

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

vehicle that puts water vapor out the tailpipe.

If we can decide as a country that our policy should be that our children or their children no longer drive vehicles with an internal combustion engine that requires us to get oil from Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, Iraq, or Venezuela, we will have done something very significant for the defense of this country.

This is about national security. We cannot be timid. And we cannot take baby steps towards an energy policy.

When we develop an energy bill—and I am on the Senate Energy Committee and I want to be part of developing that bill; I voted for the last one in the Senate; it was very controversial but I voted for it—it needs to be a bill that includes four pieces.

First, we have to incentivize additional production. Yes, it is digging and drilling, but if that is the only title, it is over. We do not accomplish much at all. Second, we need much more conservation. We waste so much more energy than we should. It is incredible how much energy we waste. We need conservation. Production, conservation. Third, we need efficiency. Everything we do, from turning on the bathroom light in the morning to using the electric shaver we plug in, can be so much more efficient and could save a substantial amount of energy. Fourth, we need renewable forms of energy. Yes, that is wind energy, solar, biodiesel, and ethanol.

Collectively, we need to create a significant national program, an Apollo-like program, where our Nation exerts its will and says: Here is where we are headed and here is how we will get there. It has to be a collective national will for us to decide we will escape the excessive dependence we have on Middle East oil. That is the only way we will achieve this goal.

I know it is longer term. But, if we do not take the first step, we can never get there. When we write a new energy proposal, I will again—and I have visited with Dr. Bodman about this—I will work with my colleagues and propose a very aggressive Apollo-type or Manhattan-type program that says, let's head this country in a new direction with a fresh choice, a different choice that makes us less dependent on the oil that comes from the ground in the Middle East.

We have no choice but to consider an energy bill a priority, a new energy policy a priority. We need to get it right. There are enough ideas to go around. I don't think any one party or any one philosophy has a lock on good suggestions or ideas with respect to a new energy bill. I do believe this, those who clinging to the past and those who believe digging and drilling represents America's energy future do no service to our kids and grandkids.

As we grapple with this issue, and with the help and leadership of Dr. Bodman at the Department of Energy when he is confirmed next week, my

hope is we can do something significant and at the end of our careers we can say we produced a significant new and interesting energy policy that takes this country well beyond the dependence that now holds us hostage.

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

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

The Senator from Arizona.

#### ATTORNEY GENERAL JOHN ASHCROFT

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, this morning, on a party-line vote, the Judiciary Committee agreed to send the nomination for the U.S. Attorney General of Judge Alberto Gonzales to the Senate floor. It is the leader's intention, as I understand it, to bring that nomination to the floor next week. So it appears to me relatively obvious that the United States of America will have a new Attorney General within the next couple of weeks.

I did not want the opportunity to pass to talk a little bit about the current Attorney General, a person for whom I have absolute respect and express appreciation for his service, not only for the State of Missouri when he represented that State as Governor and later as a Senator but for all of America during his service in the last 4 years as Attorney General of the United States.

I think sometimes people have overlooked the record of this Attorney General. I wanted to take a moment this evening to talk about some of the accomplishments of the Bush administration, and specifically the Justice Department under the leadership of Attorney General John Ashcroft. But first I want to say a couple of personal words about John Ashcroft.

When his confirmation hearing was held 4 years ago, there was opposition to him because he was deemed to be a conservative. His views were deemed to be too firmly held. Some people called him rigid in his ideology. Some people thought he was too faithful to his religion. No one questioned his intelligence or his integrity or his experience.

He is a graduate of one of the finest law schools in the country, the University of Chicago. He clearly had the public service, as a Governor of the State and as a U.S. Senator. Very few attorneys general had the same kind of experience he had.

But throughout his tenure, I think he has been criticized less for what he has accomplished than for the kind of person he is. It ought to be the other way around. People should look at the kind of leadership John Ashcroft has pro-

vided the Justice Department and be thankful that we had such a firm, intelligent, upright, faithful, and strong Attorney General. These years have called for strength which we could not have anticipated when John Ashcroft was confirmed just 4 years ago. But because just a few months later this country was brutally attacked in September of 2001, all of our public servants had to begin to operate their departments in a way they had never operated them before.

The Justice Department was no different. In fact, the Justice Department was on the front line of our defense of the homeland. There was no Homeland Security Department at that time. Immediately, the Justice Department had to begin changing the way it did business. The FBI, under the jurisdiction of the Justice Department, had major changes. Thankfully, under the leadership of John Ashcroft and now Bob Mueller, the Director of the FBI, things have begun to change, but it has not been easy. Without the strong and firm and steady leadership of John Ashcroft, it would likely not have happened.

The first obligation, therefore, of the Attorney General was and is the protection of Americans, preventing another terrorist attack, and ensuring that we maintain the proper balance between the protection of our own civil rights and our security from terrorist attack. During the period of time John Ashcroft has served, we have shut down numerous terrorist operations and cells across America. In fact, I am informed the Justice Department has brought criminal charges against 364 individuals and obtained convictions against 193 of them. Over \$2 million in funds has been frozen.

I know, because I have talked to Attorney General Ashcroft and foreign leaders, he has been able to forge a relationship with his counterparts in other countries. For example, not to be exclusive, but our European allies helped us go after terrorist cells in countries around the world. Largely because of his success in that, we have been able to integrate our law enforcement activities with other countries. Even though people may be concerned about the support that some of our allies have failed to give us in operations such as those in Iraq, I can tell you the cooperation in law enforcement and going after terrorists and terrorist cells has been very good. That is one of the good news stories in the war on terror, and John Ashcroft had a lot to do with that.

With regard to the first obligation that the Attorney General has to the American people, I can't think of a better person to have in place after 9/11 than John Ashcroft. His Department has done a terrific job.

One of the areas that is of most concern to me is violent crime. For years, Senator FEINSTEIN and I labored to secure passage of a constitutional amendment to protect the victims of