

worked on several of those cases together. During this time, I learned a great deal about how Chief McKee treated people and how he dealt with some of the most tense situations. Perhaps most importantly, though, I saw his great sense of humanity toward both victims and suspects.

Chief Jim McKee taught me there is much more to police work than arrests and convictions. He taught me about the human component in police work. He taught me about people and about compassion.

I remember one instance in particular when I saw and learned about how Jim McKee dealt with a man who had been in an auto accident. This man was involved in a horrible thing, as many accidents are, but he came out of it. He walked out of the accident, but the other person in the other vehicle did not and the other person died. This particular person was actually a suspect, and he could have been charged. The police were looking at and trying to decide whether to charge him. Actually, later on there was a grand jury that was convened. The grand jury had to make a decision whether this person was going to be charged and have to stand trial. Eventually they decided not to charge him, but Jim did not know that at the time. I saw how Jim dealt with this man and showed this man, who was going through great anguish at the time, a man who was really a suspect, and I saw how Jim worked him through this, talked to him and showed great kindness to him. That is how Jim McKee treated everyone, with great kindness and with great compassion, all the time being a professional, all the time doing his job.

It was this compassion that set Jim McKee apart. He cared deeply about people and just knew how to deal with them.

At the end of Chief McKee's distinguished 36-year career in law enforcement, I had the honor of attending his farewell banquet. I was lieutenant governor at the time and was there to pay tribute to the chief on behalf of the entire State of Ohio, and on behalf of Governor, then-Governor George Voinovich. At this reception and this dinner, I was struck by the sheer outpouring of respect and admiration and appreciation for Chief McKee's work and for his selfless contributions to our community. It was clear at this reception how important Chief McKee was to the people, to the village of Yellow Springs, and to the entire law enforcement community across the State of Ohio. I was proud to be part of this memorable event.

Following his retirement from the force in 1993, Chief McKee remained active in the community until the day he died. He was a key member of the Yellow Springs Men's Group, an organization dedicated to studying issues important to the day-to-day lives of Yellow Springs residents. Through this organization, the James A. McKee scholarship fund was established in 2002 as a

tribute both to Jim and to his legacy of community involvement.

In the recent days following Jim's death, a number of newspapers ran articles about his life and his legacy. As I read through these tributes, I was especially taken with a statement from my friend, Paul Ford, who had known Chief McKee since 1949. This is what Mr. Ford said:

We've lost a good citizen, a good friend, and a humanitarian. Once you met Jim, you were a friend.

Indeed, Jim McKee was my friend and someone for whom I had great affection and admiration. This quote really gets to why Chief McKee was so special to the community of Yellow Springs and to all of us who knew him. He dedicated his life to serving the people of Yellow Springs. He worked to keep his community safe and free from crime.

When I think about Jim McKee and his life's work as a police officer, protector of the community, I am reminded of a Bible passage from Matthew: Blessed are the peacemakers for they shall be called the children of God.

Indeed, Chief Jim McKee was a peacemaker and a protector and just a good and decent hard-working man. He was a kind person, a kind human being who always tried to do the right thing for his family, for his community, and for his Nation.

My wife Fran and I extend our heartfelt sympathy and our prayers for the entire McKee family, for his wife of 54 years, Naomi; his four daughters, Bari McKee-Teamor, Karen McKee, Jean McKee, Sandra McKee-Smith; his son, Jimmy, his five grandchildren, and one great grandson. Jim McKee loved his family. He cared deeply for them. I know they, like all of us, will miss him tremendously.

Thank you, Jim, for all you did for Yellow Springs and for our Nation. You will be remembered always in our minds and in our hearts.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

#### FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I was reading a piece in a newspaper this morning that misquoted remarks I made on the floor of the Senate recently. The journalist got it plain wrong in this case. He indicated that Senator DORGAN feels that Saddam Hussein is not dangerous.

