

the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am going to talk about Benny Johnson, no relationship.

Benny Johnson of Logic I sales in Richardson, Texas, employs 18 people and pays over \$80,000 a year for health insurance for himself, his employees, and their families. Benny has paid for their health insurance for nearly 20 years.

If health insurance premiums rise much higher, Benny is going to have to reduce benefits, drop coverage, or change plans, ending relationships with doctors they trust and know. Why would his premiums go up? Because of the McCain-Kennedy legislation in the House and Senate, which everybody knows would drive costs up.

This potentially could add Benny and his employees, and their families, to the 43 million Americans without health insurance.

It is just plain wrong. It has to stop. We have to think of Benny, his employees, and his families. Let us support the Fletcher bill.

STRENGTHENING AMERICA'S LEADERSHIP ON TRADE

(Mr. DREIER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, in just a few minutes, the gentleman from California (Chairman THOMAS) will begin the debate on the very important U.S.-Jordan Free Trade Agreement, but I want to take a moment to talk about a very important issue which we are going to be phasing in in the not-too-distant future, and that is the issue of Trade Promotion Authority.

Since that authority expired in 1994, our trading partners have been very busy negotiating a web of trade agreements that excludes the United States. Today we sit here wasting valuable time that the President and his trade negotiators could be using to improve the lives of families here in the United States and around the world.

Free trade has been a boom for the American family, from higher paying jobs to lower prices. The North American Free Trade Agreement and the World Trade Organization have increased the overall national income by \$40 billion to \$60 billion. Continued efforts to open new markets help working families that bear the brunt of hidden imported taxes on everyday items like clothes, food, and electronics. And, with 97 percent of exporters coming from small or medium-sized companies, increased exports mean better, higher paying export jobs for workers that make up the heart and soul of this country.

Along with American workers, open trade has helped to raise more than 100 million people out of poverty in the last decade. A recent World Bank study showed that developing countries that

participate actively in trade grow faster and reduce poverty faster than countries that isolate themselves.

We should grant the President Trade Promotion Authority as soon as possible to ensure that the United States continues to lead in the global economy and the fight to spread democracy and freedom throughout the world.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GUTKNECHT). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair announces that he will postpone further proceedings today on each motion to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered or on which the vote is objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

Any record votes on postponed questions will be taken later today.

UNITED STATES-JORDAN FREE TRADE AREA IMPLEMENTATION ACT

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2603) to implement the agreement establishing a United States-Jordan free trade area, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2603

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "United States-Jordan Free Trade Area Implementation Act".

SEC. 2. PURPOSES.

The purposes of this Act are—

- (1) to implement the agreement between the United States and Jordan establishing a free trade area;
- (2) to strengthen and develop the economic relations between the United States and Jordan for their mutual benefit; and
- (3) to establish free trade between the 2 nations through the removal of trade barriers.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

For purposes of this Act:

(1) AGREEMENT.—The term "Agreement" means the Agreement between the United States of America and the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan on the Establishment of a Free Trade Area, entered into on October 24, 2000.

(2) HTS.—The term "HTS" means the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States.

TITLE I—TARIFF MODIFICATIONS; RULES OF ORIGIN

SEC. 101. TARIFF MODIFICATIONS.

(a) TARIFF MODIFICATIONS PROVIDED FOR IN THE AGREEMENT.—The President may proclaim—

- (1) such modifications or continuation of any duty,
 - (2) such continuation of duty-free or excise treatment, or
 - (3) such additional duties,
- as the President determines to be necessary or appropriate to carry out article 2.1 of the Agreement and the schedule of duty reductions with respect to Jordan set out in Annex 2.1 of the Agreement.

(b) OTHER TARIFF MODIFICATIONS.—The President may proclaim—

(1) such modifications or continuation of any duty,

(2) such continuation of duty-free or excise treatment, or

(3) such additional duties,

as the President determines to be necessary or appropriate to maintain the general level of reciprocal and mutually advantageous concessions with respect to Jordan provided for by the Agreement.

SEC. 102. RULES OF ORIGIN.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) ELIGIBLE ARTICLES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The reduction or elimination of any duty imposed on any article by the United States provided for in the Agreement shall apply only if—

(i) that article is imported directly from Jordan into the customs territory of the United States; and

(ii) that article—

(I) is wholly the growth, product, or manufacture of Jordan; or

(II) is a new or different article of commerce that has been grown, produced, or manufactured in Jordan and meets the requirements of subparagraph (B).

(B) REQUIREMENTS.—

(i) GENERAL RULE.—The requirements of this subparagraph are that with respect to an article described in subparagraph (A)(ii)(II), the sum of—

(I) the cost or value of the materials produced in Jordan, plus

(II) the direct costs of processing operations performed in Jordan,

is not less than 35 percent of the appraised value of such article at the time it is entered.

(ii) MATERIALS PRODUCED IN UNITED STATES.—If the cost or value of materials produced in the customs territory of the United States is included with respect to an article to which this paragraph applies, an amount not to exceed 15 percent of the appraised value of the article at the time it is entered that is attributable to such United States cost or value may be applied toward determining the percentage referred to in clause (i).

(2) EXCLUSIONS.—No article may be considered to meet the requirements of paragraph (1)(A) by virtue of having merely undergone—

(A) simple combining or packaging operations; or

(B) mere dilution with water or mere dilution with another substance that does not materially alter the characteristics of the article.

(b) DIRECT COSTS OF PROCESSING OPERATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—As used in this section, the term "direct costs of processing operations" includes, but is not limited to—

(A) all actual labor costs involved in the growth, production, manufacture, or assembly of the specific merchandise, including fringe benefits, on-the-job training, and the cost of engineering, supervisory, quality control, and similar personnel; and

(B) dies, molds, tooling, and depreciation on machinery and equipment which are allocable to the specific merchandise.

(2) EXCLUDED COSTS.—The term "direct costs of processing operations" does not include costs which are not directly attributable to the merchandise concerned, or are not costs of manufacturing the product, such as—

(A) profit; and

(B) general expenses of doing business which are either not allocable to the specific merchandise or are not related to the

growth, production, manufacture, or assembly of the merchandise, such as administrative salaries, casualty and liability insurance, advertising, and salesmen's salaries, commissions, or expenses.

(c) **TEXTILE AND APPAREL ARTICLES.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—A textile or apparel article imported directly from Jordan into the customs territory of the United States shall be considered to meet the requirements of paragraph (1)(A) of subsection (a) only if—

(A) the article is wholly obtained or produced in Jordan;

(B) the article is a yarn, thread, twine, cordage, rope, cable, or braiding, and—

(i) the constituent staple fibers are spun in Jordan, or

(ii) the continuous filament is extruded in Jordan;

(C) the article is a fabric, including a fabric classified under chapter 59 of the HTS, and the constituent fibers, filaments, or yarns are woven, knitted, needled, tufted, felted, entangled, or transformed by any other fabric-making process in Jordan; or

(D) the article is any other textile or apparel article that is wholly assembled in Jordan from its component pieces.

(2) **DEFINITION.**—For purposes of paragraph (1), an article is “wholly obtained or produced in Jordan” if it is wholly the growth, product, or manufacture of Jordan.

(3) **SPECIAL RULES.**—

(A) **CERTAIN MADE-UP ARTICLES, TEXTILE ARTICLES IN THE PIECE, AND CERTAIN OTHER TEXTILES AND TEXTILE ARTICLES.**—Notwithstanding paragraph (1)(D) and except as provided in subparagraphs (C) and (D) of this paragraph, subparagraph (A), (B), or (C) of paragraph (1), as appropriate, shall determine whether a good that is classified under one of the following headings or subheadings of the HTS shall be considered to meet the requirements of paragraph (1)(A) of subsection (a): 5609, 5807, 5811, 6209.20.50.40, 6213, 6214, 6301, 6302, 6304, 6305, 6306, 6307.10, 6307.90, 6308, and 9404.90.

(B) **CERTAIN KNIT-TO-SHAPE TEXTILES AND TEXTILE ARTICLES.**—Notwithstanding paragraph (1)(D) and except as provided in subparagraphs (C) and (D) of this paragraph, a textile or apparel article which is knit-to-shape in Jordan shall be considered to meet the requirements of paragraph (1)(A) of subsection (a).

(C) **CERTAIN DYED AND PRINTED TEXTILES AND TEXTILE ARTICLES.**—Notwithstanding paragraph (1)(D), a good classified under heading 6117.10, 6213.00, 6214.00, 6302.22, 6302.29, 6302.52, 6302.53, 6302.59, 6302.92, 6302.93, 6302.99, 6303.92, 6303.99, 6304.19, 6304.93, 6304.99, 9404.90.85, or 9404.90.95 of the HTS, except for a good classified under any such heading as of cotton or of wool or consisting of fiber blends containing 16 percent or more by weight of cotton, shall be considered to meet the requirements of paragraph (1)(A) of subsection (a) if the fabric in the good is both dyed and printed in Jordan, and such dyeing and printing is accompanied by 2 or more of the following finishing operations: bleaching, shrinking, fulling, napping, decating, permanent stiffening, weighting, permanent embossing, or moireing.

