(Mr. Lieberman) was added as a co-sponsor of S. 38, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to permit former members of the Armed Forces who have a service-connected disability rated as total to travel on military aircraft in the same manner and to the same extent as retired members of the Armed Forces are entitled to travel on such aircraft.

At the request of Ms. Snowe, the name of the Senator from Washington (Ms. Cantwell) was added as a cosponsor of S. 104, a bill to require equitable coverage of prescription contraceptive drugs and devices, and contraceptive services under health plans.

At the request of Mr. Reid, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. Jaffords) was added as a cosponsor of S. 170, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to permit retired members of the Armed Forces who have a service-connected disability to receive both military retired pay by reason of their years of military service and disability compensation from the Department of Veterans Affairs for their disability.

At the request of Mr. Reid, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. Corzine) was added as a cosponsor of S. 255, a bill to require that health plans provide coverage for a minimum hospital stay for mastectomies and lymph node dissection for the treatment of breast cancer and coverage for secondary consultations.

At the request of Mr. Snowe, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. Corzine) was added as a cosponsor of S. 256, a bill to amend the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to protect breastfeeding by new mothers.

At the request of Mr. Snowe, the name of the Senator from New York (Ms. Clinton) was added as a cosponsor of S. 258, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to permit retired members of the Armed Forces who have a service-connected disability to receive both military retired pay by reason of their years of military service and disability compensation from the Department of Veterans Affairs for their disability.

At the request of Mr. Reid, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. Jaffords) was added as a cosponsor of S. 255, a bill to require that health plans provide coverage for a minimum hospital stay for mastectomies and lymph node dissection for the treatment of breast cancer and coverage for secondary consultations.

At the request of Ms. Snowe, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. Corzine) was added as a cosponsor of S. 256, a bill to amend the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to protect breastfeeding by new mothers.

At the request of Ms. Snowe, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. Corzine) was added as a cosponsor of S. 258, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to permit retired members of the Armed Forces who have a service-connected disability to receive both military retired pay by reason of their years of military service and disability compensation from the Department of Veterans Affairs for their disability.

At the request of Mr. Wyden, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. Burns) was added as a cosponsor of S. 288, a bill to extend the moratorium enacted by the Internet Tax Freedom Act through 2006, and encourage States to simplify their sales and use taxes.

At the request of Mr. Allard, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Ms. Brown) was added as a cosponsor of S. 345, a bill to amend the Animal Welfare Act to strike the limitation that permits interstate movement of live birds, for the purpose of fighting, to States in which animal fighting is lawful.

At the request of Mr. Hagel, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. Steveon) was added as a cosponsor of S. 486, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a 10 percent individual income tax rate for taxable years beginning in 2001 and a payroll tax credit for those taxpayers who have no income tax liability in 2001.

At the request of Mr. Hollings, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. Dayton) was added as a cosponsor of S. 566, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a 10 percent individual income tax rate for taxable years beginning in 2001 and a payroll tax credit for those taxpayers who have no income tax liability in 2001.

At the request of Mr. Boren, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. Boren) was added as a cosponsor of S. 570, a bill to establish a permanent Violence Against Women Office at the Department of Justice.

At the request of Mr. Dodd, the name of the Senator from Washington (Ms. Cantwell) was added as a cosponsor of S. 635, a bill to require that health plans provide coverage for a minimum hospital stay for mastectomies and lymph node dissection for the treatment of breast cancer and coverage for secondary consultations.

At the request of Mr. Snowe, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. Clinton) was added as a cosponsor of S. 648, a bill to provide signing bonus and mastery bonuses and mentoring programs for math and science teachers.

At the request of Mr. Shelby, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. Gregg) was added as a co-sponsor of S. Res. 41, a resolution designating April 4, 2001, as “National Murder Awareness Day.”

At the request of Mr. Boren, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. Boren) was added as a cosponsor of S. 655, a resolution designating the third week of April as “National Shaken Baby Syndrome Awareness Week” for the year 2001 and all future years.

At the request of Mr. Wellstone, the name of the Senator from Washington (Mrs. Murray) and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. Jaffords) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 55, a resolution designating the third week of April as “National Shaken Baby Syndrome Awareness Week” for the year 2001 and all future years.

At the request of Mr. Levin, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. Corzine) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 161 proposed to S. 27, a bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to provide bipartisan campaign financing.

At the request of Mr. Domenici, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr.蓓克) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 161 proposed to S. 27, supra.
But one cause of these escalating prices is indisputable: the price-fixing conspiracy of the OPEC nations. For years, they have hiked up the price by driving up the cost of imported crude oil to satisfy the greed of the oil exporters. We have long decried OPEC, but, sadly, until now no one has tried to take any action. NOPEC will, for the first time, establish clearly and plainly that when a group of competing oil producers like the OPEC nations act together to restrict supply or set prices, they are violating U.S. law. It will authorize the Attorney General or FTC to file suit under the antitrust laws for redress. Our bill will also make plain that the nations of OPEC cannot hide behind the doctrines of “Sovereign Immunity” or “Act of State” to escape the reach of American justice.

