

Defense Appropriations Subcommittee earned him high praise from President Bush for his management of \$87 billion supplemental appropriations bill in 2003.

Recently, Senator STEVENS has found himself in the midst of the debate on energy policy and finding innovative approaches to our dependency on oil. He labored intensely over these matters which he believed so strongly to be best not only for the country in particular but especially for Alaska. TED's work ethic and tenacity always made this Chamber a better place. His passion for serving his State and country will forever be remembered. Thank you, TED, for everything you have done for the United States and Alaska.

AUTO INDUSTRY BAILOUT

Mr. SPECTER. Madam President, earlier today, Senators LEVIN, BOND, VOINOVICH, STABENOW, BROWN, and I announced a legislative proposal to deal with the crisis being faced by the automobile manufacturers. For a protracted period of time, Congress has wrestled with this issue. There have been many conflicting points of view as to what ought to be done. There has been little public sympathy for the plight of the auto manufacturers because they have been on notice for a long while of the need to reorganize and to approach the manufacture of automobiles differently in order to compete with foreign cars. There have been repeated efforts in the Congress to impose mileage standards. Finally, that was done last year. Now, with the severe economic problems facing the country, the automobile manufacturers find themselves in dire straits. The chief executive officers of General Motors, Chrysler, and Ford have been on Capitol Hill with very gloomy predictions as to the future of their companies if they do not get economic aid.

It is a difficult matter to provide economic aid to all those who are in need. It is true the Federal Government has provided economic assistance to Bear Sterns and AIG, turned them down with Lehman Brothers. We are well aware of the fact that there could be very serious repercussions for the economy as a whole if the auto manufacturers fail. There has been considerable talk that they could go into a reorganization and bankruptcy and could emerge. That may well be true. But that could be risky as to what would happen.

The Congress authorized some \$700 billion to assist on an economic recovery. That legislation has not been warmly received by the American people. During the month of October, I traveled broadly in Pennsylvania and found very strong public sentiment in opposition. The Congress acted in the face of having our backs to the wall or a gun at our heads or any other metaphor of a critical nature that one would choose.

On September 29, the House of Representatives failed to pass an economic

recovery program. Senators were notified to be in the Chamber at 7:30 on Wednesday evening to vote. Regrettably, that legislative process did not follow regular order. It started off with a bill with papers from the Treasury Department. It wasn't a bill. It was a 4-page memorandum, later expanded to more than 100 pages, ultimately to more than 400 pages. But when regular order is not followed, the consequence is likely to be not so good. Regular order requires a bill that one can read and study. It requires hearings before a committee where people are proponents and opponents. There is examination and cross-examination to get at the facts. Then the committee—in this case, the Banking Committee—would sit down and have what is called a markup to go through the bill line by line.

I explain this in some detail so there might be some understanding, if anybody is listening on C-SPAN this afternoon. Certainly, the Chamber is customarily barren, as is frequently the case. Senators are busy with other matters. Then after the markup, the committee files a report. Then it comes to the floor. There is debate, discussion, amendments. Then the Senate works its will. On the House side across the Rotunda, down the hall, the House of Representatives goes through a similar process. Then representatives of the two bodies meet for a conference. Then that is presented to the President. So there is a great deal of refining.

That didn't happen with the \$700 billion economic aid proposal. It turned out there was a lot of pork in the final draft that no one had a chance to strike, to offer amendments. It was embarrassing to have to defend that kind of a bill as I traveled my State in October to explain it. So there is great skepticism, fairly stated, among the American people as to the wisdom of the Congress in putting up \$700 billion.

Now, with the automakers coming in asking for economic aid, the question arises, who next? Last Friday, I wrote to our leaders urging that we not rush to judgment. I made a similar request, made an extensive floor statement earlier this week on Monday. That letter and others are in the RECORD, and I will not encumber the RECORD further because they are available for anyone who cares to look at them.

Secretary of the Treasury Paulson has been unwilling to use the \$700 billion to assist the automakers. He may be right about that or he may be wrong about that. But that is the position the Treasury Department has taken, saying that money is for the economy generally.

