The significant aspects of recognizing the way this portion of the Bingaman amendment bill was originally stated is that it would have excluded waste from public land—namely, the national forests—unless it is specifically identified as slashings, second growth, and so forth.

It would very narrowly bring into question the residue associated with milling of timber and timber products from national forests as to whether or not that waste could be used in biomass.

For example, in my State of Alaska, it would exclude the development of any biomass as an alternative because we don't have, for all practical purposes, anything other than public land.

That is why it is so important that this change be made. I want to make sure that in the language the intention is, if you have a tree that comes off public land that has rot in it that would be basically determined not to be sufficient for milling—and, in the terminology, this would be a mill residue—indeed that would be included in the definition of what would be allowed.

Clearly, no one takes prime, quality timber and uses it for biomass. It has a higher value. So there is a check and balance in it.

Mr. CRAIG. If the Senator will yield, he makes an important point. In commercial logging operations that are qualified under the U.S. Forest Service—the legitimate timber sales—some of those logs, once cut, and beyond the 12-inch diameter size that get to the mill, that are deteriorating or have, as you call it, the rot of the center and cannot be milled, put on a mill head rig and moved, fall apart, I think that is residue by anyone's definition when it is determined, at least in the mill yard, that no commercial value can come from it. Clearly, I think that falls under that definition. But I appreciate the Senator mentioning it.

What we are doing, along with passing legislation, is establishing, by the record of the floor, what is the intent of Congress. And I think that is the intent of this legislation.

I thank the Senator for yielding.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. I certainly agree with that. I appreciate the colloquy. I think this is good utilization in the sense of biomass. But I would like to remind my colleagues that biomass just does not create energy. Somebody has to burn it. When you burn it, you generate emissions. And when you generate emissions, obviously, you have a tradeoff.

I am pleased the amendment will be accepted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate?

If not, without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The amendment (No. 3049) was agreed to.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. CRAIG. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. BINGAMAN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRADE PROMOTION AUTHORITY

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, as I understand it, we are working on an arrangement that will accommodate further progress on this part of the energy bill. I appreciate the cooperation of all those involved.

I want to take a moment to talk about a strong interest I have—and I know it is shared by the Presiding Officer and many other of our colleagues—in trade promotion authority, trade adjustment assistance, and the Andean Trade Preference Expansion Act. We will be dealing with all three of those issues in the next work period. I reemphasize the importance that I, as one Senator, put on getting that package passed during that time.

I think we all saw yesterday that the January trade deficit swelled to $28.5 billion. That is a 15 percent increase over December and sharply higher than the consensus forecast. That alone caused some analysts to lower their projections for first quarter growth by a full percentage point.

That set of numbers indicates pretty clearly how important trade is to the American economy, and it graphically demonstrates why we need to provide trade promotion authority.

Today, nearly one in every 10 U.S. jobs—an estimated 12 million jobs—is directly linked to the export of U.S. goods and services. These are good jobs that pay 13–18 percent more than the national average.

The benefits are even more pronounced in agriculture. Since passage of NAFTA in 1993, U.S. agricultural exports to Mexico have doubled.

Agricultural exports today account for one in every three U.S. acres planted; nearly 25 percent of gross cash sales in agriculture; and more than three-quarters of a million U.S. jobs.

The U.S. Trade Representative's office estimates that the average American family of four saves between $1,260 and $2,040 a year as a result of the two major trade agreements we entered into in the 1990s—NAFTA and the Uruguay Round.

And in my view, the benefits of trade today are even greater for the United States because no Nation in the world is better positioned to thrive in a global, information-based economy.

Expanding trade also offers national security and foreign policy benefits because trade opens more than new markets. When it is done correctly, it opens the way for democratic reforms. It also increases understanding and interdependence among nations, and raises the cost of conflict.

Senators BAUCUS and GRASSLEY deserve great credit for getting a bipartisan TPA proposal out of the Finance Committee with an overwhelming vote of support—18 to 3.

Their proposal not only gives the President that authority he needs to negotiate good trade agreements for the United States. It also addresses critical labor and environmental concerns. Under their proposal, labor and environmental concerns are central issues, not side issues.

The fundamental reality is that expanded trade raises living standards generally, but some people lose. That is inevitable.

Last year, we passed an important education reform bill. We agreed then that we would ''leave no child behind.'' Now we need to make sure we leave no worker behind. And that's why the package will include expanded trade adjustment assistance

This is not a partisan idea. It's an American idea.

It was also the one clear area of agreement among the recommendations of the bipartisan U.S. Trade Deficit Review Commission, which was established by Congress in 1998.

Among the key members of the commission were President Bush's trade representative, Robert Zoellick; Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld; and George Becker, the former president of the United Steelworkers.

Nor is trade adjustment assistance a new idea. It has been part of American trade policy for 40 years.

The current program, however, covers too few people. And it does not address some of the most serious problems displaced workers have in finding productive new employment.

I commend Senators BAUCUS and BINGAMAN for their leadership in putting together a proposal that corrects both of those shortcomings.

I also thank Senator SNOWE, who has been working closely with us on this effort.

We already have 47 cosponsors.

There are some reasons why we need a new, expanded program of trade adjustment assistance. I want to cite a few.

Today, if your employer's plant moves to Mexico, you are eligible for a year of additional unemployment benefits, plus education and training. But if your plant moves to Brazil—or any other nation besides Mexico—you get none of these benefits.

The new proposal says that no matter where your company moves, you get help.