In recent years a consensus has developed in international law that certain basic standards are universal, and that the international community can, and should, take action when a nation violates those fundamental standards. The response of the international community to ethnic cleansing in the former Yugoslavia and action by the courts of Britain to hold General Augusto Pinochet accountable for human rights abuses and torture that occurred when he was President of Chile are two prominent examples. The rogue actions of the international oil cartel should be treated no differently.

The most fundamental principle of a free market is that competitors cannot be permitted to conspire to limit supply or fix price. There can be no free market without this foundation. In this era of globalization, we truly need to open international markets to ensure the prosperity of all. And we should not allow any nation to flout this fundamental principle.

Some critics of this legislation have argued that suing OPEC will not work or that threatening suit will hurt more than help. I disagree. Our NOPEC legislation will, for the first time, enable our authorities to take legal action to combat the illegitimate price-fixing conspiracy of the oil cartel. It will, at a minimum, have a real deterrent effect on nations that seek to join forces to fix oil prices to the detriment of American consumers. This legislation will be the first real weapon the U.S. government has ever had to deter OPEC from violating these most basic standards of fair economic behavior.

There is also nothing remarkable about suing a foreign government about its commercial activity. There are many recent cases in which foreign governments have been held answerable for their commercial activities in U.S. courts, including a case against Iran for failure to pay for aircraft parts, a case against Argentina for breach of its obligations arising out of issuance of bonds, and a case against Costa Rica for violating the terms of a lease. Our NOPEC legislation falls squarely within this tradition.

Even under current law, there is no doubt that the actions of the international oil cartel would be in gross violation of antitrust law if engaged in by private companies. If OPEC were a group of international private companies rather than foreign governments, their actions would be nothing more than an illegal price fixing scheme. But OPEC members have used the shield of “sovereign immunity” to escape accountability for their price-fixing. The Federal Sovereign Immunities Act, though, already recognizes that the “commercial” activity of nations is not protected by sovereign immunity. And it is hard to imagine an activity that is more obviously commercial than selling oil for profit, as the OPEC nations do. Our legislation will correct one erroneous twenty-year-old federal court decision and establish that sovereign immunity doctrine will not divest a U.S. court from jurisdiction to hear a lawsuit alleging that members of the oil cartel are violating antitrust law.

In the few weeks, I have grown more certain than ever that this legislation is necessary. Between OPEC’s decision last week to cut oil production and the FTC’s conclusion that American companies do not bear primary responsibility for last summer’s gas price spike, I am convinced that we need to take action, and take action now, before the damage spreads too far.

For these reasons, I urge that my colleagues support this bill so that our nation will finally have an effective means to combat this selfish conspiracy of oil-rich nations.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 665
Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled.

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.
This Act may be cited as the “No Oil Producing and Exporting Cartels Act of 2001” or “NOPEC”.

SEC. 2. SHERMAN ACT.
The Sherman Act (15 U.S.C. 1 et seq.) is amended by adding after section 7 the following:

"SEC. 7A. OIL PRODUCING CARTELS.
It is hereby declared—

(a) NOPEC.—It shall be illegal and a violation of this Act, and the Sherman Act, for any foreign state, or any instrumentality or agent of any foreign state, to act collectively or in combination with any other foreign state, or any instrumentality or agent of any other foreign state, or any other person, whether by cartel or any other association or form of cooperation or joint action—

(1) to limit the production or distribution of oil, natural gas, or any other petroleum product;

(2) to set or maintain the price of oil, natural gas, or any petroleum product; or

(3) to otherwise take any action in restraint of trade for oil, natural gas, or any petroleum product;

when such action, combination, or collective agreement is illegally substantial, and reasonably foreseeable effect on the market, supply, price, or distribution of oil, natural gas, or other petroleum product in the United States;

(b) SOVEREIGN IMMUNITY.—A foreign state engaged in conduct in violation of subsection (a) shall not be immune under the doctrine of sovereign immunity from the jurisdiction or judgments of the courts of the United States in any action brought to enforce this section.

(c) INAPPLICABILITY OF ACT OF STATE DOCTRINE.—No court of the United States shall decline, based on the act of state doctrine, to make a determination on the merits in an action brought under this section.

(d) ENFORCEMENT.—The Attorney General of the United States and the Federal Trade Commission may bring an action to enforce this section in any district court of the United States as provided under the antitrust laws.

SEC. 3. SOVEREIGN IMMUNITY.
Section 1605(a) of title 28, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (6), by striking "or" after the semicolon;

(2) in paragraph (7), by striking the period at the end and inserting "; and";

(3) by adding at the end the following: "a determination on the merits in an action which the act of state doctrine does not bar under section 7A of the Sherman Act.

By Ms. SNOWE (for herself, Mr. LOTT, Mr. WARNER, Ms. COLINS, Mr. COCHRAN, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. BREAUX, and Mr. TORRICELLI):

S. 666. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow the use of completed contract method of accounting in the case of certain long-term naval vessel construction contracts; to the Committee on Finance.