(D) **FABRICS OF SILK, COTTON, MANMADE FIBER OR VEGETABLE FIBER.**—Notwithstanding paragraph (1)(C), a fabric classified under the HTS as of silk, cotton, man-made fiber, or vegetable fiber shall be considered to meet the requirements of paragraph (1)(A) of subsection (a) if the fabric is both dyed and printed in Jordan, and such dyeing and printing is accompanied by 2 or more of the following finishing operations: bleaching, shrinking, fulling, napping, decating, permanent stiffening, weighting, permanent embossing, or moireing.

(4) **MULTICOUNTRY RULE.**—If the origin of a textile or apparel article cannot be determined under paragraph (1) or (3), then that article shall be considered to meet the requirements of paragraph (1)(A) of subsection (a) if—

(A) the most important assembly or manufacturing process occurs in Jordan; or

(B) if the applicability of paragraph (1)(A) of subsection (a) cannot be determined under subparagraph (A), the last important assembly or manufacturing occurs in Jordan.

(d) **EXCLUSION.**—A good shall not be considered to meet the requirements of paragraph (1)(A) of subsection (a) if the good—

(1) is imported into Jordan, and, at the time of importation, would be classified under heading 0805 of the HTS; and

(2) is processed in Jordan into a good classified under any of subheadings 2009.11 through 2009.30 of the HTS.

(e) **REGULATIONS.**—The Secretary of the Treasury, after consultation with the United States Trade Representative, shall prescribe such regulations as may be necessary to carry out this section.

TITLE II—RELIEF FROM IMPORTS

Subtitle A—General Provisions

SEC. 201. DEFINITIONS.

As used in this title:

(1) **COMMISSION.**—The term “Commission” means the United States International Trade Commission.

(2) **JORDANIAN ARTICLE.**—The term “Jordanian article” means an article that qualifies for reduction or elimination of a duty under section 102.

Subtitle B—Relief From Imports Benefiting From The Agreement

SEC. 211. COMMENCING OF ACTION FOR RELIEF.

(a) **FILING OF PETITION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—A petition requesting action under this subtitle for the purpose of adjusting to the obligations of the United States under the Agreement may be filed with the Commission by an entity, including a trade association, firm, certified or recognized union, or group of workers that is representative of an industry. The Commission shall transmit a copy of any petition filed under this subsection to the United States Trade Representative.

(2) **PROVISIONAL RELIEF.**—An entity filing a petition under this subsection may request that provisional relief be provided as if the petition had been filed under section 202(a) of the Trade Act of 1974.

(3) **CRITICAL CIRCUMSTANCES.**—Any allegation that critical circumstances exist shall be included in the petition.

(b) **INVESTIGATION AND DETERMINATION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Upon the filing of a petition under subsection (a), the Commission, unless subsection (d) applies, shall promptly initiate an investigation to determine whether, as a result of the reduction or elimination of a duty provided for under the Agreement, a Jordanian article is being imported into the United States in such increased quantities, in absolute terms or relative to domestic production, and under such conditions that imports of the Jordanian article alone constitute a substantial cause of serious injury or threat thereof to the domestic industry producing an article that is like, or directly competitive with, the imported article.

(2) **CAUSATION.**—For purposes of this subtitle, a Jordanian article is being imported into the United States in increased quantities as a result of the reduction or elimination of a duty provided for under the Agreement if the reduction or elimination is a cause that contributes significantly to the increase in imports. Such cause need not be equal to or greater than any other cause.

(c) **APPLICABLE PROVISIONS.**—The following provisions of section 202 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2252) apply with respect to any investigation initiated under subsection (b):

(1) Paragraphs (1)(B) and (3) of subsection (b).

(2) Subsection (c).

(3) Subsection (d).

(d) **ARTICLES EXEMPT FROM INVESTIGATION.**—No investigation may be initiated under this section with respect to any Jordanian article if import relief has been provided under this subtitle with respect to that article.

SEC. 212. COMMISSION ACTION ON PETITION.

(a) **DETERMINATION.**—By no later than 120 days (180 days if critical circumstances have been alleged) after the date on which an investigation is initiated under section 211(b) with respect to a petition, the Commission shall make the determination required under that section.

(b) **ADDITIONAL FINDING AND RECOMMENDATION IF DETERMINATION AFFIRMATIVE.**—If the determination made by the Commission under subsection (a) with respect to imports of an article is affirmative, the Commission shall find, and recommend to the President in the report required under subsection (c), the amount of import relief that is necessary to remedy or prevent the injury found by the Commission in the determination and to facilitate the efforts of the domestic industry to make a positive adjustment to import competition. The import relief recommended by the Commission under this subsection shall be limited to that described in section 213(c).

(c) **REPORT TO PRESIDENT.**—No later than the date that is 30 days after the date on which a determination is made under subsection (a) with respect to an investigation, the Commission shall submit to the President a report that shall include—

(1) a statement of the basis for the determination;

(2) dissenting and separate views; and

(3) any finding made under subsection (b) regarding import relief.

(d) **PUBLIC NOTICE.**—Upon submitting a report to the President under subsection (c), the Commission shall promptly make public such report (with the exception of information which the Commission determines to be confidential) and shall cause a summary thereof to be published in the Federal Register.

(e) **APPLICABLE PROVISIONS.**—For purposes of this subtitle, the provisions of paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of section 330(d) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1330(d)) shall be applied with respect to determinations and findings made under this section as if such determinations and findings were made under section 202 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2252).

SEC. 213. PROVISION OF RELIEF.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—No later than the date that is 30 days after the date on which the President receives the report of the Commission containing an affirmative determination of the Commission under section 212(a), the President shall provide relief from imports of the article that is the subject of such determination to the extent that the President determines necessary to prevent or remedy the injury found by the Commission and to facilitate the efforts of the domestic industry to make a positive adjustment to import competition, unless the President determines that the provision of such relief is not in the national economic interest of the United States or, in extraordinary circumstances, that the provision of such relief would cause serious harm to the national security of the United States.

(b) **NATIONAL ECONOMIC INTEREST.**—The President may determine under subsection

(a) that providing import relief is not in the national economic interest of the United States only if the President finds that taking such action would have an adverse impact on the United States economy clearly greater than the benefits of taking such action.

(c) **NATURE OF RELIEF.**—The import relief (including provisional relief) that the President is authorized to provide under this subtitle with respect to imports of an article is—

(1) the suspension of any further reduction provided for under the United States Schedule to Annex 2.1 of the Agreement in the duty imposed on that article;

(2) an increase in the rate of duty imposed on such article to a level that does not exceed the lesser of—

(A) the column 1 general rate of duty imposed under the HTS on like articles at the time the import relief is provided; or

(B) the column 1 general rate of duty imposed under the HTS on like articles on the day before the date on which the Agreement enters into force; or

(3) in the case of a duty applied on a seasonal basis to that article, an increase in the rate of duty imposed on the article to a level that does not exceed the column 1 general rate of duty imposed under the HTS on the article for the corresponding season occurring immediately before the date on which the Agreement enters into force.

(d) **PERIOD OF RELIEF.**—The import relief that the President is authorized to provide under this section may not exceed 4 years.

(e) **RATE AFTER TERMINATION OF IMPORT RELIEF.**—When import relief under this subtitle is terminated with respect to an article—

(1) the rate of duty on that article after such termination and on or before December 31 of the year in which termination occurs shall be the rate that, according to the United States Schedule to Annex 2.1 of the Agreement for the staged elimination of the tariff, would have been in effect 1 year after the initiation of the import relief action under section 211; and

(2) the tariff treatment for that article after December 31 of the year in which termination occurs shall be, at the discretion of the President, either—

(A) the rate of duty conforming to the applicable rate set out in the United States Schedule to Annex 2.1; or

(B) the rate of duty resulting from the elimination of the tariff in equal annual stages ending on the date set out in the United States Schedule to Annex 2.1 for the elimination of the tariff.

SEC. 214. TERMINATION OF RELIEF AUTHORITY.

(a) **GENERAL RULE.**—Except as provided in subsection (b), no import relief may be provided under this subtitle after the date that is 15 years after the date on which the Agreement enters into force.

(b) **EXCEPTION.**—Import relief may be provided under this subtitle in the case of a Jordanian article after the date on which such relief would, but for this subsection, terminate under subsection (a), but only if the Government of Jordan consents to such provision.

SEC. 215. COMPENSATION AUTHORITY.

For purposes of section 123 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2133), any import relief provided by the President under section 213 shall be treated as action taken under chapter 1 of title II of such Act.

