

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 207, nays 179, not voting 47, as follows:

[Roll No. 476]

YEAS—207

Ackerman	Goodlatte	Osborne	Boswell	Kanjorski	Payne
Aderholt	Goss	Ose	Boyd	Kaptur	Pelosi
Akin	Graham	Otter	Brady (PA)	Kildee	Peterson (MN)
Armey	Granger	Oxley	Brown (FL)	Kilpatrick	Phelps
Bachus	Graves	Paul	Brown (OH)	Kind (WI)	Pomeroy
Baker	Green (WI)	Pence	Capps	Kleczka	Price (NC)
Ballenger	Greenwood	Peterson (PA)	Capuano	Kucinich	Rahall
Barr	Grucci	Petri	Cardin	LaFalce	Rangel
Bartlett	Gutknecht	Pitts	Carson (IN)	Lampson	Reyes
Bereuter	Hansen	Portman	Carson (OK)	Langevin	Rivers
Biggert	Harman	Pryce (OH)	Clement	Lantos	Rodriguez
Bilirakis	Hart	Putnam	Condit	Larsen (WA)	Roemer
Blumenauer	Hastings (WA)	Ramstad	Conyers	Larson (GT)	Ross
Blunt	Hayes	Regula	Costello	Lee	Royal-Allard
Boehlert	Hayworth	Rehberg	Coyne	Levin	Rush
Bonilla	Hefley	Reynolds	DeGette	Lewis (GA)	Sanders
Bono	Hobson	Riley	DeLauro	Lipinski	Sandlin
Boozman	Hoekstra	Rogers (KY)	DeFazio	Lofgren	Sawyer
Brady (TX)	Horn	Rogers (MI)	DeFazio	Lucas (KY)	Schakowsky
Bryant	Houghton	Rohrbacher	DeGette	Luther	Schiff
Burr	Hulshof	Ros-Lehtinen	DeLauro	Lynch	Scott
Burton	Hunter	Royce	Deutsch	Maloney (CT)	Serrano
Buyer	Hyde	Ryan (WI)	Dingell	Maloney (NY)	Sherman
Callahan	Isakson	Ryun (KS)	Doggett	Markey	Shows
Calvert	Israel	Saxton	Dooley	Mascara	Skelton
Camp	Issa	Schaffer	Edwards	Matheson	Slaughter
Cannon	Istook	Schrock	Etheridge	Matsui	Smith (WA)
Cantor	Jefferson	Sensenbrenner	Farr	McCarthy (MO)	Snyder
Capito	Jenkins	Sessions	Fattah	McCarthy (NY)	Solis
Castle	Johnson (CT)	Shadegg	Filner	McCullom	Spratt
Chabot	Johnson (IL)	Shaw	Ford	McDermott	Stark
Chambliss	Jones (NC)	Shays	Frank	McGovern	Stenholm
Coble	Keller	Sherwood	Frost	McKinney	Strickland
Collins	Kelly	Shimkus	Gephart	Meeks (NY)	Tanner
Combest	Kennedy (MN)	Shuster	Green (TX)	Menendez	Tauscher
Cooksey	Kerns	Simmons	Hall (TX)	Millender-Lee	Taylor (MS)
Cox	King (NY)	Simpson	Hastings (FL)	McDonald	Thompson (CA)
Crenshaw	Kingston	Skeen	Hilliard	Miller, Dan	Thompson (MS)
Culberson	Kirk	Smith (MI)	Hinojosa	Miller, George	Thurman
Cunningham	Knollenberg	Smith (NJ)	Hoeffel	Mink	Tierney
Davis, Jo Ann	Kolbe	Smith (TX)	Holden	Mollohan	Towns
Davis, Tom	LaHood	Stearns	Holt	Moore	Turner
Deal	Largent	Stump	Jackson (IL)	Napolitano	Velazquez
DeLay	Latham	Sununu	Jackson-Lee	Neal	Visclosky
DeMint	LaTourette	Sweeney	(TX)	Hoyer	Waters
Diaz-Balart	Leach	Tancredo	John	Oberstar	Watson (CA)
Dicks	Lewis (CA)	Tauzin	Jackson, E. B.	Obey	Watt (NC)
Doyle	Lewis (KY)	Taylor (NC)	Jones (OH)	Pascarella	Weiner
Dreier	Linder	Terry	Jones (IL)	Pastor	Woolsey
Duncan	LoBiondo	Thomas	Jones (TX)		Wynn
Dunn	Lowey	Thornberry			
Ehlers	Lucas (OK)	Thune			
Emerson	Manzullo	Tiahrt			
Eshoo	McCrery	Tiberi			
Everett	McHugh	Toomey			
Ferguson	McInnis	Traficant			
Flake	McIntyre	Upton			
Fletcher	McKeon	Vitter			
Foley	Mica	Walder			
Forbes	Miller, Gary	Walsh			
Frelinghuysen	Miller, Jeff	Wamp			
Gallegly	Moran (KS)	Watkins (OK)			
Ganske	Moran (VA)	Watts (OK)			
Gekas	Myrick	Weldon (FL)			
Gibbons	Nethercutt	Weller			
Gilchrest	Ney	Whitfield			
Gillmor	Northup	Wicker			
Gilman	Norwood	Wilson			
Goode	Nussle	Wolf			

NAYS—179

Abercrombie	Baldwin	Berman
Allen	Barcia	Berry
Andrews	Barrett	Bishop
Baca	Becerra	Blagojevich
Baird	Bentsen	Bonior
Baldacci	Berkley	Borski

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 476, had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ISAKSON). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair announces that he will postpone further proceedings today on the first 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 after debate has concluded on all motions to suspend the rules.

#### REAUTHORIZING TRADE ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE PROGRAM REAUTHORIZATION ACT

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3008) to reauthorize the trade adjustment assistance program under the Trade Act of 1974, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 3008

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

#### TITLE I—REAUTHORIZATION OF TRADE ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE PROGRAM; RELATED PROVISIONS

##### SECTION 101. REAUTHORIZATION OF PROGRAM.

(a) ASSISTANCE FOR WORKERS.—Section 245 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2317) is amended by striking "October 1, 1998, and ending September 30, 2001," each place it appears and inserting "October 1, 2001, and ending September 30, 2003".

