Senator MCCONNELL has taken a very progressive attitude as he always has on this. Many others want to make it a political kickball. I hope after the elections that enough people in both parties would sit down to form a bipartisan consensus, which is always the best way to develop foreign policy, and determine how we should spend our money.

It should not escape the notice of Members that over a dozen countries spend a larger percentage of their budget on foreign aid and foreign policy than we do. Many of these countries face difficult budgetary problems as we do. Some actually spend more dollars; Japan, for example. Some of these countries do it out of altruism but most do not. Most of them do it out of hard-eyed realism. They know that the money they spend is helping to create jobs and, frankly, Mr. President, I would expect that there are those in a country like Japan which relies heavily on exports who are delighted to see the United States withdrawing from the world stage because they know what is going to happen. But the reality is that it is in everyone's interest, both ours and our allies, for the United States, the world's oldest democracy, the world's strongest military power, and the world's largest economy, to remain actively engaged.

It is the American workers who will be laid off because exports decline. It will be Americans who will be a greater burden on their Government because the jobs leave our shores. Our competitors will increase their foreign markets because they have taken an interest in foreign aid and they have created jobs in the developing countries—in Asia, Latin America, and we are seeing the beginnings of a potentially huge market in Africa. Our markets in Europe and the First World are very saturated. If we are going to expand out exports, it is going to be in the Third World, where 95 percent of new births are occurring.

So that is the nonaltruistic argument. If we want to look at just dollars and cents, I hope that those who go home and make the great speeches and get the applause for cutting foreign aid will also at the same time say, oh, and by the way, that plant that once exported tractors that just closed and those 500 workers who are without jobs, I helped that, too. I helped close that plant. I helped shut off our access to markets worldwide, because that is really what they do.

Then ultimately we should ask ourselves the moral question. We in this country spend a few pennies per capita in some of the poorest parts of the world such as sub-Saharan Africa, a few pennies per capita even though we are the wealthiest nation on Earth. We are less than 5 percent of the world's population, but we use a quarter of the world's resources. We have a moral responsibility. In this bill, when we cut everything from UNICEF to assistance for refugees, we should ask ourselves: what do we stand for? Are we really living up to our responsibility to help ease the suffering of the billion or more people who go hungry every day?

As appropriators we have done the very best we could with the resources and the allocation we had. We have really tried to be responsible in all of these areas. But sooner or later, we are going to have to sit down and ask, can we year after year continue to cut these programs? Not if we expect to preserve or influence in the world as a protector of democracy and human rights, not if we expect to see our economy grow, not if we expect to alleviate some of the misery in the world.

With that, Mr. President, I will yield, but I do thank not only my distinguished colleague from Kentucky but also Robin Cleveland, who he mentioned and whose willingness to work in a bipartisan way with my staff was very appreciated, and Jim Bond, the clerk of the Foreign Operations Subcommittee, who I have worked with now for 22 years in the Senate and for whom I have great respect and appreciation. I also want to mention Juanita Rilling of the Committee staff, who has been an especially strong voice for protecting programs that benefit needy women and children; Anne Bordonaro, a Vermont intern from South Burlington who has been assisting the Foreign Operations Subcommittee this summer, and Emelie East, who is a member of the Appropriations Committee staff and manages the affairs of four different subcommittees; and the man who does the work of 20, Tim Rieser, who has worked on everything from the landmine ban to trying to make sure that we are responsible in what we do. Tim, who does the work on our side of the authorizing and appropriating committees, and does it on 20-hour days, deserves credit and our thanks. He is typical of many on our Senate staffs on both sides who are the unsung heroes who make this place work. I also want to thank several other staff members on our side who helped along the way, including Dick D'AMATO of the Appropriations Committee staff whose expertise in trade issues was very helpful, and who worked hard to ensure that humanitarian assistance can get to needly people in Azerbaijan. Diana Olbaum of the Foreign Relations Committee staff was as always a great help, as was Janice O'Connell, and Sheila Murphy of the majority leader's office.

