

Kolbe, a Catholic priest who gave his life for a Jewish man there.

And then, for those of you who don't know, I am a social worker, I have been a child abuse worker and I don't flinch.

But then I got half way through that tour and I came to a point in that tour where I saw the bins with glasses and the children's shoes, and this 40-something-year-old Congresswoman could not go on.

I became unglued. I had to remove myself from the small tour, go off into a private place in Auschwitz, cry in a way that shook my very soul. And when I left there, I thought, now I really know why we need an Israel.

And that is why I will fight so hard to ensure the survival of Israel. I know its importance. I know why it exists. I will always fight for the survival and the viability of the State of Israel. My support is unabashed and unwavering.

I also know why it is so important for us educate our young people—about the effects of hatred, about the importance of history.

That is why I have worked with the Polish and Jewish communities in Baltimore to develop a U.S.-Poland-Israel Exchange program. Young people from America, Poland and Israel will join together to learn about each other's history and culture. They will visit Poland and Israel, to visit historical and religious sites, to learn together about history and to work together to build a brighter future.

In closing, I would like to read the words of Eli Weisel:

Never shall I forget that night, the first night in camp, which has turned my life into one long night, seven times cursed and seven times sealed. Never shall I forget that smoke. Never shall I forget the faces of the children, whose bodies I saw turned into wreathes of smoke beneath a silent blue sky. Never shall I forget those flames which consumed my faith forever.

Never shall I forget that nocturnal silence which deprived me, for all eternity, of the desire to live. Never shall I forget those moments which murdered my God and my soul and turned my dreams to dust. Never shall I forget these things, even if I am condemned to live as long as God himself.

Mr. President, 60 years after the liberation of Auschwitz, let us pledge never to forget. And let us honor those who died in the holocaust by fighting against bigotry, hate crimes, and intolerance.

Mr. TALENT. Mr. President, since I am going to ask on behalf of the leader the resolution be agreed to, I want to express my gratitude to his office and the Democratic leader's office for their expeditious handling of this resolution, and also Senator WYDEN and all those who have cosponsored it.

On their behalf, I ask unanimous consent the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motion to reconsider be laid on the able.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 18) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S. RES. 18

Whereas on January 27, 1945, the Auschwitz extermination camp in Poland was liberated by Allied Forces during World War II after almost 5 years of murder, rape, and torture;

Whereas more than 1,000,000 innocent civilians were murdered at the Auschwitz extermination camp;

Whereas the Auschwitz extermination camp symbolizes the brutality of the Holocaust;

Whereas Americans must never forget the terrible crimes against humanity committed at the Auschwitz extermination camp and must educate future generations to promote understanding of the dangers of intolerance in order to prevent similar injustices from happening again; and

Whereas commemoration of the liberation of the Auschwitz extermination camp will instill in all Americans a greater awareness of the Holocaust: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) commemorates January 27, 2005, as the 60th anniversary of the liberation of the Auschwitz extermination camp by Allied Forces during World War II; and

(2) calls on all Americans to remember the more than 1,000,000 innocent victims murdered at the Auschwitz extermination camp as part of the Holocaust.

Mr. TALENT. Mr. President, 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. DORGAN. I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

DEMOCRATIC POLICY COMMITTEE HEARING ON SOCIAL SECURITY

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, on Friday of this week we will be holding in the Democratic Policy Committee a hearing that deals with part of our overall goal to hold oversight hearings that are not being held by committees. This Friday's hearing will be on the subject of Social Security. Among the witnesses at this hearing will be Franklin Delano Roosevelt's grandson, the AARP, and we will have a couple of employees of the Social Security Administration who will testify about efforts inside the Social Security Administration to get some of the career employees to push the issue of privatization and the issue that there is, in fact, a crisis in Social Security. We are going to have a hearing on these issues.

Incidentally, we have invited witnesses who will provide a full range of opinions. A representative of the Cato Institute is invited to appear. As we have always done with our hearings, we have people with divergent viewpoints. As I indicated previously, I would invite any Republicans to join us at any of our hearings at any time.

Our intention is not to have hearings that are "gotcha." Our intention is to have hearings, however, in circumstances where we believe oversight

has not occurred. These hearings will give us an opportunity to explore issues in a more aggressive way.

