

given our constitutional rights on the installment plan.

And the rest is history. We had the white citizens councils on the one hand. We had Martin Luther King, Jr., and burn baby burn on the other hand. And we literally had some 20 years—Malcolm X and everything else of that kind—of trauma, upset, burning here in Washington. I will never forget the riots in 1968. It has been quite a history over that period of time.

What has happened is not integrated public education. That is agreed to. But it really made legitimate Rosa Parks and everybody else coming south, the freedom riders and everything else like that. For the first time officially everyone became a full citizen under the Constitution and under the law in America on May 17, 1954.

So we made a lot of progress in the United States since that time. It was done through the valiant effort of the Summerton 66 that literally lost their lives—one was attributed to having lost his life as a result of the discord. But whatever it might be, Reverend De Laine could not return to South Carolina. The United States Senate and the House of Representatives unanimously have agreed now to present them the Congressional Gold Medal.

It had been my hope that next Monday afternoon, May 17, we would have a ceremony in the Rotunda, but we will look forward to the time later this year when we can honor Reverend De Laine, Harry and Eliza Briggs, and Levi Pearson, who really understood the Constitution in America better than this particular Senator, who at that time was only a fledgling Democratic politician. That is the history. I will be glad to go into it sometime with my colleagues about some of the arguments made.

I yield the floor.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, did I hear the Senator say that the first arguments took 3 days?

Mr. HOLLINGS. Three days, yes.

Mr. REID. Now, in the Supreme Court, if you get an hour, you are lucky.

Mr. HOLLINGS. That is right, it took 3 days. I will never forget, Henry Fonda was over at the National Theater, and I was sitting right inside the rail with John W. Davis and Mr. Briggs right at the table, and I got Fonda to sit up there with me during the 3 days. He didn't leave. He wanted to hear all the arguments. That was in December of 1952.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I say to the Senator, what a great history lesson we had today. We have only heard a short bit of the knowledge of the Senator from South Carolina. The Senator from South Carolina was one of the originals who decided things were not the way they should be in the South. He has been able to work through the process and stand for what he believed, and because of this, the people of South Carolina have elected him time after time. It is obvious why. He is a man

who is a World War II combat veteran, someone we admire so much. We are all disappointed that he has indicated he is not going to seek reelection. It is a disappointment to me.

I cannot express in words what a role model he has been for me. Not only can he stand and speak, as he did today, about the most serious subjects that face the world, but he has one of the best senses of humor of anyone I have dealt with.

Mr. HOLLINGS. I thank the distinguished Senator.

AWARDING MEDALS TO SERVICE MEMBERS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, we don't have anybody from the majority in the Chamber. I want to reiterate what I said earlier in the day. We are basically in morning business today. There is no legislative business on the floor. Senator BINGAMAN—I am speaking for him and for everyone on this side of the aisle—badly wants to do Calendar No. 507, H.R. 3104 on the Calendar of Business, which is a piece of legislation to provide for the establishment of separate campaign medals to be awarded to members of the uniformed services who participated in Operation Enduring Freedom in Afghanistan and members of the uniformed services who participated in Operation Iraqi Freedom, of course, in Iraq. I cannot imagine why we cannot do this bill, which passed the House unanimously.

I hear on the other side that "we are trying to clear it." What in the world does that mean? Is somebody opposing bringing this bill to the floor? The problem we have is that the day is winding down. As we all know, people have things to do in their States and around the country. They are going to be leaving. If we don't get something within the next 35 minutes or so, there won't be enough Senators here to allow a vote to take place.

So, again, I say to the majority, why can we not do this piece of legislation? It is something Senator BINGAMAN has worked on for more than a year. It is important legislation, something we should do. I am terribly disappointed that I am told they are trying to clear it. I don't understand what that means. Clear what? Is someone going to vote against medals for people who participated in those two theaters of war? Is it just because it is Senator BINGAMAN's idea. I don't know what it is. I hope we get real and move forward on this legislation. I apologize for making my friends wait.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas is recognized.

(The remarks of Mr. PRYOR pertaining to the submission of S. 2419 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

MORE OUTRAGED BY THE OUTRAGE

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, here we go again, rushing to give aid and comfort to our enemies—pushing, pulling, shoving, and leaping over one another to assign blame and point the finger at "America the terrible," lining up in long lines at the microphones to offer apologies to those poor, pitiful Iraqi prisoners.

Of course, I do not condone all the things that went on in that prison, but I for one refuse to join in this national act of contrition over it. Those who are wringing their hands and shouting so loudly for heads to roll over this seem to have conveniently overlooked the fact that someone's head has rolled, that of another innocent American brutally murdered by terrorists.