Then the idea has been proposed—and has been embodied in what Senators LEVIN, STABENOW, VOINOVICH, BOND, BROWN, and I announced earlier today—to use funds up to \$25 billion from the 2007 appropriations which had been designated to meet the mileage requirements but not a blank check. Before any of those funds could be uti-

lized at the direction of the Secretary of Commerce, there would have to be a plan. There would have to be a factual statement as to what the condition of the automobile manufacturers is, what would be done with the additional funds, what would be undertaken to guarantee that the moneys would not be used for increased executive pay or corporate jets or golden parachutes. There would have to be some hard, concrete facts laid out.

Last Friday, as I put in the RECORD this week, I wrote a letter to the chief executive officers of the three companies. I got no response from General Motors. I got no response from Ford. Frankly, I'm a little surprised that when an inquiry is made in that context, there is not an effort to respond, not to reach out but to respond. But executives from Chrysler came to see me, and I raised the questions as to what their condition was, how much cash they had on hand, how much cash they needed, what they would do with an infusion of economic aid, and what were the prospects for a recovery.

That matter has now been put over by the leaders until December 8. So we now have 2 weeks, next week and the week after. Presumably, on the week of December 1, there will be hearings. The automobile manufacturers are going to have a fairly heavy burden of demonstrating that there is a plan which will be viable, which would have a realistic likelihood of success.

I understand the concern of the environmentalists. My record for environmental protection is very strong. But those in the environmental community have raised the concern that the \$25 billion ought not to be directed away from changes on gas mileage. We are talking about a bridge loan. The concern is, if action is not taken now before a new administration, that there could be a disastrous result. As Senator VOINOVICH pointed out, the recession or economic problems could be even more serious. The expression he used, which I think is not inappropriate, it could go over the cliff. Nobody knows. But that is a risk, if we are going to wait until January 20. It may even be a risk in waiting until mid-December, but that is the course which we are on now. Of course, Secretary Paulson has the discretion, as he has conceded, to act with the funds which are now available. But in any event, I believe the legislation which was announced today by the six Senators,—three Democrats, three Republicans, on a bipartisan basis—is a useful approach for the future. This is very important. This is not an extra appropriation. We are not putting up more money. It is a different use of moneys already put up. The environmental issues could be safeguarded after January 20. With the Democrats in control of both Houses and the White House, they could write their own ticket to replenish that fund, if they choose to do so. But at least we are on a course now in the reasonably

near future to provide a legislative approach if—and it is a big “if”—the auto manufacturers can come forward with a hard statement of facts as to where they are, a hard statement of facts of what they could do with these funds to show their viability.

So we will await those hearings, and we will await what they do. But I would emphasize they will have to persuade the Congress to vote for the plan. But in order to persuade the Congress, they are going to have to persuade the American people over the course of the next 2 weeks with something a lot more specific than they came to town with over the course of the past several days and a lot more responsive than two of the companies not even responding to my request for a statement as to their case, as to how they propose to remain viable with the economic aid.

I thank the Chair, and, in the absence of any other Senator on the floor, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia is recognized.

TRIBUTE TO SENATORS

GORDON SMITH

Mr. WARNER. Madam President, today may mark the last day of this session, although I shall not try to make that prediction. However, I would not want this day to pass without availing myself of the opportunity and the privilege to come to this floor and say a few words on behalf of the very dear and valued friends whom I have served with in this Chamber as they depart and go on the road of life to, I expect, in each case great challenges.

GORDON SMITH and I have become friends for ever so many reasons. One, we both love the outdoors. He and his devoted wife Sharon and my wife, we have all been close friends through these years. As I look back, I will always remember GORDON. I remember when I was chairman of the Armed Services Committee and entrusted with the extraordinary responsibilities—along with other committee members, as well as, indeed, every Member of this Chamber—entrusted with those decisions relating to this Nation's Armed Forces who were fighting so valiantly then, today, and for the foreseeable future—I hope the short future—in Iraq.

