matter up with the leader for his consideration. I think the time is right to initiate such action of a sanction against oil from Iraq.

We find ourselves in a situation where not only are we enforcing a no-fly zone but we are taking out targets when he attempts to take us down, suggesting that it is certainly not in the national interest of our Nation to maintain this kind of relationship. I will be calling on the majority leader to honor his commitment to me to allow us to take up a sanction against Iraq. I suggest we do it as soon as possible.

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 President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

HEINZ AWARDS

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, after the sudden and untimely death of our colleague—and my friend—Senator John Heinz, in 1991, his wife, Teresa Heinz, set about devising a suitable and characteristic memorial to his memory. As she has said, such a task is especially difficult when the goal is to honor someone as complex and multifaceted as Senator Heinz was. She realized that no static monument or self-serving exercise in sentimentality would do, and that the only tribute befitting Senator Heinz would be one that celebrated his spirit by honoring those who live and work in the same ways he did.

Those of us who had the privilege of knowing Senator Heinz remember, with respect and affection, his tremendous energy and intellectual curiosity; his commitment to improving the lives of people; and his impatience with procedural roadblocks when they stood in the way of necessary progress. For Senator Heinz, excellence was not enough; excellence was taken as a given. What made the difference was the practical—and, yes, pragmatic—application of excellence to the goal of making America a better nation and the world a better place. Although John Heinz thought and worked on a grand scale, he understood that progress is more often made in small increments: one policy, one program, even one person, at a time. We also remember the contagious enthusiasm and palpable joy with which he pursued his goals and lived his life.

Teresa Heinz created the Heinz Awards to celebrate and carry on these qualities and characteristics—five awards in each of five categories in which John was especially interested and active during his legislative and public career: Arts and Humanities; the Environment; the Human Condition; Public Policy; and Technology and the Economy. In each of these areas, the Heinz Awards recognize outstanding achievements. In fact, the annual Heinz Awards are among the largest individual achievement prizes in the world.

The six men and women who are being honored with this year's Heinz Awards—the eighth annual Awards—have just been named. They are a distinguished and accomplished group of men and women whose lives and work have truly made a difference.

This year the Arts and Humanities Heinz Award is shared by Dudley Cocke and Rick Lowe. Mr. Cocke, with his Roadside Theater company based in Whitesburg, KY, has worked in hundreds of communities in 43 States. He is a leader in the movement to cultivate locally based art all across America. Mr. Lowe is an artist and activist who founded Project Row Houses in Houston as a way to bring a world-class art project to a low-income neighborhood where such art is rarely seen and experienced.

The Heinz Award in the Environment is conferred on Dr. Jane Lubchenco. An expert in biodiversity, conservation, and global change, Dr. Lubchenco, of Oregon State University, is one of the most influential and respected voices in environmental policy.

Cushing Dolbeare receives the Heinz Award for the Human Condition. For five decades, as many members of this House well know, Ms. Dolbeare, the founder of the National Low Income Housing Coalition, has worked across party lines to make low-income housing a government priority. I am proud to say that Ms. Dolbeare is a resident of Philadelphia, PA, my home city.

The Heinz Award for Public Policy is awarded to retired Air Force General Lee Butler, of Omaha, NE. General Butler's efforts to end nuclear proliferation and change America's nuclear deterrence policy, have resulted in increased global awareness of the threat of nuclear war and nuclear weapons.

Dr. Anita Borg, of Palo Alto, California, receives the Heinz Award for Technology, the Economy and Employment. The creator of the ''Systers'' information-sharing Internet network for women, she has been in the forefront of promoting women's participation in the advancement and uses of technology, and particularly computing.

Occasionally the Heinz Awards program bestows a special honor—the Chairman's Medal—on a truly exceptional nominee whose career has been distinguished by a pattern of singular accomplishment and character. This year a Chairman's Medal has been awarded to Dr. Ruth Patrick—who is, I am again proud to say, a resident of Philadelphia, PA—who is truly a scientific pioneer. Still actively working and contributing at the age of 93, Dr. Patrick is one of the world's leading biologists and a pioneer in predicting ecosystem risks at a time before such risks were a part of general scientific knowledge. I had the opportunity to meet with her relatively recently, and she is really a dynamo at 93.