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. President, I rise to introduce legislation to simplify and make more fairness to the naval shipyard accounting statutes under which our six major U.S. naval shipyards pay taxes on the naval ship contracts they are awarded by the Navy.

Quite simply, this legislation would permit naval shipyards to use a method of accounting under which shipbuilders would pay income taxes upon delivery of a ship rather than during construction. Under current law, profits must
be estimated during the construction phases of the shipbuilding process and taxes might be paid on those estimated profits. The legislation being proposed would simply allow naval shipbuilders to use a method of accounting, under which the shipbuilder would pay taxes when the ship is actually delivered to the Navy.

Prior to 1982, federal law permitted shipbuilders to use this method, but the law was changed due to abuses by federal contractors in another sector, having absolutely nothing to do with shipbuilding. Moreover, non-government shipbuilding contracts are already allowed to use this method of accounting, and this legislation contains provisions designed to prevent the types of abuses witnessed in the past. Specifically, the bill would restrict shipyards from advancing tax payments for a period beyond the time it takes to build a single ship.

This bill would not reduce the amount of taxes ultimately paid by the shipbuilder. It simply would defer payment until the profit is actually known upon delivery of the ship. I believe that this is the most fair and most sensible accounting method. It is the method that naval shipbuilders used to employ. It is the method which commercial builders are permitted to use to this day. This legislation has the strong support of the major shipyards that build for the Navy. As such, I strongly urge my colleagues to join me in a strong show of support for this effort.

By Mr. AKAKA (for himself and Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire):

S. 668. A bill to amend the Animal Welfare Act to ensure that all dogs and cats used by research facilities are obtained in accordance with the Animal Welfare Act; and to increase the penalties under the Act.

Mr. AKAKA. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Pet Safety and Protection Act of 2001. Senator Bob Dole today to introduce the Pet Safety and Protection Act of 2001. The bill would strengthen the Animal Welfare Act by encouraging research laboratories to obtain animals from legitimate sources that comply with the Animal Welfare Act. The bill would also reduce the Department of Agriculture’s regulatory burden by allowing the Department to use its resources more efficiently and effectively. Each year, hundreds of thousands of dollars are spent on regulating random source dealers. To combat any future violation of the Animal Welfare Act, the Pet Safety and Protection Act increases the penalties under the Act to a minimum of $1,000 per violation.

The Pet Safety and Protection Act would also reduce the Department of Agriculture’s regulatory burden by allowing the Department to use its resources more efficiently and effectively. Each year, hundreds of thousands of dollars are spent on regulating random source dealers. To combat any future violation of the Animal Welfare Act, the Pet Safety and Protection Act increases the penalties under the Act to a minimum of $1,000 per violation.

The Pet Safety and Protection Act would also reduce the Department of Agriculture’s regulatory burden by allowing the Department to use its resources more efficiently and effectively. Each year, hundreds of thousands of dollars are spent on regulating random source dealers. To combat any future violation of the Animal Welfare Act, the Pet Safety and Protection Act increases the penalties under the Act to a minimum of $1,000 per violation.

The bill would strengthen the Animal Welfare Act by encouraging research laboratories to obtain animals from legitimate sources that comply with the Animal Welfare Act. The bill would also reduce the Department of Agriculture’s regulatory burden by allowing the Department to use its resources more efficiently and effectively. Each year, hundreds of thousands of dollars are spent on regulating random source dealers. To combat any future violation of the Animal Welfare Act, the Pet Safety and Protection Act increases the penalties under the Act to a minimum of $1,000 per violation.

The bill would strengthen the Animal Welfare Act by encouraging research laboratories to obtain animals from legitimate sources that comply with the Animal Welfare Act. The bill would also reduce the Department of Agriculture’s regulatory burden by allowing the Department to use its resources more efficiently and effectively. Each year, hundreds of thousands of dollars are spent on regulating random source dealers. To combat any future violation of the Animal Welfare Act, the Pet Safety and Protection Act increases the penalties under the Act to a minimum of $1,000 per violation.

The bill would strengthen the Animal Welfare Act by encouraging research laboratories to obtain animals from legitimate sources that comply with the Animal Welfare Act. The bill would also reduce the Department of Agriculture’s regulatory burden by allowing the Department to use its resources more efficiently and effectively. Each year, hundreds of thousands of dollars are spent on regulating random source dealers. To combat any future violation of the Animal Welfare Act, the Pet Safety and Protection Act increases the penalties under the Act to a minimum of $1,000 per violation.

The bill would strengthen the Animal Welfare Act by encouraging research laboratories to obtain animals from legitimate sources that comply with the Animal Welfare Act. The bill would also reduce the Department of Agriculture’s regulatory burden by allowing the Department to use its resources more efficiently and effectively. Each year, hundreds of thousands of dollars are spent on regulating random source dealers. To combat any future violation of the Animal Welfare Act, the Pet Safety and Protection Act increases the penalties under the Act to a minimum of $1,000 per violation.