Today, workers whose company moves to another country are eligible for trade adjustment assistance. But let's say your employer provides parts to another company, and that company moves to another country. If you lose your job in that case, you are not eligible for assistance.

The new proposal makes sure these ''secondary workers'' get help, too.

For the first time, the new proposal also includes farmers.

As a general matter, expanded trade will provide billions and billions of dollars in economic growth for the United States.

Certainly, we can dedicate a small fraction of this gain to those Americans who are harmed. It is the right thing to do. Frankly, it will be impossible to build a broad consensus for expanded trade unless we do it right.

We should help American workers learn the new skills they need to earn a living. We should help them maintain health insurance while they're unemployed—and help protect against wage loss when they become re-employed.

I also want to reaffirm my strong support for the Andean Trade Preference Expansion Act.

Again, I wish we could have passed it quickly, this week, as I had originally hoped. But I am confident we can pass it in a relatively short period of time after we return.

Congress first passed the Andean Trade Preferences Act 10 years ago as a comprehensive effort to defeat narcotrafficking and reduce the flow of cocaine into the United States.

The program allows the President to provide reduced-duty or duty-free treatment for most imports from Bolivia, Columbia, Ecuador, and Peru.

The goal is simple: to provide farmers in a region that produces 100 percent of the cocaine consumed in the United States with viable economic alternatives to the production of coca.

The program works.

In the last decade, our Andean neighbors have made significant economic gains, and trade between the United States and the region has increased dramatically.

According to the International Trade Commission, between 1991 and 1999, two-way trade between the United States and Andean nations nearly doubled, and U.S. exports to the region grew by 65 percent.

The ITC also reports that ATPA has contributed significantly to the diversification of the region's exports.

In addition, the program has served as a catalyst for resolving regional conflicts, pushing the members of the Andean community—particularly Peru and Ecuador—to work toward resolution of long-standing disagreements that have undercut efforts at regional development.

ATPA is doing, in other words, precisely what it was intended to do. So there is every reason to extend it on its own merits.

But in addition, the bill we passed last year to expand U.S. trade with Caribbean countries has had the unintended effect of putting the Andean nations at a competitive disadvantage with other nations in the region.

The development and stability of the Andean region is as much in our interest as it is in theirs.

The package we will consider when we return will renew ATPA and, at the same time, level the playing field between Andean nations and their Caribbean neighbors.

I thank Senator GRAHAM of Florida for his leadership in putting together the proposal and again Chairman BAUCUS for putting the entire trade package together.

The word ''trade'' has its roots in an old Middle English word meaning ''path,'' which is connected to the word ''tread'' to move forward.

The trade package we will consider when we return will enable us to move forward in this new global economy in a way that strengthens our national security and the economic security of American businesses and families. We look forward to a good and vigorous debate when we return.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I wanted to speak very briefly in agreement with the majority leader about his comments on both trade promotion authority and trade adjustment assistance. I think the two clearly have to go together and quickly. There are a great many workers in this country who are getting inadequate benefits. Many are getting no benefits because we have not modernized our Trade Adjustment Assistance Program.

We have a good proposal to modernize that program which we passed out of the Finance Committee, and I think it is very important that we bring that up on the Senate floor after we return and pass that as quickly as possible. I know that is intended to pass in tandem with the trade promotion authority.

The administration is anxious to see that pass. I think if there are disagreements about the trade adjustment assistance proposals that we have reported out of the Finance Committee, we need to have early negotiations to resolve this.

I know the administration has expressed concerns. To my knowledge, we have not had any real counterproposals that could be seriously considered. So I hope that will get done in the next couple of weeks before we return, and I hope we will be in a position to pass a new, improved set of provisions regarding trade adjustment assistance. I think that is a real priority. I was pleased we were able to move ahead in the Finance Committee. I think it is very important to move ahead on the floor as well.

Mr. President, I thank the distinguished majority leader for his comments on the trade legislation package that we will be considering soon. Clearly, this legislation is extremely important to the economic welfare of the country and I look forward to helping him get it passed. In particular, I want to get trade adjustment assistance legislation to the floor so we can begin to help American workers and communities in a more effective way.

I have heard a lot of criticism lately about the trade adjustment assistance bill especially concerning its linkage to fast-track legislation but I have to agree with the majority leader that I see fast-track and trade adjustment assistance to be complementary. Fast-track will allow the creation of free-trade agreements that will provide broad collective benefits to Americans, but it will also result in negative impacts on American workers and communities.

From where I sit, we should not pass legislation that will negatively impact American workers without expanding and enhancing the Trade Adjustment Assistance Program. We need strong protections in place for American workers and their communities. We need a safety net that keeps these workers competitive and their communities strong. The Bush administration has stated as much many times, most recently in their trade policy agenda that came out this week.

My colleagues know that trade adjustment assistance has never been about ideologies or political parties. It has always had bi-partisan support. If my colleagues look at the number of people in their state that have used trade adjustment assistance over the years, or are using it now, they will admit the program is about helping people and communities get back on their feet. I am prepared to negotiate on the outstanding issues, and I am convinced that common ground can be found rather easily on the core components of the bill.

I thank the distinguished majority leader for his continued efforts to bring this legislation to the floor in a timely fashion, I want to thank Senator BAUCUS for his continued efforts to emphasize the importance of trade adjustment assistance, and I look forward to working with both of my colleagues in the future to ensure we pass this important legislation.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

NATIONAL LABORATORIES PARTNERSHIP IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2001—continued

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, at this time, I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendment be temporarily laid aside so that I may offer an amendment.