I know that every Member of this body joins me in saluting Teresa Heinz for creating such an apt and appropriate way of honoring the memory of our late colleague; and also in congratulating these distinguished Americans, recipients of the eighth annual Heinz Awards, for the way their lives and contributions have—and continue to—carry on the spirit and the work of Senator John Heinz, and have helped to make America, and the world, truly a better place for all of us.

I yield the floor. In the absence of any other Senator in the Chamber, 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. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

EQUAL PROTECTION OF VOTING RIGHTS ACT OF 2001

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the hour of 6 p.m. having arrived, the Senate will now resume consideration of S. 565, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 565) to establish the Commission on Voting Rights and Procedures to study and make recommendations regarding election technology, voting, and election administration, to establish a grant program under which the Office of Justice Programs and the Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice shall provide assistance to States and localities in improving election technology and the administration of Federal elections, to require States to meet uniform and nondiscriminatory election technology and administration requirements for the 2004 Federal election, and for other purposes.

Pending:

Clinton amendment No. 2906, to establish a residual ballot performance benchmark.

Dodd (for Schumer) modified amendment No. 2914, to permit the use of a signature or personal mark for the purpose of verifying the identity of voters who register by mail.

Dodd (for Kennedy) amendment No. 2916, to clarify the application of the safe harbor provisions.

Hatch amendment No. 2935, to establish the Advisory Committee on Electronic Voting and the Electoral Process, and to instruct the Attorney General to study the adequacy of existing electoral fraud statutes and penalties.

Hatch amendment No. 2936, to make the provisions of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 permanent.

Schumer/Wyden amendment No. 2937, to permit the use of a signature or personal mark for the purpose of verifying the identity of voters who register by mail.

Smith of New Hampshire amendment No. 2933, to prohibit the broadcast of certain false and untimely information on Federal elections.

Bond amendment No. 2940 (to Amendment No. 2937), to permit the use of signature verification programs to verify the identity of individuals who register to vote by mail.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the time until 6 p.m. shall be equally divided between the Senator from Connecticut, Mr. DODD, and the Senator from Kentucky, Mr. MCCONNELL, or their designees.

Who yields time?

If no one yields time, time will be charged equally to both sides.

The Senator from Oregon is recognized.

(Ms. CANTWELL assumed the chair.)

Mr. WYDEN. Madam President, in a few moments, the Senate will vote once again on cloture with respect to the election reform bill. I come to the floor to take a couple of minutes to say that, once again, Oregon's two Senators will be working together on a bipartisan basis to try to protect the voting rights of folks who, in a small State 3,000 miles from here, have come up with a system that I think can be a national model. It has empowered Americans. It empowered the people of our State—like, essentially, no other—in the Senate special election that was held in 1996, when three times the level of voter interest was shown as was shown in the previous Senate special election.

My colleague, Senator SMITH, lost in that election by a small amount. He waged a valiant campaign. He has become a colleague with whom I have worked very closely. To his great credit, after an election that I won narrowly, he made it clear there were no instances of fraud or flagrant violations that tainted the election. That is why the two of us, on a bipartisan basis, feel so strongly about protecting Oregon's election rights.

I see another northwesterner in the Chamber and currently presiding. I know the occupant of the chair feels strongly about protecting the rights of those in Washington State who vote by mail.

We are willing to meet our colleagues on the other side more than halfway. We have said that from the very beginning. Northwesterners are not a part of the Rules Committee. We have tried very hard to work with our colleagues. I have believed for some time that there is the framework of a compromise that could address the concerns of those on both sides. The senior Senator from Missouri makes a good case that more does need to be done to address fraud. I think the appropriate time to do that is in the registration process—what is essentially the front end of the voters' involvement in the political process. I am willing to meet him more than halfway in addressing those concerns.

