

any of the aforementioned achievements and many others without his innate ability to lead. Leadership is not easy. The weight of good leadership is often a difficult load to bear, but TRENT LOTT upheld his roles as senator, majority leader and whip with an admirable level of dignity and integrity throughout his tenure.

As a new Senator, I have been touched by TRENT's candor, patience, unique charm, and by observing the tremendous relationship he has with his wife Tricia. Professionally, I have benefited greatly from his knowledge and experience about how to effectively make a difference in the U.S. Senate. He is a gifted negotiator, and his strong leadership will be greatly missed. For more than three decades, Senator LOTT has been a great public servant to the people of Mississippi in Congress. I extend my best wishes to TRENT and Tricia as they begin the next phase of their lives together.

• Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I rise to wish farewell to an honored colleague and a good friend: Senator TRENT LOTT. TRENT served in Congress for 34 years, and has represented the State of Mississippi in the Senate for 18; during that time, he distinguished himself as both a dedicated and effective party leader, and a symbol of bipartisan compromise. Few Senators play both roles so well.

Those who know TRENT often describe his personal charisma and his natural leadership abilities. Those abilities have been on display for decades, manifesting themselves as early as his college days at Ole Miss, where TRENT was a fraternity president, a cheerleader, and a well-known presence on campus. TRENT brought his budding political skills to Washington, where he served as a staffer on Capitol Hill before he was elected to Congress himself, in the first of a long series of wide-margin victories.

From 1973 to 1988, TRENT represented Mississippi's conservative 5th District, serving on the House Judiciary Committee during the Watergate scandal, as well as in the Republican leadership. As Republican whip, he helped build broad coalitions to pass important domestic and national security legislation.

In 1988, TRENT was elected to the Senate by eight percentage points over his opponent and never again faced a close race, winning reelection overwhelmingly in 1994, 2000, and 2006. His skill at negotiation made him a Senate natural, and his party entrusted him with its highest leadership responsibilities: majority whip in 1995; majority leader in 1996; and, in a widely remarked-upon comeback, whip again just last year.

Newt Gingrich called TRENT "the smartest legislative politician I've ever met." And though I often disagreed on the issues with TRENT, not to mention Newt, I just as often admired his acumen. I couldn't begin to list the important legislation shepherded through

this body by the Senator from Mississippi: education reform, defense spending, trade legislation, the ratification of NATO expansion, the creation of the Department of Homeland Security, and much more. But even as he worked on matters of national and international import, he always had time for the people of Mississippi: he helped expand his state's highway system, brought research funding to its universities, and dedicated himself to Mississippi's economic recovery in the wake of Hurricane Katrina. Indeed, the challenged posed by that destructive storm convinced TRENT to put off retirement until this year; and I am sure that the people of his state are grateful for the time he could lend to their recovery efforts.

In his memoirs, TRENT compared leading the Senate to "herding cats." But today, at least, the members of this most difficult body have found some unanimity: We are united in our affection for TRENT LOTT and in our sadness at his departure. We will miss his legislative talent, his rich baritone, his taste in seersucker suits, and his fine head of hair. But we trust that he and his dear wife Tricia have many happy years ahead, and we wish them all the best. •

EXPLANATORY STATEMENT TO ACCOMPANY H.R. 2664

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, the explanatory statement to accompany H.R. 2664, which includes the Omnibus Appropriations Act for fiscal year 2008, inadvertently omitted the following items for which I had made a request to the Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration and Related Agencies Subcommittee and for which I had submitted the appropriate letter of pecuniary interest. Those items are: under the Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service Special Research Grants account, the Pacific Northwest Small Fruit Research Center for Idaho, Oregon and Washington, operated in cooperation with Washington State University, which was awarded \$329,000; under the Agriculture Research Service Salaries & Expenses account, the Potato Research Enhancement Project in Prosser, WA, co-located with the Irrigated Agriculture Research and Extension Center of Washington State University, which was awarded \$288,000 and under the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service account, the Washington Clean Plant Network which was awarded \$225,000. All three of these projects are essential to the ongoing development of my home state's vital agriculture industry. I thank Chairman KOHL and Ranking Member BENNETT for their work to correct the record with respect to these three projects.

Mr. KOHL. I thank the Senator from Washington. I have reviewed her requests to our subcommittee and she is correct. The record should reflect her requests.

