



Tariff Modifications: Miscellaneous Tariff Bills

Vivian C. Jones
Specialist in International Trade and Finance

July 23, 2010

Congressional Research Service

7-5700

www.crs.gov

RL33867

Summary

Importers often request that Members of Congress introduce bills seeking to suspend or reduce tariffs on certain imports on their behalf. The vast majority of these commodities are chemicals, raw materials, or other components used as inputs in the manufacturing process. The rationale for these requests, in general, is that they help domestic producers of the downstream goods reduce costs, thus making their products more competitive. In turn, these cost reductions can be passed on to the consumer.

In recent congressional practice, House Ways and Means and Senate Finance Committees, the committees of jurisdiction over tariffs, have combined these duty suspension bills and other technical trade provisions into larger pieces of legislation known as miscellaneous tariff bills (MTBs). Before inclusion in an MTB, the individual legislative proposals introduced by Members are reviewed by trade subcommittee staff and several executive branch agencies to ensure that they are noncontroversial (generally, that no domestic producer objects) and relatively revenue-neutral (revenue loss of no more than \$500,000 per item).

Late in the 109th Congress, the last time that MTB legislation was passed, the House passed H.R. 6406, a trade package that included suspension of duties on about 380 products until December 31, 2009. The legislation was inserted into H.R. 6111, a previously House-passed tax extension package. The Senate approved H.R. 6111, including the duty suspensions, and the bill was signed by the President on December 20, 2006 (P.L. 109-432). Tariff suspensions on about 300 other products were previously inserted into H.R. 4, The Pension Protection Act of 2006 (P.L. 109-280).

In the 110th Congress, congressional ethics and earmark reform legislation also targeted “limited tariff benefit[s],” defined as “a provision modifying the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States in a manner that benefits 10 or fewer entities.” This legislation amended House and Senate rules to make it out of order to consider bills containing earmarks, limited tax benefits, or *limited tariff benefits* unless certain disclosure and reporting requirements are met by the Member proposing the legislation and the committees of jurisdiction. Even though a November 2007 House Ways and Means Trade Subcommittee advisory called for House Members to submit legislative proposals for inclusion in a proposed MTB by December 14, 2007, no omnibus bill was introduced in either House.

In the 111th Congress, H.R. 4380, the Miscellaneous Trade and Technical Corrections Act of 2009, was introduced on December 15, 2009. This bill temporarily suspends or reduces for three years duties on over 600 products, many of which renew duty suspension or reductions that were already in place. In the Senate, Senate Finance Committee Chairman Max Baucus and Ranking Member Chuck Grassley requested on October 1, 2009, that Senators introduce miscellaneous tariff measures by the end of October—after an agreement was reached regarding additional disclosure requirements for lobbyists recommending MTB provisions. On July 7, 2010, a manager’s amendment was introduced. The House passed H.R. 4380, the United States Manufacturing Enhancement Act of 2010, by a vote of 378-43 on July 21, 2010.

Contents

Introduction	1
MTB Legislation.....	1
109 th Congress	1
110 th Congress	1
“Limited Tariff Benefit” in Ethics Legislation	2
111 th Congress.....	3
Committee, Agency, and Executive Review of MTB Legislation	4
Agency and Executive Review.....	5
International Trade Commission’s Role	5
Administration’s Response.....	6
Policy Considerations	6
Concerns About Passage of Omnibus MTBs.....	7
Rationale for Passage of Duty Suspensions	7

Tables

Table 1. Miscellaneous Trade Legislation, 97 th Congress to the Present.....	9
---	---

Contacts

Author Contact Information	11
----------------------------------	----

Introduction

Due to Congress's constitutional role as the primary actors in international trade policy, any modification of tariffs must be approved by Congress. Constituents, usually manufacturers or representatives of industry associations, will sometimes ask Members to introduce legislation seeking to reduce, repeal, or temporarily suspend duties on certain imports. Since the early 1980s, the House Ways and Means and Senate Finance committees, the primary committees of jurisdiction on trade matters, have tended to incorporate these duty suspension requests into omnibus legislation known as miscellaneous trade and technical corrections bills (MTBs). The introduction of MTB legislation in an omnibus format appears to have originated in the 97th Congress, when 58 duty suspensions were enacted in P.L. 97-446. These larger trade packages may also include minor technical corrections to U.S. trade laws and specific instructions to U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) regarding shipments of certain imported products.