(b) ASSISTANCE FOR FIRMS.—Section 256(b) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2346(b)) is amended by striking "October 1, 1998, and ending September 30, 2001" and inserting "October 1, 2001, and ending September 30, 2003".

(c) TERMINATION.—Section 285(c) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2271 note) is amended in paragraphs (1) and (2)(A) by striking "September 30, 2001" and inserting "September 30, 2003".

(d) TRAINING LIMITATION UNDER NAFTA PROGRAM.—Section 250(d)(2) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2331(d)(2)) is amended by striking "October 1, 1998, and ending September 30, 2001" and inserting "October 1, 2001, and ending September 30, 2003".

(e) CLARIFICATION OF CERTAIN REDUCTIONS.—(1) Section 231(a)(3)(B) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2291(a)(3)(B)) is amended by striking "any unemployment insurance" and inserting "any regular State unemployment insurance".

(2) Section 233(a)(1) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2293(a)(1)) is amended by striking "unemployment insurance" and inserting "regular State unemployment insurance".

(f) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on October 1, 2001.

##### SEC. 102. AMENDMENTS TO LIMITATIONS ON TRADE READJUSTMENT ALLOWANCES.

(a) INCREASE IN MAXIMUM NUMBER OF WEEKS.—Section 233(a) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2293(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), by inserting after "104-week period" the following: "(or, in the case

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. FORD, Mrs. DAVIS of California and Messrs. DAVIS of Florida, WYNN, MARKEY and LIPINSKI changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. HEFLEY and Mr. JEFFERSON changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. BROWN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 476 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "Yea."

Stated against:

of an adversely affected worker who requires a program of remedial education (as described in section 236(a)(5)(D)) in order to complete training approved for the worker under section 236, the 130-week period"; and

(2) in paragraph (3), by striking "26" each place it appears and inserting "52".

(b) ADDITIONAL WEEKS FOR INDIVIDUALS IN NEED OF REMEDIAL EDUCATION.—Section 233 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2293) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(g) Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, in order to assist an adversely affected worker to complete training approved for the worker under section 236 which includes a program of remedial education (as described in section 236(a)(5)(D)), and in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary, payments may be made as trade readjustment allowances for up to 26 additional weeks in the 26-week period that follows the last week of entitlement to trade readjustment allowances otherwise payable under this chapter."

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to an individual receiving trade readjustment allowances pursuant to chapter 2 of title II of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2271 et seq.) on or after January 1, 2001.

#### SEC. 103. EXPEDITED REVIEW OF PETITIONS BY SECRETARY OF LABOR.

Section 223(a) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2273(a)) is amended in the first sentence by striking "60 days" and inserting "40 days".

#### SEC. 104. DECLARATION OF POLICY; SENSE OF CONGRESS.

(a) DECLARATION OF POLICY.—Congress reiterates that, under the trade adjustment assistance program under chapter 2 of title II of the Trade Act of 1974, workers are eligible for transportation, childcare, and healthcare assistance, as well as other related assistance under programs administered by the Department of Labor.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the Secretary of Labor, working independently and in conjunction with the States, should, in accordance with section 225 of the Trade Act of 1974, provide more specific information about benefit allowances, training, and other employment services, and the petition and application procedures (including appropriate filing dates) for such allowances, training, and services, under the trade adjustment assistance program under chapter 2 of title II of the Trade Act of 1974 to workers who are applying for, or are certified to receive, assistance under that program, including information on all other Federal assistance available to such workers.

#### TITLE II—ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE PROGRAM FOR WORKERS SEPARATED FROM EMPLOYMENT DUE TO THE TERRORIST ATTACKS OF SEPTEMBER 11, 2001

##### SEC. 201. ESTABLISHMENT OF PROGRAM.

As soon as practicable after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Labor shall establish a program to provide adjustment assistance for workers separated from employment due to the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, in accordance with the provisions of this title.

##### SEC. 202. PETITION.

(a) PETITION.—A petition for a certification of eligibility to apply for adjustment assistance under this title may be filed with the Secretary by a group of workers (including workers in any agricultural firm or subdivision of an agricultural firm) or by their certified or recognized union or other duly authorized representative. Upon receipt of the petition, the Secretary shall promptly publish notice in the Federal Register that the Secretary has received the petition and initiated an investigation.

(b) PUBLIC HEARING.—If the petitioner, or any other person found by the Secretary to have a substantial interest in the proceedings, submits not later than 10 days after the date of the Secretary's publication under subsection (a) a request for a hearing, the Secretary shall provide for a public hearing and afford such interested persons an opportunity to be present, to produce evidence, and to be heard.

##### SEC. 203. CERTIFICATION.

(a) CERTIFICATION.—The Secretary shall certify a group of workers (including workers in any agricultural firm or subdivision of an agricultural firm) as eligible to apply for adjustment assistance under this title if the Secretary determines—

(1) that a significant number or proportion of the workers in such workers' firm or an appropriate subdivision of the firm have become totally or partially separated, or are threatened to become totally or partially separated;

(2) that sales or production, or both, of such firm or subdivision have decreased absolutely; and

(3) that the national impact of the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, contributed importantly to such total or partial separation, or threat thereof, and to such decline in sales or production, as determined by the Secretary.

(b) ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS.—The provisions of section 223 of the Trade Act of 1974 shall apply to a determination and issuance of a certification with respect to a group of workers under this title in the same manner and to the same extent as such provisions apply to a determination and issuance of a certification with respect to a group of workers under the program under subchapter A of chapter 2 of title II of such Act, to the extent determined to be appropriate by the Secretary.

(c) DEFINITION.—For purposes of subsection (a)(3), the term "contributed importantly" means a cause which is important but not necessarily more important than any other cause.

##### SEC. 204. BENEFITS.

Workers covered by a certification issued by the Secretary under section 203 shall be provided, in the same manner and to the same extent as workers covered under a certification under the program under subchapter A of chapter 2 of title II of the Trade Act of 1974, the benefits described in subchapter B of chapter 2 of title II of such Act, to the extent determined to be appropriate by the Secretary.

##### SEC. 205. ADMINISTRATION.

The provisions of subchapter C of chapter 2 of title II of the Trade Act of 1974 shall apply to the administration of the program under this title in the same manner and to the same extent as such provisions apply to the administration of the program under subchapter A of chapter 2 of title II of such Act, to the extent determined to be appropriate by the Secretary.

