

The Senator from Oregon is recognized.

TRIBUTE TO SENATORS

GORDON SMITH

Mr. WYDEN. Madam President, at this moment, exactly 13 years ago, I was locked in the toughest political battle of my life against GORDON H. SMITH. I went on to narrowly win that race and continue to hold that Senate seat today. But GORDON SMITH dusted himself off only a few months later and took on yet another very tough battle, and that time he won the Senate seat that had been held for 30 years by our remarkable Senator Mark Hatfield.

At that point, Oregonians did not know what to make of their Senate delegation. They had two Senators, myself and Senator SMITH, who were replacing Bob Packwood and Mark Hatfield. Those two individuals were the chairman of the Finance Committee and the chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee. And, of course, the old story was that Bob Packwood got to raise all of the money because he was chairman of the Finance Committee, and Mark Hatfield got to spend it all because he was chairman of the Appropriations Committee.

Of course, I was very much concerned about what was ahead because I thought it was very possibly going to be a long and uncomfortable 6 years serving with the fellow with whom I had just duked it out over many months of a political campaign that, as the two of us like to say, was not exactly for the faint hearted.

One of the great surprises of my career came, however, when I discovered that my new colleague, GORDON SMITH, was as thoughtful and kind and decent outside the political arena as he was tough and competitive inside the political arena. It was that charm and that decency and his desire to meet me halfway on Oregon's interests that got me closer to GORDON over the years and led to an unusually strong working relationship and what became a strong and genuine friendship.

GORDON lost a very tough reelection race a few weeks ago in a State that has changed rapidly from what was a very small Democratic voter edge, back when we ran against each other in 1996, to what has become a significant Democratic voter edge in 2008. GORDON and his skillful campaign team battled hard and tough as they always have. They did everything they could to withstand a formidable political tide and a very strong Democratic challenger, a challenger whom I support. So it is with mixed and conflicting emotions that I come today to pay tribute to my colleague and my friend of 12 years, GORDON H. SMITH.

GORDON and I have had plenty of political differences, enough differences, differences that we knew would be the case, that made us say from our very first meeting, when GORDON won that

race to replace Mark Hatfield, that we would be supporting each other's opponents in years ahead.

Political campaigns are important, and each of us was called upon to separate our friendship from our beliefs every 2 years. Yet I will say this afternoon that I have come to genuinely loathe much of what has become of the political process in our country. The relentless and omnipresent negative ads obscure and distort to the point that it can be difficult for the typical citizen to maintain anything resembling a healthy perspective on fundamentally good and decent individuals who seek public office.

Thankfully, the negative ads are now off the air, and I want to make sure Oregonians once again remember the GORDON SMITH I have known for 12 years. GORDON has been a good and decent and selfless public servant.

The fact is, GORDON SMITH did not need to serve another term in the Senate. He and his wife Sharon have built a strong and prosperous business, and they could have done countless things with their time that would have been more glamorous and certainly produced less strain and wear and tear on their personal lives. But GORDON ran because of his belief in the role that he believed he could play in shaping our country's future. That, in my view, is the essence of being a good public servant. No one in this body or in the State of Oregon ought to lose sight of the extraordinary sacrifices that GORDON and his wife Sharon have made over the course of almost two decades of public service.

Among GORDON's many personal triumphs in the Senate, I would like to highlight two that are especially important to our State, to our country, and to me personally. I wanted to remind my colleagues and the people of our country of the very difficult decisions made by GORDON and Sharon to share with the public and the Congress their heartrending struggle on behalf of their son, Garrett. They did this selflessly to further the cause of mental health treatment, and particularly the cause of mental health parity.

If not for GORDON's courage in sharing their family's story, I believe Congress might not have acted on mental health parity this past fall, and thousands of parents might never know that they are not alone in their difficult struggle.

There were other critical tasks that GORDON shouldered and one that I was especially appreciative for his leadership on, and that was being the voice for rural folks, for people whose way of life and quality of life is connected to natural resources that are bountiful in our State.

GORDON spoke for the farmer, and he spoke for the rancher. He spoke for the logger, for the mill worker, and the miner. He spoke for the rural communities they live in, communities that struggle to retain a voice in increasingly urban America.