SEC. 216. SUBMISSION OF PETITIONS.

A petition for import relief may be submitted to the Commission under—

(1) this subtitle;

(2) chapter 1 of title II of the Trade Act of 1974; or

(3) under both this subtitle and such chapter 1 at the same time, in which case the Commission shall consider such petitions jointly.

Subtitle C—Cases Under Title II Of The Trade Act of 1974

SEC. 221. FINDINGS AND ACTION ON JORDANIAN IMPORTS.

(a) **EFFECT OF IMPORTS.**—If, in any investigation initiated under chapter 1 of title II of the Trade Act of 1974, the Commission makes an affirmative determination (or a determination which the President may treat as an affirmative determination under such chapter by reason of section 330(d) of the Tariff Act of 1930), the Commission shall also find (and report to the President at the time such injury determination is submitted to the President) whether imports of the article from Jordan are a substantial cause of serious injury or threat thereof.

(b) **PRESIDENTIAL ACTION REGARDING JORDANIAN IMPORTS.**—In determining the nature and extent of action to be taken under chapter 1 of title II of the Trade Act of 1974, the President shall determine whether imports from Jordan are a substantial cause of the serious injury found by the Commission and, if such determination is in the negative, may exclude from such action imports from Jordan.

SEC. 222. TECHNICAL AMENDMENT.

Section 202(a)(8) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2252(a)(8)) is amended in the first sentence—

(1) by striking “and part 1” and inserting “, part 1”; and

(2) by inserting before the period at the end “, and title II of the United States-Jordan Free Trade Area Implementation Act”.

TITLE III—TEMPORARY ENTRY

SEC. 301. NONIMMIGRANT TRADERS AND INVESTORS.

Upon the basis of reciprocity secured by the Agreement, an alien who is a national of Jordan (and any spouse or child (as defined in section 101(b)(1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(b)(1)) of the alien, if accompanying or following to join the alien) shall be considered as entitled to enter the United States under and in pursuance of the provisions of the Agreement as a nonimmigrant described in section 101(a)(15)(E) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(15)(E)), if the entry is solely for a purpose described in clause (i) or (ii) of such section and the alien is otherwise admissible to the United States as such a nonimmigrant.

TITLE IV—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 401. RELATIONSHIP OF THE AGREEMENT TO UNITED STATES AND STATE LAW.

(a) **RELATIONSHIP OF AGREEMENT TO UNITED STATES LAW.**—

(1) **UNITED STATES LAW TO PREVAIL IN CONFLICT.**—No provision of the Agreement, nor the application of any such provision to any person or circumstance, that is inconsistent with any law of the United States shall have effect.

(2) **CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in this Act shall be construed—

(A) to amend or modify any law of the United States, or

(B) to limit any authority conferred under any law of the United States, unless specifically provided for in this Act.

(b) **RELATIONSHIP OF AGREEMENT TO STATE LAW.**—

(1) **LEGAL CHALLENGE.**—No State law, or the application thereof, may be declared invalid as to any person or circumstance on the ground that the provision or application is inconsistent with the Agreement, except in an action brought by the United States for the purpose of declaring such law or application invalid.

(2) **DEFINITION OF STATE LAW.**—For purposes of this subsection, the term “State law” includes—

(A) any law of a political subdivision of a State; and

(B) any State law regulating or taxing the business of insurance.

(c) **EFFECT OF AGREEMENT WITH RESPECT TO PRIVATE REMEDIES.**—No person other than the United States—

(1) shall have any cause of action or defense under the Agreement; or

(2) may challenge, in any action brought under any provision of law, any action or inaction by any department, agency, or other instrumentality of the United States, any State, or any political subdivision of a State on the ground that such action or inaction is inconsistent with the Agreement.

SEC. 402. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year after fiscal year 2001 to the Department of Commerce not more than \$100,000 for the payment of the United States share of the expenses incurred in dispute settlement proceedings under article 17 of the Agreement.

SEC. 403. IMPLEMENTING REGULATIONS.

After the date of enactment of this Act—

(1) the President may proclaim such actions, and

(2) other appropriate officers of the United States may issue such regulations, as may be necessary to ensure that any provision of this Act, or amendment made by this Act, that takes effect on the date the Agreement enters into force is appropriately implemented on such date, but no such proclamation or regulation may have an effective date earlier than the date the Agreement enters into force.

SEC. 404. EFFECTIVE DATES; EFFECT OF TERMINATION.

(a) **EFFECTIVE DATES.**—Except as provided in subsection (b), the provisions of this Act and the amendments made by this Act take effect on the date the Agreement enters into force.

(b) **EXCEPTIONS.**—Sections 1 through 3 and this title take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(c) **TERMINATION OF THE AGREEMENT.**—On the date on which the Agreement ceases to be in force, the provisions of this Act (other than this subsection) and the amendments made by this Act, shall cease to be effective.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS).

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

Mr. Speaker, first of all I want to thank the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Chairman SENSENBRENNER), for their willingness to expedite this process. As you know, many committees share jurisdiction over issues; and on this particular piece of legislation, notwithstanding the Committee on the Judiciary's jurisdictional prerogative, they were willing to exchange letters with us so that we might move forward.

As Chair of the Committee on Ways and Means, I include these letters for the record and thank the gentleman from Wisconsin (Chairman SENSENBRENNER).

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,
Washington, DC, July 30, 2001.

Hon. F. JAMES SENSENBRENNER, Jr.,
Chairman, House of Representatives, Rayburn
House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR JIM: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 2603, the "United States-Jordan Free Trade Area Implementation Act of 2001."

As you have noted, the Committee on Ways and Means ordered favorably reported, H.R. 2603, "United States-Jordan Free Trade Area Implementation Act of 2001," on Thursday, July 26, 2001. I appreciate your agreement to expedite the passage of this legislation despite containing provisions within your Committee's jurisdiction. I acknowledge your decision to forego further action on the bill was based on the understanding that it will not prejudice the Committee on the Judiciary with respect to its jurisdictional prerogatives or the appointment of conferees on this or similar legislation.

Finally, I will include in the Congressional Record a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter. Thank you for your assistance and cooperation. We look forward to working with you in the future.

Best regards,

BILL THOMAS,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
Washington, DC, July 30, 2001.

Hon. WILLIAM M. THOMAS,
Chairman, House Committee on Ways and
Means, Longworth HOB, House of Rep-
resentatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR BILL: Thank you for working with me regarding H.R. 1484, the "United States-Jordan Free Trade Areas Implementation Act," which was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on the Judiciary. As you know, the Committee on the Judiciary has a jurisdictional interest in this legislation, and I appreciate your acknowledgment of that jurisdictional interest. Because I understand the desire to have this legislation considered expeditiously by the House and because the Committee does not have a substantive concern with those provisions that fall within its jurisdiction, I do not intend to hold a hearing or markup on this legislation.

In agreeing to waive consideration by our Committee, I would expect you to agree that this procedural route should not be construed to prejudice the Committee on the Judiciary's jurisdictional interest and prerogatives on this or any similar legislation and will not be considered as precedent for consideration of matters of jurisdictional interest to my Committee in the future. The Committee on the Judiciary takes this action with the understanding that the Committee's jurisdiction over the provisions within the Committee's jurisdiction is in no way diminished or altered, and that the Committee's right to the appointment of conferees during any conference on the bill is preserved. I would also expect your support in my request to the Speaker for the appointment of conferees from my Committee with respect to matters within the jurisdiction of my Committee should a conference with the Senate be convened on this or similar legislation.

Again, thank you for your cooperation on this important matter. I would appreciate your including our exchange of letters in your Committee's report to accompany H.R. 1484.

Sincerely,

F. JAMES SENSENBRENNER, Jr.,
Chairman.

Mr. Speaker, approval of this agreement will do a number of things. One,

it will provide some degree of recognition, and, if you will, a small acknowledgment of the gratitude that the people of the United States have for the people of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan.

Jordan has played a constructive role through 2 generations of leadership in the Middle East. Their steadfast advocacy for peace and cooperation in fighting terrorism not only needs to be recognized in symbolic ways, but I believe with this particular trade pact it will be recognized in a very realistic way as well.

Although Jordan is a small market, Jordan is a trusted friend and ally; and, as importantly, it is strongly committed to liberalizing its economy. Once this agreement is ratified, more than 50 percent of the tariffs between our two countries will be eliminated overnight, and then gradually the more difficult areas will be worked down to zero, so that at the end of the 10 years, it truly will be a free trade relationship.

In addition to that, the quality of particular areas of this agreement are unsurpassed. The intellectual property rights provisions contain the highest levels of copyright protection ever included in a trade agreement. In addition, Jordan will be the first of our trading partners to bind itself to no customs duties on electronic commerce. Clearly this agreement will open Jordan's markets to U.S. services and U.S. markets to Jordan's products, whereby they can earn their way by trade.

