

has been able to make a living to support himself and his family. He believes the seas are now teeming with fish. He has seen such a rebound in the stocks, and he is very worried that the latest regulations proposed by the National Marine Fisheries Service will put him and many of his fellow fishermen out of business.

I share the grave concerns of the responsible fishermen such as Sam and those fishermen with whom I talked on Friday night at the annual fisherman's forum. They are good people. They know the sea better than any regulator in Washington, DC. How unfortunate it is, how wrong it is, that Federal fishing regulators did not involve the people who know the Gulf of Maine the best: The fishermen who are out there earning a living.

I am going to be working with my colleagues in both the House and the Senate and particularly with Maine's senior Senator, Ms. OLYMPIA SNOWE, who is the ranking Republican on the subcommittee with jurisdiction over this issue, to develop a plan, to develop an alternative approach that recognizes we can both support our fishermen and have the seas teeming with fish.

It is a false choice to say our fishermen can only go to sea half the number of days that they are now allowed, a restriction that is already extremely difficult for many fishermen and their families to accept. These further restrictions, the new approach proposed by the National Marine Fisheries Service, I fear, will spell the end for many Maine fishermen. It will make it simply impossible for them to earn a living; the restrictions are so onerous, so unreasonable, and so strict.

We need a different approach, and I believe if Federal regulators had only taken the time to involve the experts in the industry, the men and women who are fishing in the Gulf of Maine, we would have come up with a far better approach, an approach that would not only continue the process of rebuilding the fishing stocks in Maine, in the Gulf of Maine, but also would allow our hard-working, proud, and independent fishermen to earn a living.

This is an issue on which I will continue to be working with the Chair and others.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CARPER). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

TEXAS INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, today, as I have done every year I have been in the Senate, I want to especially commemorate the anniversary of Texas

independence. Many know—many do not know—the history of Texas, but I am very proud of the heritage we have. Texas is the only State that came into the Nation as a nation. There was a treaty that was made between the United States and the Republic of Texas for Texas to come into the Union. The freedom the Texans got in 1836 was hard fought and it was a long time coming. They were a part of Mexico. The Mexican Government was becoming more oppressive, and they were taxing the people, they were not giving them religious freedom, and they finally passed a law that said no one could emigrate from the United States into the Texas territory of Mexico.

So the people rebelled. They had to fight for their independence, and one of the most famous battles in the history of our country was the Battle of the Alamo.

I commemorate Texas Independence Day, which is March 2, every year, by reading the letter from William Barret Travis, that has become very famous, as he was holding down the fort at the Alamo. This was at a time when the convention was meeting at Washington-on-the-Brazos to make the formal declaration of independence from Mexico for Texas. My great, great grandfather was one of the delegates to that convention. He represented Nacogdoches, just as Thomas Rusk did.

Thomas Rusk was the first Senator to hold my seat. He and my great, great grandfather, Charles S. Taylor, were very good friends. They were partners, and they were certainly patriots in the fight for freedom for Texas.

It is with that background I would like to read the letter from William Barret Travis, remembering there were 184 Texas rebels in the Alamo at the time. There was a huge army of Santa Ana's out there, and this was the second day of the siege of the Alamo, February 24, 1836.

Fellow citizens and compatriots: I am besieged by a thousand or more of the Mexicans under Santa Ana. I have sustained a continual bombardment and cannonade for 24 hours and have not lost a man. The enemy has demanded a surrender at discretion, otherwise, the garrison are to be put to the sword, if the fort is taken. I have answered the demands with a cannon shot, and our flag still waves proudly from the wall. I shall never surrender or retreat.

Then, I call on you in the name of liberty, of patriotism and of everything dear to the American character, to come to our aid, with all dispatch. The enemy is receiving reinforcements daily and will no doubt increase to three to four thousand in four or five days. If this call is neglected, I am determined to sustain myself as long as possible and die like a soldier who never forgets what is due to his own honor and that of his country—Victory or Death.

William Barret Travis, Lt. Col, Commander.

It turns out there were 3,000 to 6,000 Mexican soldiers. They did take the Alamo, which did not have reinforcements. Gen. Sam Houston decided it would be a waste of manpower to send reinforcements because he thought the

cause was lost. Those 184 men were able to hold off the Mexican Army for days, and that allowed Gen. Sam Houston to gather his forces. The Declaration of Independence was signed on March 2, 1836, and because he was able to marshal the forces after the Alamo and take a stand at San Jacinto, that is where the war was won and the Republic of Texas was formed.

