite the fact that WTO has ruled that there is no scientific basis for this ban and that it must be removed by May 13, 1999. House Concurrent Resolution 213 underscores the fact that Congress fully expects that Europe will come into compliance with its international obligations by this date, at the latest.

In another important ruling for U.S. interests, the WTO determined that the convoluted licensing and quota system restricting the importation of bananas into the EU violates numerous provisions of the WTO and must be brought under compliance by January 1 of 1999.

Full implementation of these WTO decisions against the EU will show the world whether Europeans are committed to the credibility and long-term viability of the WTO dispute settlement system. This resolution underscores the importance that this body places on aggressively pursuing trade negotiations to eliminate trade barriers to American agricultural exports.

It calls upon the President to develop a trade agenda that puts a priority on addressing these barriers in negotiations under the auspices of the World Trade Organization and the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation Forum, and trade negotiations for a Free Trade Agreement of the Americas.

I hope my colleagues will give their unanimous support to the important objective of achieving additional market opportunities for U.S. agricultural exports, and I urge a yes vote on House Concurrent Resolution 213.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MATSUI. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of House Concurrent Resolution 213. This resolution reflects the importance of agricultural to our Nation's economy, and the fact that the elimination of foreign restrictions to our agricultural exports must be a top priority in trade negotiations.

American farmers are the most competitive suppliers in the world. They exported over $57 billion worth of agricultural goods last year, an increase of nearly one-third since 1992. Yet, old barriers and the continuing creation of new ones affecting agricultural trade are some of the most recognized problems U.S. exporters face. They are also among the most challenging for U.S. trade negotiators to resolve.

Among the most important agricultural trade issues are the implementation of dispute settlement decisions under the WTO, elimination of export subsidies, achieving transparency in foreign regulatory policies, opening up foreign market access, and ensuring that our farmers can export goods produced with safe advanced techniques, such as biotechnology.

The need to address these issues has become urgent in light of the impact of the financial crisis reducing demands for U.S. agricultural exports in Asia. These exports account for over 40 percent of our agricultural exports worldwide. The negotiations on agriculture scheduled to begin next year in the WTO, as well as negotiations in the APEC and for the Free Trade Area of the Americas, offer important opportunities to reduce and eliminate the various barriers to trade and agricultural goods.

As noted in the resolution, disputes regarding market access under existing trade agreements involve the most difficult issues between the United States and our second largest agricultural export market, the European Union. Europe has not yet lifted its import ban on beef products with growth hormones, nor implemented changes in its banana import regime to comply with their obligations under the WTO.

European regulations lack the sound scientific basis for impeding U.S. exports of livestock products and products grown with the benefit of biogenetics. We continue to have disputes over European subsidies for dairy, canned fruits, and there are numerous impediments for American wine exports.

Madam Speaker, agricultural exports are critical to the future health of America's farms and our overall economy. Foreign government compliance with the existing trade agreement commitments and the opening of new market opportunities through trade negotiations are essential.

I might just add that I am a supporter of the fast track legislation, although I have not been contacted formally by anyone on the other side of the aisle in terms of the intention of bringing this issue up in September of this year.

The administration, as we know, supports fast track. They put a great effort into it last year. But since we are reopening the whole discussion on language on the whole issue of agriculture, which I think makes a lot of sense, we also ought to look at ''necessary and appropriate,'' that language, and we ought to look at labor and the environment as well.

If we want to maximize our votes on both sides of the aisle, and right now I do not believe there are the votes to pass fast track, then we should renegotiate this and look at a realistic way, frankly, of trying to get a consensus. But if we all become stubborn, we stiffen our backs, we are going to face the same thing we did last November 14; that is, defeat of this legislation.

We cannot afford to take this to the floor and defeat it. If that should happen, that would have more of a danger in terms of our leadership in the area of agriculture and also free trade, so it is my hope that both parties would begin to look at this in terms of trying to work a consensus, not trying to just push something through.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CRANE. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from my home State of Illinois (Mr. EWING), who was author of the original resolution that we have under consideration today.

(Mr. EWING asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. EWING. Madam Speaker, my personal thanks goes to the gentleman from Illinois (Chairman CRANE) and to the gentleman from California (Mr. MATSUI) for their support of this resolution, and to the gentleman from Texas (Chairman ARCHER) for seeing that this piece of legislation is brought to the floor. I am very appreciative. I think it is very important. I think it sets a pattern for all of us and for American agriculture.