Why is it there is more indignation over a photo of a prisoner with underwear on his head than over the video of a young American with no head at all? Why is it some in this country still do not get it, that we are at war, a war against terrorists who are plotting to kill us every day, terrorists who will murder Americans at any time, anyplace, any chance they get.

Yet here we are, America on its knees in front of our enemy, begging for their forgiveness over the mistreatment of prisoners, showing our enemy and the world once again how easily America can get sidetracked, how easily America can turn against itself.

Yes, a handful of soldiers went too far with their interrogation. Clearly some of them were not properly trained to handle such duty, but the way to deal with this is with swift and sure punishment and immediate and better training.

There also needs to be more careful screening of who it is we put in these kinds of sensitive situations—and no one wants to hear this, and I am reluctant to say it, but there should also be some serious questioning of having male and female soldiers serving side by side in these kinds of military missions. Instead, I worry that the HWA, the "hand wringers of America," will add to their membership and continue to bash our country ad nauseam and, in doing so, hand over more innocent Americans to the enemy on a silver platter.

So I stand with Senator INHOFE of Oklahoma who stated that he is more outraged by the outrage than by the treatment of those prisoners. More outraged by the outrage, that is a good way of putting it. That is exactly how this Senator from Georgia feels.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

HONORING OUR SERVICE MEN AND WOMEN

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I rise to express my strong hope that we can get agreement today to move ahead

with H.R. 3104 and pass that legislation before we adjourn this week. This is legislation which has passed the House unanimously and has come over to the Senate. In my opinion, this should now pass the Senate and go to the President for signature. This is legislation that would honor those service men and women in Iraq and in Afghanistan who have served their country there or continue to serve there.

Obviously, over the last couple of weeks the reputation of our military has been stained by the horrific events at Abu Ghraib prison and every level of our military has been affected by the actions of the few who have been identified. I think all of us are looking to see the extent of the problem. All of us are anxious to ensure the problem does not continue in the future.

At this point, it is important to recognize and honor the thousands of fighting men and women who serve this Nation every day with commitment, courage, integrity, and professionalism both in Iraq and in Afghanistan.

That is the purpose of the legislation I am urging us to bring up and to pass today. We have a Senate version of this same bill that has been introduced. It has 24 cosponsors. I have introduced this legislation with Senators LUGAR and LOTT, LANDRIEU, INHOFE, GREGG, JOHNSON, ROCKEFELLER, PRYOR, REID, DASCHLE, LINCOLN, BOXER, DURBIN, BIDEN, AKAKA, EDWARDS, KERRY, CLINTON, BAYH, FEINGOLD, NELSON, CONRAD, KENNEDY, STABENOW, and DOLE. So this is a broadly supported piece of legislation on both sides of the political aisle.

I particularly want to thank the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, Senator WARNER, for his support of this important measure.

This has been a dangerous and a brutal period for our troops in Iraq in particular, but also in Afghanistan. There have been nearly 3,000 Americans injured in these 2 conflicts in recent months. More than a year after the initial Iraq invasion, the administration has announced plans to maintain a force of at least 135,000 troops in Iraq through next year, through 2005.

We will have many debates as we proceed with the Defense authorization bill next week and then later with the Defense appropriations bill, on the right level of funding, on how quickly to proceed with funding. President Bush has recently asked for another \$25 billion to be included in the defense budget for the operations in Iraq and I know there will be discussion about whether that is the appropriate amount. But clearly the liberation of Iraq is turning out to be the most significant military occupation and reconstruction effort this country has engaged in since World War II. We must not underestimate the importance of the work that is involved here. I think it is important that we recognize those whose lives are on the line to accomplish this very difficult task.

Let me talk a minute about what is at stake in this legislation. The De-

fense Department has decided in their view what is appropriate is to award to the brave men and women who are serving in those two conflicts the Global War on Terrorism Expeditionary Medal and no other medal. This is despite the fact the Global War on Terrorism Medal is meant for any individual who served overseas during this war on terror and may have come within a few hundred miles of a combat zone. The dangers of serving in Iraq and in Afghanistan are far greater. Therefore, along with my colleagues, I propose to correct what I considered a mistake by authorizing that we issue the Iraq and Afghanistan Liberation Medals in addition to the Global War on Terrorism Expeditionary Medal.

When the President was defending Secretary Rumsfeld earlier this week, he noted Secretary Rumsfeld was involved in leading the military in "two wars." If the President is willing to acknowledge the fact we are engaged in two wars, then his decision about how to award medals should be consistent with that. The policy we are currently following, that the Pentagon is currently following, is not consistent with that.

