

but a potential for getting 80 to even 90 miles per gallon by using an alternative onboard fuel system, a propulsion system, not to propel the car but to recharge the battery. Unfortunately, we have not built the battery yet. Nobody has built a battery yet that can do that or designed one that will work at minus 10 degrees Fahrenheit or 110 degrees Fahrenheit. They have worked for 10 years under all kinds of conditions. Efforts are underway in many countries to win a race to build that battery. The Federal Government has provided a fair amount of financial support, investing in technology to make sure we get to the finish line ahead of our foreign competitors. It is an important race. GM, I think, stands to benefit from this, and so do the folks who work there and those who have shares with GM. So do the rest of us, frankly.

Let me come back to what I said earlier, about the conversation I had with several people on the train coming from Wilmington today. They said to me: We didn't like the fact that you gave all that money to the banks, and we don't like the idea of giving all that money to the auto industry. If you look at what we have done with the financial institutions, we have, under the legislation, created a so-called TARP. Under that legislation we authorize the Treasury to invest in the banks, to take an equity position. With the moneys we have infused or invested into most of these banks, we bought preferred stock. That preferred stock pays initially 5 percent per year, and later 9 percent if it is not bought back by the banks. In addition, we get options, much as we did with Chrysler in 1980, that could be converted into shares of stock that we can benefit from—not just we but the taxpayers can benefit from.

The idea there was to make the investment with the possibility that if there is an upside or rebound by the financial institutions that asked for this investment, the taxpayers have the opportunity to participate in the profits, as we did with respect to Chrysler all those years ago. The money that we are now talking about, or will be debating, whether to make available for working capital for the auto companies—let me add that only Chrysler and GM have indicated an interest in drawing down this money. Ford said: We think we are OK. Maybe later we will need a line of credit. For now, we think we are all right.

That is good news. So what we are working on is an approach where we, just as we invested in the financial institutions in order to get back preferred stock that pays 5 to 9 percent and also carries the possibility of warrants that we can turn into profit-making stock shares later, we want to do the same thing with our auto industry.

The Presiding Officer will recall a year or so ago when we passed CAFE legislation. In it we passed section 136, which said we want to provide as much

as \$25 billion so that the auto companies can modernize their plants for the principal purpose of building more energy-efficient vehicles. We feel that is what is needed—high quality and good productivity. But that is one of the major things needed to be competitive in the world today: energy-efficient cars, trucks, vans, and so forth.

That \$25 billion is not going to be available, apparently, right away to go into plant modernization.

The idea is to take as much as \$15 billion of that \$25 billion to make available to Chrysler and General Motors. The idea is not to give them this money; the idea is to invest this money in ways they can use it for working capital to get them through the next several months and, in the meantime, to require, under the guidance of what has been called a czar or an oversight board whose job would be to act almost as a bankruptcy judge, to make sure that further savings are realized by both Chrysler and GM but to ensure there is some further givebacks not just from labor, not just from management, not just from bondholders, not just from dealers, and not just from lenders but all the above. It is a concept that makes sense. The idea of here is \$15 billion, and we hope you can get better and repay the money down the line, is not what we are interested in doing.

We want to improve the likelihood that we will get back every dime we lend of this \$15 billion and more, if needed, later on. But we want to make sure the companies, particularly Chrysler, Ford, and GM, make the additional changes they need to increase the likelihood that they will be viable for a long period of time.

I close by saying we are seeing a real transformation in our economy. We used to be a big manufacturing country. We are less so today. Some people say that is fine, we will be a service economy, we will provide financial services and legal services, we will have insurance companies, maybe we will grow some food to feed ourselves and some of the rest of the world. But at the end of the day, we still need to make things. We still need to make things that people here and around the world want to buy.

One of the things I believe we need to make are cars, trucks, and vans. It has been that way for a long time. It needs to continue to be that way going forward.

I have had the privilege of representing and working for the people of Delaware, gosh, since 1976, when they elected me their State treasurer. We have had two auto assembly plants in my State for 50, 60 years—a Chrysler plant and a GM plant. The Chrysler plant is going to close at the end of this month. It is painful to me, and I know all the people who work there, the retirees, all who bought their vehicles and supported the plants in ways large and small over the years. But the writing is on the wall. My fear is that is going to happen.