The resolution is really very straightforward. It expresses the sense of Congress that liberalization of trade and agriculture should be a top priority in any negotiation between the U.S. and European Union on a trade agreement.

Agriculture has a unique role in our export economy. While the total U.S. trade position has been in deficit since 1971, U.S. agricultural exports have consistently been in surplus. Millions of Americans find their employment because of our agricultural exports. About 40 percent of American agricultural commodities are exported.

The European Union has an agricultural policy, though, that is one of the most archaic in the world. The Common Agricultural Policy and free market capitalism really are mutually exclusive. They spend billions of dollars subsidizing their agriculture products and exports. This, of course, disrupts our ability to trade with the European community.

In April of this year, the European Union proposed a new trans-Atlantic marketplace which would create a free trade agreement between the European community and the U.S. Amazingly, the proposed framework left out agriculture as one of the areas which would be negotiated.

The gentleman from Texas (Chairman ARCHER) imposed this resolution when he proposed an amendment which said, we will not just apply this to the European community but to all of our trading partners. I wholeheartedly adopt and accept his amendment.

The passage of the Freedom to Farm Act in 1996 set the policy that we must help our farmers be more reliant on the marketplace and less on big government solutions. Congress cannot on one hand say, look to the marketplace, and with the other hand allow access

to markets to be slammed shut. If the U.S. is unable to pry open foreign markets and be seen as a reliable supplier of agricultural products, calls for a return to farm payments and subsidies are inevitable.

□ 1245

We must guarantee our farmers access to foreign markets and fair and equitable treatment in those markets. I am proud to be a sponsor of this resolution in the House and ask Members to vote yes to express our commitment to protecting our farmers.

Mr. MATSUI. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. BERRY).

Mr. BERRY. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of this bill. I also rise in support of America's hard working farmers. The farmers in Arkansas are facing a crisis. Troubles are coming at them from all directions.

In our State we have drought, flooding, disease, low prices and no traditional safety net. Then we add in unfair competition, and they are at the end of their rope.

I come here today to ask my colleagues to join me to help them through this, and all America's farmers. House Concurrent Resolution 213 sends a message to the Europeans that we believe that huge export subsidies and restrictive trade barriers are unfair and should be ended. The American farmer is having to compete with the combined treasuries of the European Union. It is unwise to pump billions of dollars into inefficient farm practices to create produce which is inexpensive enough to compete in the international marketplace. This is what the European Union does.

Two big problems this creates are, it keeps their farmers from developing better farm practices, and it makes it impossible for our farmers to have a fair opportunity to sell their goods internationally. America exports 30 percent of its farm products despite the tough competition created by the subsidized European produce. Two years ago we changed our farm programs to make trade the safety net for America's farmers. The farmers in America are the most efficient in the world. Only if they have open access to foreign markets will trade be an adequate replacement for our old farm programs.

Normal trade relations, fast track and IMF, all of these should be done, and also the stabilization of the Asian economies, and they are all imperative to the U.S. farmer. So is leveling the playing field so our highly efficient farmers can succeed.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill and support fair trade.

Mr. CRANE. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN).

Mr. PORTMAN. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time. I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. MATSUI) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EWING) for bringing this resolution to the floor today.

It is very important that Congress go on record in the strongest possible terms that we have got to knock down agriculture barriers around the country, around the world.

The United States is committed to free and fair trade. In fact, we have not only the largest market in the world but in many respects the most open market in the world. Yet we see around the world that there are many countries that do not offer the same kind of treatment to our products. We have got to insist that other countries around the world, particularly in the developed world and particularly the European Union, open up their markets and comply with basic international rules that are found in the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, GATT, also the General Agreement on Trade and Services, and we must also insist that these other countries around the world fully comply with the decisions of the WTO.

I am particularly pleased that the House will now be on record today specifically objecting to the EU noncompliance with the clear WTO rulings against the European Union's banana regime and against their beef hormone policy.

We also are on record today urging that the President continue to steadfastly pursue full compliance with WTO dispute settlement decisions on these two matters. Again, I want to commend the chairman, the gentleman from California (Mr. MATSUI) and others for bringing this to the floor, for highlighting this issue, and for continuing to put pressure on the Europeans to do the right thing, to open their markets in a fair way to our products.

