and antisubsidy laws and to defend those laws in international negotiations. In fact, Article 6 of the original General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT), signed in 1947, declares that dumping ''shall not be condoned.''

Furthermore, Section 702 of House Rule IX, entitled ''General Principles,'' concluded that certain matters of business arising under the Constitution mandatory in nature for the House have been held to have a privilege which superseded the rules establishing the order of business. This is a question of the House's Constitutional authority and is therefore privileged in nature. In the 105th Congress, the House ruled favorably on a measure which contained a constitutional question similar to the one before it now. On March 5, 1998, the House held that H. Res. 379, a resolution which stated that only the House had the authority to originate a revenue provision, had privilege under Rule IX, and then approved the resolution. This resolution was in response to a Senate measure which infringed upon the House's constitutional duty by repealing a revenue provision and replacing it with a user fee. H. Res. 379 had privilege before the House because the Senate provision was a revenue reducing measure. The question of privilege currently before the House concerns the same principle. A trade agreement signed by the President commits the United States and is binding under international law, even if the Congress never ratifies it. Eliminating or weakening AD or CVD laws would reduce United States Treasury receipts, thus reducing overall revenue. If these laws are placed on the table for negotiations, it would give the Administration the authority to commit the United States to agreements under power it does not have. For these reasons, my motion has privilege.

The WTO antidumping and antisubsidy rules concluded in the Uruguay Round have scarcely been tested since they entered into effect and certainly have not proved defective. Opening these rules to renegotiation could only lead to weakening them, which would in turn lead to an even greater abuse of the world's open markets, particularly that of the United States. Avoiding another divisive fight over these rules is the best way to promote progress on the other, far more important, issues facing WTO members; and it is therefore essential that negotiations on these antidumping and antisubsidy matters not be reopened under the auspices of the WTO or otherwise. Under present circumstances, launching a negotiation that includes antidumping and antisubsidy issues would affect the rights of the House and the integrity of its proceedings.

A precedent exists for bringing H. Res. 298 out of committee and to the House floor immediately. On October 26, 1999, H. Con. Res. 190 was brought to the floor under suspension of the rules because it concerned the upcoming Seattle Round. This measure only had 13 co-sponsors, while H. Res. 298 has 228 cosponsors. The majority of the House should be heard.

Two hundred and twenty-nine Members of the House of Representatives call upon the President: not to participate in any international negotiation in which antidumping or antisubsidy rules are part of the negotiating agenda; to refrain from submitting for congressional approval agreements that require changes to the current antidumping and countervailing duty laws and enforcement policies of the United States; and to enforce the antidumping and countervailing duty laws vigorously in all pending and future cases.

Mr. Speaker, this debate today is not about the merits of my resolution, nor is it about the 228 cosponsors who would like to see this matter resolved before the House. My question of privilege regards the sanctity of our proceedings as a House. The U.S. Constitution conveys upon this body the power to originate revenue provisions. It is not only our responsibility, it is our duty and obligation to send a clear message to the Administration that the United States House of Representatives will not weaken its trade laws. We need to live up to our obligations.

Mr. Speaker, since a majority of the Members of this House have signed onto the original resolution as cosponsors, I ask the Speaker to recognize any Member wishing to speak on the resolution.

HONORING THE SUFFOLK COUNTY AHRC

HON. MICHAEL P. FORBES

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 4, 1999

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my warmest wishes and congratulations to the Suffolk County Chapter of the Association for the Help of Retarded Children and to its honorees; Robert R. McMillan and Marvin L. Colson. Over the last 50 years, the Suffolk County AHRC has dedicated itself to providing educational and vocational training to both children and adults with disabilities. It gives these children and adults unique opportunities that they may otherwise have never been exposed to, and it focuses on improving all aspects of their lives. The AHRC's commitment to people with disabilities has helped and will continue to ensure that they are provided with the best care and training to further enhance their lives, and its exemplary record should serve as a shining example for all other such organizations.

This year's honorees have also proven their commitment to Long Island and people with disabilities and should be commended for their work. As the founder and chairman of the Long Island Housing Partnership, Inc., Robert R. McMillan has been devoted to creating affordable housing. As the director of the Long Island Development Disabilities, Marvin L. Colson has dedicated over 26 years to serving the disabled. Once again, I would like to congratulate and thank the AHRC and its honorees for all they have done for Suffolk County.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. SUE WILKINS MYRICK

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 4, 1999

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I missed 3 recorded votes on November 1, 1999 while I was working in my district. If I had been present, I would have voted as follows:

Rollcall vote 552, on the motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 1714, Electronic Signatures in Global and National Commerce Act, I would have voted ''yes''.

Rollcall vote 551, on the motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 2737, the Land Conveyance, Lewis and Clark National Historic Trail, I would have voted ''yes''.

Rollcall vote 550, on the motion to susped the rules and pass H.R. 348, to authorize a national civil defense and emergency management memorial, I would have voted ''yes''.

THE LITERACY INVOLVES FAMILIES TOGETHER ACT

HON. WILLIAM F. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 4, 1999

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill to improve programs for family literacy, better known as LIFT (Literacy Involves Families Together). The purpose of this legislation is to improve the quality of services provided under the Even Start Family Literacy Program and other Federal programs providing family literacy services.

As the author of the Even Start Family Literacy Program when it was first enacted in 1988, I want to be sure that the services provided to program participants are of the highest quality. Family literacy programs that are intensive and provide participants with high quality services are a very effective means of breaking the cycle of illiteracy that occurs in many families.

As we all know, parental support is instrumental to a child's academic success. Unfortunately, there are many parents who are unable to support their child's education because they themselves have dropped out of school or have a low level of literacy. Family literacy programs provide adult education services to parents and, at the same time, help ensure that their children do not fall behind in school. By working with parents and children at the same time, family literacy programs have successfully helped parents reduce their dependency on Federal assistance, obtain employment, or even advance in their current jobs. For children, the picture is just as bright. Children who participate in family literacy programs with their parents perform well in school.

Mr. Speaker, the legislation I am introducing will improve family literacy programs through several important changes to current law. For example, this legislation would authorize and provide funding for a research project to find the most effective ways to improve literacy among adults with reading difficulties. The National Institute for Child Health and Human Development has provided us with high quality scientific research on the best method for teaching children to read and the bill requires instructional programs for children to be based on scientifically based reading research. Unfortunately, there is no comparable body of research on teaching reading to adults. And yet, the statistics on adult illiteracy in this country are staggering.

According to the National Adult Literacy Survey, 40 million adults, or 20 percent of the U.S. adult population, scored at the lowest of five levels of literacy. In real terms, this means that 40 million adults struggle to maintain good jobs, have a difficult time supporting their children's education, and have poor participation