GORDON and I had many very quiet and private conversations about his deep concerns and convictions. His convictions emanated from the depths of his heart. Politics played no role in his approach to the conflict in Iraq. He was gravely concerned about the loss of life and limb, the image of this Nation, and, indeed, the families of the loved

ones who are fighting in that conflict. So I say: GORDON, we had our differences, but I respected your stance. I can see him standing back there as erect as he always was, standing and voting against me and voting against others, but again, drawing on his own deeply held personal convictions. Time will tell and history will tell if I was right or if I was wrong, but I found his counsel, his willingness to listen, his willingness to share with me his most inner thoughts about that conflict a very valuable asset as I and others in leadership positions carried the heavy burden of that conflict. So I am grateful to him. He is a very sensitive man, and he showed that sensitivity every so often as he plunged into the complex issues with regard to health care, the almost insoluble problems—problems that he recognized have to be solved, particularly so that people of lesser means can achieve a measure of health care equivalent to those who have the means can receive for themselves. It is a hallmark of how this man proudly walked his way through life, with a loving wife by his side and the family whom he loves so dearly, and always thinking about those who perhaps have not had the opportunities that he and I and others have had, particularly as it relates to health care.

He also loves the outdoors. A great golfer, we played together from time to time. His skill is far superior to mine in every way. He is a lover of art. We shared our interest in paintings, particularly paintings that had come from Scotland. To have had the friendship of GORDON SMITH is to have shared the life of a wonderful human being, and I thank GORDON for all that he has done for me and for this great Nation, and for his beloved State. I wish him well in his next venture, and I look forward to meeting him along the way.

ELIZABETH DOLE

I have known her for quite a few years. We had a wonderful evening last night where the leadership of the Republican Party—indeed, almost all of the Members of the Republican caucus—came to say not farewell, but to listen to the words of those of us who are moving on and will not be a part of the next Congress. ELIZABETH got up, and she is such a very forceful speaker. She truly speaks from the heart. She has a remarkable memory. She recalled how when both of us were bachelor and spinster, we danced together. My lovely wife, who is a dear friend of hers, kind of looked at me and I winked and said, She was the best. It is just one of her marvelous traits. Talk about glass ceilings: She shattered her share. She has taken on many challenges in the private and public sector, some of which only men have ever had, and performed her duties with great distinction, and always with a quiet sense of what we call southern humility. She is very proud of her roots and her family. How often she has referred to her mother.

She is a Phi Beta Kappa from Duke University and went on to Harvard for

a master's degree and a law degree. Secretary of Transportation, Secretary of Labor. Few women have had that much stamina, conviction, self-confidence to achieve those goals; and then, of course, to have become a U.S. Senator. That was a special challenge because she was fortunate to have as a husband Robert Dole, the Republican leader of the U.S. Senate, if I can say with a deep sense of humility, one of the best friends I ever had in this institution.

I remember talking to him one time, of course, concerning the events of that particular period, and I said he ought to think about running for leader of the Senate. Oh, no, no. No, I don't think they will ever elect me. Well, this conversation went on for some period of weeks, months, it may have been, I don't recall. Finally, I said: I have so much faith that you can win that election that I would be happy to appoint myself as one of your managers of the campaign to get it. So I took that, along with several other very fine colleagues, both of whom moved on years ago from this Chamber. And he won. He was amazed that he had won. I wasn't. I always recognized the leadership in him. He did a wonderful job as our Republican leader. His portrait proudly hangs right here in the corridor off of our Chamber. I never walk by that I don't just quietly give him a hand salute, because I was a part of the World War II generation, but a very small part, serving only in the final year of the war and always in a training command, ready as a 17-, 18-year-old kid to become a replacement for those serving abroad. Bob Dole was truly one of those who earned the accolade of the “greatest generation.” He fought in Europe. He was a young lieutenant and in leading his men in the toughest of battles in Italy, he received what for others I think would have been mortal and fatal wounds.

Because he had such an internal strength and constitution, he survived those wounds and came on to have a distinguished career. As I look back on his Senate days—and they pass so quickly, as did my 30 years—I remember taking trips with him. We went to Russia together, which was the Soviet Union at that time. He was a staunch believer that one day Russia would become just Russia once again and those people would have some measure of a voice in their Government. That did come to pass, and that was an extraordinary trip.

What I best remember is the time of the D-day anniversary. He was asked to speak in Italy, where he had fought. And then, together, we traveled to the Normandy beaches to join the President and others. In the course of that trip, we went back to the very ground on which he was wounded. He walked over to the stone wall that is still there—he remembers it ever so well—where he dragged his badly wounded body to give him a measure of protection until help could come, after which