Mr. MATSUI. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CRANE. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER), chairman of the Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific of the Committee on International Relations.

(Mr. BEREUTER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BEREUTER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

I want to commend the two gentlemen from Illinois (Mr. CRANE) and (Mr. EWING) and the gentleman from California (Mr. MATSUI) for bringing this important resolution to the floor. I am in strong support of it.

It is extremely important for two reasons: First, it puts on notice those foreign countries that restrict access to U.S. agricultural exports that the United States will simply not continue to tolerate formal or disguised barriers to U.S. agriculture imports. Though the United States agriculture trade surplus totaled nearly $57 billion in 1997, it should have been at least 5 billion more. Because countries like China restrict our meat, wheat and citrus imports and the European Union hides behind pseudo phytosanitary and sanitary barriers to U.S. agricultural imports, we, our farmers, that is, are cost a lot of money, about 5 billion at least.

Mr. Speaker, Ambassador Carla Hills, former USTR, and President George Bush nearly imposed hundreds of millions of dollars in additional tariffs on European gourmet products sold in the United States because the European Union would not agree to reduce export subsidies under the Uruguay Round trade negotiations. That near trade war ultimately led to the Blair House agricultural trade accord and eventually the creation of the World Trade Organization.

Ambassador Hills and the President, President Bush, proved, through their proposed 301 trade action, that trade liberalization often only occurs when tough trade sanctions are taken or credibly threatened. It is an important lesson that Ambassador Barshefsky followed in her intellectual property rights action against the People's Republic of China, and it is a lessen we may have to revisit again.

Currently many foreign countries necessarily cling to protectionist policies in agriculture while reducing trade barriers in other sectors. The United States, as one of the world's most competitive agricultural exporters, cannot stand by while foreign countries deny our farmers the ability to sell their products.

Therefore, Madam Speaker, this resolution is also important because it tells the USTR that it must use all conceivable remedies to open foreign markets to U.S. agriculture exports.

Mr. Speaker, this Member rises in strong support of H. Con. Res. 213 and this Member would like to commend the two distinguished gentlemen from Illinois (Chairman CRANE and Chairman EWING) and the gentleman from California (Mr. MATSUI) for bringing this important resolution to the floor.

H. Con. Res. 213 is extremely important for two reasons. First, it puts on notice those foreign countries that restrict access to U.S. agricultural exports that the United States will simply not continue to tolerate formal or disguised barriers to U.S. agricultural imports. Though the United States agricultural trade surplus totalled approximately $57 billion in 1997, it should have been at least $5 billion more because countries like China restrict our meat, wheat, and citrus imports and the European Union hides behind pseudo phytosanitary and sanitary barriers to U.S. agricultural imports. Their actions cost American farmers approximately $5 billion in annual sales.

Mr. Speaker, Ambassador Carla Hills, the former USTR, and President George Bush nearly imposed hundreds of millions in additional tariffs on European gourmet products sold in the United States because the European Union would not agree to reduce export subsidies under the Uruguay Round trade negotiations. That near trade war ultimately led to the Blair House agricultural trade accord and eventually the creation of the World Trade

Organization. Ambassador Hills and President Bush proved through their proposed 301 trade action that trade liberalization often only occurs when tough trade sanctions are taken or credibly threatened. It is an important lesson that Ambassador Barshefsky followed in her intellectual property action against the People's Republic of China, and it is a lesson that we may have to revisit again.

Currently, many foreign countries necessarily cling to protectionist policies in agriculture while reducing trade barriers in other sectors. The United States, as one of the world's most competitive agricultural exporters, cannot stand by while foreign countries deny our farmers the ability to sell their products.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, this resolution is also important because it tells the United States Trade Representative that it must use all conceivable remedies to open foreign markets to U.S. agricultural exports. That includes not ''cherry picking,'' or negotiating trade liberalization in individual sectors, while undermining our ability to have a cross-sectoral, multilateral trade negotiation that drastically reduces barriers to agricultural trade. It also includes recognizing that we must use access to our own market as leverage to gain market access for U.S. agricultural exports worldwide. We cannot, for example, continue to see the European Union ignore science and impose its attitudes on hormones as a phoney barrier against beef exports from my state and our Nation.

This Member urges the United States Trade Representative to negotiate forcefully on behalf of U.S. agriculture as we approach the 1999 agricultural negotiations through the World Trade Organization.

This Member urges his colleagues to support H. Con. Res. 213.