This report discusses the current process by which duty suspension bills and other provisions are introduced, reviewed by several government agencies and committee staff, made available for public comment, and finally included in omnibus MTB legislation reported out by the committees of jurisdiction.

MTB Legislation

In recent Congresses, the number of duty suspensions has strikingly increased. For example, in the 109th Congress, the last Congress in which stand-alone MTB legislation was enacted, duty suspensions were granted until the end of 2009, to 680 products. If the bills introduced in the House and in the Senate were combined, more than 1000 individual pieces of duty suspension legislation were introduced for possible inclusion in the MTB package.

109th Congress

Congress did not pass stand-alone MTB legislation during the 109th Congress. Instead, almost 700 MTB provisions were attached to other legislation before the House Ways and Means and Senate Finance Committees. First, about 300 duty suspensions were attached to H.R. 4 (Boehner), the "Pension Protection Act of 2006," (P.L. 109-280), signed by the President on August 6, 2006. Second, On December 7, 2006, the House and Senate reached an agreement on trade legislation to be included in a larger legislative package of tax break extensions. As part of the House-Senate compromise, H.R. 6406 (Thomas, introduced December 7, 2006) proposed to suspend or reduce tariffs on about 380 additional products. H.R. 6406 passed the House on December 8, 2006, by a vote of 212-184. H.R. 6406 was ultimately appended to a previously House-passed tax extension package (H.R. 6111, Tauscher). H.R. 6111, including the duty suspensions, passed the Senate on December 9. The President signed H.R. 6111 on December 20, 2006 (P.L. 109-432). Both P.L. 109-280 and P.L. 109-432 suspended tariffs until December 31, 2009.

110th Congress

In the 110th Congress, no MTB was introduced in either House. Although a November 2007 Ways and Means advisory called for House Members to submit legislative proposals for inclusion in a proposed MTB by December 14, 2007, no omnibus bill was introduced. However, individual

provisions introduced continued to be vetted by the Trade Subcommittee, agency input was submitted, and proposed duty suspensions were posted on the Ways and Means Committee website for public comment.

Since most of the duty suspensions passed in 2006 were not set to expire until the end of 2009, many lawmakers reportedly regarded the end of 2009 as the “real deadline” for passage of an MTB—thus making consideration of an MTB in the 111th Congress more likely.¹

“Limited Tariff Benefit” in Ethics Legislation

In the 110th Congress, the House adopted earmark reform parliamentary procedures that also extended to “limited tariff benefits.” In section 404 of H.Res. 6, *Adopting the Rules of the House of Representatives*, the resolution defined a limited tariff benefit as “a provision modifying the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States in a manner that benefits 10 or fewer entities.” A simple resolution such as H.Res. 6 is only effective in the chamber that adopts it, and, once adopted, requires no further action. The House earmark procedures—including procedures for limited tariff benefits—are, therefore, now in effect.²

House rules (see House Rule XXI, clause 9) now provide that in order to be considered on the House floor, a bill or joint resolution reported by a committee must include in the report a list of congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, and *limited tariff benefits* in the bill or the report, along with the name of the Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner requesting them, or a statement certifying that the proposal does not contain them.³ Similarly, if a bill or joint resolution is not reported by the committee prior to floor consideration, the chairman of each committee of initial referral must cause a similar list of benefits and requesting Members to be printed in the *Congressional Record*. In the case of conference reports, a list of benefits included in the conference report or accompanying joint explanatory statement and the requesting Members must be included in the joint explanatory statement in order to consider the conference report.⁴

