

Chechen people and to strip them of their culture and history, including their language, architecture, music and even familial ties.

It was only in 1957 that Stalin's deportation order was repealed. However, many of those Chechens that were able to make the arduous journey back to their homes in the Caucasus found them occupied by new residents, many of whom violently opposed the Chechen return.

Today, the Chechen people are enduring yet another brutal assault directed by Moscow's authorities. Over the last year and half Russian President Vladimir Putin has conducted an indiscriminate war against the Chechen people. Russian forces subjected Chechnya's capital, Grozny, to a destruction unseen in Europe since World War II, and they have leveled numerous other Chechen towns and villages. Russian forces have herded the Chechen population into refugee or internment camps. This war against the Chechen people has left literally hundreds of thousands homeless and countless thousands of innocents dead. Let us not forget that more than 100,000 Chechens were killed in the Russo-Chechen war of 1994-1996—100,000 out of a population of fewer than a million.

Mr. President, it is with these facts in mind that I introduce a resolution marking next week's anniversary of Stalin's mass deportation of the Chechen people in 1944. My hope is that this resolution will communicate to the Chechen people the Senate's awareness of the suffering that they have endured and are enduring today. It is my hope that this resolution will prompt others to view the ongoing war in Chechnya within the historic context of the repeated abuses suffered by the Chechen people. By promoting a broader awareness of the history of Chechen people, I am confident that this resolution will contribute positively to the efforts of those who are trying to prompt a peaceful, political, and just end to war in Chechnya.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED

SMITH AMENDMENT NO. 12

Mr. SMITH of Oregon submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 287, to direct the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission to impose cost-of-service based rates on sales by public utilities of electric energy at wholesale in the western energy market; which was referred to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

On page 3, strike subsection (d) and insert the following:

(d) LIMITATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—A cost-of-service based rate shall not apply to a sale of electric energy at wholesale for delivery in a State that—

(A) prohibits public utilities from passing through to retail consumers wholesale rates approved by the Commission; or

(B) imposes a price limit on the sale of electric energy at retail that—

(i) precludes a public utility from recovering costs on a cost-of-service based rate; or

(ii) has precluded a public utility from making a payment when due to any entity within the western energy market from which the public utility purchased electric energy, and the default has not been cured.

(2) NO ORDERS TO SELL WITHOUT GUARANTEE OF PAYMENT.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, neither the Secretary of Energy, the Commission, any other officer or agency in the Executive branch, nor any court may issue an order that requires a seller of electric energy or natural gas to sell electric energy or natural gas to a purchaser in a State described in paragraph (1) unless there is a guarantee that, as determined by the Commission, is sufficient to ensure that the seller will be paid the full purchase price when due.

(3) REQUIREMENT TO MEET IN-STATE DEMAND.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a State public utility commission in the western energy market may prohibit a public utility in the State from making any sale of electric energy to a purchaser in a State described in paragraph (1) at any time at which the public utility is not meeting the demand for electric energy in the service area of the public utility.

(e) REPORT.—Not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Energy shall—

(1) conduct an investigation to determine whether any public utility in a State described in subsection (d)(1) has been rendered uncreditworthy or has defaulted on any payment for electric energy as a result of a transfer of funds by the public utility to a parent company or to a subsidiary of the public utility (except a payment made in accordance with a State deregulation statute); and

(2) submit to the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce and Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate a report describing the results of the investigation.

(f) DURATION.—A cost-of-service based electric energy rate imposed under this Act shall remain in effect until such time as the market for electric energy in the western energy market reflects just and reasonable rates, as determined by the Commission.

(g) REPEAL.—This Act is repealed, and any cost-of-service based electric energy rate imposed under this Act that is then in effect shall no longer be effective, on the date that is 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act.

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. President, today I am filing an amendment to S. 287, bill to direct the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission to impose cost-of-service based rates on sales by public utilities of electric energy at wholesale in the western energy market.