The bill would strengthen the Animal Welfare Act by encouraging research laboratories to obtain animals from legitimate sources that comply with the Animal Welfare Act. The bill would also reduce the Department of Agriculture’s regulatory burden by allowing the Department to use its resources more efficiently and effectively. Each year, hundreds of thousands of dollars are spent on regulating random source dealers. To combat any future violation of the Animal Welfare Act, the Pet Safety and Protection Act increases the penalties under the Act to a minimum of $1,000 per violation.

The bill would strengthen the Animal Welfare Act by encouraging research laboratories to obtain animals from legitimate sources that comply with the Animal Welfare Act. The bill would also reduce the Department of Agriculture’s regulatory burden by allowing the Department to use its resources more efficiently and effectively. Each year, hundreds of thousands of dollars are spent on regulating random source dealers. To combat any future violation of the Animal Welfare Act, the Pet Safety and Protection Act increases the penalties under the Act to a minimum of $1,000 per violation.

The bill would strengthen the Animal Welfare Act by encouraging research laboratories to obtain animals from legitimate sources that comply with the Animal Welfare Act. The bill would also reduce the Department of Agriculture’s regulatory burden by allowing the Department to use its resources more efficiently and effectively. Each year, hundreds of thousands of dollars are spent on regulating random source dealers. To combat any future violation of the Animal Welfare Act, the Pet Safety and Protection Act increases the penalties under the Act to a minimum of $1,000 per violation.

The bill would strengthen the Animal Welfare Act by encouraging research laboratories to obtain animals from legitimate sources that comply with the Animal Welfare Act. The bill would also reduce the Department of Agriculture’s regulatory burden by allowing the Department to use its resources more efficiently and effectively. Each year, hundreds of thousands of dollars are spent on regulating random source dealers. To combat any future violation of the Animal Welfare Act, the Pet Safety and Protection Act increases the penalties under the Act to a minimum of $1,000 per violation.

The bill would strengthen the Animal Welfare Act by encouraging research laboratories to obtain animals from legitimate sources that comply with the Animal Welfare Act. The bill would also reduce the Department of Agriculture’s regulatory burden by allowing the Department to use its resources more efficiently and effectively. Each year, hundreds of thousands of dollars are spent on regulating random source dealers. To combat any future violation of the Animal Welfare Act, the Pet Safety and Protection Act increases the penalties under the Act to a minimum of $1,000 per violation.

The bill would strengthen the Animal Welfare Act by encouraging research laboratories to obtain animals from legitimate sources that comply with the Animal Welfare Act. The bill would also reduce the Department of Agriculture’s regulatory burden by allowing the Department to use its resources more efficiently and effectively. Each year, hundreds of thousands of dollars are spent on regulating random source dealers. To combat any future violation of the Animal Welfare Act, the Pet Safety and Protection Act increases the penalties under the Act to a minimum of $1,000 per violation.

The bill would strengthen the Animal Welfare Act by encouraging research laboratories to obtain animals from legitimate sources that comply with the Animal Welfare Act. The bill would also reduce the Department of Agriculture’s regulatory burden by allowing the Department to use its resources more efficiently and effectively. Each year, hundreds of thousands of dollars are spent on regulating random source dealers. To combat any future violation of the Animal Welfare Act, the Pet Safety and Protection Act increases the penalties under the Act to a minimum of $1,000 per violation.

The bill would strengthen the Animal Welfare Act by encouraging research laboratories to obtain animals from legitimate sources that comply with the Animal Welfare Act. The bill would also reduce the Department of Agriculture’s regulatory burden by allowing the Department to use its resources more efficiently and effectively. Each year, hundreds of thousands of dollars are spent on regulating random source dealers. To combat any future violation of the Animal Welfare Act, the Pet Safety and Protection Act increases the penalties under the Act to a minimum of $1,000 per violation.

The bill would strengthen the Animal Welfare Act by encouraging research laboratories to obtain animals from legitimate sources that comply with the Animal Welfare Act. The bill would also reduce the Department of Agriculture’s regulatory burden by allowing the Department to use its resources more efficiently and effectively. Each year, hundreds of thousands of dollars are spent on regulating random source dealers. To combat any future violation of the Animal Welfare Act, the Pet Safety and Protection Act increases the penalties under the Act to a minimum of $1,000 per violation.

The bill would strengthen the Animal Welfare Act by encouraging research laboratories to obtain animals from legitimate sources that comply with the Animal Welfare Act. The bill would also reduce the Department of Agriculture’s regulatory burden by allowing the Department to use its resources more efficiently and effectively. Each year, hundreds of thousands of dollars are spent on regulating random source dealers. To combat any future violation of the Animal Welfare Act, the Pet Safety and Protection Act increases the penalties under the Act to a minimum of $1,000 per violation.