##### SEC. 206. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) SECRETARY.—The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Labor.

(2) TERRORIST ATTACKS OF SEPTEMBER 11, 2001.—The term "terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001" means the following events that occurred on September 11, 2001:

(A) The attack, using two hijacked commercial aircraft, that was made on the towers of the World Trade Center in New York City.

(B) The attack, using a hijacked commercial aircraft, that was made on the Pentagon.

(C) The hijacking of a commercial aircraft and the subsequent crash of the aircraft in

the State of Pennsylvania, in the County of Somerset.

##### SEC. 207. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary to carry out this title \$2,000,000,000 for fiscal years 2002 and 2003.

(b) AVAILABILITY.—Amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations under subsection (a) are authorized to remain available until expended.

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, I asked for consideration of this bill, as amended, because the underlying bill, the Trade Adjustment Assistance Act, expired on October 1.

In the committee we passed as a placeholder, if you will, a simple extension of the bill, fully intending, once we understood the consequences of September 11 and our ability to make additional adjustments, that we would, as we are doing here today, offer amendments on the floor of the House.

So I would like to address, other than the simple reauthorization, what those amendments are.

The Trade Adjustment Assistance Act says that if one loses one's job primarily related to trade, they are to get assistance and retraining. The problem is the current structure says that they also get income support while they are being retrained. The income support runs out before the training ends, and what we are doing is reconciling the differences between the two.

But beyond that, because of the events on September 11, we believe that it is entirely appropriate to include in this bill, notwithstanding the fact that it is supposed to be tied to trade, an act for the Secretary of Labor to assess those individuals who lost their job through no fault of their own associated with the tragic events on September 11.

That declaration would be virtually identical to the declaration that she is currently empowered to exercise in the area of trade. And to assist her in doing this for the 2-year period of this provision, we provide \$1 billion this year and \$1 billion next year, a total of \$2 billion.

There has been some discussion and, my assumption is, some confusion on the other side of the aisle on materials that have been prepared to describe what this measure does. It does not require an appropriation. The provisions of the Trade Adjustment Act are an entitlement, and when the money is made available, it is available. It is not a requirement that a second hurdle be met. It is not that we could give with one hand and take away with another.

Anyone who supports this measure can have comfort in knowing that it not only makes more sense out of the

assistance given to those who lose their jobs through trade, but for the next 2 years, those who were the unfortunate victims, from an employment point of view, because of September 11 will be able to have this assistance, as well.

In addition to that, since both the trade and the September 11 events are keyed to those who lost their job primarily associated with trade, we have discussed with the administration, and at the appropriate time I would like to place in the RECORD a letter from the Secretary of Labor who agrees that, although they may not have lost their job primarily because of the event, either trade or the tragedy of September 11, that there is additional support for those who secondarily lost their job, and that program is in place and will be used to expand the opportunities to assist people, even though they would not be classified under the primary trigger that is in this bill.

That is the sum and substance of what we have in front of us. It is a significant improvement in the underlying bill, and clearly, we have added this provision over 2 years at \$1 billion a year to focus on those who lost their jobs not necessarily through trade, but because of the tragic events of September 11, and we allow the Secretary of Labor to make a decision similar to those who lost their jobs in trade.

The letter from the Secretary of Labor referred to earlier is as follows:

SECRETARY OF LABOR,  
Washington, DC.

Hon. WILLIAM M. THOMAS,  
Chairman, House Ways and Means Committee,  
U.S. House of Representatives, Washington,  
DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN THOMAS: As you know, the Trade Adjustment Assistance (TAA) programs authorized income support and training for workers who are able to demonstrate that they lost their jobs because an increase in imports of a "like or directly competitive product" contributed importantly to the job loss. I understand that a number of workers, including those in the textile industry, have been unable to obtain certifications under the TAA programs because they are classified as "secondary workers" and do not produce a product "like or directly competitive with" the important product. As a result, these workers cannot meet the TAA standard.

Nevertheless, I recognize that these secondary workers may have also been adversely affected by a trade agreement. Accordingly, I commit to using my current authority under the Workforce Investment Act to provide national emergency grants that can be used to provide income support, training and other reemployment services to eligible workers in firms that are determined to be secondary workers. Eligible workers would be required to meet the following criteria: (1) the subject firm must be a supplier of products to a TAA certified firm under 19 U.S.C. 2272(a) that is directly affected by imports, and (2) the loss of business with the directly affected firm must have contributed importantly to worker separations at the subject firm.

I recognize that while trade agreements will result in net economic benefits and increased job opportunities, some workers may be adversely affected. It is our responsibility to assure that hardworking Americans have

appropriate opportunities to adjust to trade-related changes to the workforce.

Sincerely,

ELAINE L. CHAO.

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 bill came before the Committee on Ways and Means. It did so in a way that did not allow us to add the reforms that are necessary for TAA.

Those reforms are many. Many of them have been recommended by GAO. Many of them are contained in the bill that is now in the Senate Finance Committee; actually, it is out of the Senate Finance Committee. Many of them are in a bill that has been introduced in this House. They relate to everything from the training provisions to wage insurance, to health insurance, to trade assistance for communities.

None of these are covered by this bill, so what we have before us is a reauthorization of TAA, with essentially two additions. One of them would allow the income maintenance to be for the same period as the training provision.

I am in favor of that, Mr. Speaker. Everybody should understand, however, that we are talking about a very small number of people who would be affected. As I understand it, less than 1 percent of those who are dislocated, or about 1 percent, would benefit from this provision.

The second relates to the \$2 billion add-on. This was not discussed in the Committee on Ways and Means, and its implications remain unclear. I want to talk a bit about it substantively and raise a few questions.

But for everybody listening, I would say the following: We are going to be taking up a fast track TPA bill. One reason I think this bill is being brought up this morning this way is in case someone would like to use this as a reason to vote for a TPA fast track bill, I urge that there is no justification for using that as a reason.

TAA should have been expanded, and beyond what is being provided this morning. This morning is a quickie effort to move. It is inadequate. It has been called a small step, and that is, at best, what it is.

The gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS), our chairman, has said that no appropriation is needed. While the language may not be clear, I accept that. Then we have the question of \$2 billion. I think the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS) said it is \$1 billion every year; it is not \$2 billion each year. As a result, there is a good question as to how many people this will really cover.