My amendment would clarify the circumstances under which the Commission may impose interim limitations on the cost of electric energy, and provide a sunset date. While I applaud my colleague's efforts to help restore stability to the wholesale electricity market on the west coast, I believe S. 287 continues to insulate retail customers in California from the energy crisis in a way that is hampering conservation and investment in new generation.

By contrast, my constituents and energy-sensitive businesses in Oregon are already feeling the effects of the price volatility in the west. Utilities in the northwest are facing current rate in-

creases of eleven to fifty percent. The customers of the Bonneville Power Administration are facing the prospect of 95 percent rate increases beginning in October, when current contracts expire.

I know that there is significant support for short-term wholesale price caps for the entire western market. However, that doesn't address what is still going on in California, where retail prices are capped at a level that is insulating consumers from the price shocks being felt by the rest of the West. So long as these retail rates remain capped at the current levels, there is no incentive to conserve, and no incentive for additional generation. Both conservation and additional generation are the keys to the long-term solution.

Much of the media attention in recent weeks has focused on efforts to keep the lights on in California and to keep that state's two largest utilities from going bankrupt. But the West Coast energy market extends to eleven other western states, including Oregon, that are all interconnected by the high-voltage transmission system.

I believe there is more that California can and must do immediately to address this situation. I know the California legislature is grappling with this situation, and I hope it will take the steps to restore the creditworthiness of California's utilities.

First and foremost, it must approve further electric rate increases. This is necessary to send the right price signals to Californians to conserve energy. Further, price increases are necessary to help California's investor-owned utilities—which have recently been reduced to “junk bond” status—

from going bankrupt. Avoiding bankruptcy for these utilities is important for Oregon and other western states. Since the middle of December, Northwest utilities have been forced to sell their surplus power into California, with no guarantee of being paid. If the California utilities subsequently seek bankruptcy protection, it will be Oregonians who are stuck with the bill for California's failed restructuring effort.

In fact, certain Oregon utilities are already receiving bills from California's power exchange for funds owed to the exchange by California utilities. In addition, the Bonneville Power Administration is owed over 100 million dollars for power sales it made into California in November 2000.

My amendment to the legislation offered by my colleague from California would do the following: It limits the authorities provided to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (Commission) to impose west-wide wholesale price caps by stipulating that the wholesale price cap cannot be imposed on sales into any state that has refused to allow utilities to pass on Commission-approved rates, has capped retail rates at levels that do not allow utilities to recover costs on a cost-of-service based rate, or has capped rates at a level that results in a default of payments for electricity.

Further, the amendment stipulates that the Secretary of Energy, the Commission, or the courts may not order sales of electricity or natural gas into any such state without guarantees of being paid. It also allows state public utility commissions in other western states to make sure that utility service areas are served before utilities in their respective states can sell into what might be a higher market in California.

It also orders the Secretary of Energy to conduct an inquiry into the charges of shifting funds between utilities and parent holding companies. Two weeks ago, at a hearing of the Energy Committee, I asked three California utilities if they were seeing any decrease in demand in response to calls for conservation. The answer was no.

I also asked several energy experts if, in their opinion, state officials in California were taking the measures needed to fix their broken restructuring effort. Again, the answer was either "No" or "Mostly, but not completely."

To put a human face on what is happening in my state, I would like to discuss a letter I recently received from a rural school district in my state. Basically, they are pleading for the energy crisis to be fixed because, as a small school district, they are having to take resources away from students to pay energy bills. Their local utility has just added a 20 percent surcharge to the cost of electricity. The district also heats a number of its school buildings with natural gas. In November 1999, the bill was \$4,383.59. By November 2000, the bill to heat the same buildings was \$11,942.

Another small school district in my state is concerned that its power bills may go up by \$100,000. For them, that means laying off two teachers.

Oregon is doing its part to conserve, and to build new resources. My amendment today is trying to prod California to send the right price signals to its consumers to join us in this fight.