House Rule XXIII, clause 17(a) provides that any Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner requesting a limited tariff benefit must provide a written disclosure to the chairman and ranking minority member of the committee of jurisdiction including (1) the name of the sponsor, (2) identification of the individual or entities “reasonably anticipated to benefit” from the measure, (3) the purpose of the limited tariff benefit, and (4) a certification that the sponsoring Member or spouse has no financial interest in the benefit. The committees of jurisdiction are directed to maintain the disclosures and make the statements regarding limited tariff benefits included in a committee-reported bill or conference report “open for public inspection.”

In Title I of S. 1, the *Legislative Transparency and Accountability Act of 2007*, the Senate also included disclosure requirements for congressionally directed spending similar to those passed in

¹ “Senate GOP Trade Counsel Sees No Miscellaneous Tariff Bill This Year,” *Inside U.S. Trade*, August 8, 2008.

² CRS Report RS22866, *Earmark Disclosure Rules in the House: Member and Committee Requirements*, by Megan Suzanne Lynch.

³ *Ibid.*

⁴ *Ibid.* The House may waive this rule by unanimous consent (that is, if no Member objects) or by a motion to suspend the rules and pass the measure, which requires a two-thirds vote to adopt. The rule also provides a mechanism for the House to decide on a case-by-case basis whether to adopt a special rule waiving this new rule, which requires a majority vote.

the House. An amended version of S. 1 was considered in the House and passed on July 31, 2007. The Senate then passed an identical version on August 2, 2007. The President signed the legislation on September 14, 2007 (became P.L. 110-81).

Sec. 521 of the law amended the standing rules of the Senate⁵ to provide that it will not be in order to consider a bill, joint resolution reported by any committee, a bill or joint resolution not reported by a committee, or the adoption of a conference committee report, unless the chairman of the committee of jurisdiction, the majority leader, or his or her designee, certifies that any congressionally directed spending items (earmarks), limited tariff benefits, or limited tax benefits (1) have been identified (“through lists, charts, or other similar means including the name of each Senator who submitted the request”); and are (2) searchable “on a publicly accessible congressional website” at least 48 hours (or “as soon as practicable” in the case of spending items proposed in floor amendments) prior to the vote. If the disclosure is not completed, the measure is subject to a point of order.⁶ The law’s definition of “limited tariff benefit” was identical to the definition in H.Res. 6—“a provision modifying the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States in a manner that benefits 10 or fewer entities.”

Any Senator who requests a limited tariff benefit (or any other directed spending item mentioned in the law) must now disclose in writing the name of the sponsor, the name and location of the intended recipient, any individual or entities reasonably anticipated to benefit, and the purpose of the benefit. Senators must also certify that the principal purpose of any directed spending is not to further only the pecuniary interest of the Member or only the interest of the Member’s immediate family, or only the pecuniary interest of a limited class of persons or enterprises when the Member, his or her family, or enterprises controlled by them are members of the affected class.⁷

111th Congress

House Ways and Means Trade Subcommittee Chairman Sander M. Levin and Ranking Member Kevin Brady announced the introduction of H.R. 4380, the Miscellaneous Tariff and Technical Corrections Act of 2009, on December 15, 2009. The bill renews many of the duty suspensions that were in place prior to January 1, 2009. The bill covers more than 600 products, most of which are manufacturing inputs for finished goods made in the United States.

On October 1, 2009, the Senate Finance Committee announced that it would also move forward on an MTB, and laid out the process for Senators to introduce individual bills for consideration in a final omnibus package by October 30, 2009. This announcement came after a bipartisan agreement between House and Senate leadership was reached involving additional disclosure requirements for lobbyists. When engaging in lobbying activities associated with the MTB process, lobbyists must now register these efforts under a separate issue code (“TAR” for tariff). Senate Finance Committee Ranking Member Chuck Grassley sought this requirement so that the

⁵ See Senate Rule XLIV. CRS Report RS22867, *Earmark Disclosure Rules in the Senate: Member and Committee Requirements*, by Megan Suzanne Lynch.