Of course, I have never said that, would not say that, and whoever listened to my remarks previously either chose to reinterpret them in a way that is not accurate or chose to ignore what I said. Let me describe what I said.

I talked about the dangers presented by North Korea. I talked about the importance of prosecuting the war on terrorism, and protecting this country against terrorist attacks. And I said that while Iraq and Saddam Hussein are a problem, we have to face these other issues as well.

If today trucks are backing up to a plant in North Korea and moving fuel rods that will become processed and become part of a nuclear bombmaking process, and a bomb could be sold by North Korea to other countries, and to terrorists, that is a serious problem. That could come back in a year and a half or 2 years into this country in the form of a nuclear bomb possessed by a terrorist. That is serious business.

We are told that the trucks are moving. We are told that is what is happening in North Korea. And yet there does not seem to be the same kind of attention paid to it as is now paid to the country of Iraq.

We are told there is an orange level of alert in our country today, which suggests once again the threat posed by Osama bin Laden and his fellow terrorist, who have not yet been apprehended.

So we are facing terrorist groups, Osama bin Laden, Korea, Saddam Hussein, and Iraq.

My point is not that Saddam Hussein is not dangerous; he indeed is dangerous. We ought to deal with him. Frankly, the credit of having inspectors in Iraq at this point belongs to the President; otherwise they would not have been able to enter Iraq and begin the inspections. If Saddam Hussein does not disarm, he will be disarmed either by this country or this country and other countries acting in concert. That is just a fact.

My point is that is not the only challenge we face and not necessarily the greatest challenge we face. If trucks are moving spent fuel rods in North Korea today, then we better make a judgment to deal with that.

If we have an orange alert in this country today because terrorist groups have mobilized and intelligence suggests that an orange alert is warranted, then we had better be concerned about that. And we had better prosecute that war against terrorism as aggressively as we pursue Saddam Hussein. That is my point.

Now I have come to the floor today to speak about a related subject, and that is the subject of energy. We import oil in order to run our country's automobile fleets, stationary engines, and so on. We import 20 million barrels a day. Saudi Arabia is our No. 1 importer—Mexico, Canada, Venezuela, Nigeria—Iraq is No. 6 at 289,000 barrels. Our country is very dependent on energy from a Middle East that is rocked by turmoil. If tonight, God forbid, terrorists were able to interrupt the flow of energy, the flow of oil to our country from Saudi Arabia and Iraq, for example, our economy would be in trouble. That is just a plain fact.

Does it make sense for us to continue to be so dependent on oil coming from that part of the world? I don't think so. So what will we do about that? Let me describe a couple of things.

Yesterday my colleagues from South Dakota, Senator DASCHLE and others, Senator JOHNSON, myself, and Senator

CONRAD, introduced a piece of legislation dealing with ethanol, renewable fuels. Ethanol is a fuel in which you grow a crop in the field, you harvest it, you take a kernel of corn, you extract from the kernel of corn the drop of alcohol and you have the protein feedstock left. You extend America's energy supply, you still have something for cattle to eat, and you grow it year after year after year and you are not dependent on Saudi Arabia or Iraq. It is a renewable fuel that you produce year after year. Here is the way you produce ethanol. You grow a crop such as corn, finely grind it, separate it into component sugars, distill the sugars to make ethanol, and you put it in a vehicle. It is very simple. You are growing crops to produce America's energy. That is what ethanol is about. You can do it with barley. You can do it with sugar beets, start with sugar beets. You can do it with potatoes. You grow your energy.

We import 55 percent of the oil we consume in this country. That is expected to grow to 68 percent by 2025. Nearly all of our cars and trucks run on gasoline. They are the main reasons our country imports so much oil.

I think this chart shows what is happening with respect to energy in our country. We have a demand line that is going up. You will see that the reason for that, by and large, is transportation. Mostly that is vehicles—cars, trucks, other vehicles. This is where the demand is, transportation.