Mr. Speaker, the reason that we are now in front of the House is that, notwithstanding those excellent portions of the agreement that I indicated, there was an attempt in this particular agreement in dealing with our friend and ally to dictate the way in which sanctions would be dealt with; that is, to expand beyond historical parameters, that for the first time, this agreement includes treating labor and the environment equally with trade. That in itself is not necessarily not a good thing to do, but what it did do was lock in the old-fashioned trade sanctions, while expanding it to new areas. That, to the present administration, to this majority, is an unacceptable structure.

Not wanting to go back and require a revision of the agreement, what we were able to do was to exchange between the Hashemite Government of Jordan and the United States Government an exchange of letters in which, notwithstanding the Clinton Administration's attempt to use this particular agreement to further its own agenda, neither the Government of the United States nor the Government of Jordan intend to exercise trade sanctions in the areas in the agreement, especially in terms of formal dispute resolution. Rather, they have committed themselves to a cooperative structure in the exchange of these two letters, especially looking for alternate mecha-

nisms that will help to secure compliance without recourse to, as I said, those traditional trade sanctions that are the letter of the agreement.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the exchange of letters between the Hashemite Government of Jordan and the United States Government.

U.S. TRADE REPRESENTATIVE,
Washington, DC, July 23, 2001.

His Excellency MARWAN MUASHER,
Ambassador of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan to the United States.

DEAR MR. AMBASSADOR: I wish to share my Government's view on implementation of the dispute settlement provisions included in the Agreement between the United States of America and the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan on the Establishment of a Free Trade Area, signed on October 24, 2000.

Given the close working relationship between our two Governments, the volume of trade between our two countries, and the clear rules of the Agreement, I would expect few if any differences to arise between our two Governments over the interpretation or application of the Agreement. Should any differences arise under the Agreement, my Government will make every effort to resolve them without recourse to formal dispute settlement procedures.

In particular, my Government would not expect or intend to apply the Agreement's dispute settlement enforcement procedures to secure its rights under the Agreement in a manner that results in blocking trade. In light of the wide range of our bilateral ties and the spirit of collaboration that characterizes our relations, my Government considers that appropriate measures for resolving any differences that may arise regarding the Agreement would be bilateral consultations and other procedures, particularly alternative mechanisms, that will help to secure compliance without recourse to traditional trade sanctions.

Sincerely,

ROBERT B. ZOELLICK,
U.S. Trade Representative.

EMBASSY OF THE HASHEMITE
KINGDOM OF JORDAN,
Washington, DC, July 23, 2001.

Hon. ROBERT B. ZOELLICK,
U.S. Trade Representative,
United States of America.

DEAR MR. AMBASSADOR: I wish to share my Government's views on implementation of the dispute settlement provisions included in the Agreement between the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan and the United States of America on the Establishment of a Free Trade Area, signed on October 24, 2000.

Given the close working relationship between our two Governments, the volume of trade between our two countries, and the clear rules of the Agreement, I would expect few if any differences to arise between our two Governments over the interpretation or application of the Agreement. Should any differences arise under the Agreement, my Government will make every effort to resolve them without recourse to formal dispute settlement procedures.

In particular, my Government would not expect or intend to apply the Agreement's dispute settlement enforcement procedures to secure its rights under the Agreement in a manner that results in blocking trade. In light of the wide range of our bilateral ties and the spirit of collaboration that characterizes our relations, my Government considers that appropriate measures for resolving any differences that may arise regarding

the Agreement would be bilateral consultations and other procedures, particularly alternative mechanisms, that will help to secure compliance without recourse to traditional trade sanctions.

Sincerely,

MARWAN MUASHER,
Ambassador.

Mr. Speaker, with these letters, it means that, notwithstanding the narrow, specific wording of the document, the attempt to drive a particular political agenda with this agreement, in which all are in favor of increasing trade to the point of free and open trade between the United States and Jordan, this agreement becomes acceptable, especially when this is the first instance in which the 21st century needs to be addressed with clearly a better way to deal with perceived violations and actual violations of agreements.

Alternate mechanisms beyond the old-fashioned 19th and early 20th century tools are really what is needed to develop and grow trade in this century. I am pleased to say that with the exchange of letters, notwithstanding the specifics of this agreement, we have begun to move down that direction; and we continue to work together to present to this House a Trade Promotion Authority which builds on this exchange of letters between the Government of the United States and the Hashemite Government of Jordan.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, this agreement indeed is an important one. It is important in terms of national security. Jordan is important in the quest for peace and security in the Mideast.

This agreement is important economically. A healthy Jordanian economy is important in and of itself, and for Jordan to play a constructive role in the Middle East.

This agreement is important because it addresses essential ingredients of the economic relationship between our two nations.

It is important because it recognizes that included in that economic relationship are labor and environmental standards.

This agreement is so important that it should have been presented to this House for approval many months ago. The delay was because some did not like the provisions relating to labor and the environment. That position was and is misguided.

Domestic labor markets and environmental standards are relevant to trade and competition within a nation and competition and trade between nations. That has become increasingly true as the volume of international trade has increased dramatically and as nations with very different economic structures trade and compete with one another. Recognition of that reality is simply inescapable in this era of trade. It is not a political question, it is a matter of sheer economic reality.

The Government of Jordan was willing from the start, and I emphasize that, to address that reality. Some in the United States were not. As a result, after several different notions have been suggested, there has been an exchange of letters between the two governments. They do not amend the agreement, they do not forego any of its provisions; they say what their intention and expectations are as to implementation of all the provisions in the agreement.

Both nations have strong practices on labor and environmental standards. The governments say in the letters that if either fails to meet their commitments to enforce such standards, or any other provisions of the agreement, and I emphasize that, any of the other provisions of the agreement, they do not expect or intend to use traditional trade sanctions to enforce them.

That was unnecessary and unfortunate. It is unwise to say that regardless of the violations of a trade agreement, the expectation is that any method of enforcement will not be used. Trade sanctions are always a last resort, but to set a precedent in any agreement that under no circumstances is there any expectation that they may have to be used as to any provision is a mistake, an unwise precedent.

It was unnecessary because the agreement carefully sets up a framework for all kinds of consultations and mediation over a long period of time before either party could use sanctions, and only after recurring violations affecting trade, and only with appropriate and commensurate measures.

I support our approving this agreement because of the importance of the U.S.-Jordanian relationship and because the agreement within its four corners still stands.

□ 1030

But cutting corners on the important issues of labor and environmental standards and trade agreements is a step backwards for future constructive action on trade. But today, to proceed on Jordan is important, and we should do so.

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

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

I would say to the gentleman the only unfortunate circumstance in this agreement was the unfortunate consequences of taking advantage to push a domestic agenda on trade with as important and vital a strategic partner as Jordan. We would have preferred that this domestic agenda on trade be done in a slightly different way. The letters, in fact, go a long way toward correcting that attempt, to grab the initiative on a domestic agenda on trade by using this agreement.

Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), one of the leading advocates and spokesmen for trade in the House of Representa-

tives and the chairman of the Committee on Rules.

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

I, of course, was going to begin by talking about the great importance of bringing about stability in the region and the benefits of this U.S.-Jordan Free Trade Agreement to economic growth and all, but since both the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) have gotten to the issue of labor and the environment and this very important exchange of letters, and I congratulate the chairman for having put that arrangement together. I think it is important to underscore why it is that there seems to be this disagreement.

We believe very passionately that the best way to deal with those important issues of labor and the environment is through economic growth. Mr. Speaker, there is a great arrogance that exists as we proceed with this debate on trade for the United States of America to try to impose on developing nations around the world, nations that are struggling to get onto the first rung of the economic ladder, standards with which they cannot comply. They cannot comply.

I recall so well, following the very important December 1999 Seattle ministerial meeting of the World Trade Organization, the cover of the Economist Magazine the week after that meeting was very telling. It said, when they talked about the imposition of sanctions, when President Clinton talked about the imposition of sanctions on issues of labor and the environment, the cover had a picture and above that picture was the caption: "Who Is the Real Loser at Seattle?" The photograph, Mr. Speaker, was of a starving baby in Bangladesh.

It is so apparent that those countries which we hope to help get into the international community are being prevented because of, as the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS) said appropriately, the imposition of a domestic agenda on other nations. It is unfortunate that Jordan was caught in the middle on this issue; however, we do want to see environmental standards and worker rights improved in Jordan.

We believe that the economic growth that is going to follow this kind of effort is important for the stability of the region. It is very important for bringing about greater stability as it expands throughout the Middle East. I hope this is just really the second, following the U.S.-Israel Free Trade Agreement, the second in steps that will help us bring about the very, very important economic growth and stability that is needed there.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1½ minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I want to move on to other speakers, but I want the RECORD to be clear: I was in meetings with the Jordanian Government from the outset, at least in discussions with this

body, and the King said they were willing to negotiate on labor and environmental standards. Do not talk about shoving this down somebody's throat. It is not true.