The bill would strengthen the Animal Welfare Act by encouraging research laboratories to obtain animals from legitimate sources that comply with the Animal Welfare Act. The bill would also reduce the Department of Agriculture’s regulatory burden by allowing the Department to use its resources more efficiently and effectively. Each year, hundreds of thousands of dollars are spent on regulating random source dealers. To combat any future violation of the Animal Welfare Act, the Pet Safety and Protection Act increases the penalties under the Act to a minimum of $1,000 per violation.
and parental empowerment in public education through greater competition and choice, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, I am very pleased to join today with my distinguished colleague from New Hampshire, Senator Gregg, and a bipartisan group of cosponsors to introduce the Empowering Parents Act of 2001. Senator Judd Gregg has been a consistent champion of charter schools and a passionate advocate of competition and choice in public education. I cannot imagine a better colleague to partner with on my first legislative initiative in the U.S. Senate.

Like the Senator from New Hampshire, I come from a small State. Also like my friend from New Hampshire, I was once the governor of my small State. I think it is appropriate, that Senator Gregg and I have seen fit to team up so early in my tenure here in the Senate and tend to have been, it was fond of saying that we need more people in Washington who think and act like Governors. My years in the National Governors' Association taught me that Governors tend to be results-oriented and tend to have a healthy impatience for partisan bickering.

We in this Chamber will always have our disagreements. Next week, for example, we are scheduled to begin debate on the budget and every expectation is that it will be a very partisan battle. That makes it all the more important, that we push forward in those areas where we're able to reach bipartisan agreement. The issue of vouchers is one on which we are unlikely to come to a consensus. Expanding the number of charter schools and broadening public school choice, however, is something that we can agree on, and we should.

Charter schools and public school choice inject market forces into our schools. They empower parents to make choices to send their children to a variety of different schools. That means that schools which offer what students and parents want, be it foreign languages, more math and science, higher academic standards, or discipline, those schools will be full. Schools which fail to listen to their customers, to parents and students, may see their student populations diminish until those schools change. At the same time, the number of Delaware public schools, held to high standards of public accountability. And unlike voucher programs, public school choice preserves the promise that public education and the common school tradition have always been premised.

In my State, we've enthusiastically embraced both the charter movement and public school choice. We introduced charter schools and statewide public school choice almost five years ago. A greater percentage of families exercise public school choice in Delaware today than in any other State in the Nation, and in the last year alone the number of Delaware students in charter schools and public schools has doubled.

The evidence is that these reforms, together with high standards and broad-based educator accountability, are working to raise student achievement and to narrow the achievement gap between students of different racial and ethnic backgrounds. Students tested last spring, at every grade level tested and in each of our counties, made significant progress when measured against their peers throughout the country, as well as against Delaware's own academic standards.

Let me tell you briefly, about one of the schools in my State that is helping to accomplish both of these goals, raising student achievement and closing the achievement gap. In Delaware, we have close to 200 public schools. Students in all of these schools take Delaware's State tests measuring what students know and can do in reading, writing, and math. We also measure our schools by the incidence of poverty. A school with the highest incidence of poverty in my State is the East Side Charter School in Wilmington, DE. The incidence of poverty there is over 80 percent. Its students are almost all minority. It is right in the center of the projects area of Wilmington. In the first year after East Side Charter School opened its doors, almost none of its students met our State standards in math. Last spring, there was only one school in our State where every third grader who took our math test met or exceeded our standards. That school was the East Side Charter School.

It's a remarkable story, and it has been possible because the East Side Charter School is a remarkable school. Kids can come early and stay late. They have a longer school year. They wear school uniforms. Parents have to sign something akin to a contract of mutual responsibility. Educators are given greater authority to innovate and innovate. With highly qualified and highly motivated teachers, working with strong leadership from active citizens who want to make a positive difference for their community, the East Side Charter School has become a beacon of hope to parents and students in a neighborhood where they and older generations have a pizza or newspaper delivered to their door. It has provided parents in that community with an option for their children they might not otherwise have had.

The legislation that Senator Gregg and I are introducing today aims to make similar options available in communities all across our country, particularly in low-income communities and communities with low-performing schools, just like Wilmington's East Side. It encourages States and local districts with low-performing schools to expand public school choice. It also eliminates many of the artificial barriers to charter school financing that have prevented many public charter schools from keeping pace with the growing demand among parents and students.

Language was inserted in the FY 2001 Labor-HHS appropriations bill granting States the right to transfer out of a failing school. Some similar provision will likely be included in any legislation we pass this year reauthorizing the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Unfortunately, the right to transfer out of a failing school will not be included. The movement is not a panacea but it is a powerful array of alternatives for parents. Nor, as far as I am concerned, will a $1,500 voucher, though I know there is some disagreement on this point even among supporters of this bill. In some high poverty school districts, there are no higher performing schools for students to transfer into. In other districts, administrative barriers or capacity constraints could well limit the choice provided to parents to a single alternative, which may or may not be the school that parents believe best meets their child's needs. Moreover, at least in my State—and I don't pretend to know the circumstances in other State.
States—you can’t get your kid in to get an education at the private or parochial school.