Mr. CRANE. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. WATKINS), another distinguished colleague on the Committee on Ways and Means.

(Mr. WATKINS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WATKINS. Madam Speaker, in my 16 years of service in the United States Congress, I have never spoken twice one day after the other on the floor of the House. I rise to speak today because of the crisis of the American farmer and rancher. It is one that is caused by the closing of markets in Asia, where we normally export 45 percent of our agriculture exports.

We find also that the European Union is subsidizing their internal as well as their external markets by some 75 percent of their budget. Freedom to farm should mean also freedom to the markets.

Today we have also another crisis, and that is the most severe drought since the dust bowl days or 1934 and unless the weather changes the worst drought in the history of our country come September or come October. We have a survival problem on the farm. I urge President Clinton, Agriculture Secretary Dan Glickman, and this Congress to provide additional emergency drought relief funds for feed and hay assistance. I am delighted to be here supportive of this sense of the Congress, because for 20 months, since I have been back in Congress, I have pounded the table, I have talked about the unfair trade barrier of growth hormones with the European Union. They have literally stopped the market of United States beef and, think about the crisis. Our cattle people having to go to market because they do not have grass, hay or feed. The drought has wiped them out. They have to sell large numbers cheap on the domestic market. They cannot sell overseas. They are in an unfair situation.

I know the agony and the pain of the American cattleman because I was there in the drought of 1956. I was there selling cattle for 10 cents a pound. I know what they are going through. We must do everything we can. We must have the will to help the American farmer be able to stay on the farm and the cattlemen be able to continue to produce.

I was in Europe, and one of the Agriculture ministers said to me, we will pay whatever the price to maintain their domestic agriculture food basket. They will, because they went hungry twice, once in World War I and once in World War II. We must have the will if we are going to maintain the American agriculture for the National Security of our country.

Mr. MATSUI. Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT).

(Mr. TRAFICANT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TRAFICANT. Madam Speaker, I hate to come to the floor and oppose these bills, and I am certainly not going to oppose this resolution.

It bothers me when I oppose two of the finest Members of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CRANE), the gentleman from California (Mr. MATSUI). But so help me, I disagree with our trade policy.

I believe our trade policy is now a national security problem, and no one is looking at it. Our trade deficits continue to explode. Our negative balance of payments at record levels. And everybody idealistically pushing a button that I believe in all practical purposes is not working.

Quite frankly, many of our competitors simply do not open their markets. China, Europe, Japan, every President since Nixon threatened Japan with sanctions, including the current President, President Clinton. If every President had to threaten Japan every 2 years with sanctions, it is evident to me, just the son of a truck driver, that Japan has never complied, Japan has never opened their markets, and we are a bunch of fools.

China has a 34 percent tariff on most of our goods. They are selling tennis shoes, they were called sneakers in the old days, for $150 that cost 17 cents a pair to make over there. I do not see any signs in K Mart and Wal-Mart that say, these sneakers only cost $8 because they are only costing 17 cents in China. They are getting every penny they can out of it. They are squeezing the Buffalo on the nickel.

This is a sense of the Congress resolution. I can support it. But it does not have enough teeth.

The Constitution of the United States of America says, the United States Congress shall regulate commerce with foreign nations. It does not mean that we should turn that power over to the White House. It does not mean that a bunch of bureaucrats in the trade rep's office, who end up going on the employ of China and Japan corporations, should make that decision. Congress should do it.

Here is what I am saying. We should have a reciprocal trigger in our trade agreements that says, you have free trade as long as we have free trade. But when you put up a barrier, you will receive a barrier in kind from Uncle Sam.

That is the way to do it. If we do not, we are going to pay the piper, we are going to continue to lose big, good paying jobs. If I had $100 million to invest, I sure as hell would not invest it in America. I would go right across the board to Mexico with no regs, with low labor costs. And they are doing it. And get ready for it, no one wants to listen.

Idealism has taken over the United States Congress. I think Congress should be a little more practical, take back the powers that the Constitution has vested in us and regulate commerce with foreign nations on a fair, reciprocal basis.

If we do not do that, in my opinion we have failed the American worker, failed the American taxpayers and, worst of all, we fail ourselves, fail ourselves.

I love the chairman, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CRANE), and the gentleman from California (Mr. MATSUI). They are doing a good job. But I would hope that they would look at reciprocity and some fairness for American trade.