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

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

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent I be allowed to speak for 10 minutes as in morning business.

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

ELECTION REFORM

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I understand we are going to be going back to a vote pretty soon relative to the issue of antifraud provisions associated with election reform. We all have different views on this issue. I can certainly recognize and support the simplicity of encouraging voters to have a relatively easy method to vote and register. However, Mr. BOND, the Senator from Missouri, has made quite a point of how fraud occurs. I gather we have seen scams, particularly in Missouri, relative to voter fraud, registering dead neighbors and diseased alderman, and in one case a dog that evidently voted several times and the jig was up when the dog was called for jury duty.

A system that allows that much flexibility is a little too flexible. I hope we address reasonable requirements to encourage people to vote but have reasonable identification so we do not have fraudulent activities such as the dog that was called to jury duty.

IRAQ

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I came to the floor last week to talk about Iraq. I indicated that U.S. forces enforcing the no-fly zone since 1992 were fired on for the second time this year. Of course, our forces responded by destroying an Iraqi air defense group north of Baghdad. This is a continuing commitment we have had to enforce a no-fly zone under the U.N. proclamation over Iraq.

The inconsistency is that, on one hand, we are enforcing this no-fly zone; on the other, we are importing oil from Iraq. Even on September 11, when the attack on the Trade Centers occurred, we were importing a little over 1 million barrels of oil a day from Iraq. Today we import some 875,000 barrels. We are enforcing a no-fly zone, putting

the lives of our men and women at risk, yet we are becoming even more dependent on that part of the world for our oil supply.

As I indicated, this is the second time this year we have bombed Iraq, taking out targets. We are off to a troubling start. Last year, Iraq shot at U.S. forces enforcing the no-fly zone some 400 times. We responded with a like force some 25 times. On one hand, we make a fist at Iraq; on the other, we want to take their oil.

As I indicated, in September there was more than a million barrels. This is a point that I think has been lost to some extent, but it has not been lost on the brave men and women who enforce this no-fly zone each day.

I would like to read a passage I found in today's National Journal. It quoted BG Edward Ellis, Commander, Northern Watch, Combined Task Forces. He says very eloquently:

I know the rules of engagement are sometimes frustrating for my pilots, whose natural reaction when they get shot at is to want to do some leveling, leveling of something. But anyone who thinks that military action shouldn't be governed by political constraints is naive. The political reality is we're not at war with Iraq at this point, and if we reacted harshly, we could force the hand or limit the options of U.S. policymakers who are trying to figure out what to do about Saddam Hussein.

Having said that, I do think there is merit to the argument that the policy makers might want to address this issue sooner than later, because of the inherent jeopardy of this mission.

Saddam has put a bounty on our heads.

The bottom line is, we continue to fly and the Iraqis continue to shoot at us. Nobody should be especially surprised if eventually they happen to hit something.

That comes from BG Edward Ellis, Commander of the Northern Watch, Combined Task Forces.

Our Nation was built on the premise that statesman and soldier are two different professions. But in this instance, I hope my colleagues will make a note of the warning of General Ellis from the front lines, that perhaps his wisdom will guide us to make the right choices for dealing with Iraq and certainly the right choices about our dependence on Iraq; that is, to substantially eliminate that dependence and reduce our dependence on imported oil through the Mideast.

I was also struck by a Gallup Poll that came out the other day. It was in USA Today and a number of our national periodicals. I am told it was the most comprehensive poll on Muslim countries and their views with regard to America. They polled people in Pakistan, Indonesia, Lebanon, Jordan, Morocco, Iraq, Saudi Arabia, and Kuwait. I don't know about you, Mr. President, but when I read those results they were frightening, and they should give us pause. Residents of these countries viewed America unfavorably by a 2-to-1 margin. Some of these countries are supposed to be good friends of ours, but their views and their people's attitude towards us certainly doesn't show it.

Friends or not, we get a lot of energy from this area, and I think we have become dangerously reliant upon them. Let's look at the numbers: 61 percent of the residents of those countries, in polling information from Gallup, suggest that the Arabs were not responsible for 9-11. In other words, those who carried citizenship from those countries, they bear no responsibility. Only 18 percent of the people in these countries believe that Arabs were even involved in the terrorism that took place on September 11.