When we look at the number of people who were dislocated before September 11 and add those who were dislocated after September 11, there is no way \$1 billion is adequate funding for this program. That is another reason that is a small step at best.

Then there is the issue of the training benefit. As I understand, the TAA

program caps the training benefit at \$100 million. If that is true, what is going to happen with the way this is handled is that we will not have nearly adequate funds for the training component because that apparently is still capped. Maybe there can be clarification of that.

But as I understand it, the cap of \$100 million remains, so essentially we are going to have a disequilibrium between the income provision and the training provision, and we are going to have many, many more people who might be eligible than was true before September 11. There is no provision for health insurance in this program.

Now, I want to say just a word about the issue of coverage, because one of the reforms that we should have been undertaking in this legislation, which is not even touched upon except perhaps indirectly, is who is covered. Will service workers be covered? Presently they are not, and it is not clear that they would be under this provision, because the TAA bill generally does not cover service workers.

The Secretary of Labor has said that secondary workers or, I should say, those who were laid off in a secondary way as a result of September 11, will become eligible under this program, I guess under rules and regulations that are promulgated by the Secretary. That leaves this program with much lack of clarity. There is no direction in this legislation as to how the Secretary of Labor should conduct herself and how she should implement the definition as she now sees it.

So this is a proposal that has come up at the last minute. These changes do not get at many of the basic issues of reform.

In terms of the relation of the training provision to the income provision, that has serious questions as to adequacy. Clearly it will not be adequate in terms of money, and it is not clear who would be covered.

I will leave it for further debate to clarify these issues. I hope that would happen, and then leave it for every Member to make a judgment. It may be that this is a tiny step forward. It should not be used as a rationale for a vote on any other bill.

Let us have a little bit of discussion now as to what is involved in this very small step when we should have been undertaking, as the Senate Finance Committee did a few days ago, some major reform of TAA.

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

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

For what it is worth, for the record, the discussion and the vote in the committee on trade assistance was that it was a voice vote and no amendments were offered. I think we have to understand the context in which that discussion took place.

In addition to that, the gentleman from Michigan laments the fact that there is nothing in this particular provision for people who were laid off prior

to September 11. We have to understand that this particular structure is triggered off of an event, a trade-related job loss, and now we are extending it to the tragedy of September 11 job loss.

□ 1000

Not just any job loss. The President has spoken repeatedly on what he wants on an expanded assistance, including additional weeks, additional money, and additional assistance, not just on unemployment compensation but on health insurance as well. We on this side of the aisle, with the support of leadership, have also talked about expanding that area. That is in fact a different subject matter to be discussed at a different time. And this particular vehicle never was intended nor should it carry a response to unemployment because of a recession or a more generally difficult problem that spreads beyond the trigger of trade-related; and now for 2 years, those people who lost their jobs in association with the tragedy surrounding September 11.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CRANE), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Trade.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3008 is a bill to reauthorize the trade adjustment assistance programs for 2 years until September 30, 2003. The current authorization expired in September but is continuing subject to the continuing resolution adopted last month and running until November 16, 2001.

It is an economic fact that free trade helps our overall economy. The value of the Uruguay Round Agreements and NAFTA to the U.S. economy was over \$65 billion. A recent study at the University of Michigan, right next to the gentleman from Michigan's district, found that a new round could add double again that benefit. The general direction of trade policy should therefore be obvious. We should work assiduously toward free trade.

Nevertheless, it is also a fact that free trade accelerates economic change, which disproportionately hurts some industries and people. It is important then for us to offer a hand to those people and industries. We should help them adjust. This means that workers may need to train for other types of jobs, and during that training and subsequent job search time, they may need more direct assistance than States routinely provide. Similarly, firms need assistance in making strategic adjustments necessary to remain competitive in a global economy. The trade adjustment assistance programs provide this help.

All three TAA programs have proven successful and popular in softening the impact of foreign competition on workers in impacted industries. Workers may receive cash payments, job training, and allowances for job search and relocation expenses. In addition, we

have heard concerns from Members about the problems in their districts and the need to increase the direct assistance for workers in order for them to complete their training. Accordingly, we are increasing the direct assistance by an additional 26 weeks and shortening the time that the government has to process petitions.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to support this bill and reauthorize the trade adjustment assistance programs.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. McDERMOTT).

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, whatever of the issues are in the trade adjustment bill, they are not the reason this bill is out here. This bill is out here as a vehicle for putting some things through the House that the chairman and others think will blind the eyes of Members of this House and will offer them some hope that there will be something done for the unemployed workers in this country, and that then they will say, well, since we have done that for the unemployed workers, we can now go ahead and pass fast track.

Now, the Speaker stood right here and promised us that we would do something about the health care and the unemployed workers of this country. When this bill came before the committee, every amendment was non-germane. No one said this is our chance to put unemployment up here. This is our chance to put up health care. It was a narrow little trade adjustment bill. And so now, after it gets out of the committee, they take it up to the Committee on Rules, and the Committee on Rules sticks in a bunch of stuff that nobody has looked at.

There is not anybody who can stand on this floor and say there will be one single unemployed worker in this country whose health care benefits will be protected by this bill. There is a bill that is going over to the Senate in the last days of the session, and we have had a recession in this country since March and we have not done anything, and we are here on the 5th of December, 6th of December, whatever it is, and we still have not had hearings in the House of Representatives on what really needs to be done to the unemployment system.

We have States in this country that do not have enough money for 3 months of unemployment benefits. Did we have a hearing on that? Did we talk about it? No. We have simply stuck \$9 billion into a bill that went out of here, called the stimulus package, and said give it to the Governors; they will do whatever is right. Well, at least they figured out now that they want to make it done by the Congress, because Governors would have to call legislators into session to get anything done.

This is a fraud. This is a fraud. It has not had hearings, and you people have messed up the Medicare system in this country because you will not have

hearings and figure out how it is going to work. And then suddenly since 1997, we are back every year fixing, fixing, fixing. Here's \$2 billion for health; just throw it out there into the air and maybe it will happen to come down in the hands of somebody who is unemployed.

Give it to the Governors. Where is that going to get anybody?

We are all going to vote for this, but nobody should be confused about what this is.

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

Mr. Speaker, I find it ironic that the gentleman says that every amendment they offered was nongermane. Would you not think, if they were serious, they could offer a germane amendment? It was basically to be able to say that they were not able to do what they wanted to do.