Domestic production of oil, as you can see, is fairly flat. If we were to go up to ANWR in Alaska, as some would like us to do—I don't happen to support it—you would see what would happen as a result of ANWR—almost nothing. Or if we go on into the Gulf of Mexico, which I do support—that will not solve all of our energy needs. We are just not going to solve our problems with those approaches. We have to produce more, and we will produce more—produce more coal, produce more oil, and natural gas. We will do it in ways that protect our environment as much as possible. But that is not enough. We need to do much more than that.

One of the answers, in my judgment, is to have much greater production of ethanol. And so we are introducing legislation, as my colleague from South Dakota, Senator DASCHLE, said yesterday, with a renewable fuels provision. It has been carefully negotiated over many months. Twenty groups—National Corn Growers, the Renewable Fuels Association, the American Farm Bureau, National Farmers Union—have all sent letters supporting this legislation that we have introduced.

We now produce 1.8 billion gallons of pure ethanol. This provision will add 3.2 billion new gallons. So by 2012, we will be producing 5 billion gallons of ethanol.

I think with this provision, the ethanol industry will continue to grow. That translates to a new market, for example, for corn as the feedstock for

an ethanol plant—1.2 billion bushels. That is new opportunities to farmers to invest in value-added agriculture, new opportunities to extend America's energy supply, new opportunities to make our country less dependent on Saudi Arabian oil, on oil from Iraq. All of that makes good sense. There are substantial economic benefits available with respect to this, and substantial security benefits for our country that will accrue from our passing this legislation.

So I rise today to say the introduction yesterday by myself, by Senator DASCHLE, and many others with respect to this major piece of legislation dealing with ethanol is a significant step forward. My hope is, on a bipartisan basis, we will be able to move this legislation in this Congress, recognizing that having less dependence on oil from the most troubled region in the world is advisable for this country.

How do you do that? By extending America's energy supply through the production of ethanol, the production of something that is renewable, year after year after year. It is not something that is depleting, it is renewable. That is why this legislation makes such good sense.

There is something else we can and should do. I am going to introduce legislation the day we get back from next week's break. I intended to introduce it yesterday, but for a couple of reasons I have held it, and will continue to refine it just a bit.

I will propose a project that deals with the hydrogen economy and fuel cells. The President mentioned this in his State of the Union Address to the Congress. I commend the President for it. It is exactly the right idea. I have been working on this for some long while.

In fact, the bill that passed the Senate last year, the energy bill, contained a provision I added that said by the year 2020 America should aspire to have 2.5 million fuel cell cars that are using hydrogen—2.5 million fuel cell cars on the road.

Give or take, there are 700 million vehicles in the world. Give or take, there are about 70 million vehicles produced each and every year. Almost all of them are vehicles with carburetors through which you put gasoline and you create power for the engine and you drive off in the automobile. Nothing has changed in a century—nothing at all.

My first car was an antique 1924 Model T Ford. I restored it, then sold it. I put gasoline in that little old antique Model T Ford the same way you put gasoline in a 2003 Ford: You pull up to a pump, put the hose in the tank, and start pumping gas. Nothing has changed in 100 years—nothing.

The question is, Are we going to pole-vault over all these discussions and move to a new day and a new technology? Sure, we are going to discuss ANWR and CAFE standards and all the other issues that dominated debate last

year. But if that is all we discuss, then every 25 years we will come back and discuss the same thing, and our policies will be known as "yesterday forever."

Why don't we begin discussing new technology and a new day, a new type of energy for this country's future, a hydrogen future with fuel cells for vehicles?

I mentioned our energy security is threatened. We import 55 percent of the oil. That is going to go to 68 percent by 2025. Most of our cars and trucks run on gasoline. That is why we import so much oil. Two-thirds of the 20 million barrels of oil we use each day is used for transportation.