Secondly, imposition of our standards? Nonsense. When it comes to core labor standards, these are ILO standards that most nations have already agreed to.

Child labor? Forced labor? The ability of workers to associate and organize? That is imposing our standards? These are international standards. Are we imposing our standards when we insist on intellectual property or on subsidies in agriculture? The gentleman uses a different standard when it comes to one or another.

Environmental standards. The President withdrew from Kyoto because developing nations were not in the Kyoto Accord, and now someone comes to this floor and says because we want countries to enforce the environmental standards, in this case, their own, it is a domestic agenda or it is a political agenda. It is not. This relates to the terms in competition of countries, and there are some basic standards that need to be applied and to be implemented.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN).

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

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support the agreement that is before us. Jordan is a friend of the United States in the Middle East. They are moving forward in opening direct trade between their country and Israel, and they are truly our ally in seeking peace in the Middle East and in fighting terrorist activities.

I also support this agreement because it is a good agreement. It is a good agreement from the point of view of the United States. We already have a Free Trade Agreement with Israel. This Free Trade Agreement will open up opportunities for American producers and manufacturers. And we have made progress, as the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) has pointed out, on labor and environment; that is, removing barriers to fair trade because of the standards of other countries being far below the standards here in the United States. That works to the disadvantage of U.S. manufacturers and producers. We made progress in this agreement because Jordan agreed to enforce its own laws in the trade agreement. What is wrong with that?

Now, Mr. Speaker, I must tell my colleagues, I am concerned about the letters that were exchanged between Jordan and the United States that the distinguished Chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means put in the RECORD. These letters were requested by the United States. Make no mistake about it, this was not Jordan's idea, this was the United States' idea. It was because we were concerned that we

were painting new territory in allowing us to have in the core agreement labor and the environmental standards.

Mr. Speaker, if we are going to enforce labor and environmental standards, they have to be in the core agreement. We have seen that every time we have tried to put them in side agreements, it has been ineffective in enforcing the standards that we told the American public that we were fighting for. This letter puts labor and environment as a second tier issue. That is wrong. It should not be a second tier issue. Most of the other provisions in the Jordanian agreement can be enforced through WTO since they are in the multinational agreement.

Mr. Speaker, this letter, I hope, will not be precedent for the future, because we can make progress in bilateral agreements on increasing world standards for labor and environment; we can make progress so that American producers and manufacturers and farmers can effectively compete internationally by raising international standards in labor and environment. We make progress in the bilateral agreement such as with Jordan so that we can move the WTO, the multinational agreements, so that they can move forward in these areas.

Mr. Speaker, this is a good agreement. It should be supported. We made a mistake by requesting the exchange of letters.

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

Mr. Speaker, I can understand the perplexity of my friends on the other side over the letters in which they say the letters were not Jordan's idea. Well, let us return to the negotiation between the Clinton administration and the Jordanians.

I cannot believe it was the Jordanians' idea to lay on the table old-fashioned sanctions in which products are used to retaliate against violations extended to labor and the environment. I have a hunch it was the Clinton administration that laid these on the table. And, of course, my friend from Michigan then says, they did not object to them. Of course they are not going to object to them. They are going to say, yes, to whatever is laid on the table.

So I do not think the argument about basic standards being implemented is the issue. It was the fact that the Jordanians were required to agree to a sanctions structure that was imposed upon them by the Clinton administration. The letters were not Jordan's idea, but the basic document was not Jordan's idea either.

What we have is an ability to reach agreement and move forward. Frankly, we would not be here today without the letters. So I think the letters were a very good thing.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ENGLISH), a member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

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

Mr. Speaker, our relationship with Jordan is a strategic one, and that alone is reason enough for this trade agreement to be desirable. But H.R. 2603 is also a model for how we can pursue a balanced trade relationship with a developing country whose legal system and workplace environment is radically different from our own.

This trade agreement with Jordan represents the first free trade agreement with an Arab Nation and will give us closer trade ties to the Arab world. Trading with Jordan will be mutually beneficial and strengthen them as our ally.

But Jordan also represents a country that plays a critical role in the Middle East peace process. Beyond that, this agreement negotiated by the last administration provides us with a sensible and balanced approach to addressing blue and green issues in trade agreements, discouraging a race to the bottom by countries seeking to attract investment and lure jobs.

This agreement will benefit not only Jordanians, but American workers by creating an export market for high value-added U.S. products in a nation that cannot make these products for themselves. The bill phases out all tariffs during a 10-year period and establishes the first-ever bilateral commitment regarding e-commerce. It also addresses intellectual property rights and the protections for copyrights, trademarks and patents, as well as makes a specific commitment to opening markets in the services sector.

But as a truly inclusive trade agreement, H.R. 2603 addresses various labor and environmental concerns. This agreement does not seek to place further labor and environmental regulations on Jordan, but rather, requires that they enforce the law that they already have on their books. Jordan cannot relax environmental standards to attract trade, and they have agreed to fully enforce national labor laws. This agreement provides us with a model, perhaps not the only one, but a very promising one, for engaging in fair trade with a developing country, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the very distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I certainly support this agreement, as I did in committee, but the handling of this bill really represents another foreign policy failure for the Bush Administration.

During the last week alone, this Administration has stood alone and isolated from 178 other countries on how to resolve climate change and global warming. It has stood alone and isolated from seven years of negotiations about how to make an international agreement on germ warfare more effective. And it reasserted its intention to unilaterally reject the Antiballistic

Missile Treaty that has contributed to three decades of peace.

Little wonder that this week's conservative Economist magazine raises the question: "Stop the World, I Want to Get Off: Has George Bush Ever Met a Treaty that He Liked?" Well, it is not this one, because today the Republicans here on the House floor display their real paranoia about any attempt to protect workers and the environment from the potential adverse consequences of international trade.

Mr. Speaker, this is an outmoded trade policy that the Bush Administration is advancing at the very time that a number of our trading partners are recognizing that environmental issues need to be addressed as we look at the question of international trade. It is a policy that is consistent only with the Bush Administration's anti-environmental attitudes and policies here in the United States.

□ 1045

Trade is certainly vital to our country, but if more international commerce with a particular country leads to the reliance on more child labor or the destruction of rain forests or endangered species, those are important considerations to be avoided through negotiation.

This agreement with the small, but important, country of Jordan fortunately did not involve any of those particular concerns; but the Clinton Administration, wisely working with the country of Jordan, provided that if there were repeated violations of a country's own laws, not our laws in Jordan but Jordan's laws in Jordan to protect workers and the environment, then that could be the subject of trade sanctions.

That scares the Republicans to death, the very thought that on an international level we might give consideration to the way trade impacts workers, child laborers, the environment, endangered species, rain forests, or other sensitive environmental areas.

They are opposed to even the most modest safeguards like those contained in this agreement, so they have not fast-tracked this agreement; rather, they have slow-tracked it. They have slow-tracked it for the last six or seven months, refusing to present this trade agreement to the Congress to act upon.

Today they rush it to the floor with minimum debate because they do not want any attention on the contradictions in their own trade policy. That is a trade policy of slow-tracking that tells us a great deal about this so-called fast track proposal.

I support more trade, but not by granting President Bush a blank check, open-ended trade authority to do anything he wants. It is clear from his rejection of these modest safeguards that he will not do right by workers and the environment unless we put strict conditions on any trade negotiating authority that Congress decides to delegate to him.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KNOLLENBERG).

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

I rise in very strong support of this agreement, Mr. Speaker, and I urge my colleagues on both sides to support passage.

The U.S.-Jordan Free Trade Agreement will provide economic benefits to both countries. That is what we are really here about. This agreement will eliminate tariffs on virtually all trade between the two countries within 10 years. Passage of this agreement offers the prospect of rapid growth in the U.S.-Jordan trade relationship.

In addition to economic benefits, this agreement will help to strengthen our association with a key ally in the Middle East. Jordan is a trusted friend and ally of the U.S. and is strongly committed to liberalizing its economy. The agreement provides important support to Jordan's commitment.

In addition, the U.S.-Jordan FTA builds on other U.S. initiatives in the region designed to encourage economic development and regional integration. This includes, of course, the 1985 U.S.-Israel Free Trade Agreement and its extension to areas administered by the Palestinian Authority in 1996.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote yes on this agreement.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN).

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, the gentleman from Michigan, for yielding time to me.

Let me preface my statement by saying that I support the Jordan-U.S. trade agreement and plan to vote for it. That said, this agreement illustrates why this Congress must not relinquish our right to amend future trade agreements and why we must vote down Fast Track.

When we look closely at this, we see the fingerprints of the brand-name drug industry all over it. This agreement provides protections for the drug industry more stringent than those established by the World Trade Organization.