While some of us in this body have not shared the administration's view on the wisdom of going to war in Iraq, we are united when it comes to supporting our troops. These young men and women from Active Duty, from National Guard, and from Reserves are all volunteers. They exemplify the very essence of what it means to be a patriot. We believe what they are doing in Iraq and what they are doing in Afghanistan today differs from military expeditionary activity such as peace-keeping operations or enforcement of no-fly zones.

They continue to serve even though they do not know when they will return home to their family, to their friends. They continue to serve despite the constant threat which they face to their own lives and the tremendous hardship many of them face.

There is a difference between an expeditionary medal and a campaign medal and it is a well-recognized difference that goes back throughout our military history. We only need to look at an excerpt from U.S. Army Qualifications for the Armed Forces Expeditionary Medal and the Kosovo Campaign Medal. In order to receive the Armed Forces Expeditionary Medal, you did not need to go to war; you only needed to be "placed in such a position that in the opinion of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, hostile action by foreign Armed Forces was imminent even though it does not materialize."

However, to earn the Kosovo Campaign Medal, the standard was higher. A military member was required to:

Be engaged in actual combat or duty that is equally hazardous as combat duty, during the Operation with armed opposition, regardless of time in the Area of Engagement. Or while participating in the Operation regardless of time [the service member] is wounded

or injured or requires medical evacuation from the Area of Engagement.

Many within the military agree there is a difference. According to the *Army Times*, and let me quote their statement, they say:

Campaign medals help to establish immediate rapport with individuals checking into a unit.

An expeditionary medal like the Global War on Terrorism Medal does not necessarily denote the individual with that medal has ever been involved in combat. A campaign medal is designed to recognize military personnel who have risked their lives in combat.

Campaign medals matter. Let me give another quotation here.

When a marine shows up at a new duty station, commanders look first at his decorations and physical fitness score, the first to see where he has been, the second to see if he can hang [tough]. They know what you have done and how serious you are. . . . If you are a good marine, people are going to award you when it comes time. . . .

That is the statement of a sergeant, as quoted in the *Army Times*.

In my view it is time we agreed with the rank and file in the military, recognize the sacrifice of our young men and women who are fighting to assist in Iraq, including great Americans such as Army SP Joseph Hudson from my home State, from Alamogordo, NM, who was held as a prisoner of war. The Nation was captivated as we watched Specialist Hudson several months ago being interrogated by the enemy. Asked to divulge his military occupation, Specialist Hudson stared defiantly into the camera and said, "I follow orders."

Those of us whose sons and daughters were united in worrying about Specialist Hudson's family—and the entire Nation rejoiced when he was liberated—that same circumstance has played out with regard to many other men and women who have served and are continuing to serve our Nation in those conflicts.

We have also asked a great deal from the Reserve and National Guard forces in our States. The reconstruction of Iraq would not be possible without the commitment and sacrifice of the 170,000 guard and reservists currently on active duty.

In my view it is absolutely essential we go ahead and act on this legislation. I know there may be some who say this legislation has been incorporated, or the same provisions have been incorporated in the Defense authorization bill which will be considered on the Senate floor next week, and therefore we need not take action today. The problem with dealing with it on the Defense authorization bill as part of the Defense authorization bill is all of us who have been around the Senate know that bill will not get to the President's desk for signature until late this summer or maybe fall. What I am urging is we take the bill the House has passed unanimously, without a dissenting vote, we pass that same legislation,

and send it to the President for signature, so these two campaign medals, one for Iraq and one for Afghanistan, can begin to be awarded to these brave men and women.

I hope we can get the needed clearance on the Republican side. All Democratic Senators have agreed to this course of action so we can bring up this legislation and pass it.

I am informed there is objection at this point; at least clearance has not been achieved. I hope that can be remedied and we can act on this bill before we leave town this week.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I inquire, is there currently business before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is in morning business with a 10-minute time limit.

U.S. ENERGY MARKET

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I come to the Senate floor once again today, as I have on three different occasions over the last 2 weeks, to visit with my colleagues about the State of the U.S. energy market and what is happening out there that I am afraid some of my colleagues are not yet understanding in a way that will cause them to act to help us shape a national energy policy for our country.

When I was on the floor of the Senate 2 weeks ago, I mentioned that gas at the pump in California had hit \$2.25 a gallon. A few days later, I announced that gas had hit \$2.50 a gallon in the State of California. Yesterday, gas hit over \$3 a gallon in the Los Angeles market—a historic high not only for this Nation but most assuredly for the State of California. In our State of Idaho—I say “our” State because my colleague, MIKE CRAPO, is presiding at this moment—in some instances, gas has gone over \$2 per gallon. For those of us who travel the miles across Idaho to get from one small community to another, that begins to have a very real impact upon the ability of our citizens to simply move across the State of Idaho, let alone those businesses and industries that use large volumes of chemicals, gasoline, and diesel for the conduct of their businesses.

