

WTO was not a Republican one.

Just a few minutes ago, one of our colleagues from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) suggesting his great concerns about the WTO and was very critical of his own Administration. I would say to the National Journal, when they do an article like that cover story on Republican isolationism perhaps they ought to be a little bit more careful that they are doing it competently and that they are not doing it with bias.

I was also very concerned, Mr. Speaker, when I saw some comments by National Security Advisor Sandy Berger when the conflict took place in East Timor. He suggested in a variety of ways, some things he has retracted, others he has not, that we, of course, could not be involved even in assisting the Australians in trying to keep peace in East Timor because, after all, it was not in the center of Europe.

Now, if that is not isolationism, at least it is Eurocentrism, and it is the kind of thing that bothers Asians and Pacific leaders and their citizens, and with good cause.

I urge my colleagues to take a look at the need to come back for bipartisanship in foreign policy and I urge the administration, Mr. Speaker, to be more careful that they do not alienate some of their best friends for a bipartisan foreign policy on the Republicans' side of the aisle in either House of Congress.

#### WTO IN SEATTLE

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, many of us have come to this floor of the House of Representatives today and on previous days for 5 minutes and 1 minutes in various speeches to talk about asking that the United States not support accession for China to the World Trade Organization. We are instead insisting that labor standards and environmental standards be applied to our trading partners, the same kind of environmental standards and labor standards that we follow in this country. If that makes us isolationists, as my friend, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER) suggested earlier, then so be it. But the fact is that those of us that believe in the right kinds of labor standards and the right kinds of environmental standards around the world want to lift people up around the world, not continue this downward spiral on food safety and labor standard and environmental standards that our trading policy seems to move us towards.

Republican leadership last week wrote a letter to the administration demanding that our USTR, U.S. trade rep bureaucrats, do not include labor standards in any of the discussions at the World Trade Organization. The Republican leadership of the Committee

on Ways and Means is insisting that the U.S. trade rep ensure that developing countries require that we protect property rights but not human rights, not labor standards, not environmental rights.

At the same time, Mr. Speaker, Trade Ambassador Charlene Barshefsky, an unelected official who never seems to miss an opportunity to publicly diminish the importance of labor rights, was supposed to meet with some of us here in the House last night and explain whether or not the administration really plans to push for stronger worker environmental rights in Seattle.

What happened? Did we have a chance to talk about how Huffy Bicycle has closed its last American plant because it cannot compete with cheap imports from China, a place where trying to form an independent trade union will get one thrown in prison or even killed?

Did we have a chance to talk about some of the maquiladora factories in Mexico which dump their pollution into the same water that their workers have to drink?

Did we get a chance to talk about why armed guards will not permit independent monitors into the garment factories in El Salvador which ship millions of dollars worth of merchandise here every year?

No, we did not, and that is because Ambassador Barshefsky and a score of other American trade bureaucrats were heading off to the People's Republic of China to try to secure a last minute deal to get China into the World Trade Organization.

As we speak, U.S. trade bureaucrats are busy coddling the same gang of dictators that are busy arresting, torturing and even killing Chinese people that practice Falun Gong, which as far as I can tell is the same thing as torturing and killing Christians and Muslims and any other group of people that have spiritual beliefs in that country.

So instead of having a real dialogue on whether the Seattle ministerial will have any discussion about human rights, worker rights, human rights, instead of having a chance to hear exactly what is going to happen in Seattle, the administration wants to commit this country to a policy that will continue to hurt workers, a policy that continues the human rights abuses, child labor, slave labor, forced abortions, persecution of Christians and Muslims and Falun Gong and all kinds of religious minorities in China that will continue to allow that kind of policy to happen in China.

We can bet the farm on it. If the People's Republic of China accedes to the World Trade Organization, if this country's government supports China accession to the World Trade Organization, that is the last we will ever hear about human rights.

Do we really think a totalitarian government that performs forced abortions is ever going to protect labor

rights? Do we believe that a totalitarian government which kills thousands of its own people in slave labor camps and then sells their organs is ever going to let the WTO implement any sort of framework to protect the rights of workers?

Mr. Speaker, we should stand strong against the accession of China to the WTO.

#### ANTIDUMPING AND ANTISUBSIDY PROVISIONS SHOULD NOT BE NEGOTIATED AWAY IN NEW ROUND OF WTO

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

Mr. VISLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to press my argument that as the new round of WTO negotiations begin in Seattle later this month, we should support the administration's position not to negotiate away the antidumping and antisubsidy provisions of our trade laws.

I would also ask that this House vote to support this position by supporting H. Res. 298.

Seattle is the follow-on to the Uruguay Round which was completed on April 15, 1994, and signed by ministers from over 125 countries. Part of this agreement included changes to the antidumping laws which had been included in GATT since its original inception in 1947. In fact, article 6 of the 1947 GATT states very clearly that the contracting parties recognize that dumping is to be condemned.

The scope of negotiations at the Seattle round discussions of the World Trade Organization were specified during the Uruguay Round. However, some countries now are seeking to circumvent the agreed list of negotiating topics and reopen the debate over the WTO's antidumping and antisubsidy rules.

Antidumping duties are assessed on imported merchandise that is sold at less than fair market value. Countervailing duties are assessed to reverse the effects of foreign government subsidies to manufacturers. Today, over 290 products from 59 countries have been found to have been traded in violation of these international standards.

The ability to impose binding tariffs and apply them equitably to all trading partners is the key to a smooth and liberal flow of trade. Many of my colleagues think that this is a steel issue. That could not be further from the truth. The experience of the U.S. cement industry indicates that the antidumping law can be an effective remedy for unfairly priced imports.