Look at the fine print of section 20 of Article 4 on intellectual property. Not only does this agreement impose barriers to generic access in Jordan that are greater than those in place here, it prevents the United States from using a WTO sanction mechanism, compulsory licensing, to bring down grossly inflated drug prices.

The Jordan trade pact blocks the U.S. from ever enacting compulsory licensing law, now or in the future, to combat excessive drug prices.

While Congress waited for the trade agreement to be negotiated, our drug industry convinced the U.S. Trade Representative to tie our hands and to tie Jordan's hands. It is outrageous that the drug industry can have this kind of

influence, particularly when their pricing practices are robbing Americans blind. But that is what happens when Congress has too little oversight in trade agreements.

If Fast Track passes, what will the future hold once the drug industry and other special interests know that Congress cannot amend the trade agreement? How many poison pills will we have to swallow or will the American public have to swallow?

It is provisions like these, slipped into trade agreements, which are the reason why Fast Track is such a threat to the best interests of our constituents. While trade agreements go to great lengths to protect investors and protect property rights, these agreements rarely include enforceable provisions to protect workers in the U.S. or abroad. Like the Jordan agreement, corporations will slip provisions into the text that will abuse the most vulnerable of society.

Three years ago, Fast Track was defeated in Congress, 243 to 180. Vote for the Jordan trade agreement but defeat Fast Track, which allows bad provisions in good trade agreements.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's courtesy in yielding time to me to speak on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I have a slightly different perspective than my friend, the gentleman from Ohio. I happen to believe very strongly that trade promotion authority is important and that our future, not just from our region but for our country and for developing nations around the world, lies in fairer, freer trade.

I supported the trade promotion authority for the last administration. I hope to be able to support it for this administration.

But I would look at this agreement today as a model for an approach that we can have trade promotion authority, which I think is important, but do it in a way that brings us together, where we can have 300 or 400 people on this floor, as the gentleman from Michigan is looking for ways to be able to express these concerns about environment, about worker standards.

This agreement that we have before us can be a template in a way that does not divide us but actually strengthens free trade. It brings it in a way that does not have to have a partisan edge to it, and actually encourages countries to be able to develop their own labor and environmental standards.

We have a number of companies around the world that are doing pioneering work in their own work to be able to advance higher standards for the environment and the workplace; international corporations that are showing the way in terms of how to treat their employees in patterns of compensation and worker safety.

I would strongly urge that we approve this agreement before us, and

that we look at this as a template for how we ought to put together trade promotion authority.

I commend the gentleman from Michigan for the work that he is doing on our side of the aisle to have a broader conversation. He, I think, has shown through his work on China that there are ways to bring us together. I encourage this Chamber to look at this agreement as a way that we can do this in a way that we will not lose the opportunity to develop the consensus. I thank the gentleman for his efforts.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE), who through his time and talent has assisted for a long time. I look forward to working with him as we move trade promotion authority.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the U.S.-Jordan Free Trade Agreement. I want to begin by thanking President Clinton, acknowledging his role in negotiating this agreement. I want to praise President Bush for bringing this agreement forward in a determined fashion.

I really want to commend the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS), and the gentleman from the subcommittee, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CRANE), and the ranking member, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN), for their bipartisan support in bringing this agreement forward.

Mr. Speaker, this agreement is critical to the foreign policy of the United States. It is of enormous political significance to us. Jordan is a vital ally of ours in the Middle East. It has been in the past; and it continues to be a leader in this peace process, this Middle East peace process.

Let there be no doubt, we have relied heavily on Jordan to play a constructive role in building peace in the region, and certainly the least we can do today is extend our hand in free trade.

This role that Jordan has played is a very difficult one. It is located geographically between Iraq and Syria and the west bank of the Jordan. Over half of its population is of Palestinian descent. In short, it is in the heart of a region that is plagued by centuries of conflict. It lies on the edge of a potential conflict all along all of its borders.

Despite this, it has had strong political leadership over the years that has taken repeatedly difficult steps towards peace, started by former King Hussein with a peace agreement between Jordan and Israel in 1994, and that continues today under the leadership of his son, King Abdullah II.

We must implement this free trade agreement, not because of the economic benefits the U.S. may receive, although there are some. We must implement this agreement because it will help Jordan develop economically and become more prosperous. With the

prosperity and the prospect for economic stability, we can help it continue to lead by example in a region where greater, stronger leadership is so desperately needed.

Just a couple of months ago, I led a delegation of members of the Committee on Appropriations to Israel, Egypt, and to Jordan. In all of those countries, we appreciated the importance of trade as a driver of regional economic growth.

Mr. Speaker, this is an important agreement. I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BONIOR), our distinguished whip.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding time to me, and I thank him and others who worked on this agreement.

Mr. Speaker, the agreement we face today is a good agreement. It furthers our relationship with our friends and allies; and it increases the prospect, as we have heard, for economic and political stability in the Middle East. It contains modest yet meaningful standards for worker rights and the environment. For the first time, Mr. Speaker, these values are considered as terms of the agreement, just as tariffs, just as intellectual property traditionally have been.

But what I am concerned about is the interjection of these side letters. The administration, I think, is undermining a good deal with these side letters. The side letter effectively removes the possibility of enforcing labor and environmental violations by tough enforcement mechanisms of sanctions. The side letter places a higher value on commercial provisions which are still enforceable by sanctions through the WTO.

Overall, the side letters suggest that we value our goods over our workers. It has been the nexus, the heart of the problem we have had on the trade issue. This was a solid agreement negotiated in good faith by two strategic friends and partners. It deserves to be implemented as such.

This agreement was once a good step forward, including worker rights and environmental standards in a trade agreement. Now, with the side letter, it becomes yet another reflection of the trade policies of the past that deny the realities of today.

We must remember the administration's actions to gut these modest worker rights and environmental provisions when we look to future agreements in this Congress, especially Fast Track. Fast Track requires us to put all our faith in Presidential authority. The action on the Jordan agreement should warn us against that. This administration gives with one hand while trying to take away with the other.

Mr. Speaker, I will vote for this trade agreement because I believe in the deal that was negotiated, and that is on the floor today. It is a step forward. But I

am deeply disappointed with the administration's attempt to undermine the deal and to turn the clock back.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CANTOR).

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2603, which, in a comprehensive fashion, eliminates barriers to bilateral trade in goods and services between the United States and the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan.

I would posit that this agreement does bring us together by providing a positive structure for dealing with trade violations, rather than controversial and potentially ineffective sanctions.

Economic prosperity, stability, and religious tolerance form the foundation of our foreign policy in the Middle East. In a region where daily violence has almost become a fact of life, the establishment of economic cooperation is a vitally important aspect of creating an environment where the nations of the Middle East can exist in peace and with prosperity.

This agreement will enable the United States to have a productive economic exchange with a valuable trading partner that has been a stabilizing factor in that region. The spirit of bilateral economic cooperation between these two countries will be beneficial to both our nations, and sends a signal to the world that nations that share our values and desire for peace will prosper.

Jordan has been a steadfast partner for promoting peace and fighting terrorism, and I welcome this agreement.

□ 1100

I commend the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS) for his leadership on the issue and again urge my colleagues to support this important legislation.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend, my very distinguished colleague from Michigan, Mr. LEVIN, for yielding me this time.

I strongly support this resolution that approves the U.S.-Jordan Free Trade Agreement. The United States rarely gets a chance to score a clear victory that will promote economic growth, regional stability, reward a trusted ally, and affirm our most basic democratic values. We have such an opportunity right now with this agreement. Even though Jordan is only our 100th largest trading partner, the Jordan Free Trade Agreement is crucial to our national interest.

First, this agreement holds the potential of jump-starting a process of trade liberalization that has slowed down considerably since 1995. Under this agreement, duties on almost all goods would be phased out over a 10-year period. Jordan commits itself to

opening its markets fully to U.S. manufacturers, farmers, and service providers. The Jordan FTA is the first such agreement ever to address issues related to electronic commerce and the Internet, with Jordan promising to ratify international agreements ensuring the protection of software and audio recordings on the Internet. Also under this agreement both sides pledge much greater openness in the resolution of disputes.

More significant than this contribution to open trade is what the Jordan FTA should mean for our continuing pursuit of peace and stability in the Middle East. Since coming to power after the death of his legendary father, King Hussein, 2 years ago, King Abdallah has launched a series of progressive reforms intended to modernize Jordan's economy. The nation has joined the World Trade Organization, deregulated some of its service industries, and strengthened its intellectual property laws. It has also stood with the United States politically, helping to enforce our trade embargo against Iraq, and serving as a voice of moderation among the Arab states.