Mr. CRANE. Madam Speaker, I would remind my colleague from Youngstown that we are trying to move in that direction, and I know it is not as fast as he would like, but we are. I would again remind him that we have been, to our dismay, at full employment for almost 3 years in a row now.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LATHAM).

Mr. LATHAM. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time, and I want to thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CRANE) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EWING) for authorizing this resolution. I rise in strong support.

The European Union is a critical market for U.S. agriculture. U.S. agriculture exports to the European communities were 10.5 billion in 1997, and imports from the EU to the U.S. totaled about 7.5 billion.

However, the fact remains, the EU subsidizes agriculture far more than

the United States. The EU export subsidies and domestic support programs are estimated to total almost $50 billion. U.S. programs total about $5.5 billion. The European Union's agricultural policies are so punitive that they have actually been known to distort entire world markets.

□ 1300

Tariff and nontariff trade barriers must come down.

These policies hurt American farmers, they toy with our world markets, and we must level the playing field. Free and fair trade is critical to the success of our agricultural community.

This Congress will continue to fight for improved access for agricultural exports. The President should join Congress in reducing and eventually eliminating agriculture from foreign sanctions.

The 1999 World Trade Organization negotiations should address the issues that are important to America's farmers and important to rural America's economic health. The 1999 World Trade Organization negotiations present the administration with an opportunity to reduce barriers to free trade and expand on the many opportunities that will assist our cash-strapped farmers, and we must insist that decisions are based on sound science in Europe.

It is in the United States' best interests to address unfair trade practices during the next year's negotiations. Let's continue to push for reduction in nontariff trade barriers, and I hope the U.S.-European trade relationship will continue to be successful in the future.

Mr. CRANE. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN.)

(Mr. GILMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GILMAN. Madam Speaker, I would like to address a bill that passed already, and that is the common agricultural policy. I come to the floor in my capacity as chairman of our Committee on International Relations, and having participated for many years in the exchange between our Nation and the European Parliament, I certainly agree with the thrust of that measure.

The European Union's agricultural policies are certainly aggravating our bilateral relations and are harming American farmers and American high-tech industries. In our Committee on International Relations we have had a number of hearings on the EU's policies which unduly restrict exports of bioengineered products. We have taken that policy up directly with the president of the European Commission and with other members of the Commission, as well as with members of the European Parliament during our twice-yearly meetings.

We recently had a European parliamentary delegation visit Texas, during the course of which they visited Texas A&M University in College Station, where they met many European scientists working in the U.S. because their research cannot be supported in Europe. I think the Europeans are beginning to get the message. They are going to be left behind, with an antiquated, costly agricultural sector.

Of course, the EU's common agricultural policy is wrongheaded. Over time it will have to change because of changes in the world economy and because of the pending admission of Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic to the EU. The current policies of the EU are clearly not sustainable.

I understand the concerns of our farm sector now under the dual threat of drought conditions and of unfair subsidies from Europe. But I am concerned that the controversies over the effect of our sanctions policies have led some to blame the downturn in our agricultural exports as being related to the implementation of our national security statutes. In fact, sanctions affect, if anything, a very small proportion of our $60 billion agricultural exports.

And in the case of the Pakistan sanctions, we moved quickly, cooperating with the Committee on Agriculture, and amended the sanctions law to prevent any loss of our export markets by allowing substantial taxpayer dollars to help support wheat sales to Pakistan.

Madam Speaker, we need to concentrate on the real problems of agriculture. We should refrain from creating the impression that by tearing down our national security laws we are going to do something substantial to help our farmers.

I just want to remind my colleagues that we have important meetings with our European Union parliamentarians, and I would urge my colleagues to help participate in those exchanges. I think it would help them to more fully understand the complexities of our own problems.

Mr. MATSUI. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, before I yield back the balance of my time, to first commend the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CRANE) for bringing this bill through the subcommittee, the full committee, and on to the floor of the House; and I want to also congratulate, of course, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EWING) as well.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, reluctantly I must rise in opposition to H. Con. Res. 213. While I understand and support the interest of our domestic agricultural sector, this resolution could have far reaching negative ramifications.

This Sense of Congress expresses Congressional disapproval of the European Union's trade practices. In fact, the United States and the European Union should be getting together to explore how to develop better trade relations. This bill does not help this process.