⁶ Any Senator may waive the application of the rule or all points of order under the rule pending an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Senate.

⁷ P.L. 110-81, sec. 521, Amendment to Rule XLIV, paragraph 9.

process “would benefit from improved transparency in the disclosure of lobbying activities associated with individual miscellaneous tariff bills.”⁸

On June 7, 2010, House Ways and Means Committee Chairman Levin and Trade Subcommittee Chairman Tanner issued a “Dear Colleague” letter urging Members to support passage of the MTB (H.R. 4380). The letter mentioned that “some have attempted to characterize MTB provisions as ‘congressional earmarks,’” and enclosed a copy of the House Rules pointing out the definitions of “earmark” and “limited tariff benefit” as discussed in the previous section (see ““Limited Tariff Benefit” in Ethics Legislation” above).⁹ The letter also mentioned the vetting process (discussed in more detail below) and mentioned that the MTB could generate an increase in U.S. production and support U.S. jobs.¹⁰

On July 7, 2010, the committee released a draft manager’s amendment to H.R. 4380, the “United States Manufacturing Enhancement Act of 2010.” The manager’s amendment divided the duty suspensions into three categories: Title I included bills requesting new duty suspensions or reductions that had a House and Senate counterpart; Title II included House bills extending expired MTB provisions; and Title III included Senate bills extending expired provisions. Bills in Titles II and III (extensions of expired provisions only) were subject to retroactive treatment effective January 1, 2010. The Ways and Means Committee posted the manager’s amendment on its website and sought comments and feedback on the proposed legislation.¹¹

H.R. 4380 subsequently passed in the House on July 21, 2010, under suspension of the rules by a vote of 378-43.

Committee, Agency, and Executive Review of MTB Legislation

In recent practice, one MTB has been introduced per Congress. In most cases, the MTB process is begun by the House Ways and Means and Senate Finance committee chairs (the committees of jurisdiction) sending out Dear Colleague letters inviting Members to introduce stand-alone legislation on proposed duty suspensions. The deadline for introduction is usually several months before an MTB is expected to be reported out of committee. The MTB, when introduced, includes all committee-approved measures, including duty suspensions. The stated legislative goal of the committees is for an MTB to be “non-controversial”—meaning that the measure is able to pass both Houses by unanimous consent or under suspension of the rules.¹²

In recent Congresses, due to the number of bills submitted, the committees of jurisdiction have tended to request comments from interested parties at the subcommittee level, rather than holding hearings on these bills. In practice, the subcommittee considers duty suspensions for inclusion in the MTB only if the corresponding goods or materials are deemed “noncontroversial” or “noncompetitive,” meaning that (1) there is no domestic producer objecting to the duty

⁸ “Grassley Welcomes New Transparency in Miscellaneous Tariff Bill Process,” Press Release, October 1, 2009.

⁹ U.S. Congress, House Committee on Ways and Means, *Support Passage of the Miscellaneous Tariff Bill (MTB)*, Dear Colleague letter, 111th Cong., 2nd sess., June 7, 2010.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*

¹¹ See House Ways and Means Committee website, <http://waysandmeans.house.gov/>, “Hot Topics.”

¹² See U.S. House, Committee on Ways and Means Trade Subcommittee Advisory, “Levin and Herger Request Introduction of Miscellaneous Tariff and Duty Suspension Bills by December 14, 2007”, November 1, 2007.

suspension, and (2) the suspension or reduction of the tariff is seen to be in the interest of U.S. “downstream” manufacturers (and theoretically, consumers).