Then the next argument is what in the world is trade adjustment assistance, which expired on October 1, doing on the floor the same day we are taking up trade promotion authority? The idea if we do enter into additional negotiations and we have some trade agreements, that someone may lose employment based upon the fact that we have the new trade agreements and we would not have reauthorized the legislation that takes care of those who lose their jobs because of trade.

If the gentleman from Washington (Mr. McDERMOTT) does not understand why trade adjustment assistance is on the floor on the same day that we consider trade promotion authority, then I just do not know if there is any help for him.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. DUNN) who has been a tremendous help in focusing especially those portions of the bill dealing with workers who lost their jobs because of September 11.

Ms. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3008 to reauthorize the trade adjustment assistance program and to temporarily extend new coverage for workers who were impacted by September 11.

TAA is critical for countless workers who have been adversely affected by foreign competition or by terrorist attacks. Many of the people I represent in Washington State will benefit from the job training services and unemployment compensation that are provided by this provision.

In 1998 and 1999, TAA provided \$10 million worth of benefits to over 19,000 Boeing workers who were laid off. Many of the 20,000 to 30,000 Boeing workers who have been or will be laid off by the end of next year can now qualify for assistance from the traditional TAA and the new expanded coverage. This bill enhances income support benefits for an additional 26 weeks and it shortens the petition review time from 60 days to 40 days. These are changes that will help reduce paperwork while providing a very necessary safety net to workers.

I want to assure the former speaker that I am very happy this legislation also includes provisions that the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS) and I have added to ensure that States already providing supplemental unemployment coverage beyond the Federal mandates are not penalized.

Under current Federal law, Washington State residents could not use TAA benefits until the State's regular and supplemental unemployment benefits were exhausted. I want to thank the gentleman from California (Chairman THOMAS) and Subcommittee on Trade chairman, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CRANE) for working with the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS) and me to give Washington State greater flexibility by enabling the people we represent to qualify for TAA much earlier.

We have got to do all we can, Mr. Speaker, to provide relief to those who are now coping with the very difficult circumstances that displaced workers face. This legislation is a positive step in providing much needed assistance to those who reside in the area. I represent the great Pacific Northwest. My constituents there are very eager to get back to work.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BENTSEN) who is the author of a comprehensive TAA bill in the House.

(Mr. BENTSEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

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

Mr. Speaker, let me say I am going to vote for this bill, but this bill is a day late and a dollar short. This issue has been on the front burner, I think, of the whole trade debate for many, many years. And I think as the chairman and the ranking member know, there have been numerous articles in economic journals and academia about the whole issue of trade adjustment assistance.

This is a program that was created in 1962, and I cannot think of any program that was created in 1962 that somebody in Congress has not talked about the need to reform, and this program certainly needs reform. As best as I can tell from this bill, it does not address the issues of secondary workers in any clear-cut fashion or manner. It does not address the issue of allowing workers who we want to go back into retraining to get a part-time job to help put food on the table, which is really counter to every other public assistance program that we have addressed in the time I have been in this Congress.

It does not have anything to do with providing for better coordination between the Federal Government and State and local government, where a lot of these dollars are done through the work force training partnership programs that we have.

We had a situation a couple of years ago in El Paso, Texas where Hasbro

had shut down plants, and they took TAA money and were teaching workers English instead of giving them skills to work in light manufacturing which needed jobs in the El Paso area, which is very much a bilingual area.

This bill, quite frankly, does not do enough. I am one who in the past has supported I think every trade bill that has come up. And every time I have done that, I have said we need to do more to help those who do not win from trade. And I am not alone in this view. A few weeks ago, the Chairman of the Federal Reserve, Alan Greenspan, very much a free trader, made remarks at the International Institute for Economics at their inaugural dinner. In that debate, the chairman said that trade is not necessarily about increasing a net gain of jobs, it is about raising the standard of living, and there are those who lose from comparative advantage even in the United States and that we have to do more to help those workers who fall behind.

This bill, quite frankly, does not do enough. If we were serious about doing this, we would bring up my bill, 3359; or the chairman can do his own bill, put it on the floor, let us debate it. This is a serious program that affects millions of Americans who do not benefit from trade. I believe the general economy can benefit from trade, but there are fellow Americans who do not. We should be doing more about it. This bill does not do it. There is a better way to do it.

I would hope that the House would get back on the right track as it relates to trade and address the issues so all our fellow Americans can benefit from this.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. JOHNSON), the sponsor of this legislation.

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this legislation and I am interested that so many of my colleagues are criticizing the process by which it came to the floor or criticizing the fact that it does not do enough.

This is the first time in the history of this country that Congress has offered 2 years of stipend plus training costs to the unemployed. It is the first time. And those benefits are over and above the half-year of unemployment compensation benefits under current law.

The Democrats were in control of this House for 40 years. Never ever did they offer this kind of benefit to people unemployed as a result of foreign competition and, in this case, we are extending these remarkable benefits to those who lost their jobs as a result of a terrorist action as well.

Now, we need to lay our controversies aside and vote this through. This is an exceptional benefit for people who were unemployed as a result of foreign competition or as a result of the attack on September 11.

□ 1015

Let me tell my colleagues what it means. Remember your own people in your own district. Unemployment compensation is a small amount of money, and the unemployed have to keep going out and proving that they are looking for a job. Under TAA we said, look, you have the right for retraining and you will not have to go out and look for a job during this period. We are going to pay their unemployment comp so they have a way to support their family and we are going to pay for their training.

I have had people tell me in my district, as recently as 4 months ago, that, no, they were not looking for a job because under TAA, they had the right to go back to school. I just heard the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BENTSEN) say that they were teaching English as a second language. Is not that an incredibly important thing for a person to be able to have the opportunity to learn if they want real career advancement?

I have had many people, particularly women, tell me it is wonderful that I can go back and get my high school diploma. I can learn English as a second language and I am going to take this training, too, because in the period of time in which I can get training costs and a stipend, I can change my life.

Often people, at least in my district, go from high school into the factories or from very minimal education into the factories, and I will tell my colleagues that for many of them, often their company losing its competitive position, resulting in their having the TAA benefits, has changed their lives. They do not have to take the next job if they can afford to live on unemployment comp, which they often can if the other spouse is working, and go back to school. The joy in their eyes, as they have the chance to learn English, as they have the chance to get a degree, as they can go to the community college, as they can go to a medical technology course to prepare for a career that will offer them a higher salary and a lifestyle they are going to be proud of and happy with.

