

That is not the right thing. The whole motivation for a reorganization of procedure under chapter 11 would be to save the company, to save the jobs and save the industry. This Senate has no business trying to act as some sort of super bankruptcy judge in a reorganization. Our action in sending out money enables the continuation of bad behavior. It pretty closely approximates that psychological syndrome called enabler where the person who is drinking too heavily, instead of confronting the problem, the person's problem, you give them more money which allows them to continue to drink and they don't confront their problem and the problem continues to get worse.

It is time to confront the problem. Let's save this industry, and let's do so within the legal procedures the Nation has. And at some point if we can help them financially, let's do so. But we need to be sure, on behalf of the taxpayers, that we know exactly what the circumstance is, that a full examination of these companies has been undertaken. The idea of giving them billions of dollars based on a very poor statement of need is not acceptable to the people of the United States.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SESSIONS. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CARDIN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I was in error earlier in saying that there was a \$15 billion line item in this legislation that we saw. In looking at it with my staff, basically this legislation, if it were to pass, would authorize the expenditure of \$25 billion—really \$24.5 billion—to the car companies. It also at the same time states that even though that money is coming out of the energy efficiency \$25 billion, it also says that \$25 billion will be available for expenditure in addition. So that is how I would say that as we read the legislation, it is an authorization of over \$49 billion, in reality, to the automobile companies. It would take an additional appropriation for \$25 billion, but that would be a single step instead of the normal legislative process. It enhances the ability for that to be expended. I think that is a correct statement. There is no reference, as has been discussed in the papers, about \$15 billion. But it authorizes the full 25.

It says: There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Energy sums as may be necessary for the purpose of replenishing the funds made available to the President's designee under this section. It also says: No provision shall be construed to prohibit or limit the Secretary of Energy from processing applications for loans under

the section. That is the existing \$25 billion. So they still will get the loans under the \$25 billion plus the other. I think in all fairness, the way we read this is a \$49 billion authorization, not 25, and certainly not 15.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia is recognized for 10 minutes.

TARP

Mr. WEBB. Mr. President, I rise to talk about our foreign policy. Before doing so, I wish to point out that I have spent the last 2 hours presiding and listening to a number of very strong statements with respect to the automobile bailout and also the proposal that there be some action to limit the next tranche of \$300 billion to come on the TARP program. I associate myself with the remarks of the Senator from North Dakota on those issues. We had a pretty hard vote on October 1 with respect to the TARP program. I was among the overwhelming majority of people in the Senate who voted to go ahead with this program, after the assurances of this administration and the people who had been negotiating on our behalf about the danger that the world economy was in, the prospect of a cataclysmic effect if we did not do something.

I am going to look very hard at this next tranche. We should all recall that the program that was voted to go forward was a program that was going to address the situation of toxic assets. The concern that I and many others had about giving one individual the authority in the executive branch to use these funds in a way that did not have a substantial oversight was borne out over what has happened. There is a very high bar that will go forward before I personally would vote in favor of continuing to allow the Secretary of the Treasury in an outgoing administration to be dispensing these types of funds so close to the approach of a new administration.

AUTOMOBILE INDUSTRY BAILOUT

Mr. WEBB. Mr. President, a lot of comments have been made about the automobile bailout. We are in a situation, because of the extreme effect on our entire economy over the past several months, where there is a legitimate issue of cashflow rather than the innovation or lack thereof that has gone into the automobile industry. I am favorably disposed to supporting this loan provision, which is what it is, if the right requirements are placed in the proposal. I should point out, for all of the information that has gone back and forth over the past 2 hours, the irony that Senator DORGAN mentioned, that the chief of Merrill Lynch is today arguing for a \$10 million bonus for a company that had a loss of almost \$12 billion last year. That is a private company. I won't pass any commercial

judgment on that. But it does stand in stark contrast to what the CEO of Ford has proposed, going to \$1 a year, if we can inject some cashflow into their business to attempt to get them through this period and back into a situation where they can properly manage their future.