Furthermore, the volume of imports and corresponding revenue loss must be “revenue neutral” or generally not more than \$500,000 per commodity per year. For example, the Congressional Budget Office estimated that all duty suspensions and extensions to suspensions in House-passed H.R. 4380 would cost the government about \$298 million in lost revenue over 10 years.¹³

Agency and Executive Review

After duty suspension bills are introduced and referred, they are reviewed by trade subcommittee staff, who, in turn, solicit comments from the Administration (including the United States Trade Representative, CBP, and the Department of Commerce), and the International Trade Commission (ITC). Committee staff often solicit public comments directly, but may do so through administration channels or the ITC. Duty suspensions that do not meet the above criteria are generally filtered out in this process.

International Trade Commission’s Role

Generally, the ITC is the first agency that provides a response to the committees, and is the only agency directly required to do so by statute.¹⁴ The ITC usually contacts companies and industry groups through its Office of Industries (either through direct contact or by sending out a questionnaire) to solicit responses from interested parties, especially looking for U.S. producers of similar goods as those targeted for duty suspensions.

The ITC issues “congressional bill reports” on the stand-alone bills, which they forward to the committees and share with relevant agencies in the executive branch.¹⁵ These reports provide information on the dollar amount and volume of trade; estimated revenue loss if the tariff is suspended; and technical information, including proper nomenclature, HTS heading, and Chemical Abstracts number, if applicable. The reports also list the proponent company’s name, other domestic firms contacted by the ITC, and each firm’s position on the proposal. If a company writes a letter either supporting or opposing the duty suspension, a copy of the letter is also attached.¹⁶

¹³ Congressional Budget Office. Cost Estimate. *CBO-Estimated Revenue Effect of Titles I, II and III of H.R. 4380, Amending the Harmonized Tariff Schedule to Modify Temporarily Certain Rates of Duty, as dated July 20, 2010, July 20, 2010.*

¹⁴ 19 U.S.C. 1332 (d) and (g).

¹⁵ The ITC also publishes congressional bill reports on the Internet. See http://www.usitc.gov/tata/hts/other/rel_doc/bill_reports/index.htm.

¹⁶ The ITC takes no official position on duty suspension measures, but relays any domestic company support or objections to committee staff. An example of an instance in which an objection has been raised can be found in U.S. International Trade Commission, Memorandum on Proposed Tariff Legislation of the 109th Congress on S. 791 (Santorum) on a proposed duty suspension on plasma flat panel screen assemblies for use in televisions (http://hotdocs.usitc.gov/tata/hts/other/rel_doc/bill_reports/s-0791.pdf). The ITC report on S. 701 (Lautenberg) proposing a duty suspension on sorbic acid is an example of an instance in which no domestic opposition was noted (http://hotdocs.usitc.gov/tata/hts/other/rel_doc/bill_reports/s-0698.pdf).

Administration's Response

The overall administration response is coordinated by the Department of Commerce (Commerce). Analysts at Commerce also research the targeted commodities, either independently or in conjunction with the ITC, depending on the time frame. With regard to comments on duty suspensions, Commerce generally does not object to a suspension of duties on a commodity unless a U.S. producer is found. In most cases, intra-company transfers (instances in which a multinational with a subsidiary in the United States imports a product manufactured in a plant owned by the same company overseas) are also not opposed, even if a like product is manufactured in the United States.

CBP also comments on duty suspensions, largely by recommending reclassifications or changes in nomenclature for ease in administering the proposed tariff changes. CBP has a formal agreement to share this information with the ITC, and may also provide information to other agencies. However, if certain measures impact CBP more directly (e.g., changes in duty drawback statutes, legislative responses to CBP rulings, liquidations and reliquidations, or permanent duty suspensions), CBP also communicates directly to the committees on a confidential basis.

The Office of the United States Trade Representative (USTR) may also comment on individual duty suspension bills, but generally focuses on larger issues in the legislation that would more permanently affect U.S. trade policy. However, USTR officials indicate that the administration usually prefers that any tariff modifications in MTBs are temporary, so that more permanent revisions of duties can continue to be used in trade negotiations to seek reciprocal tariff benefits for U.S. exports.