This is the first time ever in history that the United States Government has offered people 104 weeks of this benefit. I appreciate all the ancillary concerns of my colleagues, but do not let those ancillary concerns and the angers that are afoot in this body between this body and the other body prevent us from putting out there this kind of benefit that is going to help people at a level we have never been willing to help them before.

Let me just add one thing about the September 11th victims, those unemployed as a result of the September 11 attack. It is very hard, to determine in law exactly who is unemployed as a result of foreign competition as to determine who is unemployed as a result of the New York attack. Our Department of Labor has been very generous in their definitions and I believe will continue to be very generous in making people eligible for these benefits.

I have had a lot of experience with this in Connecticut. I represent a town that was all machine tools, bearings. Name the manufacturing facility and it used to be in my hometown, and I have been through this right up till recent years. The Department of Labor has been very open about it. They have been very generous about the definition, and people have benefited enormously, and I believe they will be the same kind of good helpmate in identifying who exactly the September 11 unemployed are. I urge support of this bill.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, could I ask how much time is remaining on both sides?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ISAKSON). The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) has 6 minutes. The gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS) has 5½ minutes.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the very distinguished gentleman from Maine (Mr. BALDACCIO).

Mr. BALDACCIO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) for yielding me the time and also for the work put into this.

We talk about trade agreements and we talk about the global economy, but every once in a while we need to make sure that we have a rearview mirror and that the rearview mirror is clearly focused to understand people who get left behind.

This program is one of the programs that assists people that get left behind and those relationships that we establish, and that is why it is vitally important to make sure that the resources are there and the tools are there so that people can have another opportunity, can get the training and education necessary.

In our own State of Maine, we faced these challenges of losing jobs in traditional manufacturing industries and this year has been no exception. There were 19 different applications for trade adjustment assistance awaiting review for Maine companies. This program has helped over 1,000 workers in Maine every year to retrain and restart their lives. It allows the workers to adapt to the 21st century economy while extending a crucial helping hand during troubled times.

I do wish that the bill had gone further in expanding this valuable program. The TAA law should be changed to be able to cover all forms of production shifts to other countries. The funding for the program needed to be more because it usually runs out of money for its training budget. This past year the Maine Department of Labor had to apply for \$1.2 million in national emergency grants from the U.S. Department of Labor to cover costs. So we need to be able to look at expanding funding to ensure this.

However, although this bill is not perfect, the program is important to workers in Maine and around the coun-

try, and I urge my colleagues to vote for its reauthorization.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. HOUGHTON), who has experience in this area both within and without Congress.

Mr. HOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, trade is a tricky business. What we are trying to do is go beyond the bounds of the United States and move into other areas, and this is very, very important. We are going to be talking about this later, because there are people who want our goods and services, but in the process, it is an uneven balancing act and people either in government or in business management can make decisions as far as going abroad. Yet at the same time there are people down in the system who are doing their best to be able to work diligently, loyally, who have no control over that.

Sometimes the squeeze comes because of the imbalance in this process and they need protection, and this is what the bill is all about.

I think it makes a great deal of sense. I think the conditions are fine. Maybe we will be able to enrich it later on, but it is a good start, and I heartily endorse the TAA bill H.R. 3008.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the very distinguished gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT).

(Mr. SPRATT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I come from textile country, and I have seen the effects of imports upon jobs in the area where I live, \$77 billion trade deficit in textiles and apparel last year. Over the last 10 years, we have lost about a million jobs in textile and apparel, and I can tell my colleagues, from my own district, my own State, from the Carolinas to the southeast, only a minute percentage of these people who have lost their jobs have been able to get trade adjustment assistance benefits.

That is a hard truth. We have heard these benefits extolled here on the floor, but in truth, very, very few people qualify for them.

It is shameful how little we do for the people we know are going to be hurt by the trade policies that we adopt, and anybody who thinks that this is going to make it easier to vote for fast track, easier to vote for trade promotion authority, they better think again, because this bill is a pittance. This bill will do very little. It does nothing to expand the eligibility of these people we know are going to be direct hits. They are not collateral casualties in this war. They are direct hits.

We know when we lower the tariffs, get rid of the quotas, that textiles are going to come flooding into our markets by an even greater volume and quantity, and we know exactly who is going to be hurt and who is going to be hit. No question about it, they are direct hits.

We say that we have got these benefits for them so they can have this marvelous change of life, this mid-course adjustment, but in truth, they have still got a house payment to make. They have still got car payments to make, and I know from talking to countless textile workers in my own district, very, very few of them, if they have it, can afford to exercise their COBRA benefits out of the meager unemployment income that they receive.

This is a mirage. Worse still, it is deceitful. It holds out that we are doing something significant when there is an agenda full of changes recommended to TAA that should start with the Department of Labor, which is woefully, woefully understaffed to handle the volume of applications under TAA. This is a pittance compared to what needs to be done, and we should be ashamed that we are bringing this up in the name of helping people who are going to be hurt by trade.

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

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. McDERMOTT).

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, is it the gentleman from Michigan's understanding that the intention of this bill is to make benefits available for Boeing workers who have been laid off after September 11 and for 100,000 airline employees who have been laid off since September 11?

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McDERMOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. LEVIN. It is not easy to read this bill, but I think so.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Michigan thinks so? So I have got to go home to my district and tell my people they might be covered by this, it is not clear?

Mr. LEVIN. It is not clear, and indeed, there will have to be regulations issued by the Department of Labor in terms of those who are affected secondarily.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I think that is why this bill is really a fraud. It seems to do something for people but it is not clear. It is subject to interpretation by the Department of Labor.

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

In the earlier reincarnation of the gentleman from Washington's statement on the floor, he indicated that he was going to be supporting the bill. I do not know what happened in the intervening moments, but apparently he is now supporting a fraud.