We held hearings previously, for example, on contract abuses in Iraq by the Halliburton corporation. We will have another hearing on that subject, along with allegations about another company engaged in contract abuses in Iraq, because there is substantial waste, fraud, and abuse. The evidence of that is all around us. There is precious little effort or energy on the part of some in Congress to take a look at it and deal with it and do something about it.

SOCIAL SECURITY

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I wish to make a couple of comments about the future of Social Security because the President talked about this issue again this morning. This is a big issue. I noticed in a recent newspaper article that someone, who philosophically doesn't appear to believe in Social Security, said: "Social Security is the soft underbelly of the welfare state."

Social Security is a program that was signed into law by Franklin Delano Roosevelt in 1930's. It is an insurance program. Money is taken from workers' paychecks in the form of something called FICA taxes. The "I" in FICA is insurance, not investment. Social Security is an insurance program. It has lifted tens of millions of elderly people out of poverty in this country. It has been amazingly successful. It is not in crisis. The President did not use that word—"crisis"—today, but he has used it the past, and others also have. It is not in crisis.

We have a responsibility with respect to the Social Security system to make some adjustments as we go along. According to the Congressional Budget Office, the Social Security system will be fully solvent until the year 2052. In the period beyond 2052, if no changes are made, Social Security would be able to pay about 80 percent of what we now pay in benefits. In fact, people are living longer, healthier, better lives as a result of Social Security. Yes, it is successful. People are living longer and healthier lives. We can and will and should make some adjustments in Social Security, but major surgery is not needed. I do not support privatized accounts in the Social Security system.

With respect to retirement security, we have two things. Social Security is the foundation. That is the basic retirement insurance. It is the one without risk and that will be there no matter what. Above that, we have retirement investments, 401(k)s, IRAs, and other private pension programs. I support those as well. I have supported aggressive incentives for the American people to invest in the stock market, in 401(k)s and IRAs and other retirement accounts. That is different than Social Security, the basic foundation of retirement security. The President suggests we should begin taking apart

the foundation. I do not support that. I do not agree with it. I say let us build on the first, second, and third floor of this structure, but let us keep the foundation intact.

Social Security, the social insurance program you pay into during your working life and you can expect to get when you retire, has made life better for tens of millions of retired elderly Americans. We ought not take it apart.

The President proposes this: He says let us borrow \$1 trillion to \$3 trillion and invest that borrowing in the stock market and then have faith that somehow that will produce substantial returns and at the same time reduce benefits in the Social Security program. He suggests that it will all come out just fine. Well, it will not come out just fine.

I point out that the President also told us 4 years ago that we were going to have budget surpluses as far as the eye. It didn't turn out that way. We went from the largest budget surpluses to the largest budget deficits in history. There is not exactly a substantial amount of evidence that the economic estimates in the future from this administration will be on the mark. In fact, just the opposite is true.

Our obligation is to understand the basics of retirement security. My grandmother, as I have told you before, said you don't borrow for retirement, you save for retirement. That is why this notion of borrowing \$1 trillion to \$3 trillion to stick in the stock market begins with a premise that doesn't make any sense.

Incidentally, one other thing: Third-grade math will tell you there is no connection here. If, in fact, those who want to privatize a portion of Social Security allege that Social Security is in trouble because the actuaries estimate average economic growth at only 1.8 percent per year, then they cannot on the other hand allege that if there are private accounts you are going to get a 7-percent return. An economy growing at 1.8 percent a year on average cannot produce the corporate profits that will rise and increase the stock market to produce 7-percent returns on investment over the long term. It doesn't work. You have inconsistent arguments for a policy that, in my judgment, is not the right policy for our country.

I welcome the debate. I don't begrudge anyone for taking a position that is dramatically different from mine. I just believe that those who believe we should privatize a portion of Social Security system are just plain wrong.