It was written fairly frequently in Oregon's papers, and was in the New York Times at one point, that there was something in the State of Oregon that people came to say was the Senate's odd couple. In fact, I think the headline in the New York Times when they talked about us was wildly inflationary, and GORDON and I came to laugh about it. I think the headline was, "Oregon's Odd Couple Makes It Work." It was essentially all about how there were two Senators from Oregon; one of them was a Mormon fellow. He was a Republican. He was from somewhere called Pendleton. GORDON and I were never convinced that folks in the New York Times knew exactly where Pendleton was, but that is how GORDON was described.

Then they said, the other Senator was a Jewish guy, and he was from Portland and he was a legal aide lawyer for the senior citizens, and he was an activist with the Gray Panthers. What in the world would these two people ever have in common?

Well, I want people to know that gentle spirit, that Mormon from wheat and pea country taught this Jewish fellow from the city an awful lot about the too often forgotten voices, particularly those in our rural communities.

In his absence, I will do everything I can to remind colleagues, particularly Democratic colleagues on my side of the aisle, of the challenges faced in rural communities, of the people and the issues that GORDON H. SMITH championed every single day in the Senate. I wish GORDON and Sharon well in whatever their future endeavors are. I have already made it clear they will always have my friendship and assistance in any project they pursue in the days ahead. But most importantly, I come to the floor and thank GORDON for his personal friendship to me and his service to our State. I ask my colleagues here and the people of our home State to voice their thanks today to two very special people, Sharon and GORDON H. SMITH.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SPECTER. Madam President, I have listened to the eloquent comments of the Senator from Oregon, Mr. WYDEN. I had planned to insert a statement in the RECORD complementing Senator GORDON SMITH on his tenure, but I would like to add my voice of laudatory comments at the conclusion of the statement of Senator WYDEN. I agree with him that Senator GORDON SMITH has made an enormous contribution to the Senate in his two terms, and he will be sorely missed. He is a member of a small band of moderates on this side of the aisle. I suggest that GORDON SMITH's brand of Republicanism is very much in need in this body. Very frequently, Members on the Democratic side of the aisle seek co-sponsors. I have been told on a number of occasions that the "pickins are slim." GORDON's absence will make it more difficult.

GORDON SMITH has been outspoken on many of the very important causes which require bipartisanship. He was one of the few on this side of the aisle to sponsor legislation to fight hate crimes, for example. At the outset, support for Federal funding for embryonic stem cell research was limited. GORDON SMITH was at the forefront of that effort, as I was. GORDON SMITH made a very eloquent speech from his chair a few rows behind me on the Iraq war. He was moved one day to come over and spoke from the heart, something which happens relatively infrequently in this Chamber. Sometimes people in this Chamber speak from the head. Even that has its limited aspects, if we take a close look at the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. But GORDON SMITH was a big plus here.

I would like to associate myself with the remarks of Senator WYDEN. I know GORDON is a young, vigorous man. He has a bright future ahead of him. I think he will live to fight another day on the political wars. Some of us have had an election loss or two. It is a learning experience, not one I recommend, but there are ways to move forward. That can be a lesson which could stand anyone in good stead. I am sure Senator GORDON SMITH has a great future ahead of him.

JOHN SUNUNU

Madam President, I also wish to pay tribute to my friend Senator JOHN SUNUNU for his service to the country and his contributions to the U.S. Senate. Senator SUNUNU's departure from the Senate will be a great loss to this body, as well as to the state of New Hampshire.

I have known Senator SUNUNU since he joined the Senate in 2002. I have always found him to be an intelligent, engaged, and capable legislator who cares deeply for the well-being of his constituents and doing what is right for the Nation, regardless of the political cost.

Senator SUNUNU followed his father and mother into public service, when he ran for public office in 1996 and won the election in New Hampshire's First Congressional District. JOHN served three terms in the U.S. House of Representatives where he quickly established a reputation as an innovative legislator. JOHN effectively applied his extensive background in science, engineering, and small business during his six years in the House of Representatives where he rose to become vice-chairman of the Budget Committee and took a leading role in shaping our Nation's annual budget priorities.

In 2002, JOHN joined the Senate after defeating both an incumbent Senator and an incumbent Governor to become the youngest Member of the United States Senate. I have admired JOHN's work on his committees: the Finance Committee, the Commerce Committee, and the Homeland Security and Government Affairs Committee. On these committees, SUNUNU played a major role on the lobbying reform legislation,

and he got the Bush Administration to make some crucial changes in the Patriot Act before he voted to reauthorize it.

SUNUNU has also gained a reputation as a well respected fiscal conservative.