Unrelated to help to establish new charter schools in communities with low-performing schools, and unless we provide encouragement to the States and local school districts that serve these communities to create broad and meaningful choice at the intra-district level and ideally at the inter-district level, the right to “choice out” of a failing school will be little more than an empty promise. The Empowering Parents Act aims to keep the promise by helping to ensure that parents are empowered with real choices for their children within the public school system.

The Empowering Parents Act does three things. First, it provides $200 million in formula funding to charter schools and local districts with low-performing schools for the purpose of expanding public school choice. This will help to make the right to public school choice that we intend to make part of title I a meaningful right for parents with children trapped in failing schools.

Second, the Empowering Parents Act expands the credit enhancement demonstration for charter schools that passed last year and also exempts all interest on charter school loans from federal taxes. This will leverage private financing to help charter schools finance start-up costs, as well as the costs associated with the acquisition and renovation of facilities, the most commonly cited barriers to the establishment of new charter schools.

Third and finally, the Empowering Parents Act creates incentives for States to provide per pupil facilities funding programs for charter schools. According to GAO’s report, “Charter Schools: Limited Access to Facility Financing,” the per pupil allocations that charter schools receive as public schools to educate public school students are frequently just a fraction of the amount that is provided annually to traditional public schools for operating expenses and thus provide none of the funding that traditional public schools receive for facility costs. Additionally, GAO reports that school districts that are allowed to share local facility cost savings within their district often do not. The result is that charter schools are forced to literally take money out of the classroom, dipping into funds meant to pay teachers and purchase textbooks, just so they can secure a roof over their students’ heads. The Empowering Parents Act would provide matching grants to States to encourage them to level the playing field between charters and traditional public schools with respect to facility financing.

Mr. President, the call for competition and choice among accountable public schools can be heard all across America. Just 7 years ago, there was only one charter school in existence in the entire nation. Today, 36 States and the District of Columbia have charter school laws, and there are over 350,000 students attending nearly 1,700 charter schools. As fast as the movement for charters and choice has grown, the reality is that the ideal of involved and empowered parents choosing a child’s school from among a range of diverse but accountable public schools remains the exception rather than the rule in America. In fact, 7 out of 10 charter schools around the country have a waiting list of students they can’t accommodate. The charters and choice movement is a grassroots movement, and thus, appropriately, most of action is taking place at the state and local level. There is an old saying, however, that you must lead, follow, or get out of the way. We are sparking innovation in schools around the country, and there is a role for the Federal Government to play in spreading the synergy.

A key role of the Federal Government in the area of education is to level the playing field for children that come from tough, disadvantaged backgrounds. We are committed in America to the principle that every child deserves a real chance to reach high standards of achievement. I have said often that we need to start our efforts to level the playing field by ensuring that every child enters kindergarten ready to learn, which means promoting early childhood education, beginning with full funding for Head Start. However, charter schools and public school choice should also play an integral part in our efforts to close the achievement gap, because whenever a child is left trapped in a failing school, it means that we have failed as a nation to fulfill the promise of opportunity for all and special privileges for none.

Passing the Empowering Parents Act would represent a landmark federal commitment to parental involvement and parental empowerment in public education. It would send a clear message from coast to coast that we will no longer settle in America for a public education system that traps students in schools that fail to meet high standards. That’s not a Republican message. That’s not a Democrat message. That’s a message of hope and opportunity, a message I believe Republicans and Democrats can embrace together.

When Lynne Cheney visited Delaware last fall, she introduced the “Renewable Fuels Act of 2001.” Over the years, Senator Lugar has been one of the nation’s leading champions of American agriculture and energy independence, and I am pleased to work with him on this effort to encourage the use of ethanol in our nation’s fuel supply in a way that improves air quality and strengthens the nation’s energy security.

The bill Senator Lugar and I are introducing today is a refinement of a proposal we introduced in the last Congress. Many of the provisions of that bill were included in legislation reported by the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee in September 2000. Unfortunately, time ran out on the 106th Congress before final action could be taken on that committee bill.
The Renewable Fuels Act of 2001 allows states to address a serious ground-water contamination problem by phasing out MTBE out of ground-water, reduce emissions of greenhouse gases, diversify our domestic liquid fuels production base, and promote investment and job creation in rural communities. The bill will also result in substantial reductions in taxpayer outlays by enabling farmers to value-add their products into renewable liquid fuels and reduce oil imports that are exacerbating our trade deficit.

The genesis of this legislation is found in the compelling need to resolve the problem of MTBE contamination of groundwater, and rural communities in California. As we discovered in the 106th Congress, the solution to this problem, whose roots go back over a decade to the congressional debate on the merits of the RFG with oxygenates program, has run its course and that states should be allowed to waive its oxygenate requirements. I do not accept this argument and will strongly resist any effort to grant state petitions to opt out of the 1990 RFG minimum oxygen standard requirements. That option is not supported by the science and would simply encourage multinational oil companies to import more crude oil and to use energy-intensive methods to refine it into toxic aromatics that combust into highly carcinogenic benzene.