So while I was accused by some of our folks on the other side of being a little bit too much of an alarmist a week ago in speaking about this, I will simply hold my tone down today. But I have to think that the average consumer who swiped his credit card with a \$50 limit and found out that before he

could get his SUV filled, he had ran out the limit of the credit card and had to swipe it one more time because the gas pump shut down got a very rude awakening this week in the Los Angeles basin.

Who ever thought it would cost \$45 or \$50 to fuel your automobile? That is what it is costing today. I said a couple weeks ago that the average citizen this fiscal year would spend \$300 to \$500 just for gasoline than a year ago. I need to update that a little bit. Now we are up to about \$560 instead of \$400. That has happened just within the course of a week and a half. Yet, the Senate still cannot get its act together. It cannot produce a national energy policy that we have been debating and refining in this Chamber and in the appropriate committees for the last 5 years. Somehow it just isn't quite perfect.

In the course of those years, we quit producing as a country. We kept demanding and growing, and our growth, in large part, is based on surplus energy that was built into our system over the last two decades. But as our economy comes back on line, that surplus is gone.

Let's remember what happened at the last peak of an economic cycle in the State of California, when the State of California went dark, and businesses and industries had to curtail production because they didn't have electricity—or very little—or it wasn't reliable or stable. Have we done anything to correct that, to create sustainability and reliability in the system?

The answer is that we have not done anything. We have debated it loudly and clearly, but we really could not get our political act together to solve the problem in California and the region. We have not drilled any more oil wells in the United States. We have not been allowed to drill where we think there are literally billions of barrels of oil in Alaska because somebody said it might damage the environment. Yet we have already proved by drilling in Alaska that proper procedure in the 1970s didn't damage the environment. Our abilities now, in 2004, are so much enhanced that we know we will not damage the environment. But it became the clarion call of the environmental movement in this country not to touch ANWR. So, politically, we did not; we could not. The votes simply were not here to do it.

What would happen today if ANWR were developed and the production was on line, even though it wasn't pumping at the moment? We could say to OPEC, to other countries around the world, that we are going to turn the valve of ANWR on and flow the oil through the pipeline of Valdez and fill our tankers and bring them down to Anacortes, WA, and to the refineries of California, and begin to refine the oil of Alaska.

I bet OPEC would scratch its head and say: Maybe we better change our ways a little bit. Maybe getting \$30 to \$35 a barrel is not realistic because we forced the United States to be less reli-

ant on us and more reliable on themselves. It is called fungibility in the oil market.

We cannot do that today because politically we have not been allowed to do the right kind of exploration and environmentally sound development in Alaska.

We are hoping this economy keeps going, keeps growing, keeps rebounding the way it currently is, but what is putting a phenomenal amount of pressure on it at this moment in the form of greater input costs into almost every aspect of the economy is the cost of energy, whether it is the average home and consumer or whether it is our farmers in the State of Idaho who this past February, when they sat down with their banker to develop their line of credit for the year, penciled in an energy cost and a fertilizer cost, little knowing what they penciled in was 30 to 40 percent inadequate from what it was actually going to cost them. They have today found out their fertilizer costs doubled. Why? Because phosphate is made from natural gas, natural gas processes, and natural gas went from \$2.50 a million cubic feet to \$6.50 to \$7 a million cubic feet, and the cost of fertilizer went through the roof.

So fertilizer got applied less in some areas and where it did not get applied, the farmer rolled the dice and gambled, hoping somehow the value of the crop produced would increase 25, 30, or 40 percent, which, of course, won't happen. That is agriculture alone.

What about the chemical industry? What about those kinds of industries up and down the east coast of America that produce the chemicals for this country? Many of them have already shut down, and they have taken their production to Europe. It has cost us thousands of jobs.

I must tell those men and women who are out of work: Why don't you pick up the phone and call your Senators and ask your Senators how they voted on the Energy bill, and if they voted no, why did that vote cost you your job because the cost of energy went through the roof and your company had to shut down. That is, in part, the reality America is facing today.

While all of us are excited about the growth of the economy and the thousands of new jobs that are being created at this moment, there is a cloud hanging over Wall Street and the investment community. They openly say that cloud is the unpredictable high cost of energy and the impact it will have on certain segments of the economy that are highly dependent upon it.

What did we do when we crafted S. 2095? We built a broad-based, incentivized bill that said we ought to be producing in all segments of the energy market. It was not selective. It said America would grow and America would prosper with an abundance of energy at a reasonable price that was reliable and available. Therefore, our bill, S. 2095, encouraged domestic oil