The chairman of the Rules Committee, Senator DODD, has worked on a variety of compromises to try to address the concerns of our colleagues on both sides of the aisle, and he and I are going to continue to do that. But we do have to voice our strong objection to gutting a system that is working, that has empowered thousands and thousands of voters.

Unfortunately, if we go forward today with the bill as written, it will do great damage to those States that do vote by mail. Every review of the disputed 2000 election showed that there were a variety of errors with punchcard voting machines. But what we want to do is address those concerns and not roll back the clock, which is what you would do if you did damage to States that vote by mail. We think our signature verification process is a good one. It is one that has been in place to ensure that there are not those who would engage in fraud. At the end of the day, we think voting by mail—the process used exclusively in Oregon—is not one that should be thrown overboard to deal with problems of fraud in other parts of the country. We have a system that works. We have a system that empowers the people in our State. It is not a system riddled by corruption.

I am going to yield the floor now because I see the chairman of the committee and ranking minority member here. Both of them have been very helpful in working with this Senator. I want them to know that, however the vote turns out, I am going to continue to work with them. I assure them, having just spoken with my colleague, Senator SMITH, tonight as well, that he and I are working right now on ideas to address the concerns of both sides of the aisle to get over this Oregon issue. Oregon's two Senators are united on a bipartisan basis to address this concern.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, at 6:15 this evening, the Senate will vote on cloture, that is to cut off debate on a pending amendment which would permit voting on a signature alone. This has been a contentious subject because there are those who contend that it ought to be that easy for somebody to vote, contrasted with others of us who believe that simply on a signature it is insufficient to avoid fraud.

The underlying bill on election reform is a very important bill. There is no need to recount what happened in the Presidential election of the year 2000, with special emphasis on Florida, to emphasize the need for reform of the voting process, to bring modern technology into play, to avoid the chads and the dimples, and to find a way to have voters' intent recorded honestly and completely.

The drafters of the underlying bill have worked very hard on all aspects of it, including ways to deal with this question of fraud. They came up with a compromise which said somebody could be accorded the right to vote if there was a photo identification, or if the individual had some other document which showed that person was in existence, such as a utility bill or a bank statement or a government check or a generalized provision or any kind of a document which is similar, to show that a voter, ''Mr. John Voter,'' ''Mrs. Jane Voter,'' actually was in existence.

The reason for this procedure to avoid fraud is that many people have been on the rolls who were not in existence: names from decedents, names from nonexistent people, and animals that were represented to be named people. In an effort to be funny, I think the latter reference has sort of denigrated the subject, which is really very serious.

But my view is, the requirement for some document to show that a person is in existence is minimal and necessary. I say that based on the experience I have had as District Attorney of Philadelphia in prosecuting vote fraud.

The distinguished Presiding Officer comes from the State of Delaware, which is pretty close to Philadelphia. It is widely known that in a rough, tough political city, such as Philadelphia, there is a lot of vote fraud. It happens to be a fact of life.

During my 8 years as District Attorney of Philadelphia, from the 1960s into the 1970s, I prosecuted many people for vote fraud in both political parties—Republicans and Democrats. It is a very serious problem.

But if you have someone who can vote simply on a signature, then that person can register with a signature. Someone could register as ''Mr. John Voter'' with a signature, and it being on file on the voters' rolls, later they could mail in a vote, ''Mr. John Voter,'' which is the same signature and that person may not be in existence at all.

I had a little discussion on Friday with the Senator from Oregon about this subject and made the point that, it is a case which cannot be successfully investigated or cannot be successfully prosecuted. You simply have to have an identity of a person whom you can locate to serve a warrant of arrest and to bring into court and to prosecute. But if there is no such person as ''Mr. John Voter,'' if it is a name which is fictitious, backed up only by the signature on registration or the signature on voting, you simply can't prove it.

The Senator from Oregon brought up one illustration: Somebody who boasted about having done it. Well, if you have a confession, you can prosecute, if you establish the corpus delicti as well, but that is so highly unusual and so unrealistic in dealing with the underlying problem, as not to require extended refutation.