Mr. BENNETT. I concur with Senator KOHL, the subcommittee chairman, in this action.

TRADE ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, today, we face a major setback to the effort to advance American exports and freer international trade. Some on the other side of the aisle are threatening to kill trade adjustment assistance, or TAA.

Trade adjustment assistance provides training, health, and income benefits to trade-displaced workers. It has been integral to America's trade policy since 1962. That is when President Kennedy first created the program.

TAA has helped America's workers to improve their competitiveness. It has helped workers to retrain and retool. And it has provided Americans the security of knowing that the government will help them if trade causes a displacement.

Trade adjustment assistance has been vital to my home State of Montana. Since the last TAA reauthorization in 2002, more than 1,500 Montanans have participated in the TAA program. It has helped workers especially in the lumber industry to retrain and re-enter the workforce.

In May, one particular Montanan, Jerry Ann Ross of Eureka, testified about trade adjustment assistance before the Senate Finance Committee. Jerry's story is like that of many Montanans who have been laid off from American lumber mills.

Jerry worked at a lumber mill for 13 years. But then in 2005, she lost her job. That is when she became eligible for trade adjustment assistance. With TAA's help, Jerry entered a training program at Flathead Valley Community College. She expects to graduate this month.

With TAA's help, Jerry has updated her skills. She has made herself more competitive in the workforce as a construction superintendent and an accountant. Jerry's is one of many TAA success stories around the country.

At the Finance Committee hearing, we also learned that the current trade adjustment assistance is not perfect. It needs to be updated. We need to improve it to reflect today's globalized economy.

That is why in July, along with Senator OLYMPIA SNOWE, I introduced the Trade and Globalization Adjustment Assistance Act. Our bill would correct the flaws of today's program.

Our bill would extend TAA benefits to service workers. Service workers account for four out of five jobs in our economy. Our bill would extend TAA benefits to workers whose companies outsource to China, India, and other countries with which America does not have a free-trade agreement. Our bill would increase training funds for States. It would make sure that States have enough money to retrain workers. And our bill would increase the portion of the health care tax credit that the

Government provides to ensure that trade-displaced workers have access to health care coverage while they are retraining.

The House passed similar legislation in November. But the Senate has not yet completed the job. That is why a 3-month extension of trade adjustment assistance is critical. It would keep the current program going. It would provide time for Congress to complete its work on reauthorizing the program.

Last week, the House passed a 3-month extension of the TAA program. The House bill is fully offset. It is non-controversial. That bill should have passed easily in the Senate. But instead, some on the other side of the aisle have chosen to hold it up. Their dispute is over an unrelated issue. As a consequence, some on the other side of the aisle are close to allowing trade adjustment assistance to expire.

TAA expiration would send a horrible message to America's workers, especially those who depend on trade adjustment assistance. TAA expiration would also send a terrible message about the 2008 trade agenda. If the Senate cannot pass a 3-month extension of trade adjustment assistance, I am not sure what the Congress can do on trade next year.

Reauthorization and modernization of trade adjustment assistance is my No. 1 trade priority for 2008. It is the right thing to do. American workers deserve no less.

Unless Congress passes a robust TAA bill next year, I don't see how we can move pending trade agreements. Trade adjustment assistance has to come first.

So, Mr. President, I call on my colleagues on the other side of the aisle who are holding up this modest extension of trade adjustment to think again. I call on them to allow this useful program to continue, and I call on them to step back from what could be a major setback to American exports and freer international trade.

CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, I wish to speak on an issue that is extremely important to families all across the country—consumer product safety. I have spent the past year working with several of my colleagues to reform and reinvigorate the agency charged with protecting consumers from unsafe products, the Consumer Product Safety Commission, CPSC. These efforts have resulted in good progress. We have restored the Commission's ability to conduct business without a quorum, we have provided historic increases in CPSC's funding, and we have passed pool safety legislation to protect children from drain entrapment.

Earlier this fall, I introduced legislation, S. 2045, the Consumer Product Safety Commission Reform Act of 2007, to ensure the CPSC has the authority and tools they need to protect families from dangerous imported products. We

have all seen enough evidence in the press and on our retailers' shelves to know that reform is needed. Senators INOUYE, DURBIN, KLOBUCHAR, BILL NELSON, BROWN, SCHUMER, MENENDEZ, CASEY, and HARKIN have all joined me in this historic effort, and their contributions to the bill have been enormous. The Senate Commerce Committee reported S. 2045 in October by voice vote. Since that time, we have been working in a bipartisan fashion to move our legislation out of the Senate and to provide these protections for the American public.