I am particularly concerned about this hard line bargaining stance given the growing crisis for the many small banana farmers in the Caribbean Windward Islands. The United States Trade Representative, acting on behalf of the giant U.S. multinational corporation Chiquita Banana, unilaterally went to the World Trade Organization in an effort to tear down the relationship the European Union had with small and family farmers in the Carribean.

The European Union had set up a special trade relationship with their former colonies in the Carribean and West Africa. This was going to be sunseted in 10 years but Chiquita wanted it ended immediately, before the Carribean had a chance to develop alternative economic strategies. The United States Trade Representative still refuses to negotiate with the Windward Islands and they now face imminent economic catastrophe.

Our actions directly led to this negative outcome. This legislation only increases the possibility that other small developing countries will suffer as a result of our battles with other economic giants like the European Union. We need to approach each trade situation on a case by case basis and use thoughtful negotiating to avoid other Carribean like disasters. For these reasons I oppose this bill.

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H. Con. Res. 213, which expresses the sense of Congress that the elimination of restrictions on U.S. agricultural products by U.S. trading partners should be a top priority in trade negotiations. I congratulate Mr. Ewing, the sponsor of this resolution, Mr. Archer, the Chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, and Mr. Crane, the Chairman of the Trade Subcommittee, for bringing this resolution before the House.

It is very important that agriculture should be a top priority with the Administration in all trade negotiations. This resolution calls on the President to develop such a trade agenda and for the U.S. to seek competitive opportunities for U.S. agricultural exports. Finally, the resolution provides that the U.S. Trade Representative should not engage in trade negotiations with the European Union if the U.S. Trade Representative determines that trade negotiations would undermine a successful result in the 1999 WTO negotiations.

While this resolution is directed at all nations, the European Union is specifically mentioned. Using any yardstick, the EU subsidizes agriculture more than the U.S. This is a well known fact. EU export subsidies and domestic support total $47 billion. U.S. export subsidies and domestic support total $5.3 billion.

Not only does the EU spend large amounts of money, it spends that money on programs that distort world markets. Certainly the EU should spend whatever it and its taxpayers determine appropriate to support EU farmers. But the EU should not link that support to production and thereby distort world agriculture markets.

For American farmers and ranchers, trade is an essential part of their livelihood. Currently exports account for 30% of U.S. farm cash receipts. We produce much more than we consume in the United States; therefore exports are vital to the prosperity and success of U.S. farmers and ranchers.

H. Con. Res. 213 cites specific disputes with the European Union. Two cases brought by the U.S. against EU agriculture practices regarding trade in beef and bananas resulted in positive decisions for the U.S. Despite that, no trade in beef or bananas has resumed.

In 1996, significant reforms were made to U.S. farm programs. These reforms returned control of the farming operation to the producers in exchange for sharp restrictions on the

level of government support to the farmer. The goal was to provide U.S. farmers with the flexibility to plant for the market. Farmer's income will come from the marketplace and not from the government. For this plan to be successful, the U.S. government must ensure that our farmers and ranchers can compete against other exporters, and not against foreign governments.

This resolution expresses the importance of U.S. agricultural trade and I urge Members to support H. Con. Res. 213.

Mr. MATSUI. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CRANE. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. EMERSON). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CRANE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 213, as amended.

The question was taken.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 5 of rule I and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

MISCELLANEOUS TRADE AND TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS ACT OF 1998

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4342) to make miscellaneous and technical changes to various trade laws, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 4342

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''Miscellaneous Trade and Technical Corrections Act of 1998''.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

TITLE I—MISCELLANEOUS TRADE CORRECTIONS

Sec. 1001. Clerical amendments.
Sec. 1002. Obsolete references to GATT.