On Friday morning, I heard on the radio the voice of the majority leader objecting to the position taken that there ought to be some document identifying the name with the voter, saying that Senator BOND, who has been the major proponent of the position I have articulated—that Senator BOND was insisting on photo ID, which is not the

case. The underlying bill does not insist on photo ID. If it did, I would have a different position. It requires and insists only on a document which shows the identity and some document showing the person is in existence.

I noted the Senator from New York, Mr. SCHUMER, was quoted over the weekend saying that if his amendment, the one which is pending now on the cloture vote, is not accepted, that we go ahead and pass the underlying bill. It is my hope that the majority leader, who controls the calendar, will leave the bill up and have it passed.

Democrats have had a majority on the committee. They reported this bill out in its current form, which, as I say, is a carefully crafted compromise. It is my view that the bill in that posture ought to be acted upon by the full Senate and ought to be enacted, even if the Schumer amendment is not part of the bill because cloture cannot be obtained on the amendment.

I yield the floor.

AMENDMENT NO. 2937, WITHDRAWN

Mr. DODD. Madam President, I am about to make a unanimous consent request on behalf of the Senator from New York and the Senator from Oregon, so we can move and get to the cloture vote. I thank all of those who have worked over the weekend and all day today. We are down to an issue or two—maybe one, frankly. I hope we can resolve that.

In order to demonstrate the good faith we have in this effort, I ask unanimous consent—and I have spoken with Senator SCHUMER—that the Schumer-Wyden amendment be withdrawn.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DODD. Madam President, we have made some great progress today. In fact, we have pretty much agreed on a package dealing with issues such as the uniform standards, the savings clause, and several other items. I will not go through them now. I will provide a litany of what we have agreed upon afterwards. We are down to maybe the issue of Oregon and Washington. In order to get us moving along, and rather than trying to write that last piece here tonight, we wanted to indicate to our colleagues where we were on this issue. This place works on comity, and we have to rely on good-faith commitments. I am satisfied that what we have agreed to today will be part of a final package. I turn to my colleague now.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I thank my good friend from Connecticut for withdrawing the Schumer amendment. That is certainly a step in the right direction. I echo his observations that even though, after the cloture vote, I understand we may be going to energy, we are close to passing an election reform bill of which I think Members on both sides of the aisle can feel proud. I have assured my friend from Connecticut that we are going to work to pare down the remaining amendments on our side. I know he is going to be doing the same thing.

We believe there are only a few issues that are serious, and, hopefully, we will be able to say to the majority leader soon that we have the ability to put together a agreement that we can bring this up and, hopefully, dispose of it in half a day.

Mr. DODD. Madam President, I know the Senator from Oregon may want to make additional comments. I agree with those sentiments, and our message would be to both sides and the media that this has been very productive. This is a complicated issue. It obviously involves local communities, States, up to the Federal Government, in the decisionmaking process.

It has not been easy to pull this all together. We are on the brink of doing something very worthwhile, something very historic, as we both described over the last number of months. The decision to set this aside while we move to energy—normally one might say that is a death knell. I have been assured by the majority leader, who cares deeply about this issue, that as soon as we have a package that we can bring forward, which I am convinced we can, we will get to that matter and resolve it.

This is not putting it on a side track where it will languish in the coming weeks. We intend to work intensely over the next several days to bring back an agreement, hopefully the end of the week.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I want to mention to my colleagues on this side of the aisle the vote we are about to have at 6:15 p.m, hopefully, will be the same vote. It is a vote to oppose cloture, even though we are toward the end of this bill. The reason is, we have not been able to figure out which of our amendments will be shut out by the invocation of cloture. I urge my Republican colleagues to, once again, vote no on cloture, while at the same time saying I think we are very close to wrapping up this bill, as the Senator from Connecticut and I have previously outlined tonight.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Madam President, I will be very brief.