FOREIGN POLICY DEVELOPMENT

Mr. WEBB. Mr. President, I wish to discuss another issue I have had a great deal of concern about for many years, particularly since the time I came to the Senate. That is the role of the legislative branch in the development of foreign policy and the abrogation of the legislative branch during this past administration when it comes to foreign policy. Over the past nearly 8 years, the executive branch has been a runaway train. Unfortunately, this isn't simply the Bush administration. It also is the policies that have come out of the Department of Defense and the Department of State. We have observed over the past year the negotiation of a future relationship with Iraq that has gotten almost no attention in the Congress. This is not simply a SOFA, status of forces agreement, as we have seen in dozens of other countries around the world which are implemented pursuant to our legal authority to be in those countries. This also is a strategic framework agreement, a document which defines our future relationship with Iraq, which in Iraq had to be approved by their Cabinet, by their Parliament, and now will be subject to a plebiscite and which, in the United States, simply has been approved by the signature of one individual out of the Department of State.

I was among many who began expressing my concern about this a little more than a year ago. I believe it is stark evidence of how the legislative branch, the Congress, has abrogated its constitutional responsibilities in the area of the evocation of foreign policy.

I am going to put a map up in the Chamber. It is a very busy map, but I want to take time to explain something else. I think it is very important for my fellow Senators and people over in the other House of the Congress to understand the implications of what has been going on in Afghanistan.

We have heard throughout the Presidential campaign that we should be focusing our energy away from Iraq and into Afghanistan. We have been having these types of discussions without the articulation of a clear strategy. We are moving to the point where we are soon going to have at least 60,000 American troops in Afghanistan.

When I was there as a journalist in 2004, we had about 10,000 American troops in Afghanistan. It is going to be very important, as the new administration comes in, to impress upon not only the administration but individuals in the State Department and the Department of Defense that they must come forward with a strategy that will

enable us to know when the end comes. You do not have a strategy if you cannot articulate the end point.

We have another very serious problem with respect to our presence in Afghanistan, and that is all of the logistical lines into Afghanistan are in areas that could cause the United States great concern.

This—I am going to draw a circle around it on this busy map—is Afghanistan right here. Afghanistan is a landlocked country, as everyone in this Congress surely knows. The supply routes into Afghanistan are principally through Pakistan: from Karachi up into Peshawar, through the famed Khyber Pass, which caused the British such problems and difficulties more than 100 years ago, in through the mountainous areas of the federally administered tribal regions and the Northwest Frontier Province very lawless areas where al-Qaida and the Taliban operate heavily. So 80 percent of the supplies that go into Afghanistan go via land through Pakistan.

To the north, Uzbekistan has indicated it probably will not allow alternate supply routes if problems occur in Pakistan. Iran, obviously, is not going to allow supply routes to go in to supply our troops in Afghanistan, which leaves Turkmenistan. Turkmenistan is very close to Russia, which we have been in very difficult relationships with, particularly since the incidents in Georgia last summer.

So what does this mean? There is an old saying—Frederick the Great, supposedly, was the first to say it—and that is: Without supplies, no army is brave.

If you look at this route in Pakistan, over the past 6 months this is what has happened:

In March, there were attacks in the Khyber region that set fire to 40 to 50 oil tankers. These are convoys that are not protected by the American military because the American military does not operate in combat areas in Pakistan. So in March: 40 to 50 oil tankers.

In April, Taliban raiders stole military helicopter engines valued at \$13 million.

In November, 12 vehicles were hijacked near the Khyber Pass. Two humvees were included in the hijackings.

Last week, 22 more vehicles were destroyed at a truck stop between Peshawar and the Khyber Pass.

Yesterday, 145 vehicles, trailers, and containers were destroyed in a warehouse just outside of Peshawar.

Today, there was a separate attack at a shipping terminal near Peshawar which destroyed 50 trucks carrying containers.

This is millions and millions of dollars worth of equipment in an area where we in our present policy cannot provide military security. We have Pakistani security forces, we have Pakistani truck drivers, and we are in a very delicate relationship with Pakistan itself.