NOTICE OF HEARING

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the information of the Senate and the public that a hearing has been scheduled before the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

The hearing will take place on Thursday, March 1, 2001 at 9:30 a.m. in room SD-106 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building in Washington, D.C.

The purpose of this hearing is to receive testimony on S. 26, a bill to amend the Department of Energy Authorization Act to authorize the Secretary of Energy to impose interim limitations on the cost of electric energy to protect consumers from unjust and unreasonable prices in the electric energy market, S. 80, California Electricity Consumers Relief Act of 2001, and S. 287, a bill to direct the Federal

Energy Regulatory Commission to impose cost-of-service based rates on sales by public utilities of electric energy at wholesale in the western energy market, and amendment No. 12 to S. 287.

Because of the limited time available for the hearing, witnesses may testify by invitation only. However, those wishing to submit written testimony for the hearing record should send two copies of their testimony to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, United States Senate, SRC-2 Senate Russell Courtyard, Washington, D.C. 20510-6150.

For further information, please call Trici Heninger at (202) 224-7875.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Governmental Affairs be authorized to meet on Thursday, February 15, 2001 at 11 a.m. for a business meeting to consider pending Committee business.

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

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions be authorized to meet for a hearing on President Bush's Education Proposals during the session of the Senate on Thursday, February 15, 2001 at 9:30 a.m.

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

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet to conduct a markup on Thursday, February 15, 2001 at 10 a.m. The markup will take place in Dirksen Room 226.

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

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a member of my staff, Kevin Krukfy, be allowed the privilege of the floor.

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

SENATE SCHEDULE

Mr. LOTT. For the information of all Senators, the two sides of the aisle are in the process of clearing a resolution, if at all possible, on the energy situation. We are hoping to work through that. If we can do so, we expect it will pass on a voice vote. Therefore, there will be no further votes this week.

The Senate will reconvene on Monday, February 26, and following the reading of George Washington's Fare-

well Address by the junior Senator, appropriately, from Virginia, Mr. ALLEN, the Senate will then conduct a lengthy period of morning business.

On Wednesday of that week, the Senate will be expected to begin consideration of the bankruptcy bill.

I thank my colleagues for their cooperation.

Again, I want to say that we may or may not have a resolution with regard to the energy situation. But the Senate would like to acknowledge there is a problem in this country and commit to taking appropriate and comprehensive actions in dealing with this problem in the weeks ahead.

I wish all of my colleagues a very enjoyable Presidents' Day work period.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

PAUL D. COVERDELL

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, we have just adopted a resolution offered by the majority leader and others that will honor our former colleague, Paul Coverdell of Georgia, for his service as a Member of this body, as a member of the political life of the State of Georgia, and as a Director of the U.S. Peace Corps.

This resolution, among other things, would name the Washington national headquarters of the Peace Corps as the Paul D. Coverdell Peace Corps Headquarters.

The bill would also authorize \$10 million in appropriations to give an award to the University of Georgia to support the construction of the Paul D. Coverdell Building at the Institute of Biomedical and Health Sciences at the University of Georgia.

The legislation to honor our former colleague, in addition to what was done last year—when we enacted the Paul D. Coverdell Worldwide School Act of 2000—would designate the Worldwide Schools Program as the Paul D. Coverdell Worldwide Schools Program that was begun by Senator Coverdell when he was Director of the Peace Corps.

Last year's action was a fitting one by this Congress to honor our former colleague and is an appropriate tribute which recognizes the special contribution Paul Coverdell made to the Peace Corps during his tenure as its Director. I strongly and enthusiastically supported its enactment.

Let me, first of all, say there is a particular reason I speak on this particular issue, in addition to my affection for Paul Coverdell and the years I spent working with him.

As I mentioned a moment ago in the colloquy with the distinguished majority leader, some 33 years ago, after I finished college, I served as a Peace Corps volunteer in the Dominican Republic not far from the Haitian border for 2½ years in the mountains. I worked with 22 communities and some 11,000 people in the northwest region of that country. It was an important period of maturation in my life. I learned