By entering into this agreement, we are promoting regional economic growth, and sending a strong and positive signal of support to a crucial ally. If we were to delay this trade agreement that the previous Clinton administration worked out so constructively, it would send the opposite and wrong signal. This trade agreement marks a new approach to addressing labor and environmental provisions that I think is reasonable and realistic.

Approval of this agreement should give us some momentum now to move forward on our larger bipartisan trade agenda, most notably trade promotion authority. Global agreements can be values driven as well as profits driven, and that is why I urge my colleagues to approve this agreement and reaffirm our commitment to this vital ally in the Middle East.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time, a long 30 seconds, to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. McDERMOTT).

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, so much to say.

Mr. Speaker, I am here to vote for the Jordan treaty, but the world will little note nor long remember what we do here today. But what was important about today was the President of the United States showed his hand. He is not trustworthy. He will take an agreement, and when it is being out here on the floor he will then write a letter and undo it.

Now, let us give them trade promotion authority, shall we? He will go and negotiate, he will bring a treaty in here, we will vote for it, and as we vote "aye" or "no," he will be putting in the mailbox at the White House a letter to somebody saying, "I didn't mean it, guys. This does not really count. You know we didn't really mean what's in this."

Watch and remember what happened with those letters on this issue. Vote for this but do not forget.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS) has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. THOMAS. Well, gee, Mr. Speaker, I guess I am a little bit confused. Apparently the gentleman from Washington thinks that President Bush negotiated this agreement. Perhaps I should shock him into reality and indicate that the proper response on this floor should have been shame on you. Shame on your administration in trying to push your domestic trade agenda by making an offer to Jordan you knew they could not refuse. What kind of diplomatic relationship is that?

The mistake of using Jordan as a pawn has partially been corrected by the exchange of letters. And so when my colleague stands up here and says piously, gee, we are trying to reverse an agreement in which we just want some standards for labor and the environment, I would note, as I said at the very beginning, there is nothing wrong with that. We need to move in that direction. Get over it. The previous administration tried to sneak an agreement through, and it was not done. Now, let us sit down and work together and talk about not using antiquated sanctions in resolving these new issues.

The bottom line is this, Mr. Speaker. This agreement is on the suspension calendar. We all agree that our friend and ally is long overdue this recognition. Let us vote "yes" on H.R. 2603.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, the U.S.-Jordan Free Trade Agreement with the United States is good for Jordan, good for the United States and good for peace in the Middle East. By eliminating trade barriers between both our countries, it will increase trade. In doing so, it will strengthen one of the most constructive regimes in the Middle East regarding the Peace Process.

Under King Abdallah's leadership, Jordan has already made significant strides in modernizing its economy and in opening its markets to the outside world. For example, Jordan has embarked on a major privatization program that includes its telecommunications sector, and has improved its record on intellectual property rights.

This agreement will accelerate that process by guaranteeing:

The elimination of all tariffs on industrial goods and farm products within 10 years;

Free trade in services, giving American service providers full access to services of key importance;

Modern intellectual property rights commitments, which will provide prospects for technology-based industries, copyright-based industries, and pharmaceutical companies;

A joint commitment to promote a liberalized trade environment for e-commerce that should encourage investment in new technologies, and avoid imposing customs duties on electronic transmissions.

Just as Jordan has been a model for constructive participation in the Peace Process, the U.S.-Jordan Free Trade Agreement can

help to make it an economic model for the rest of the Arab world.

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support H.R. 2603, the United States-Jordan Free Trade Implementation Act.

Jordan is a small Arab country with abundant natural resources such as oil. The Persian Gulf crisis aggravated Jordan's already serious economic problems, forcing the government to put a hiatus on the International Monetary Fund program, stop most debt payments, and suspend rescheduling negotiations. However, the economy rebounded in 1992, thanks to the influx of capital repatriated by workers returning from the Gulf.

After averaging 9 percent in 1992-95, GDP growth averaged only 2 percent during 1996-99. In an attempt to spur growth, King Abdallah of Jordan has undertaken some economic reform measures, including partial privatization of some state-owned enterprises. These actions culminated with Jordan's entry in January 2000 into the World Trade Organization (WTO).

I have personally met with King Abdallah on several occasions. I was pleased to host the King and Queen in 1999, when they visited Northern Virginia to discuss possible investment opportunities in Jordan with regional high technology and telecommunications companies. The King and representatives from his government showed a keen interest in exploring trade opportunities with our technology sector. The attendees, which included CEOs and Presidents of national high-tech organizations and companies, were overwhelmingly impressed with the King's knowledge of the industry and his openness towards working with them.

Mr. Speaker, I believe passage of H.R. 2306 will have significant and positive economic and political impacts for both Jordan and the United States. The U.S.-Jordan Free Trade Agreement (FTA) will increase levels of trade in services for both nations, boost the Jordanian economy, contribute to easing unemployment, attract foreign direct investments from both U.S. and other foreign-based companies, and reinforce momentum for additional economic reform in Jordan. In the year 2000, total bilateral trade between the U.S. and Jordan was approximately \$385 million, with U.S. exports to Jordan accounting for about 80 percent or \$310 million of this total. In the same year, U.S. imports from Jordan totaled \$73 million and accounted for approximately 20 percent of total bilateral trade.

The FTA builds on other U.S. initiatives in the region that are designed to encourage economic development and regional integration, including: the 1996 extension of the U.S.-Israel Free Trade Agreement to areas administered by the Palestinian Authority; and the 1996 creation of Qualified Industrial Zones (QIZ), which are areas under joint Israeli and Jordanian control whose exports are eligible for duty-free treatment in the United States.

Once passed by the Congress and the Jordanian Parliament, the U.S.-Jordan FTA will be the first U.S. free trade agreement with an independent Arab country, and Jordan will be the fourth country in the world to have a bilateral free trade agreement with America—all of which reflects the close bond between the two nations, and reaffirms our commitment to this burgeoning relationship.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise as a co-sponsor of H.R. 2603, the United States-Jordan Free-Trade Agreement.

This legislation, as approved, would implement H.Doc. 107-15 as it was submitted to Congress on January 6, 2001 by former President Clinton, and would make the trade agreement we negotiated with the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan operational.

Jordan is a moderate Arab nation and an ally of both the United States and Israel. The free trade agreement negotiated by the Clinton administration will help to solidify trade and commerce between the United States and Jordan.

As you know Mr. Speaker, free trade is vital to political stability and economic development not only in the Middle East but also around the world. With free trade nations are not only able to exchange goods but also ideas. It is the ideas of freedom and democracy that is the greatest export the United States can offer to the rest of the world.

Under the agreement negotiated by the United States and Jordan, both nations have committed themselves to removing almost all duties on trade in ten years. The two countries have also committed themselves to safeguarding intellectual property and copyrights.

Most importantly the agreement includes provisions to protect worker rights and the environment.

The Middle East is an emerging region and the United States should do all it can to help the nations of the Middle East develop their economic potential. Jordan has played an integral role in leading the region to a freer and a more secure future.

King Abdullah has made important commitments to implement necessary economic and political reforms. Jordan has also been an important partner in the Middle East peace process, and a leading voice among moderate Arab nations for normalizing relations with the State of Israel.

By supporting free trade with Jordan the United States Congress will be recognizing Jordan's role as a peace partner in the Middle East.

Free trade will give American companies more access not only to the Jordanian market but also to markets in Israel and Egypt. While at the same time providing for greater economic development in the region.

Currently, New York State conducts \$23 million worth of trade with Jordan. In the next ten years this volume is expected to increase as Jordan's economy continues to grow. This will create more jobs for my constituents and more prosperity for the people of Jordan.

Mr. Speaker, it is important for the United States to continue playing its historic role in the Middle East as a voice for peace and democracy. Free trade with Jordan recognizes both Jordan's role as a peace partner in the Middle East and it reasserts America's commitment to peace and stability in the Middle East. I would also like to point out the United States-Jordan Free Trade Agreement is supported by Israel, evidence of Israel's continued commitment to peace and stability in the region.

At this hour of crises in the Middle East it is important for the United States Congress to stand with the people of Israel and Jordan by supporting free trade and democracy in the region.

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation, which provides for implementation of a free trade agreement between the United States and Jordan, elimi-

nating duties and commercial barriers to bilateral trade in goods and services.

The U.S.-Jordan Free Trade Agreement was negotiated during the Clinton Administration, although it was completed too late to secure Congressional action last year. If enacted, Jordan would become only the fourth country, after Canada, Mexico and Israel, with which the United States has a free-trade arrangement. I support implementation of the Jordan FTA because I believe it will help advance the long-term U.S. objective of fostering greater Middle East regional economic integration, while providing greater market access for U.S. goods, services, and investment.