The question that was offered to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN), I believe, should have been answered this way. Do the Boeing employees and do the airline employees believe that the events of September 11, which included the government mandatory grounding of aircraft, the significant

reduction in income to airlines, and their subsequent requirement to cancel airplane contracts, primarily tie to the September 11 event? If the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) is so bemuddled about trying to read this bill, that he could not answer yes to that question, then his answer was a political one and not an honest one.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished gentleman from Washington (Mr. McDERMOTT), is a former Illinoisan and from the Chicago area, and I know that Boeing has moved to Chicago, and we are not laying folks off in Chicago, and I just wanted to find out if the gentleman from Washington (Mr. McDERMOTT) was in any way involved in trying to get them to move to God's country.

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

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have, 1½ minutes?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan has 1½ minutes.

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

Let me just read what the standard is so that instead of the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS), as he sometimes does question motives, let us talk about what is in the law. It says for whom in, "The national impact of the terrorist attacks on September 11 contributed importantly to their job loss."

If anybody thinks that is a very clear standard, I ask them to think twice. It is better than nothing, but do not parade it for what it is not. I want to close by pointing out that in order for persons to be eligible for this, they must be eligible for unemployment insurance first. Less than 40 percent, and maybe it is only about a third of the workers in this country qualify for unemployment compensation in their State, and also, less than a fifth of low income workers qualify, including many in the services industry.

So what this has is not only a small amount of money for what is truly needed, not only does it have no other reforms, nothing for health care, but it is not going to cover a huge number of people who were affected by the September 11 tragedy, who clearly were affected. I just want everybody to understand what this bill really is and make no pretense that it is a reason to vote for any other bill.

□ 1030

Mr. THOMAS. How much time do I have remaining, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ISAKSON). The gentleman from California has 3 minutes remaining.

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

The name of this legislation is trade adjustment assistance. It is not undifferentiated unemployment compensa-

tion. There is another whole set of statutes, procedures, and funding to deal with unemployment in general. This measure's title is Trade Adjustment Assistance.

What we have done is to expand this bill to cover those individuals who, through no fault of their own, in a way in which they can show a nexus, and the gentleman from Michigan is entirely correct, that the loss of their job was a result of a contribution importantly tied to the September 11 event.

The gentleman then went on to complain about a number of other factors in which people are not eligible for unemployment in general. Not that it is tied to trade or the September 11 event, but that he is concerned about, in general, the failure of the unemployment insurance program to reach out to more people. We are going to have ample opportunity to deal with that in a larger context. The President has spoken to that issue. We have voted on that issue in this body in the stimulus package, and we have said we are willing to go far beyond what had been offered previously. That is not what is in front of us.

And I will repeat my understanding of the question of the gentleman from Washington. Because of the way in which the tragedy on September 11 occurred, the government ordered all planes grounded. The airlines suffered significant financial losses that resulted in the release of employees that otherwise would not have been released, and it resulted in the cancellation of airplane purchase contracts that otherwise would not have occurred. What we are expected to believe is that the Secretary of Labor would have great difficulty in associating those two events, the two events that the gentleman from Washington is concerned would not be covered by this legislation; that the Secretary of Labor would say neither of those qualify under this legislation.

I will tell the gentleman from Washington, I believe they do, and I will do everything in my power to make sure that the Secretary of labor says that those who lost their jobs because airplane contracts were canceled by airlines who had a shrinking in revenue because the government said they could not fly, and they released employees because of that same circumstance, certainly would be able to say that the loss of their jobs and the events associated with September 11 contributed importantly to the loss of those jobs. Those hurdles are not difficult ones to overcome.

Beyond that, we need to continue to work together, quit haranguing, and make sure that people who are currently unemployed, and who will become unemployed because the House has acted and the Senate has not on the larger questions, need to be preserved for another day.

On this measure, I urge my colleagues to vote "aye." It is better than it has ever been before.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to rise in support of the reauthorization of the Trade Adjustment Assistance program.

Over the last 5 years, even as the economy in the rest of the country was booming, the manufacturing economy in Southeastern Wisconsin has been declining. While there are many companies in my district that could not survive without international trade, some companies have moved their operations outside U.S. borders. This is unfortunate for both the workers and the economy of Southeastern Wisconsin. TAA offers a way to buffer the transition.

The relocation of Southeastern Wisconsin companies outside the U.S. border has been constant over the past decade. In my 3-year tenure, I have seen the MacWhyte Co. of Kenosha shift production to Canada, Outboard Marine Corp. of Beloit go bankrupt, and Acme Die Casting of Racine shut down because of foreign competition. These companies, and several others over the years have applied for and have been granted either TAA and NAFTA-TAA, or both, for their workers. While TAA is not the same as a stable job, it gives workers a chance to access valuable job training while receiving expanded state unemployment insurance or an \$800 relocation expense reimbursement if the worker decides his skills are valuable at another company elsewhere.

TAA for workers guarantees extended unemployment benefits and job training to those left jobless when imported goods have contributed significantly to their job loss. A similar program exists for workers affected by the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) when American firms relocate production to Mexico or Canada. H.R. 3008 reauthorizes TAA and NAFTA-TAA through FY2003. This bill extends direct benefits for an additional 26 weeks over the previous 78 weeks to total 104 weeks of both training and direct benefits. I supported this bill when it passed the Ways and Means Committee and support it today. I also voted in favor of an appropriation of \$416 million in H.R. 3061, the FY2002 Labor, Health and Human Services and Education Appropriations bill.

Mr. Speaker, reauthorization of TAA and NAFTA-TAA is in the interest of the United States and, especially to those workers in Southeastern Wisconsin that have lost their livelihood as a result of international pressures. I am proud to be a co-sponsor and strong supporter of this bill.

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bill, which provides a two-year reauthorization of the Trade Adjustment Assistance program. While I am pleased that Ways and Means Committee worked to increase direct benefits to trade displaced workers and new benefit coverage to workers affected by the September 11th terrorist attacks, I am disappointed that the broader reauthorization provisions contained in a bill I introduced were not included in this legislation.

With my colleague ANNA ESHOO, I was pleased to offer H.R. 3359, which is the House version of legislation offered by Senators BINGAMAN, BAUCUS and DASCHLE as S. 1209, and was recently reported out of the Senate Finance Committee. H.R. 3359 would enact real reform and modification of the existing TAA program, which has been in existence since 1962 to help workers and communities address the difficulties presented by international trade. I wish the House Leadership

had seen fit to consider this critical legislation, and I remain hopeful that many provisions of this bill will be adopted during conference consideration following the expected adoption of S. 1209.