TITLE II—TEMPORARY DUTY SUSPENSIONS; OTHER TRADE PROVISIONS

Subtitle A—Temporary Duty Suspensions

Sec. 2001. 6-chloro-4-(cyclopropylethynyl)-1, 4-dihydro-4-(trifluromethyl)-2h-3, 1-Benzoxazin-2-one.
Sec. 2002. Oxirane, (s)-triphenylmethyloxy)methyl)-.
Sec. 2003. [r-(r*,r*)]-1,2,3,4-butanetetrol-1,4-dimethanesulfonate.
Sec. 2004. (s)-n-[[5-[2-(2-amino-4,6,7,8-tetrahydro-4-oxo-1h-pyrimido[5,4-b][1,4]thiazin-6-yl)ethyl]-2-thienyl]carbonyl]-l-glutamic acid.
Sec. 2005. 2-Amino-6-methyl-5-(4-pyridinylthio)-4-(1h)-quinazolinone, dihydrochloride.
Sec. 2006. 9-[2-[[bis [(pivaloyloxy) methoxy] phosphinyl]- methoxy] ethyl]adenine.
Sec. 2007. (R)-9-[-2-(phos phononmethoxy propyl)adenine.
Sec. 2008. (R)-propylene carbonate.
Sec. 2009. 9-(2-hydroxyethyl)adenine.
Sec. 2010. (R)-9-(2-hydroxypropyl)adenine.
Sec. 2011. Chloromethyl-2-propyl carbonate.
Sec. 2012. (R)-chloropropanediol.
Sec. 2013. Irganox 1520.
Sec. 2014. Irganox 1425.
Sec. 2015. Irganox 565.
Sec. 2016. Irganox 1520LR.
Sec. 2017. Irgacor 252LD.
Sec. 2018. Irgacor 1405.
Sec. 2019. 2-amino-4-(4-aminobenzoyl amino)-benzenesulfonic acid sodium salt.
Sec. 2020. 5-amino-n-(2-hydroxyethyl)-2,3-xylenesulfonamide.
Sec. 2021. 3-amino-2′-(sulfatoethyl sulfonyl) ethyl benzamide.
Sec. 2022. ACM.
Sec. 2023. C.I. Pigment Yellow 109.
Sec. 2024. C.I. Pigment Yellow 110.
Sec. 2025. Halofenozide.
Sec. 2026. β-bromo-β-nitrostyrene.
Sec. 2027. Beta Hydroxyalkylamide.
Sec. 2028. 2,6-dimethyl-m-dioxan-4-ol Acetate.
Sec. 2029. Grilamid TR90.
Sec. 2030. C.I. Pigment Yellow 181.
Sec. 2031. Butanamide, 2,2′-[3,3′-dichloro [1,1′-biphenyl]-4,4′-diyl) bis (azo)] bis [n-(2,3-dihydro-2-oxo-1h-benzimidazol-5-yl)-3-oxo (pigment orange).
Sec. 2032. Butanamide, n,n′-(3,3′dimethyl[1,1′-biphenyl]-4,4′-diyl)bis[2-[2,4-dichlorophenyl)azo]-3-oxo-.
Sec. 2033. C.I. Pigment Yellow 154.
Sec. 2034. C.I. Pigment Yellow 180.
Sec. 2035. C.I. Pigment Yellow 191.
Sec. 2036. KN001.
Sec. 2037. DEMT.
Sec. 2038. IN–w4280.
Sec. 2039. 2-chloro-n-[2,6-dinitro-4-(trifluoromethyl)phenyl]-N-ethyl-6-fluorobenzene-methanamine.
Sec. 2040. Propanoic acid, 2-[4-[(5-chloro-3-fluoro-2-pyridinyl)oxy]phenoxy]-2-propynyl ester.
Sec. 2041. 2,4-dichloro 3,5-dinitrobenzotrifluoride.
Sec. 2042. Acetic acid, [(5-chloro-8-quinolinyl)oxy]-, 1-methylhexyl ester.
Sec. 2043. Acetic acid, [[2-chloro-4-fluoro-5-[(tetrahydro-3-oxo-1H, 3H-[1,3,4] thiadiazolo [3,4-a]pyridazin-1-ylidene)amino]phenyl]thio]-, methyl ester.
Sec. 2044. Chloroacetone.
Sec. 2045. Sodium N-methyl-N oleoyl taurate.
Sec. 2046. Dialkylnaphthalene sulfonic acid sodium salt.
Sec. 2047. O-(6-chloro-3-phenyl-4-pyridazinyl)-S-octyl-carbonothioate.
Sec. 2048. 4-cyclopropyl-6-methyl-2-phenylamino-pyrimidine.
Sec. 2049. O, O-dimethyl-s-[5-methoxy-2-oxo-1,3,4-thiadiazol-3(2h)-yl-methyl]-dithiophosphate.
Sec. 2050. (Ethyl [2-(4-phenoxyphenoxy) ethyl] carbamate.