Now let me describe a car that uses fuel cells. This chart shows a vehicle, a Ford Focus. It is a fuel cell vehicle, production-ready prototype, unveiled in autumn 2002. I drove one a couple days ago, drove one last summer. In fact, we have had fuel cell vehicles that drove all the way from Los Angeles to New York.

This is a picture of a hydrogen fueling station at Powertech Labs. Fueling infrastructure is critically important to make hydrogen fuel cars a reality.

Hydrogen cars do not have to be compact. This is a picture of a fuel cell vehicle, a Nissan Xterra, fueled by compressed hydrogen, tested on public roads in California in the year 2001.

Finally, a picture of a more futuristic looking vehicle, the General Motors Hy-Wire Fuel Cell Concept Car, unveiled in August of 2002.

Let me describe what Europe is doing in fuel cells. The European Commission has invested significantly in fuel cell cars, and industry is commending them for it. Herbert Kohler, director of Environmental Affairs at DaimlerChrysler, said political support was vital for the car industry to move to fuel cells. They can do a lot for themselves, but at a certain point they need fuel, and that means involving others.

It means the development of a supply of hydrogen, which is ubiquitous, by the way. Through electrolysis, you can separate the hydrogen and oxygen in water, develop the hydrogen supply, and put water vapor out the tailpipe of the car. You have the tailpipe of a vehicle that emits water vapor. What a great thing for the environment!

The European Commission, the executive body of the Europe Union, has earmarked more than 2.1 billion Euros, \$2 billion, for research over 5 years. A central focus will be hydrogen fuel cells.

Let me tell you what Japan is doing. Japanese carmakers are flooring it on fuel cells. Tokyo's fuel cell initiative has all the hallmarks of a far-sighted strategy, Business Week says, and calls to mind Tokyo's blossoming success in hybrids. Americans are snapping up these fuel-efficient, environmentally friendly cars, and fuel cells could turn out to be a bigger, more important chapter in exactly the same book.

I don't think we ought to stand around here and continue to debate

small issues so that every 25 years we can have a repeat of the same debate. I think we ought to debate big issues. I think we ought to have a world view change here, with respect to how we want to power our vehicle fleet. I think we want to convert to hydrogen fuel.

That ought not scare those who produce oil, natural gas, and use coal. In fact, those same companies are some of the companies in the lead, in the forefront of moving to a hydrogen economy.

You can produce hydrogen from fossil fuels. We are always going to need and use fossil fuels. But wouldn't it be great to power our vehicle fleet with hydrogen and fuel cells so that we don't need Middle East oil?

Wouldn't that be a wonderful future for this country and at the same time improve our environment, because we are going to use hydrogen and fuel cells and put only water vapor out of the back of the car through the tailpipe?

That is exactly what we ought to do. How you do you get that done? I have met with representatives of the hydrogen and fuel cell industries. They are anxious. They are engaged in substantial research. But the fact is they cannot do this alone.

The conversion of the vehicle fleet in our country to the big idea of the hydrogen economy and fuel cells will not and cannot happen without the support of the Government. I propose an Apollo-like program. When I say Apollo program, I am talking about the program by which John F. Kennedy said, "We are going to go to the Moon by the end of the decade." I think our country should decide to move to the hydrogen economy and fuel cell vehicles with a big idea and in a big way to help make it happen as public policy. The Europeans and the Japanese are moving in that direction, and we should, too.

As I indicated, last year I put a piece in the energy bill that says we aspire to have a goal of 2.5 million vehicles on the road in 2020 in this country using fuel cells.

Now, the President proposed a \$1.2 billion hydrogen fuel cell program. Only half of that is new money. That is not a big idea. It is the right idea. But it is not big and bold.

I propose a \$6.5 billion 10-year program that is really going to move this country to say we want to enact change. We want to move to a hydrogen economy and develop fuel cell vehicles to help create the infrastructure for the production of hydrogen and the storage and transportation of hydrogen. We want to provide incentives for people to buy the fuel cell vehicle.