Today we are here to consider the need for increased attention to the plight of workers affected by U.S. supported international trade agreements. As someone who has supported pro-trade measures in the past, I believe the negative effects on workers and communities has been often overlooked by proponents in the trade debate. Regardless of how each Member of Congress feels about globalization and free trade, I believe there is general agreement that the existing federal program to assist workers displaced by trade is outdated and in serious need of reform.

The current TAA program contains benefits criteria that are too restrictive; exclude too many workers; are inconsistent and contain confusing regulations—including a separate program under NAFTA; provide inadequate funding for job training, and lacks health care coverage.

My bill would improve on the current TAA in a number of ways, including the establishment of allowance, training, relocation and support service assistance to workers affected by shifts in production. The measures would also harmonize existing TAA programs to provide more effective and efficient results for individuals and communities. The legislation would facilitate on-the-job training and faster reemployment for older workers by providing up to two years in wage insurance for qualified workers over age 50. Additionally, income maintenance would be increased from 52 to 78 weeks, and funds available for training would be increased to ensure that workers taking part-time jobs would not lose training benefits. H.R. 3359 would also provide a tax credit for 50 percent of COBRA payments, increase assistance for job relocation and link TAA recipients to child care and health care benefits under existing programs. To help communities respond to job losses more quickly and efficiently, this bill would encourage greater cooperation between federal, state, regional, and local agencies that deal with individuals receiving trade adjustment assistance.

Mr. Speaker, as we move toward consideration of the Trade Promotion Authority later today, I believe we must not discount the effect of trade to the American workers. I believe we can improve the trade adjustment assistance programs in a fundamental and beneficial way. Congress should pass legislation that will make these improvements in the trade adjustment assistance program, and I ask my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Speaker, I strongly support H.R. 3008, the reauthorization of the Trade Adjustment Act, which is a vital program to help those workers who have lost their jobs due to increased imports. TAA gives these displaced workers the best chance for new employment opportunities. The program provides retraining, education, job search assistance, and income support to get people through the trials of unemployment and toward a new job.

I want to commend Chairman THOMAS and Ranking Member RANGEL for including in this bill additional benefits to reflect the economic consequences of September 11. These workers, including many in Washington State, sud-

denly were left jobless due to the terrorist attacks and I am glad that this bill will help them. However, we need to provide even more benefits for all jobless Americans whatever the cause of their unemployment.

And finally, my deepest gratitude goes to Chairman THOMAS and Ranking Member RANGEL for including a provision in H.R. 3008 to correct a problem that penalizes Washington and other States with supplemental unemployment programs for displaced workers who are being retrained. Congresswoman DUNN and myself brought to their attention the fact that TAA benefits would be delayed in States like Washington that have taken the forward-looking step of creating their own supplemental retraining programs. It makes no sense to put Washington and these other States at a disadvantage because they have decided to provide their displaced workers with additional help. I am grateful that Chairman THOMAS and Ranking Member RANGEL understood the unfairness of this situation and agreed to correct it.

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

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. 3008, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those present have voted in the affirmative.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

#### CUSTOMS BORDER SECURITY ACT OF 2001

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3129) to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 2002 and 2003 for the United States Customs Service for antiterrorism, drug interdiction, and other operations, for the Office of the United States Trade Representative, for the United States International Trade Commission, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 3129

*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 "Customs Border Security Act of 2001".

#### SEC. 2. TABLE OF CONTENTS.

The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title.

Sec. 2. Table of contents.

#### TITLE I—UNITED STATES CUSTOMS SERVICE

Subtitle A—Drug Enforcement and Other Noncommercial and Commercial Operations

Sec. 101. Authorization of appropriations for noncommercial operations, commercial operations, and air and marine interdiction.

Sec. 102. Antiterrorist and illicit narcotics detection equipment for the United States-Mexico border, United States-Canada border, and Florida and the Gulf Coast seaports.

Sec. 103. Compliance with performance plan requirements.

Subtitle B—Child Cyber-Smuggling Center of the Customs Service

Sec. 111. Authorization of appropriations for program to prevent child pornography/child sexual exploitation.

#### Subtitle C—Miscellaneous Provisions

Sec. 121. Additional Customs Service officers for United States-Canada border.

Sec. 122. Study and report relating to personnel practices of the Customs Service.

Sec. 123. Study and report relating to accounting and auditing procedures of the Customs Service.

Sec. 124. Establishment and implementation of cost accounting system; reports.

Sec. 125. Study and report relating to timeliness of prospective rulings.

Sec. 126. Study and report relating to Customs user fees.

Sec. 127. Fees for Customs inspections at express courier facilities.

#### Subtitle D—Antiterrorism Provisions

Sec. 141. Immunity for United States officials that act in good faith.

Sec. 142. Emergency adjustments to offices, ports of entry, or staffing of the Customs Service.

Sec. 143. Mandatory advanced electronic information for cargo and passengers.

Sec. 144. Border search authority for certain contraband in outbound mail.

Sec. 145. Authorization of appropriations for reestablishment of Customs operations in New York City.

#### Subtitle E—Textile Transshipment Provisions

Sec. 151. GAO audit of textile transshipment monitoring by Customs Service.

Sec. 152. Authorization of appropriations for textile transshipment enforcement operations.

Sec. 153. Implementation of the African Growth and Opportunity Act.

#### TITLE II—OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES TRADE REPRESENTATIVE

Sec. 201. Authorization of appropriations.

#### TITLE III—UNITED STATES INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

Sec. 301. Authorization of appropriations.

#### TITLE IV—OTHER TRADE PROVISIONS

Sec. 401. Increase in aggregate value of articles exempt from duty acquired abroad by United States residents.

Sec. 402. Regulatory audit procedures.

#### TITLE I—UNITED STATES CUSTOMS SERVICE

Subtitle A—Drug Enforcement and Other Noncommercial and Commercial Operations

SEC. 101. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR NONCOMMERCIAL OPERATIONS, COMMERCIAL OPERATIONS, AND AIR AND MARINE INTERDICTION.

(a) NONCOMMERCIAL OPERATIONS.—Section 301(b)(1) of the Customs Procedural Reform and Simplification Act of 1978 (19 U.S.C. 2075(b)(1)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A) to read as follows: "(A) \$899,121,000 for fiscal year 2002.;" and