Policy Considerations

Tariffs on many products have been reduced over a period of almost seven decades as a result of bilateral and multilateral trade negotiations. Most economists believe that lower foreign tariffs benefit U.S. exporters because they make U.S. goods more competitive in foreign markets, and that lower U.S. tariffs can benefit domestic manufacturers and consumers because the cost savings on imported goods may be passed on consumers and other “downstream” producers.

Tariffs are also used protectively in many countries, including the United States, in an effort to help domestic industries remain competitive—especially those considered vulnerable to foreign imports, such as agriculture, textiles, and steel. Duty suspensions on these more competitive products would largely be considered controversial, thus ineligible for inclusion in an MTB.

Supporters of duty suspension measures point out that since they are largely requested on chemicals, raw materials, and other production inputs, they are a significant means of reducing manufacturing costs. Some opponents, however, view them as an increasingly popular means by which Congress confers a benefit on business constituents, and point to instances in which competing domestic manufacturers have been harmed, despite the efforts of committee staff and administrative agencies to control their impact.

Concerns About Passage of Omnibus MTBs

Despite the efforts of House and Senate committees to ensure the neutrality of MTBs, insertion of controversial measures has also held up floor consideration of the legislation in the past, especially in the Senate. These measures have largely dealt with trade policy concerns rather than duty suspensions. For example, the last omnibus MTB reported out of the Senate—first introduced in 2002—reportedly faced opposition from Senator Richard Shelby, who placed a hold on the bill because it did not include a provision to roll back preferential access previously given to beneficiaries of the Caribbean Basin Trade Partnership Act in the Trade Act of 2002 (P.L. 107-210).¹⁷ Several other provisions, including one proposing to grant normal trade relations status to Laos, one to repeal the Antidumping Act of 1916 (pursuant to a WTO ruling), and another providing a trust fund for U.S. wool producers also met with objections.¹⁸ Ultimately, the bill passed in late 2004 (P.L. 108-429).

Some private-sector supporters of MTB legislation have reportedly criticized the MTB process because they say that the large omnibus bills have come to be seen by Members as a moving vehicle to which they could attach trade initiatives unrelated to duty suspensions.¹⁹ One source indicated that part of the problem is that since many trade policy votes take place under fast-track rules, Members are prevented from amending the legislation. Since Members see fewer opportunities to move their trade policy issues, the MTB becomes an attractive target on which to attach potentially controversial trade measures.²⁰

Observers have suggested various ways to ensure that MTB legislation is enacted in future Congresses. One alternative is the creation of a separate “fast-track” procedure by which the Ways and Means Committee would introduce a bill consisting solely of duty suspensions and customs-related matters that could only be voted up or down with no amendments.²¹ Others suggested that future miscellaneous tariff measures could be worked out between Ways and Means and Finance Committee staff and then attached to larger revenue measures,²² which was the procedure ultimately implemented in the 109th Congress. Others suggest giving the President the authority to issue duty suspension proclamations.²³

Rationale for Passage of Duty Suspensions

According to House Ways and Means Committee documents, duty suspensions are considered “in light of compelling circumstances of inadequate domestic supply, unusually demanding conditions, or long-run changes in marketing conditions warranting special legislation.”²⁴ In this light, there are several reasons that duty suspensions have merited consideration.

¹⁷ The Senator insisted that the preferential access of socks from Caribbean nations needed to be rolled back because it was harmful to Alabama sock producers. Letter to Senator Charles Grassley, Chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, from Senators Richard Shelby and Jeff Sessions, October 4, 2002.

¹⁸ Inside U.S. Trade, “Miscellaneous Tariff Bill Approved, Supporters Seek New Approach,” November 26, 2004.

¹⁹ “Miscellaneous Tariff Bill Approved, Supporters Seek New Approach,” *Inside U.S. Trade*, November 26, 2004.

²⁰ Ibid.

²¹ Ibid.

²² Ibid.

²³ Ibid.