This will be one of the best things this country has done. It will be one of the big ideas of the century. That is why I think it is so important.

We talk about this with the backdrop of a troubled world—substantial problems in the Middle East, Central and Southern Asia, terrorism, North Korea, and Iraq. When you think of the difficulties that exist and the small

thread our economy hangs on, making sure that tonight, tomorrow, the next day, and every day of the week and every month we get enough oil into this country from places like Iraq, like Venezuela, like Saudi Arabia, and Algeria in order to power our vehicle fleet, then we ought to understand this economy is held hostage by forces we don't control.

It is dangerous for this economy to be dependent on things we cannot and will not be able to control in the long term. But we can—as we have in many other areas—create incentives and new technology and new opportunities to solve old problems.

That is exactly what I propose with this initiative. I intend to introduce this the day we get back. I expect and hope it will be bipartisan. I have been talking to some Democrats and some Republicans.

The President has said this is a good idea. Good for him. I commend him for it. I think he proposed a step in the right direction. And, frankly, having the Bush administration be supportive of this kind of technology change is excellent. It is good for this country. But the Administration's approach is more timid and less bold than it should be.

I am going to propose an Apollo-type program that says let us really move and get this accomplished. I hope to have substantial bipartisan support as we begin to write an energy bill this year in the Senate.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BENNETT). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

---

#### LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now return to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

---

#### MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. FRIST. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period for morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

---

#### A TRYING TIME FOR OUR NATION

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, in a few minutes I will be closing the Senate for our recess break, but I wanted to take this opportunity to speak a few moments on an issue that is on my mind and on the mind of my wife and family, and it is on the minds of most every American today in what I would consider very trying times, from an intel-

lectual standpoint, from an emotional standpoint, a spiritual standpoint. And indeed, this week has been a very trying week for the Nation.

There is much alarm about the increased threat of terrorism. We know we are at a time that is closely approaching the possible use of force to ensure that Saddam Hussein is disarmed of weapons of mass destruction, such as chemical agents and biological agents; and we all feel the stress all across America—not just in this body in Washington, DC, and in New York, where the stress level is high because of the symbolic value of being a potential site for attack. We are concerned for families, we are concerned for friends, we are concerned for neighbors all over America, and we are concerned for the service men and women overseas.

As elected officials in this body, we have taken the opportunity over the last 3 or 4 days, coinciding with the increased alert, to talk about the nature of our duties and responsibilities both to our constituents, as well as to our families as we serve in this body. We, in the Senate, have a great honor to serve in this beautiful Chamber, in this beautiful Capitol Building, and it is indeed the symbol of our Nation's strength and our Nation's purpose. Throughout this week, while fully aware that our enemies, as I speak now and as so many have debated so many issues over the course of the week, are plotting their evil designs. We know that. Yet we continue to carry out our duties as Senators and as citizens. It is truly remarkable.

I could not be prouder of the many fine women and men who make up this institution. Yes, I have mentioned the Senators, but I also include the thousands of individuals who come to this building and surrounding buildings on Capitol Hill to support the activities of what goes on in this body and in this room as we debate and amend and pass legislation. Through very difficult, long, and hard hours so many have demonstrated to this fine city and to the Nation that life must go on in times of threat and increased alert.

Terrorists will have won when they can so intimidate us that we stop performing our most basic duties and responsibilities. Clearly, they have not, nor will they.

Last week Secretary Tom Ridge of the Department of Homeland Security announced the President had determined that the Nation should be moved to that next higher level of alert, a heightened threat level. Attorney General John Ashcroft explained this was done in response to recent reporting that indicates an increased likelihood that al-Qaida may attempt to attack Americans in the United States and/or abroad around the end of the Haj, the Muslim religious period ending mid-February, 2003.

What does this mean? It is confusing to the American people. It is confusing based on what one reads and sees on