The Jordan FTA not only sends a strong message to Jordanians and its neighbors about the economic benefits of peace, but significantly contributes to stability throughout the region. This Agreement is the culmination of our economic partnership with Jordan, which has also included U.S.-Jordanian cooperation on Jordan's accession to the World Trade Organization (WTO), our joint Trade and Investment Framework Agreement, and our Bilateral Investment Treaty. This Agreement also represents a vote of confidence in Jordan's economic reform program, which should serve as a source of growth and opportunity for Jordanians in the coming years.

I am pleased that the Jordan FTA includes the highest possible commitments from Jordan on behalf of U.S. business on key issues, providing significant liberalization across a wide spectrum of trade issues. The FTA builds on economic reforms Jordan has made by requiring it to eliminate tariffs on agriculture goods and industrial products within a decade, strengthen intellectual property protections and liberalize services trade.

Perhaps most importantly, the Jordan FTA contains provisions in which both our countries agree not to relax environmental or labor standards in order to enhance competitiveness. For the first time, these provisions are in the main body of the agreement. It is important to note that the FTA does not require either country to adopt any new laws in these areas, but rather includes commitments that each country enforce its own labor and environmental laws. While I understand that the Bush administration has exchanged letters with Jordan pledging neither country would use sanctions to enforce that part of the pact, I believe the approach taken under this bill is the right approach—it allows this body to move forward on an agreement of strategic importance that emphasizes the importance of labor and environmental standards to existing and future U.S. trade policy. In light of the agreement on this issue, it would serve this body well to work toward a similar compromise that can garner broad bipartisan support for Trade Promotion Authority, which the House may consider as soon as this week.

I am pleased that the House moved the Jordan FTA largely as negotiated. However, with less than \$400 million in two-way trade between the U.S. and Jordan—about the same volume of trade the U.S. conducts with China in a single day—the real impact of congressional approval of this agreement is to show our support for a key U.S. ally in a troubled region of the world. Given the relatively small volume of trade with Jordan, the strategic significance of the U.S.-Jordanian relationship, and the importance Jordanians place on this free trade agreement, it is highly unlikely that

any Administration, Democrat or Republican, present or future, will be forced to impose trade sanctions on Jordan. However, since this agreement includes language that neither mandates or precludes any means of enforcement, it signifies a critical shift in U.S. priorities; one that reflects growing concerns over the effect of globalization on U.S. jobs and economic opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, passage of the Jordan FTA is more significant than the trade benefits included in this legislation. Passage of this implementing bill sends an important signal of support to our allies and our trading partners that the U.S. intends to be an important player in promoting trade policies that open markets to U.S. exports and create U.S. jobs, while addressing concerns related to the effects of increased globalization on our economy. We may never reach consensus on the issue of the most appropriate means of enforcing labor and environmental violations, but I think that all Members can agree on the importance of expanding exports and creating good paying jobs for Americans, while providing adequate safeguards to preserve our economic interests. With passage of the Jordan FTA, I believe we are taking an important first step in achieving these goals, and I urge my colleagues to approve this bill.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, this Member rises today to express his support for H.R. 2603, which implements the United States-Jordan Free Trade Area Agreement. This Member would like to thank the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS), the Chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, for introducing this legislation and for his efforts in bringing this measure to the House Floor.

The U.S.-Jordan Free Trade Agreement, which was signed by President Clinton on October 24, 2000, will eliminate commercial barriers and duties to bilateral trade in goods and services originating in Jordan and the United States. The agreement will eliminate virtually all tariffs on trade between Jordan and the U.S. within ten years.

The U.S.-Jordan Agreement is part of the broader U.S. effort to encourage free trade in the Middle East. For example, in 1985, the U.S.-Israel Free Trade Agreement was signed and it was extended to areas administered by the Palestinian Authority in 1996. In addition, the U.S. has also signed Trade and Investment Framework Agreements with Egypt in 1999 and Turkey in 2000. It should also be noted Jordan joined the World Trade Organization in April of 2000.

This Member would like to focus on the following three aspects of the U.S.-Jordan Free Trade Agreement: the agriculture sector, the services sector, and the environmental and labor provisions.

First, with regard to agriculture, the top U.S. exports to Jordan include wheat and corn. In 1999, the U.S. exported \$26 million of wheat and \$10 million of corn to Jordan. With low prices and higher supplies of agricultural commodities, this free trade agreement is a step in the right direction.

Second, the U.S.-Jordan Free Trade Agreement opens the Jordanian service markets to U.S. companies, which includes engineering, architecture, financial services, and courier services to name just a few. Some U.S. companies should directly benefit from this opening of the service markets in Jordan. Services

trade is becoming a bigger part of the overall trade picture. In fact, worldwide services trade totaled \$309 billion in 1998, which resulted in an \$84 billion positive balance for the U.S. in services for 1998. This positive trade balance for services is in stark contrast to the U.S. merchandise trade deficit.

As the Chairman of the House Financial Services Subcommittee on International Monetary Policy and Trade, this Member has focused on the importance of financial services trade. My Subcommittee conducted a hearing in June 2001 on financial services trade with insurance, securities, and banking witnesses testifying. At this hearing, the Subcommittee learned that U.S. trade in financial services equaled \$20.5 billion. This is a 26.7 percent increase from the U.S.'s 1999 financial services trade data. Unlike the current overall U.S. trade deficit, the U.S. financial services trade had a positive balance of \$8.8 billion in 2000.

Third, the U.S.-Jordan Free Trade Agreement also includes labor and environment provisions. This is the first time that these types of provisions have been included in the main text of a U.S. free trade agreement. This Member would like to note that these labor and environment provisions focus on Jordan and the U.S. enforcing its own labor and environmental laws. This agreement does not impose any labor and environment standards on Jordan or the U.S.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, this Member urges his colleagues to support H.R. 2603, the implementation of the U.S.-Jordan Free Trade Agreement.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2603, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. 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 the subject of H.R. 2603.

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

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2002

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, by the direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 213 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 213

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for

consideration of the bill (H.R. 2647) making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. Points of order against consideration of the bill for failure to comply with clause 4(c) of rule XIII are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The bill shall be considered as read. Points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI are waived. No amendment to the bill shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio (Ms. PRYCE) is recognized for 1 hour.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to my colleague and good friend, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL); pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purposes of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 213 is a structured rule which provides for 1 hour of general debate equally divided between the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. TAYLOR), chairman of the subcommittee, and the ranking member, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN), for the consideration of H.R. 2647, the fiscal year 2002 Legislative Branch Appropriations bill.

After general debate, the rule makes in order only the amendments printed in the Committee on Rules report; an amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ROTHMAN) and an amendment offered by the gentleman from the great State of Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT).

The rule waives points of order against consideration of the bill for failure to comply with clause 4(c) of rule XIII requiring a 3-day availability of printed hearings on general appropriations bills, as well as clause 2 of rule XXI prohibiting unauthorized or legislative provisions. The rule also waives all points of order against the amendments printed in the report.

Finally, the rule permits the minority to offer a motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, to quote the great Yogi Berra, "It's like deja vu all over again," as the Legislative Branch Appropriations bill provides yet another example of a carefully crafted bill from the Committee on Appropriations that balances fiscal discipline with the true needs of the first branch of our government, the legislative branch. This legislation represents a responsible increase in overall spending of 4.5 percent.

I would like to commend the chairman and the ranking member, and all the members of the subcommittee, for their hard work on what is truly a non-controversial bill.

Mr. Speaker, it has been said that our Nation's capitol building and its campus serves three distinct and important purposes. First, it is a working office building. The central meeting place of our Federal legislature.

Second, it is a museum that preserves our Nation's history and marks its many legislative battles and victories.

And, finally, this capitol is a living monument to democracy, which sits upon the great pedestal of Capitol Hill, clear for all to see.

Mr. Speaker, the Legislative Branch Appropriations bill safeguards these important roles by ensuring funding needs of this institution are met. Specifically, the bill funds congressional operations for the House of Representatives, including our staffs and employees. It addresses the needs of the U.S. Capitol Police, and continues to support their efforts to modernize as they perform essential security functions for the protection of not just Members of Congress and our staffs but also the millions of visitors who come to the seat of our government every year.

The bill includes funding to hire an additional 79 new police officers and provides a 4.6 percent cost of living adjustment and a salary increase for comparability pay.

This bill provides for the needs of the Architect of the Capitol as well, including its various operations and maintenance activities under its jurisdiction for the capitol, House office buildings, and the surrounding grounds.

In addition, this bill funds the needs of the invaluable but often behind-the-scenes work performed by the Congressional Budget Office, the Government Printing Office, the General Accounting Office, the Library of Congress, and the Congressional Research Service, including all the employees who collectively help us and our staff make sense of the many complex issues that we face each and every day.

Mr. Speaker, this bill also includes a number of steps to help meet the needs of an ever-changing and dynamic workforce, as well as help this institution keep pace as an employer. It includes a monthly transit benefit to encourage alternative means of transportation, and modest infrastructure changes to make cycling to work more appealing.