

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of business arising under the Constitution mandatory in nature for the House have been held to have a privilege which superseded the rules establishing the order of business.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 co-sponsors. 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 coun-

tervailing 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 Sig-

natures 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 Covenants, Lewis and Clark National Historic Trail, I would have voted "yes".

Rollcall vote 550, on the motion to suspend 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

rates in community activities. In order to have high quality family literacy programs, we need to ensure the instruction provided to both adult and child participants is based on sound scientific research on reading. By authorizing research on how adults learn to read as a part of this legislation, we are taking a positive step in this direction.

In addition, the LIFT Act would help raise the quality of family literacy programs by allowing States to use a portion of their Even Start dollars to provide training and technical assistance to Even Start providers. States would provide such training through a grant, contract, or other agreement with an organization experienced in providing quality training and technical assistance to family literacy instructors. States could not, however, reduce the level of service to program participants in order to provide such training and technical assistance.

The LIFT Act would also permit Even Start projects to operate for more than 8 years. I have heard from many projects that they will have difficulty continuing to operate once Federal support for their project is totally eliminated. As such, the LIFT Act would allow projects to receive Federal support for more than 8 years, but would reduce the level of support to 35 percent of the cost of operating the project. States would, however, be able to eliminate funding for any project if it did not meet program goals and State indicators of program quality.

The final change I want to highlight is a provision which would focus additional program dollars on high needs populations. Once funding for the Even Start Family Literacy Program reaches \$250 million, a total of 6 percent of funding would be reserved to serve migrants and Native Americans. These are some of our most vulnerable families and I believe it is most appropriate to use additional funds to serve their needs. At the present time, a total of 5 percent of program dollars are reserved for Even Start projects for migrants and Native Americans.

Mr. Speaker, these are but a few of the highlights of this important legislation. Its enactment will ensure the long-term success of Even Start and other family literacy programs operated with Federal funds by providing for quality improvements. I urge my colleagues to join me in support of this legislation.

HONORING UAW LOCAL 599'S 60TH ANNIVERSARY AND THE RECIPIENTS OF THE "WALTER P. REUTHER DISTINGUISHED SERVICE AWARD"

HON. DEBBIE STABENOW

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 4, 1999

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to recognize the 60th anniversary of UAW Local 599 which will be celebrated on November 6, 1999, and the men and women who will receive the "Walter P. Reuther Distinguished Service Award."

The same solidarity that began in 1937 and 44 days later resulted in the first major industry wide contract in the United States is still thriving today. During those 44 days and nights the members of the fledgling UAW and

the Flint community forged an alliance which has endured for the past 60 years. The brothers and sisters of Local 599 continue to give back to the community that played such a pivotal role in their success. Local 599 has collected over \$1 million to help provide community residents with shelter, food, clothing, and medical care. They have coordinated the Marine Toys For Tots program which has given 10,000 children the overwhelming joy and excitement of a Christmas morning surprise for the past 10 years. The list of organizations to which they have given is long and includes the United Way, Easter Seals, American Cancer Society, Good Will, and the Salvation Army. The "Walter P. Reuther Distinguished Service Award" is being presented to Robert Aidif, David Aiken, Dale Bingley, Dennis Carl, Jesse Collins, Russell W. Cook, Harvey "Whitey" De Groot, Patrick Dolan, Larry Farlin, Maurice "Mo" Felling, Ted Henderson, Ken Mead, Frank Molina, Shirley Prater, Gene Ridley, John D. Rogers, Dale Scanlon, G. Jean Garza-Smith, Robbie Stevens, Nick Vukovich, Jerry Ward, Greg Wheeler, Don Wilson, Tom Worden, and James Yaklin in recognition of 20 years of recorded service in an elective office in the local union. These individuals have served their union brothers and sisters of UAW Local 599 and their communities with unparalleled devotion and perseverance.

I would like to thank the men and women receiving the "Walter P. Reuther Distinguished Service Award" for their contributions and UAW Local 599 for 60 years of solidarity not only within the plant, but throughout the community. The union brothers and sisters of UAW Local 599 epitomize the values that have made our Nation great.

WOMEN'S HEALTH AND CANCER RIGHTS CONFORMING AMENDMENTS OF 1999

HON. SUE W. KELLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 4, 1999

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce the Women's Health and Cancer Rights Conforming Amendments of 1999. This bill is a technical correction to legislation adopted by Congress last year that ensures reconstructive surgery coverage for all stages of reconstruction, including symmetrical reconstruction, for breast cancer patients.

In the last Congress I introduced H.R. 616, the Women's Health and Cancer Rights Act of 1998. A specific provision of this bill that requires coverage for reconstructive procedures after breast cancer surgery was passed into law in Title IX of the Omnibus Budget Bill. While passage of last year's legislation was a wonderful step forward, a loophole has been identified which seriously weakens the intent of this legislation. The bill I am proposing would correct this flaw by conforming the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to the requirements consistent with the Women's Health and Cancer Rights Act. This change would provide a civil monetary penalty against those health plans who fail to provide coverage for breast reconstruction following mastectomy or other breast cancer surgery.

There is indeed precedence for such a technical correction. Similar corrections were made

to the Internal Revenue Code as part of the Taxpayer's Relief Act of 1997 to ensure compliance to the Mental Health Parity Act of 1996 and the Newborns' and Mothers' Health Protection Act of 1996. The correction I am seeking today is like these and would ensure compliance to the Women's Health and Cancer Rights Act of 1998.

Studies have documented that the fear of losing a breast is a leading reason why women do not participate in early breast cancer detection programs. Now that coverage is guaranteed for reconstructive surgery following breast cancer surgery, it is time to put the teeth in that language and hold health plans accountable for providing that coverage. As we continue this month of Breast Cancer Awareness, let us make this important correction to ensure the best possible support for breast cancer victims.

CONCERN WITH THE NEXT ROUND OF THE WTO AND TRADE LIBERALIZATION

HON. ENI F.H. FALEOMAVAEGA

OF AMERICAN SAMOA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 4, 1999

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, the prospect of a "Millennium Round" of trade liberalization is inspiring heated debate both within the United States and the international community. While further liberalization could bring new opportunities for growth, there is much evidence that the costs of free trade have thus far outweighed the benefits for the majority of the world's people.

Mr. Speaker, if the United States is to maintain its commitment to strengthening democracy domestically and abroad, and to improving the quality of life for all its citizens, it is imperative that a thorough review of WTO policies and procedures be undertaken. Too many questions remain about the effects of trade liberalization—as illustrated by our Nation's mixed experience with NAFTA—and the United States should not rush blindly into a new round of WTO negotiations.

On this timely subject, Mr. Speaker, I recommend to our colleagues and the Nation an excellent article authored by Nora Connor, a Research Associate with the highly-regarded Council on Hemispheric Affairs (COHA), which is based in Washington.

WTO FACES INTERNAL DISCORD, PUBLIC OPPOSITION

With the World Trade Organization ministerial meetings just days away, trade officials are still arguing over the basic agenda for the Seattle event. An October meeting in Lausanne clarified differences among participants, but saw little progress toward resolving them. Though certain items were to be given priority for a possible "Millennium Round" of trade talks, consensus has proven elusive. WTO member countries remain divided on issues such as the impact of the organization on environmental and labor issues, as well as the prioritization of specific agenda items.

In addition, WTO representatives will be facing raucous public opposition to a new round of trade talks. Numerous national and international groups have denounced the effects of previous free trade measures. These groups have planned large-scale protests to coincide with the ministerial, acting on behalf of labor rights, the environment, sustainable development, consumer rights,