As this happens and we see plants such as our plant in Newark, DE, the Chrysler plant, close, it is important we also remember the people who are losing their jobs there, the folks who have not enough experience, enough time to retire and be eligible for benefits. As they prepare to close the doors at the Chrysler plant in Newark, DE, I wish to make sure the folks who are losing their livelihood have the opportunity to be trained for other jobs in my State or other States that will enable them to be gainfully employed, to make a decent income for themselves and to support their families.

One of the things we can do, in addition to providing, if you will, a loan guarantee or direct loan with strong conditions to these auto companies, is remember our responsibilities to those who are left behind and those left behind without the prospect of ever working again in the auto industry.

There are some countries around the world—Finland comes to mind, Denmark, and a couple others—that do a good job. As industries grow up, mature, the nature of the job market, the industries in those countries change. Some countries around the world do a very good job of helping people whose skills for building, whether it is cars or buggies or buggy whips, are no longer appropriate—retraining people, supporting them for a period of time, giving them the social support net they need but then training them for jobs that need to be done, in this case, in the 21st century.

There you have it, some thoughts. My hope is we will come back and have a robust debate for the remainder of this week, and before this week is over we will vote not to give away \$15 billion to Chrysler or to GM but that we will vote to be willing, as we did in 1980, to make an investment that has a potential upside, not just for the people who work in the companies, not just for the people who own shares of those companies but also for the American taxpayers. If we do take on this risk, there needs to be a reward for the taxpayers whose money is at risk.

Mr. President, thank you for this opportunity. 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. DURBIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. McCASKILL). Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### TRIBUTE TO EINAR DYHRKOPP

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, this past Saturday, 1 day before the 75th anniversary of the attack on Pearl Harbor, a survivor of a different World War II kamikaze bombing died quietly at his home in Shawneetown, IL, at the age of 82.

Einar Dyhrkopp, business leader, public servant, and patriot, was a 19-year-old Navy firefighter assigned to the bowels of the USS *Aaron Ward* when the destroyer-minelayer was attacked by 25 kamikaze bombers in the battle for Okinawa.

In the years after World War II, Gen. George C. Marshall was asked if America had any secret weapons to win that conflict. General Marshall replied, yes, we do, "the best darn kids in the world." Einar was just the kind of kid General Marshall was talking about. About 365 men were assigned to the USS *Aaron Ward*; 42 of them burned to death or were lost overboard in the 52-minute battle on May 3, 1945. Einar was one of the lucky ones: he survived the attack, although his hair was burned to his scalp as he fought to douse the ship's flames.

When the war ended, Einar came home like so many World War II vets, found new ways to serve his country. He married Frances, and they had a son. He was a banker, a business leader, a livestock and grain farmer in southern Illinois, and a great politician. He was elected mayor of Shawneetown, IL, where he was born and lived his entire life. He was a self-described "dyed in the wool" Democrat. He was respected and admired by people from both political parties.

He was also a dedicated public servant. In 1993, Einar Dyhrkopp was appointed by President Bill Clinton to the U.S. Postal Service Board of Governors and served two terms as the Chairman. During his tenure, the Postal Service experienced an unprecedented 5 straight years of positive net income. It also enhanced service and increased its ontime delivery rate for next-day delivery to 94 percent. He cared about the Postal Service's bottom line and its customers. He talked to me so many times about issues related to the Postal Service. He cared about the workers there too. He once invited picketing postal workers in for coffee and cinnamon rolls and, after talking with them, answered all of their questions. He visited countless postal facilities, asking employees what we can do to make their job better and make our services better in the Postal Service. In 2003, the post office in his beloved Shawneetown was rededicated and renamed in his honor. Einar had tears in his eyes as the tributes were read.

Mr. Dyhrkopp also served on several Illinois State commissions and was a member of the Regional Advisory Board of Southern Illinois University Public Policy Institute.