²⁴ U.S. Congress, House Committee on Ways and Means, *Report on Legislative Activity During the 97th Congress of* (continued...)

First, in some cases, a higher tariff rate may apply to a relatively uncompetitive product because it is aggregated in a Harmonized Tariff Schedule (HTS) grouping that also contains similar products that are considered more import-sensitive. This is often the case where certain chemical compounds are concerned. In these cases, a new HTS subheading is created, thus disaggregating the product in question so that the duty can be suspended on it without affecting the tariff on the more import-competing products.

Second, there might be no current domestic production of a particular product, or it might not be produced in sufficient quantities to satisfy domestic demand. Therefore, U.S. producers who use the commodity as manufacturing input may have to depend on imports. In this case, a duty suspension could lower the overall price of the good without significant harm to domestic suppliers.

Third, the duty rate of a component essential in the manufacture of a domestic product may be higher than that on the comparable imported finished good. One example of this was a case in which casein button blanks used by U.S. button manufacturers were imported at 22.1% *ad valorem* (tariff is a percentage rate based on the value of the good), while finished buttons were imported at a rate of 6.9% *ad valorem*. Domestic producers complained that they were put at a competitive disadvantage *vis-à-vis* foreign manufacturers of the same product because of the higher duty rate for the raw material.²⁵

Fourth, multinational corporations sometimes manufacture commodities at foreign subsidiaries and import them to be used as components in domestically produced merchandise. For example, a U.S. automobile manufacturer may fabricate some of its car parts in a plant overseas, and then import the parts into the United States, where it assembles the finished product. Congress, on occasion, may consider these duty suspensions in order to facilitate the transaction because the importing company would not be likely to purchase it from a domestic producer.

Fifth, a nonprofit association may wish to import an item and ask their Member to introduce a one-time duty suspension for the product. For example, churches have sometimes requested duty-free status for pipe organs purchased from Europe, or an educational institution might ask for duty-free status for parts used in the construction of a telescope.

A sixth, less frequent, reason for congressional approval of duty suspension legislation is that it represents a compelling national interest. For example, in 1942, the 77th Congress considered the suspension of import duties on all scrap metal because the War Production Board predicted a shortage of as much as 6.5 million tons of metal necessary for the defense industry to operate its open hearth and electric furnaces at full capacity.²⁶ The board recommended that all barriers to importing these metals be dropped. The bill passed both chambers by unanimous consent.

(...continued)

the Committee on Ways and Means, 97th Cong., 2nd sess., January 3, 1983, H.Report 97-1005 (Washington: GPO, 1983), p. 69.

²⁵ P.L. 97-446, 96 Stat. 2329.

²⁶ U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Finance. *Hearing to Suspend Tariffs on Scrap Metals; to Amend the Internal Revenue Code Relating to Production of Alcohol; to Amend Internal Revenue Code Relating to the Leakage and Evaporation of Distilled Spirits*, 77th Congress, Second Session, March 5, 1942.

Table I. Miscellaneous Trade Legislation, 97th Congress to the Present

Congress	Bill No./Sponsor	Reports	Status
111 th	H.R. 4380	See House Ways and Means Committee website: http://waysandmeans.house.gov/press/PRArticle.aspx?NewsID=10418 and Senate Finance Committee website: http://finance.senate.gov/legislation/comment/?id=54211d78-fc55-51c6-b8e6-0b9ef2f44044	12/16/2009: Referred to House Ways and Means Committee. 7/7/2010: Draft Manager's Amendment Released. 7/21/2010: Passed House under suspension of rules (378-43)
110 th	No MTB Introduced	Information was posted on the House Ways and Means website.	11/1/2007: House Ways and Means Trade Subcte. Advisory requesting MTB legislation by Dec. 14, 2007.
109 th	H.R. 6406 (Thomas)/H.R. 6111 (Tauscher).	No published reports on MTB legislation. Information and highlights were posted on the House Ways and Means Committee website.	12/8/2006: H.R. 6406 passed House. 12/9/2006: H.R. 6111 (including provisions of 6406) passed Senate. 12/20/2006: P.L. 109-432, in Tax Relief and Health Care Act of 2006.
109 th	H.R. 4 (Boehner) contained about 300 duty suspension measures.	No published reports on MTB legislation.	8/17/2006: P.L. 109-280, in the Pension Protection Act of 2006.
109 th	H.R. 4944 (Shaw)	No published reports.	3/15/2006: passed House.
108 th	H.R. 1047 (Crane)	H.Rept. 108-771 (conference report)	12/3/2004: P.L. 108-429, the Miscellaneous Trade and Technical Corrections Act of 2004.