Sec. 2051. 3-(6-methoxy-4-methyl-1,3,5-triazin-2-yl)-1-[2-(2-chloroethoxy)-phenylsulfonyl]-urea.
Sec. 2052. [(2S,4R)/(2R,4S)]/[(2R,4R)/(2S,4S)-1-{2-[4-(4-chloro-phenoxy)-2-chlorophenyl]-4-methyl-1,3-dioxolan-2-yl-methyl}-1H-1,2,4-triazole.
Sec. 2053. Substrates of synthetic quartz or synthetic fused silica.
Sec. 2054. KL540.
Sec. 2055. Methyl thioglycolate.
Sec. 2056. Tebufenozide.
Sec. 2057. Organic luminescent pigments, dyes, and fibers for security applications, and 4-Hexylresorcinol (excluding daylight florescent pigments and dyes).
Sec. 2058. DPX–e6758.
Sec. 2059. Benzenepropanal, 4-(1,1-Dimethylethyl)-alpha-Methyl-.
Sec. 2060. Elimination of duty on Ziram.
Sec. 2061. Ethylene, tetrafluoro copolymer with ethylene (ETFE).
Sec. 2062. 2-naphthalene-carboxamide 4-[[5-[[[4-(aminocarbonyl)phenyl]amino] carbonyl]-2-methoxyphenyl]azo]-n-(5-chloro-2,4-dimethoxyphenyl)-3-hydroxy-.
Sec. 2063. Benzenesulfonic acid, 4-[[3-[[2-hydroxy-3-[[4-methoxyphenyl) amino]carbonyl]-1-naphthalenyl]azo]-4-methylbenzoyl]amino]-, calcium salt (2:1).
Sec. 2064. Pigment Red 185.
Sec. 2065. Pigment Red 208.
Sec. 2066. Pigment Red 188.
Sec. 2067. Certain weaving machines.
Sec. 2068. Chloromethyl pivalate.
Sec. 2069. 9-[2-(r)-[[bis [[isopropoxycarbonyl) oxymethoxy]phosphinoyl] methoxy]propyl] adenine fumarate (1:1).
Sec. 2070. Diethyl p-toluene sulfonyloxymenthylphosphonate.
Sec. 2071. 1,4-benzenedicarboxylic acid, 2-[[1-[[(2,3-di-hydro-2-oxo-1h-benzimidazol-5-yl)amino carbonyl]-2-oxopropyl]azo]-,dimethyl ester.
Sec. 2072. Anti-HIV/anti-AIDS drugs.
Sec. 2073. Anti-cancer drugs.
Sec. 2074. 2-amino-5-bromo-6-methyl-4-(1h)-quinazol- inone.
Sec. 2075. 2-amino-6-methyl-5-(4-pyridinylthio)-4-(1h)-quinazolinone.
Sec. 2076. 2-amino-5-nitrothiazole.
Sec. 2077. 2-amino-5-nitrobenzenesulfonic acid, monosodium salt.
Sec. 2078. 2-amino-5-nitrobenzenesulfonic acid, monoammonium salt.
Sec. 2079. 2-amino-5-nitrobenzenesulfonic acid.
Sec. 2080. 3-(4,5-dihydro-3-methyl-5-oxo-1h-pyrazol-1-y1)benzenesulfonic acid.
Sec. 2081. 4-chloro-3-nitrobenzenesulfonic acid.
Sec. 2082. 4-chloro-3-nitrobenzenesulfonic acid, monopotassium salt.
Sec. 2083. 4-chloro-3-nitrobenzenesulfonic acid, monosodium salt.
Sec. 2084. 2-methyl-5-nitrobenzenesulfonic acid.
Sec. 2085. 6-bromo-2,4,dinitroaniline.
Sec. 2086. 4-chloropyridine hydrochloride.
Sec. 2087. 3-ethoxycarbonyl-aminophenyl-n-phenyl- carbamate (desmedipham).
Sec. 2088. [s-(r*,r*)]-2,3-dihydroxy-butanedioic acid.
Sec. 2089. (3s)-2,2-dimethyl-3-thiomorpholine carboxylic acid.
Sec. 2090. Diiodomethyl-*p*-tolylsulfone.
Sec. 2091. 2-ethoxy-2,3-dihydro-3,3-dimethyl-5-benzofuranyl methanesulfonate (ethofumesate).
Sec. 2092. Skating boots for use in the manufacture of in-line roller skates.
Sec. 2093. 2-4-dichloro-5-hydrazino-phenol-monohy- drochloride.