

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 cling 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