On a personal note, Senator SUNUNU has been a very good friend to me. When I underwent chemotherapy for Hodgkin's disease and lost my hair, Senator SUNUNU showed up one day on the Senate floor with a shaved head. He said that he had shaved his head in a sign of solidarity for what I was going through.

I wish JOHN, his wife Kitty, and his three lovely children the best of luck as they move forward. I have no doubt that Senator SUNUNU has a bright future and will continue to make important contributions to New Hampshire and the entire Nation.

ELIZABETH DOLE

Senator ELIZABETH DOLE is a colleague leaving the U.S. Senate not in defeat but in the wake of a career dedicated to public service and an unwavering commitment to her country. She has had an illustrious career as a two-time cabinet member, President of Red Cross, and U.S. Senator. ELIZABETH is a model for all young women considering a career in government, for in times when the ceiling had but few cracks she bore through the naysayers and showed a woman belongs in the Nation's highest positions.

After graduating from Harvard Law as one of just 29 woman in a class of 550, "Liddy" went to work in the White House Office of Consumer Affairs where she worked under both President Johnson and Nixon. Pledging her allegiance to her job and duty to the country, Senator DOLE opted to switch parties in order to continue her stay in the White House. After a stint on the Federal Trade Commission, President Reagan appointed ELIZABETH Secretary of Transportation in 1983. She served valiantly in that position for 4½ years, proving her skill at managing a Federal Department, and became the Secretary of Labor under President George H.W. Bush. With this position, ELIZABETH became the first woman to hold two different cabinet positions under two different administrations.

In 1991 ELIZABETH accepted a different challenge becoming the President of the American Red Cross, dedicating her time to building an institution whose impassioned mission is to aid our Nation's citizens who are in need of emergency assistance. During her tenure with the Red Cross, ELIZABETH took a brief hiatus to stand by her husband, Senator Bob Dole, as he represented our party as the nominee for President in 1996. After a hard-fought race ELIZABETH began looking into the idea of running for our Nation's highest office on her own right. This came to fruition in 1999 as she again led the way for women and became the first official female candidate for President. She exhibited toughness and political tact in a race that history

had not been very welcoming to women.

In 2001 ELIZABETH's path to the U.S. Senate took her through her birth home of Salisbury, NC. Using her full career serving our Nation as a foundation, ELIZABETH won her seat to the U.S. Senate and immediately made her presence known. Spending her time on the Armed Services, Banking, Small Business and Aging committees, ELIZABETH worked for North Carolinians with the same passion and dedication she possessed throughout her career. Her achievements were many, but to name a few she successfully opposed potential closings of U.S. military bases, protected delicate wetlands and woodlands in northeastern North Carolina from ruination from an ill-advised Navy landing strip proposal, and also served as the chairwoman of the National Republican Senatorial Committee for the 2004 election cycle.

I wish to thank ELIZABETH for her service, friendship, and for being there for my dear friend Bob throughout the years. Senator DOLE, your contributions to this chamber and our Nation will forever be remembered.

I yield the floor.

TED STEVENS

Madam President, the departure of the senior Senator from Alaska will surely deprive the Senate of an exemplary leader who has made a profound effect on this body. Being the longest serving Republican in Senate history, Senator STEVENS has made countless contributions to this body. His achievements include serving as the chairman of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, former chairman of the full Appropriations Committee, and President Pro Tempore.

TED's temper is generally misunderstood except by those who know him best. He doesn't lose it, but he does use it—and effectively. However, it is true that on occasion he makes Vesuvius look mild. I recollect one all-night session during Senator Howard Baker's tenure as majority leader when TED expressed himself in an unusually emphatic way. As I recall it, the debate arose over Senator Proxmire's comments about submitting vouchers for travel expense in Wisconsin on his contention that Washington, DC, was his home base. That prompted a reaction from TED, who was aghast at the thought of Washington, DC, being any Senator's home when he had the majestic Alaska to claim as his home.

Senator STEVENS' service during WWII in the U.S. Army Air Corps has given him a special understanding of defense matters. He is a distinguished veteran of the U.S. Army Air Corps, having flown support missions for the Flying Tigers of the 14th Air Force during World War II, for which he was awarded numerous medals, including the Distinguished Flying Cross. Upon his arrival in the U.S. Senate in 1968 it became evident TED would become a leader on military and defense issues. His hard work as the chairman of the

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