Congress	Bill No./Sponsor	Reports	Status
107 th	H.R. 5385 (Crane)	No published reports.	10/7/2002: passed House.
106 th	H.R. 4868 (Crane)	H.Rept. 106-789 S.Rept. 106-503	11/9/2000: P.L. 106-476, the Tariff Suspension and Trade Act of 2000.
106 th	H.R. 435 (Archer)	see H.Rept. 105-367 (on related bill H.R. 2622 in 105 th). see S.Rept. 106-2 (on related bill S. 262)	6/25/1999: P.L. 106-36, the Miscellaneous Tariff and Technical Correction Act of 1999.
105 th	H.R. 4856 (Archer)	see H.Rept. 105-367 (on rel. bill H.R. 2622). see S.Rept. 105-356 (on rel. bill H.R. 4342)	10/20/1998: passed House.
105 th	H.R. 4342 (Crane)	H.Rept. 105-671; S.Rept. 105-356	8/4/1998: passed House.
104 th	H.R. 3815 (Crane)	H.Rept. 104-718 S.Rept. 104-393	10/11/1996: P.L. 104-295, the Miscellaneous Trade and Technical Corrections Act of 1996.
103 rd	H.R. 5110 (Gephardt)	H.Rept. 103-826, parts 1 and 2. (See S.Rept. 103-421 on related bill S. 2467)	12/8/1998: became P.L. 103-465. Uruguay Round Implementation bill; see Subtitle B, Tariff Modifications, secs. 112-116.
102 nd	H.R. 4318 (Gibbons)	H.Rept. 102-634, WCMP 102-37	7/31/1992: passed House.
101 st	H.R. 1594 (Gibbons)	see H.Rept. 101-427 (on related bill H.R. 4328) S.Rept. 101-252; H.Rept. 101-650 (conf. rpt.)	8/20/1990: P.L. 101-382, the Customs and Trade Act of 1990.
100 th	H.R. 4333 (Rostenkowski)	H.Rept. 100-795; H.Rept. 100-1104 (conf. rpt.), vols 1 and 2	11/10/1988: P.L. 100-647, Technical and Miscellaneous Revenue Act of 1988

Congress	Bill No./Sponsor	Reports	Status
100 th	H.R. 4848 (Rostenkowski)	no published reports on subtitle G	8/23/1988: P.L. 100-418, Omnibus Trade and Competitiveness Act of 1988, subtitle G, Tariff Provisions
99 th	H.R. 4800 (Wright) H.R. 5686 (Rostenkowski)	no published reports	5/22/1986: H.R. 4800 passed House. 10/14/1986: H.R. 5686 passed House.
98 th	H.R. 3398 (Gibbons), H.R. 6064 (Gibbons)	H.Rept. 98-267; S.Rept. 98-308	10/30/1984: P.L. 98-573, the Trade and Tariff Act of 1984, Title I.
97 th	H.R. 4566 (Gibbons), H.R. 6867 (Gibbons)	H.Rept. 97-257 H. Rept. 97-837 H. Rept. 97-989 S.Rept. 97-564	10/12/1983: P.L. 97-446, the Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Materials Importation Act of 1982.

Author Contact Information

Vivian C. Jones
Specialist in International Trade and Finance
vcjones@crs.loc.gov, 7-7823