I grew up in a town of 300 people. Everybody knew everybody. I knew everyone who lived in that town. I knew the people who retired in that town and had nothing but their Social Security checks. I wasn't alive at a time when those who retired and had nothing didn't have a Social Security check, but I know that at that point in time half of those who became elderly in

this country lived in poverty. Some 50 percent of the American elderly lived in poverty. Growing up in my small hometown, I knew everybody. I understood who benefitted so substantially from that monthly Social Security check and who would have lived in poverty without it. This is not about statistics; it is about real people. Those are the people who built this country and created this wonderful life which we inherited. People say we inherited this wonderful life from those who went before us and we owe it to our children. The question is, How will we deal with it? How will we treat it? Will we be responsible and make the right choices?

Those who came before us built something that is unique on this globe. We share this Earth that circles the Sun with 6 billion neighbors. Through the blessings of God, we happened to be born right here and are living right now. A lot of people on this Earth can say that. There is no place else like this. There is no one on this Earth who has what we have. It has been given to us by people who worked hard and who understood that part of what we have created in this country is to help lift tens of millions of elderly people out of poverty through something called Social Security. We ought to be here to expand it, to protect it, to nurture it, and to make sure it is available for 100 years—not take it apart. We are going to have a real debate about that.

Once again, I am not going to be engaged in name calling or be pejorative about those who have different opinions. There is room for a lot of different opinions. I feel strongly about this, and I welcome this debate. This is about values and what our country values. We will have a hearing on this subject on Friday. I invite everyone here who might wish to attend to be part of it.

NOMINATION OF SAMUEL BODMAN

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I wish to make a brief statement about the person who is destined to become the new Secretary of Energy, someone for whom I voted in the Energy Committee this morning and someone I am very pleased to support and think brings considerable skill to the position of Secretary of Energy. He has not yet been confirmed by the full Senate, but he was approved unanimously by the Energy Committee this morning.

I commend President Bush for his selection. We have had some controversial nominees, but the selection of Dr. Bodman is the selection of someone whose capabilities, skills, and experience I believe lend themselves very well to the demand and the duties of Secretary of Energy. At this time, when we have these compelling energy issues, the President has made a good choice.

Mr. Bodman is a person of considerable skill and talent who I am going to be proud to support, and who I voted

for in the Energy Committee this morning.

When I talk about trade, as I did yesterday, one of the significant issues of trade and economic opportunity in the future for this country is the issue of oil and energy. We are now importing nearly 60 percent of our oil. Everyone talks about independence and trying to be free from the grip of those who live in troubled parts of the world. Yet we allow these countries to hold us hostage to the supply that comes from their oil pipeline.

Every 25 years we grow concerned and start worrying about energy. We all put on our suit and start debating energy. In the end it is a bunch of people in dark suits that huff and puff and do nothing. And every 25 years we develop a "new" strategy that is exactly the same, dig and drill.

This strategy is what I like to call a yesterday forever policy. Yes, we should dig. And yes, we should drill. But if this is all we have for an energy policy, it is yesterday forever, and 25 years from now we will be back here talking about it again—perhaps a different bunch of Senators—but we will talk about the same thing.

The question is, Can we do something different? I have often told my colleagues that my first automobile when I was in school was a 1924 Model T Ford that I restored. I bought it for \$25. I lovingly restored it over 2 years. It was not much of a car. You could not date in it and it was not much of a car for someone in high school. The thing about it is that you put gasoline in a 1924 Ford exactly the same way you put gasoline in a 2005 Ford. You drive up to a pump and stick a hose in the tank and start pumping. Nothing has changed. Everything in our lives has changed, but nothing has changed with respect to the way we put gasoline through a carburetor. This country is so overwhelmingly dependent on oil from troubled parts of the world that if we do not get vocal and do something significant, shame on us.

In 2003, the President called for developing hydrogen fuel cells. I said at the time, I welcomed that and thought it was a terrific idea, although it was more timid than what I proposed. I proposed a \$6.5 billion, 10-year Apollo-type program that would move us to a position where we are no longer putting gasoline through carburetors and depending on foreign oil. And I still believe we should move to a hydrogen fuel cell future.

The fact is, there are enormous benefits if we create a hydrogen fuel cell program. First, hydrogen is ubiquitous. It is everywhere. I understand there are concerns regarding production, storage, distribution, and infrastructure. I understand that, but these concerns are not insurmountable and hydrogen is everywhere.

When you drive a hydrogen fuel cell vehicle, what comes out of the tailpipe? Water vapor. It is a wonderful thing for the environment to drive a