I am hoping that in this type of situation, where 80 percent of our cargo is coming in through Pakistan, and where our ability to resupply our military from other areas depends on our relationship with Russia, that our new administration and the leadership in the State Department and the Department of Defense will take a very hard look at how many military people we want to have in Afghanistan, what it is we want them to do, how we are going to resupply them, how we are going to conduct our relationships inside Pakistan, what our alternatives might be if those convoys continue to be interrupted, and, finally, how we will know when we have concluded our strategic purpose in this part of the world.

With that, I yield the floor.

TRIBUTE TO SENATORS

TED STEVENS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I rise once again to honor a distinguished colleague and the longest serving Republican in the history of this body, Senator TED STEVENS.

I said it this morning. I will say it again: In the history of this Nation, no one man has done more for one State than TED STEVENS—no one. His commitment to the people of Alaska has been as constant as the Northern Star. And the list of things he has done on their behalf in a remarkable 40-year career is as vast as the State itself.

Today we remember that legendary service, and the man who achieved it.

Born in Indianapolis 85 years ago this week, TED STEVENS made his mark early. At 19, he was flying C-46 transport planes over the Himalayas in support of the legendary Flying Tigers. His appetite for adventure took him to Oregon and Montana for college, and then to even more exotic places as a pilot in the Army Air Corps. For his bravery, TED would receive a Distinguished Flying Cross and an Air Medal. It was the first of many, many honors.

A decorated war veteran by his early-twenties, TED returned to California to resume his studies, and later enrolled at Harvard Law School. After law school, TED came to Washington, married a girl named Ann, and then set out on a new adventure in the vast expanse of the Alaska territory.

He would go on to devote the rest of his life to helping the people of Alaska achieve the same rights and privileges that those in the lower 48 took for granted. And today, the name TED STEVENS is synonymous with the State he loves. It always will be.

Who else can say that they helped draw the borders of the State in which they live? Well, TED can. As Senator MURKOWSKI put it: “for forty years, TED STEVENS has been Alaska.” He was there at the creation. And an entire generation of Alaskans have grown up not ever knowing the Senate without him.

TED will tell you he works so hard because there is so much work to do.

Alaskans don't have the benefit of centuries of infrastructure and planning that much of the rest of the country does. Of the giant State's more than 200 villages, only a handful had running water when TED came to the Senate. Thanks largely to him, roughly half of them do now.

No one has done more for the U.S. Armed Forces than TED STEVENS. He secured funds for the F-117, to replace Air Force One, for unmanned aerial vehicles like the Predator and Global Hawk, and for a replacement Coast Guard icebreaker and the F-16 program. TED was instrumental in ensuring funds for early military research on everything from breast cancer to AIDS.

TED STEVENS once said:

They sent me here to stand up for the state of Alaska.

For 40 years, he fulfilled that charge with passion and purpose. And the Senate will never forget TED STEVENS.

GORDON SMITH

Mr. BUNNING. Mr. President, I would like to honor my friend and colleague from Oregon, Senator GORDON SMITH.

I have worked with GORDON since coming over to the Senate in 1998. It has been an honor and privilege to serve on both the Senate Finance Committee and Energy and Natural Resources Committee with him. GORDON has a long list of accomplishments to show for the people of Oregon and the Nation. He has served the people of Oregon well, and I know they are proud to call him one of their own. His leadership in the Senate will be missed, and it has truly been an honor serving with him.

I thank GORDON for all of his contributions to the U.S. Senate, and I wish him and his family the best of luck in their future endeavors.

ELIZABETH DOLE

Mr. President, today I pay tribute to my distinguished colleague from North Carolina, Senator ELIZABETH DOLE, who will be retiring from the Senate at the conclusion of the 110th Congress.

I have worked with Senator DOLE since she was elected to serve the people of North Carolina in 2002. I have also had the privilege of serving on the Senate Banking Committee with Senator DOLE. She has dedicated her adult life to serve her country proudly. Senator DOLE has had the distinct honor to serve in several capacities such as Deputy Assistant to the Nixon administration for Consumer Affairs, as a member of the Federal Trade Commission, Secretary of Transportation under President Reagan, and Secretary of Labor under President George H.W. Bush. Her heart and character can also be summed up by her work as the President of the American Red Cross and the impact she has had, on not only the lives of Americans, but also those abroad. A person of that caliber will be missed in the Senate.