I applaud President Bush’s vision for ethanol. We agree that it is time to make ethanol an integral part of this country’s fuel mix, in a manner that is predictable, sustainable, cost effective, and environmentally sound. MTBE is on its way out. The “Renewable Fuels Act of 2001” meets all of these criteria.

Consider the agricultural, energy and environmental benefits of our approach. A review of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD debate shows that the Congress had several major objectives in enacting the RFG with oxygenates program, including: to improve the environment by reducing mobile source vehicle emissions (VOC ozone precursors; toxics; NOx; and CO2); to improve energy security by reducing oil imports; to stimulate the economy, especially in rural areas; and to provide regulatory relief to the automobile industry, small businesses/stationary sources, and state and local authorities.

The bill’s RFS provision would increase ethanol demand from baseline projections of 2.0 billion gallons, to a minimum of 4.6 billion gallons, over the next 10 years. This is a substantial increase when compared with sales last year, which reached approximately 1.5 billion gallons. USDA found that, under this renewable fuels standard, farm incomes would increase by an average of $1.3 billion per year each year from 2000 to 2010. That total is more than $33 billion for hard hit rural communities. Taxpayer outlays would drop dramatically due to the improved, market-based terms of trade in basic farm commodities. Some experts calculate that the nation’s taxpayers would directly benefit from billions of dollars per year in farm program savings.

At today’s price for imported oil, our bill’s RFS provision would save the country over $1 billion annually in current dollars. The “Renewable Fuels Act of 2001” will triple the use of renewable fuels in the United States over the next 10 years. This tripling represents less than 4 percent of the nation’s total motor fuels consumption, which is well below the oil industry’s projected demand growth over the next 10 years. However, while small in relationship to the market share of multinational oil companies, it would account for the lion’s share of the stated goal of Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee Chairman FRANK MUKWOKSI when he recently announced his Committee’s goal to reduce the Nation’s oil import dependence over that same period.

As for the environment, the Renewable Fuels Act of 2001 provides states like California with a way to get MTBE out of groundwater without sacrificing ethanol’s contribution to the reduction of emissions of the greenhouses gases linked to global climate change.
March 30, 2001

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—SENATE

5179

whether that legislation will be based
on consideration of all of the environ-
mental and energy security issues in-
volved.

The Renewable Fuels Act of 2001 will
be good for our economy and our envi-
ronment. Most important of all, it will
facilitate the development of renew-
able fuels from a development critical to
ensuring U.S. national and economic
security and stabilizing gas prices.

The security of our whole economy
revolves around our over-dependence
on energy sources from the unstable
nations of the Middle East. We must be
able to address this challenge. Finding
an environmentally sensitive way to
promote the use of renewable fuels is
an important part of this challenge.

That is what I believe our bill will ac-
complish.

The Renewable Fuels Act of 2001 will
lead to at least four billion seven hun-
dred million gallons of ethanol being
produced in 2011 compared to one bil-
lion, six hundred million gallons today.

Under the Act, one gallon of cellulosic
ethanol will count for one and one-half
gallons of regular ethanol in deter-
mining whether a refiner has met the
Renewable Fuels Standard in a par-
icular year. This will greatly accel-
erate the development of renewable
fuels made from cellulosic biomass.

These fuels produce no net greenhouse
gas emissions.

The Renewable Fuels Act of 2001 will
establish a nationwide Renewable
Fuels Standard, RFS, that would in-
crease the current use of renewable
fuels from 0.6 percent of all motor fuel
sold in the United States in 2000 to 1.5
percent by 2011. Refiners who produced
renewable fuels beyond the standard
could sell credits to other refiners who
crosed to under comply with the RFS.

This bill would require the EPA Ad-
ministrator to end the use of MTBE
within the next 10 years in order to
protect the public health and the en-
vironment. And it would establish strict “anti
backsliding provisions” to capture all of
the air quality benefits of MTBE and
ethanol as MTBE is phased down and
then phased out.

Unlike last year’s bill, this bill re-
tains the Minimum Oxygen Standard
in the Clean Air Act Amendments.

However, the Clean Air Act is amended
to ensure that, after MTBE is removed
from gasoline, there will be no back-
sliding in clean air provisions related
to ground level ozone and toxic air
pollution and also that there will be strict
limitations on the aromatic content of
reformulated gasoline and of all gaso-
line in order to further safeguard clean air.