Mr. DODD. Madam President, I want to yield to our colleague from New York, whose amendment I just withdrew on his behalf.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky controls the remainder of the time.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I ask unanimous——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky controls the time.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, how much time do I have?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Three minutes.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I yield a minute and a half to the Senator from New York.

Mr. SCHUMER. I do not mind if the Senator from Oregon speaks first for 1 minute. He needs another minute, and I will take the remaining 2 minutes.

Mr. MCCONNELL. The remaining time I have I yield in equal division to the Senators from Oregon and New York.

Mr. WYDEN. Madam President, I thank my friend from Kentucky. I will be brief. I want it understood tonight that in the withdrawal of this amendment, I am doing this as part of a good-faith effort to find common ground with my colleagues. The people of Oregon feel so strongly about this issue that I could not let this bill go to final passage until it protects Oregon's election rights, but I would like to advance the consideration of the legislation by this body. That is why I am not objecting tonight.

Senator SMITH and I will continue to work with our colleagues on a bipartisan basis to address this issue. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, if the Senator from Connecticut has not asked unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment, I do, or concur in that request.

I wish to make three points. First, it is the strong view of those of us on this side—certainly of me—that while this amendment has a great deal of merit, the bill is more important than the amendment. I am willing to withdraw it not because I think any deal was broken; it was clearly not. We all had agreed there would be amendments and, in fact, it is our side's understanding there was an agreement that the Gregg amendment would be accepted and there would be a vote without a filibuster. That was explicit. If anything, if any deal was broken, it was done on the other side.

Two, the amendment is an important amendment because there are, as I mentioned in my speeches, hundreds of thousands of people, if not millions, for whom it will be much harder to vote. This amendment would have made it easier for them to vote without increasing fraud by very much. We believe in the amendment, and we will try to deal with this issue in some other way, in some other form.

Third, the bill is an excellent bill. The Senator from Connecticut, the Senator from Kentucky, the Senator from Missouri, and myself have spent a great deal of time on it. It will improve elections. It will do a lot to prevent the Floridas from happening and the 2000s from happening. I think it would be wrong to let the entire bill go down because of this worthy amendment. Therefore, I have no problem in withdrawing it to move the bill forward. That is something each of us is called upon to do: To see things go forward for the legislative process and avoid gridlock.

I will withdraw the amendment if it has not been withdrawn already. If it has, I concur in the withdrawal.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment has been withdrawn.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the time of 6:15 p.m. having arrived, pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close the debate on S. 565, the election reform bill:

Christopher Dodd, Harry Reid, Charles Schumer, Ron Wyden, Debbie Stabenow, Patty Murray, Tom Daschle, Jeff Bingaman, Daniel Inouye, Carl Levin, Max Baucus, Joe Biden, Pat Leahy, James M. Jeffords, Barbara Mikulski, Bob Graham, Edward M. Kennedy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on S. 565, the election reform bill, shall be brought to a close? The yeas and nays are required under the rule. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. TORRICELLI) is necessarily absent.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from Alaska (Mr. STEVENS), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. HUTCHINSON), and the Senator from Virginia (Mr. ALLEN) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 51, nays 44, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 40 Leg.]

YEAS—51

Akaka	Dodd	Levin
Baucus	Dorgan	Lieberman
Bayh	Durbin	Lincoln
Biden	Edwards	Mikulski
Bingaman	Feingold	Miller
Boxer	Feinstein	Murray
Breaux	Graham	Nelson (FL)
Byrd	Harkin	Nelson (NE)
Cantwell	Hollings	Reed
Carnahan	Inouye	Reid
Carper	Jeffords	Rockefeller
Cleland	Johnson	Sarbanes
Clinton	Kennedy	Schumer
Conrad	Kerry	Smith (OR)
Corzine	Kohl	Stabenow
Daschle	Landrieu	Wellstone
Dayton	Leahy	Wyden

NAYS—44

Allard	Domenici	Kyl
Bennett	Ensign	Lott
Bond	Enzi	Lugar
Brownback	Fitzgerald	McCain
Bunning	Frist	McConnell
Burns	Gramm	Murkowski
Campbell	Grassley	Nickles
Chafee	Gregg	Roberts
Cochran	Hagel	Santorum
Collins	Hatch	Sessions
Craig	Helms	Shelby
Crapo	Hutchison	Smith (NH)
DeWine	Inhofe	
Snowe	Thomas	Thurmond
Specter	Thompson	Voinovich

NOT VOTING—5

Allen	Stevens	Warner
Hutchinson	Torricelli	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote the yeas are 51, the nays are 44. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected.

The Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. DASCHLE. Madam President, I am sure I share the disappointment of a number of our colleagues in our inability to come to some closure on this legislation. But I will say the good news is the distinguished Senator from Connecticut, the manager of the bill, and the Senator from Kentucky, his comanager, have agreed to continue to attempt to work out what remaining differences exist.

I will also say, because so much good work has been done, it is my strong desire to bring this bill to a successful completion. We are going to do that. I have made a commitment to Senator DODD and to all of our colleagues that at such time as we have been able to work out procedurally a way to resolve these final matters, we will bring the bill back under a unanimous consent agreement.

So when that unanimous consent agreement is reached, it is my desire and my commitment to renew the debate on this issue. This is too important to let go. It is too important not to find some final resolution to the remaining questions.

We spent a lot of time on this bill. I don't want to lose that investment in time and effort. Obviously, the stakes are quite high. We recognize those stakes. We recognize the effort made. We recognize the progress we have made in the last couple of weeks. We are just not quite there yet.

But as I have noted on several occasions, it is my strong desire to go to the energy bill. That will be what we do tomorrow. I hope Senators will be prepared to come to the floor midmorning, 10 o'clock. We will begin the debate on energy. I am sure there will be opening statements, and we will begin entertaining amendments. I hope Senators are prepared to have a good debate about energy. We will hopefully resolve that issue and move to other questions.

It is my expectation that if some agreement has not yet been reached on the campaign finance reform bill, I will be asking unanimous consent to take that up as well. It will be the only thing that would take us off the energy bill prior to the time we complete it. But my hope is we can reach some agreement procedurally on the campaign finance reform bill as well. If not, of course, when we resolve these issues, if we can resolve them, on energy, my intention is to move to the campaign finance reform bill.

So we have a full agenda over the course of the next 3 weeks. Energy begins tomorrow. Hopefully campaign finance reform and election reform can also be addressed successfully before we complete our work in this work period.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be dispensed with.

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

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent the Senate now proceed to a period of morning business with Senators permitted to speak for not to exceed 5 minutes each.

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

CELEBRATING BLACK HISTORY MONTH FEBRUARY 2002

Mr. REID. Mr. President, every February our Nation celebrates Black History Month to recognize the contributions that African Americans have made to America. It provides us with a special time to commemorate the accomplishments of African Americans and reflect upon their role in our country's diversity and growth. I believe it is important to acknowledge the vision of leaders such as Frederick Douglass, Martin Luther King, Jr., and Thurgood Marshall and the efforts of countless others who struggled to bring down the barriers of inequality in this country. They confronted enormous obstacles to make life better for future generations and for all Americans.

As we reflect upon our Nation's history, we see that America has made great strides in improving the status of ethnic and racial minorities. Today African Americans are leaders in our communities, the arts and sciences, and the business world. We no longer accept legal discrimination in any form. We no longer allow the use of poll taxes that prohibited African Americans from voting. And we no longer tolerate discrimination in public accommodations, such as water fountains, lunch counters or movie houses reserved for whites only.

While taking pride in how far we have come, we must recall the painful memories of segregation and intolerance in the not so distant past. Up until the 1950's, casinos and hotels in my own State of Nevada, like many public accommodations did not welcome blacks. But when the Moulin Rouge opened its doors in Las Vegas in 1955, African Americans were received warmly. There they could find lodging, enjoy the casino and see the best entertainers of the day. The Moulin Rouge became one of our Nation's first major interracial hotels and paved the way for the integration of all of Nevada's