In Kuwait, 36 percent said the attacks were justifiable, the highest number of any country. That is rather troubling to me because we only have to go back to 1992 when we fought a war to keep Saddam Hussein from invading Kuwait and going on into Saudi Arabia. Here is Kuwait, 36 percent of the people say the attacks were justifiable. If it were not for our action, Saddam Hussein would be in Saudi Arabia today; he would have taken over Kuwait.

Only 9 percent say U.S. military action in Afghanistan is justified. Let me say that again. Only 9 percent, according to the Gallup Poll, say U.S. military action is justified even though the people of Afghanistan were happy, in our view at least, to throw off the yoke of the Taliban and al-Qaida that was strangling them to death, certainly, in our opinion, using that country as a clubhouse for gangsters and terrorists.

I am appalled by these figures. I am worried and I think it should bother all Members of this body. Why? Because we are too dependent on these countries that clearly have a different view of the United States. The poll shows the United States has a 16-percent approval rating in Saudi Arabia. I hope that irony is not lost, that we also get 16 percent of our oil from Saudi Arabia.

What are we going to do about it? The governments of some of these countries are friends of ours, but what about the people? The Gallup Poll shows that, despite our money, our aid, our support, they either don't like us or they don't trust us, or both.

What really concerns all of us is the manner in which this lack of trust, this hatred, is fostered within these countries. We know that fundamentalist schools in some of the Muslim countries do not necessarily preach democracy. We have heard about these schools, where they teach youngsters to hate western ideas, western democracy, and especially America. The real concern is they are teaching some of these young people who are going to be the leaders of tomorrow. These are youngsters who might grow up believing that dying while killing an American is a great thing. These are the young people who will not forever be satisfied with their government's sending them to schools. They will want to take the power themselves from what they learned. As we know, children are very impressionable.

What I am concerned with today is what this leadership could become. I

am also concerned at the lack, in this body, of a concentrated effort to reduce our dependence on oil from that part of the world. We are sending money to Saddam Hussein every day for oil—somewhere in the area of \$15 million every day.

Our President has taken a strong stance for energy independence, against terrorism, recognizing that we can't eliminate that dependence but we can reduce it.

I think the Gallup Poll numbers are so true. I think it is also true that we should reflect, at this crucial time, on our relationship with Iraq, particularly our knowledge that Saddam Hussein has been able to evade the monitoring activities of the United Nations within Iraq, particularly recognizing that we have not had any inspectors there under the U.N. for nearly 4 years, particularly in view of the fact that we have evidence that shows he has a missile capability, a delivery capability, and that he may be working towards a biological and/or nuclear warhead.

Where is he aiming? We know Israel is one of the countries within his sights. The question is, When do we address and resolve, if you will, what this threat might become? Do we initiate, through a mandate, inspections that occur immediately? And what kind of reaction can we expect from Saddam Hussein? Clearly, the U.N. is unable to do its job, but this threat is increasing. It is being fostered by dollars from the United States that we pay Saddam Hussein for his oil at the same time we are bombing him and taking out his targets. He is using the money to keep his Republican Guard alive. He is obviously using the money to develop his missile capability.

The question is, How do we begin to unwind Iraq? What is it going to take? Do we wait for an action that costs American lives? This is a very sobering question, but I cannot stand in this body and condone our continued dependence on oil from a neighbor such as Saddam Hussein.

I challenge the leader, who has previously given me his assurance that we would be able to address in this session an action that would be initiated against Iraq, Senate action expressing not only our displeasure but setting up the mechanics to ensure that we did not purchase any more oil from Saddam Hussein. We can do that, just as we initiated action against Iran, from which the United States has not had any oil for many years. Basically, what we are talking about is a sanction. We have sanctions against Libya. We have sanctions against Iran. But I find it very frustrating that we have not gone forth and sanctioned Saddam Hussein and oil imports coming to the United States from Iraq.

As I mentioned some time ago, when we had the unanimous consent agreement—and the RECORD will show that the leader allowed me an opportunity to bring this matter up at the appropriate time—I will again bring this

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 Dolbear receives the Heinz Award for the Human Condition. For five decades, as many members of this House well know, Ms. Dolbear, 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. Dolbear 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.