I hope that my colleagues will exami-
n this bill as well as other legislative
approaches that would spur the devel-
opment of renewable fuels such as eth-
anol, whether derived from corn or
other agricultural or plant materials,
while maintaining strict clean air re-
quirements.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLU-
TION 30—CONDEMNING THE DE-
STRUCTION OF PRE-ISLAMIC
STATUES IN AFGHANISTAN BY
THE TALIBAN REGIME

Mr. AKAKA (for himself, Mr. KERRY,
and Mr. WELLSTONE) submitted the fol-
lowing concurrent resolution; which
was referred to the Committee on For-
eign Relations:

S. Con. Res. 30

Whereas many of the oldest and most sig-
nificant Buddhist statues in the world have
been located in Afghanistan, which, at the
time that many of the statues were carved,
was one of the most cosmopolitan regions in
the world, and hosted merchants, travelers,
and artists from China, India, Central Asia,
and the Roman Empire;

Whereas such statues have been part of the
common heritage of mankind, and such cul-
tural treasures must be preserved for future
generations;

Whereas on February 26, 2001, the leader
of the Taliban regime, Mullah Mohammad
Omar, reversed his regime’s previous policy
and ordered the destruction of all pre-Is-
lamic statues in Afghanistan;

Whereas approximately 120-foot-tall and 100-
foot-tall statues carved out of a mountainside
at Bamiyan, one of which is believed to have
been the world’s largest statue of a
standing Buddha;

Whereas the religion of Islam and Buddhist
statues have coexisted in Afghanistan as
part of the unique historical and cultural
heritage of that nation for more than 1,000
years;

Whereas the destruction of the pre-Islamic
statues contradicts the basic tenet of the
Islamic faith that other religions should be
honored and treated with respect, a tenet enunciated
in the Qur’an verses: “There is no compulsion
in religion” and “Unto you your religion, and unto me
my religion;”

Whereas people of many faiths and nation-
alities have contributed to the destruction of the
statues in Afghanistan, including many
Muslim theologians, communities, and gov-
ernments;

Whereas the Taliban regime has previously
demonstrated its lack of respect for inter-
national norms by its brutal repression of
women, its widespread violation of human
rights, its hindrance of humanitarian relief
efforts, and its support for terrorist groups
throughout the world; and

Whereas the destruction of the statues vio-
lates the United Nations Convention Con-
cerning the Protection of the World Cultural
and Natural Heritage, which was ratified by
Afghanistan on March 25, 1979; Now, there-
fore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Rep-
resentatives concurring), That Congress—
(1) joins with people and governments
around the world in condemning the destruc-
tion of pre-Islamic statues in Afghanistan by
the Taliban regime;

(2) urges the Taliban regime to stop de-
stroying such statues; and

(3) calls upon the Taliban regime to grant
the United Nations Educational, Scientific
and Cultural Organization and other inter-
national organizations immediate access to
Afghanistan to survey the damage and facili-
tate international efforts to preserve and
safeguard the remaining statues.

Mr. AKAKA. Mr. President, I rise
today to introduce a concurrent resolu-
tion condemning the destruction of pre-Islamic statues in Afghanistan by
the Taliban regime. A similar resolu-
tion has been introduced by the House of
Representatives. This resolution ex-
presses the grave concern of the Con-
gress over the recent destruction of re-
ligious treasures in Afghanistan by the
taliban regime, which is carried out by
the Afghani people by their Taliban rulers.

Afghanistan is home to a rich cul-
tural heritage, steeped in Buddhist his-
tory and ancient artifacts. More than 1,500
years ago, a pair of Buddha statues,
each standing over 100 feet tall, was
carved out of a mountainside in Bamiyan.

Since their creation, these statues
have been visited by many people.

They were both religious and cul-
tural treasures; they become one of
the most important models for the de-
piction elsewhere of Buddha.

Significant relics such as these should have
been preserved for the edification and enlightenment of future generations.

Islam and Buddhist civilizations coexisted in Afghanistan for more than 1,000
years. Two years ago, Mullah Mo-

hammad Omar, the leader of the
Taliban regime, called for the preserva-
tion of Buddhist cultural heritage in
Afghanistan. The Islamic faith sup-
ports religious tolerance and coexist-
ence, evidenced in the Qur’anic verse
“Unto you your religion, and unto me
my religion.”

In spite of this edict, several times
within the last year the leaders of the
Taliban regime have ordered the mili-
tary to disfigure these and other Bud-
dhist statues. On February 26, 2001,
Taliban leader Mullah Mohammed
Omar ordered the utter destruction of
these irreplaceable cultural treasures,
along with all other pre-Islamic stat-
ues in the nation, calling them “shrines of infidels.” Mohammed Omar
mentioned the destruction of Bud-

Nisaii and the tenets of Islam. Shari’ah refers to the laws and way of life pre-
scribed by Allah in the Qur’an, and dictates ideology of faith, behav-
ior, manners, and practical daily life. Destruction of the statues clearly con-
trdicts a basic tenet of the Islamic faith which is tolerance.

The recent destruction of Bud-
dhist statuary is the latest action by
the Taliban demonstrating an open dis-
regard for international opinion and
basic norms of human behavior which
include respect for individuals and
their beliefs. Tales of horrific human
rights violations continue to be told.

Concealed reports are dispersed
for political reasons, being held in
windowless cells without food and hung
by their legs while being beaten with
cables. In January of this year, Taliban
troops massacred several hundred
Hazaras, members of a Muslim ethnic
minority group in the Bamiyan province.
This was just the latest in a series of such
slaughters. Such executions are not un-
common.