I would also like to add my voice to that of my colleague from California, Senator FEINSTEIN, and my colleague from Washington, Senator MURRAY, in calling for a criminal investigation by the Department of Justice into allegations that Enron has manipulated prices in the Western electricity markets.

As my colleagues are aware, the Western electricity crisis of 2000 and 2001 has taken a tremendous toll on the economy of my state, and of Oregon and California. As a result of electricity prices that spiraled to as much as 1000 times the normal rates, consumers throughout the West have paid dearly. They have paid in their utility bills—which have been raised as much as 60 percent—and they have paid with job loss in communities that have seen entire industries shut down.

Madam President, throughout the Western electricity crisis, I joined with many of my Western colleagues in asking the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) to step in and do its job—to ensure just and reasonable rates. For many months, FERC refused and assured many of us that the Western power crisis was simply the result of drought and a shortage of electricity—a shortage that many of us raised questions about, given that it seemed to materialize over night.

FERC and this administration repeatedly denied what many of the impacted citizens in Washington state knew intuitively to be true—that our Western markets were being manipulated by a handful of companies that drew enormous profits directly from their pockets and from the coffers of their businesses.

With the collapse of Enron, Senator BINGAMAN, chairman of the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee, wisely called a hearing to assess the bankruptcy's impacts on the energy markets. At this hearing, on January 29, I asked FERC Chairman Pat Wood to take a close look at allegations that Enron have been manipulating markets. In a letter sent that same day, I wrote:

Congress and our nation's consumers-particularly those of the Pacific Northwest, who have suffered through retail rate increases of up to 50 percent over the past year-deserve to know whether Enron was manipulating Western power markets at their expense. After Enron collapsed, prices in the West's forward energy markets plummeted by 20 to 30 percent. Where there's smoke there's often fire, and we must investigate whether we have a simple coincidence here, or something more. The public deserves answers and, if appropriate, corrective action.

In response to my request, FERC opened a staff investigation on these allegations. And late yesterday, this investigation revealed the first real smoking gun. Now posted on the Commission's Website, you will find memos in which attorneys from Enron outline their strategies for manipulating prices in Western markets.

This has real, direct impacts on consumers in my state. During the height

of the crisis, many utilities in my state signed long-term contracts with Enron at prices that looked like deals at the time-in a severely dysfunctional market—but today, are two to three times current market rates. The Bonneville Power Administration, for example, which provides 60 percent of all the power consumed in my state, is on the hook for \$700 million worth of Enron contracts over the next few years. In today's market, these contracts would be half as costly. Nevertheless, Bonneville and the consumers of the Northwest continue to be held hostage. They continue to pay Enron. At the conclusion of this investigation, I hope that FERC will see to it that justice is done. If markets were manipulated—as the evidence now suggests-Washington State consumers should be given relief from these contracts.

In addition to these ongoing FERC proceedings, I do hope the Justice Department will open a criminal investigation into Enron's actions to manipulate electricity prices and defraud consumer-ratepayers.

But I also look forward to this body exercising what I believe is necessary continued oversight. This morning, at an Energy and Natural Resources Committee hearing, Senator BINGAMAN and I discussed the possibility of a hearing on these issues. I also believe that the Judiciary Committee may be an appropriate forum for discussing the antitrust component of these allegations.

But in addition, I hope my colleagues-and particularly those who will serve on the Energy bill conference committee-will pay close attention to what this means for our nation's electricity markets. During the debate on that bill, I offered a consumer protection amendment to the electricity title that I believe would have prevented a recurrence of the Western energy crisis and incorporated many of the lessons we have learned and continue to learn-from Enron's collapse. My amendment suggested that before FERC was allowed to open up markets like California to deregulation, it should have to establish clear market rules, have in place the mechanisms necessary to monitor markets to detect manipulation. It would have directed FERC to take decisive, corrective action to protect consumers when abuses do occur. And it would have given FERC and state utility commissions the access to books and records. they would need to discover evidence like the memos we have now found in this Enron investigation, almost two years after the energy crisis began and after months of business closures and rate hikes across the West.

I hope Attorney General Ashcroft will heed our call today. I look forward to continuing our oversight of this issue in the Energy Committee, and I hope our conferees will consider this new evidence—that Enron has been manipulating power markets—as they consider the energy bill.

I yield the floor.

THE BUSH ADMINISTRATION DECI-SION TO "UNSIGN" THE ROME STATUTE

Mr. DASCHLE. Madam President, I come to the floor to express my disappointment with the Bush Administration's decision to unsign the Rome Statute, and withdraw the United States from the process of creating an international criminal court.

We are told this decision was made in order to protect American troops and American sovereignty from a faceless international bureaucracy. Unfortunately, it does the opposite. In fact, this decision vastly decreases our ability to shape the ICC, ignores the fact that the ICC will come into existence regardless of whether we are involved or not, and raises the specter of unilateralism just as we will be turning to our allies for help in a series of crucial policy, diplomatic—and perhaps military—undertakings.

Administrations since President Truman have supported the establishment of a criminal court to try the worst crimes against humanity. Reasonable people can disagree about the merits of the Rome Statute. Like many of my colleagues, I have some concerns about its jurisdiction and potential impact on U.S. forces deployed overseas.

I do not, however, think the consequences of simply walking away from the Statute should be ignored. Instead of asserting our leadership, we are abdicating it. Instead of shaping the court to serve our interests, we have relinquished our seat at the table and removed ourselves from a position to shape it at all.

This is especially disappointing, Madam President, when you consider the simple fact that the ICC will still come into existence in July. That was made clear in New York on April 11, when the 60th nation ratified the Rome Statute, putting it into effect. To date, 64 nations have ratified the statute. Only one—the United States—has withdrawn.

When it comes time to pick prosecutors and judges, which it will do, we will not be at the table. And when it comes time to consider rules of evidence, which it will do, our voices will be absent.

But let's consider also exactly who some of those 60 are—Britain, Canada, France, Italy and Spain, all NATO allies, all currently fighting side-by-side with our troops in Afghanistan and the Balkans. And all whom we hope to count on in future conflicts in our war on terrorism.

Yesterday afternoon, our Ambassador-at-Large for War Crimes Issues said that America had "washed our hands [of the ICC]. It's over." If it were only so, Madam President. We did not put the ICC out of business. But we did take ourselves out of the action—and out of a position to influence the ICC. The decision to unsign was the wrong decision at the wrong time and, most troubling of all, not in keeping with the American national interest.