There was the one curious political chapter in his life. In 1986, Einar Dyhrkopp ran what he called a non-campaign for the U.S. Senate. He ran on the Illinois Solidarity Party slate, a roster of statewide candidates put together by Adlai Stevenson III. Mr. Stevenson, son of the two-time Democratic Presidential candidate, had won the Democratic nomination for Gov-

ernor, but that primary had been raided by the LaRouche party. He abandoned the Democratic Party ticket after two disciples of the extremist Lyndon LaRouche won slots on the Democratic slate in a disastrous primary election. Mr. Stevenson said he could not in good conscience share a ticket with people whose views he found so objectionable. State law required that the new Illinois Solidarity Party field a whole slate of statewide candidates, not just the gubernatorial candidate. So Einar stepped up and agreed to be the new party's nominee for U.S. Senate.

What a crazy campaign. Mr. Dyhrkopp did not accept a single penny in campaign contributions. He did not spend a dollar or make one speech. He did not even vote for himself, announcing he was going to cast his ballot for his friend, the incumbent, Senator Alan Dixon. As one political writer put it, his strategy was "not to leave the house until the election was over so he wouldn't draw attention or votes away from Senator . . . Dixon." Despite his best efforts to avoid the voters, Einar ended up with 15,000 votes. That is the kind of man he was—hard not to like. As my friend Paul Simon said some years ago, "Einar Dyhrkopp represents responsible citizenship at its best. He has aided his community and provided leadership on the State and national scene. He has gone out of his way to help those who need assistance."

For years after the bombing of the USS *Aaron Ward*, Einar did not talk about the attack. He told a reporter, "When you go through something like we went through together, almost everyone wants to get it out of their minds the first few years." Later in life, he changed his mind. He became active in a group of survivors of the *Aaron Ward* attack. He was interviewed by Southern Illinois University's public broadcasting stations in conjunction with the broadcast of "The War," by Ken Burns, a documentary on World War II. He told a reporter that his change of heart was simply because "[w]e do not want the experience lost. If you lose history, you're destined to repeat it."

America's history might have taken a far different and darker course had Einar Dyhrkopp and millions of others of "the best darned kids in the world" not sacrificed and served in that conflict and had they not come back home to serve their Nation in other ways for decades more.

He was a good man who gave much to his community, much to my State of Illinois, and much to America. Last Friday, at the urging of some friends who told me he was seriously ill, I called his home. Frances answered the phone, and I told her who I was. I said I thought I would say a word or two to Einar if he can take the call. Well, she said, I am not sure he can talk to you. I did not know how sick he was. And she leaned over, and I could overhear her saying: Einar, it is Senator DURBIN.

The next think I knew, Einar was on the phone. We only chatted for a minute or two. We talked about the great times we had together, about that wonderful man, Paul Simon, who inspired us all to get involved in public life.

He said: I think this is the end for me.

I said: You have had a good run at it, Einar. You have been with some great people, and you have been a great friend.

Those were our last words. He died the following day.

I offer my sympathy to Mr. Dyhrkopp's wife Frances, their family, including their three grandchildren, and so many friends in southern Illinois. Einar Dyhrkopp will be missed.

I yield the floor, and 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. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

#### TRIBUTE TO SENATORS

JOHN WARNER

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, Today is a day I have dreaded. Today I say farewell to my good friend and esteemed colleague, Senator JOHN WARNER.

A few years ago, in an article for a Capitol Hill publication, Senator WARNER called attention to the courage of America's war veterans. He explained that the men and women who serve in our military are "heroes [who] share the timeless virtues of patriotism and selfless devotion to duty in defending our country."

Mr. President, Senator WARNER is one of my "heroes." He is a man who has always displayed "the timeless virtues of patriotism and selfless devotion to duty in defending our country."

Indeed, Senator WARNER has spent his life in service to our country. He enlisted in the Navy at the tender age of 17 in order to serve in World War II. A few years later, he joined the Marines in order to serve in the Korean conflict. From 1969 to 1972, he served as the Assistant Secretary of the Navy, and from 1972 to 1974, as Secretary of the Navy.

In 1978, he was elected to the U.S. Senate, and is now the second longest-serving Senator in the history of his beloved Commonwealth of Virginia.

His entire Senate career has been marked by his dignity, style, grace, and integrity. He is one of those men with whom one can disagree without rancor. I cannot recall ever hearing anyone speak ill of JOHN WARNER.

A few years ago, on another occasion in which I paid tribute to my good friend, I referred to him as "the classiest of class acts"—and he is. We