As many of you are aware, the House of Representatives is scheduled to consider their version of CPSC reform today. I applaud the House for getting involved in this very important issue and was pleased to see that many of the ideas we developed in S. 2045 were incorporated into the House bill. I believe this effort is a very important first step to reauthorize this agency and provide it with some of the tools necessary to work more diligently on behalf of the American consumer. This is a goal that I share with all cosponsors of my bill, many of my colleagues in the Senate, and my counterparts in the House. While the House bill is a good step, I believe S. 2045 contains many additional reforms critical to improving our consumer product safety laws. I also believe the Senate now stands poised to build upon the actions of the House and provide even greater assurances to the American public.

Though I would have preferred to accomplish this task this year—and we have worked very hard to make this a reality—it seems the timing of the rest of the week simply makes this task nearly impossible. I would say to my colleagues in the Senate that we are very close to achieving bipartisan compromise to allow this bill to go forward early next year. I have expressed to the majority leader my desire to continue to move forward with S. 2045, and I hope to secure time for floor consideration at the earliest possible time when Congress returns in January. Consumer product safety is too important to the American people to not give them our very best effort, and I believe the Senate needs time to consider this legislation on the Senate floor.

I would like to take a moment to highlight some areas of concern that I have with the House legislation where the Senate legislation provides greater protection, areas that I hope to improve upon when Congress returns next year. To begin, S. 2045 provides greater reauthorization levels for a longer length of time than H.R. 4040. While the House seeks to reauthorize the CPSC for three years, S. 2045 reauthorizes the CPSC for 7 years. S. 2045 provides over \$526 million more in authorized funding than H.R. 4040. Our legislation takes a long term approach to reauthorize the agency, which I believe brings stability to the agency in addition to their enforcement efforts. The

last time the CPSC was reauthorized was in 1990 for only a 2-year period. During the 17 years between the last authorization and now, the CPSC has withered on the vine, a victim of underfunding and understaffing. I believe the systemic problems that have surfaced over these 17 years demonstrate the need for looking forward to the future as we debate reauthorization.

The Senate bill also gives greater authority to State attorneys general to assist the CPSC in their consumer product enforcement efforts. While H.R. 4040 only provides State attorneys general with a very limited role in protecting consumers, S. 2045 ensures that these officials can act as real cops on the beat, looking out for consumers and restoring confidence in the marketplace by enforcing the provisions of the entire Consumer Product Safety Act, not limited sections.

S. 2045 also furthers the mission of the CPSC by placing more information about dangerous products in the hands of families when the dangers become known instead of allowing manufacturers to bog down the disclosure of information through lengthy court battles. S. 2045 will allow parents to make educated and cautious decisions about the products they are placing in their homes. While the House bill only seeks to clarify the existing statute in this respect, the Senate bill can actually place real and timely information in the hands of consumers. I believe such a result can only enhance the security and well-being of our fellow Americans.

One very important difference between the House and Senate version of this legislation is the standards set for testing children's toys. H.R. 4040 asks the CPSC to decide if current voluntary standards are feasible for manufacturers' testing procedures and whether they should be adopted. It is very obvious to me, as well as millions of moms, dads, and grandparents around the country that testing requirements must be elevated. S. 2045 would make these voluntary standards mandatory for testing and safety.

Furthermore, S. 2045 adds real teeth to the enforcement capabilities of the CPSC. Though I applaud the House for increasing civil penalties to which a violator may be subject to \$10 million, I do not believe this level is sufficient to deter bad actors. Placing dangerous products in the hands of American consumers must not be the cost of doing business. S. 2045 increases the cap in civil penalties to \$100 million and strengthens criminal penalties for those aggravated violators that seemingly show a disregard to the health and safety of consumers and the laws enacted by this body. H.R. 4040 does not remove the requirement that the CPSC notify violators of noncompliance prior to seeking criminal penalties. This may seem minor, but this provision of the Consumer Product Safety Act has hamstrung the CPSC's ability to pursue egregious violators to the point