I see the distinguished majority leader on the floor, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the majority leader.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I extend my appreciation to the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MCCONNELL], for the outstanding work he did in managing this bill, and also to the Senator from Vermont, who is always ready to go to work and do the job. They indicated they could do it in a reasonable period of time, and while I like for the subcommittee chairmen to get their bills through in 3 hours or less on the appropriations committees, I think they did an excellent job. They did take 16 hours and 15 minutes, which is pretty good considering the long history on foreign operations appropriations bills. There were 11 rollcall votes.

So the Senate is certainly working and producing results, and I thank these two Senators and all Senators for their cooperation and their work in completing the foreign operations appropriations bill.

I might say the Senate now, I believe, has completed action on five appropriations bills. We are ready to begin on the sixth one. I see the Senator from New Mexico is ready to go. I understand that the order of last night provided that the Senate is now to begin consideration of the energy and water appropriations bill. The managers have indicated that they would anticipate amendments to be offered to that bill today. Therefore, I will announce that additional rollcall votes can be expected today unless an agreement can be reached to limit the amendments to the energy and water appropriations bill.

Also, it is my intent and hope that a similar agreement can be reached with respect to the legislative appropriations bill for Monday, thereby allowing all votes to be set at 10 a.m. on Tuesday. So all Senators are urged to cooperate in formulating that agreement. If we can do that, we could work today on energy and water, Monday on the legislative appropriations bill, and then have them both completed with the votes at 10 a.m. on Tuesday.

I hope all Senators who intend to offer amendments to the energy and water appropriations bill will do so as early as possible today so that we can complete action, advise the Members what they can expect on the bill, and then move on to the remaining appropriations bills.

Mr. President, I yield the floor to the chairman of the energy and water appropriations bill.

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1997

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now proceed to the consideration of S. 1959, which the clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1959) making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1997, and for other purposes.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum for just a moment until Senator JOHNSTON arrives.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMITH). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I first wish to thank the distinguished majority leader for scheduling our bill this morning. It is obvious that we are trying on our side to get as many appropriations bills through as possible. This will be another of those bills, and it is important that we get this one done.

As I understand it, for those Senators or staffers informing Senators who are listening, it is the intention of the leader that we proceed and that there be votes today. However, there is an alternative being circulated, and that is if you would give us the amendments, at least by name, we could agree on what all the amendments are shortly. Then we would urge consent that there not be votes today and that the amendments will be offered the remainder of the day and part of Monday, which I think is a very good approach. But we would like to know what the amendments are today, and that is what we are circulating in the Cloakrooms and on the hot lines.

Mr. President, first, I note the presence of Senator BENNETT JOHNSTON, who for 22 years either chaired or served on this subcommittee, and, frankly, I take over the chairmanship with full understanding that I have a great deal to learn about the intricacies of the Department of Energy, its accounts and all of its various functions, and certainly the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation, which are two very major institutions out there in America that do a lot of good and are frequently criticized, but I believe both are doing a very excellent job in terms of projects and programs they are undertaking. But, essentially, Senator JOHNSTON has taken the lead in many important aspects of building science and research through the Department of Energy, and he has been an advocate of keeping our nuclear arsenal safe, sound and responsive, and much of that occurs by virtue of the policies in this bill and the money appropriated. Since this is his last undertaking on the floor for this bill, I would like to yield to him for his opening remarks, and then I will follow with some.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I very much appreciate the very warm and generous remarks of my colleague from New Mexico. While he is new in the chairmanship on this committee, he is not new to the committee. We have worked side by side for all of these 22 years, because New Mexico, of course, has a very vital interest in the work of this committee.

The State of New Mexico can thank Senator PETE DOMENICI for the presence and the health and viability of much of that State's Federal presence. The Federal presence in the State of New Mexico is rather overwhelming and would not have been such an overwhelming presence but for Senator PETE DOMENICI. We have worked together to make that so, and it is in the Nation's interest. The national labs, particularly, are an American resource that needs to be nurtured and used and developed and continued for the benefit of this country. So we are very pleased for that.

Also, since this is my last time to manage this bill for the minority, I would like to mention the longstanding relationship I have with the chairman of the full committee, Senator HATFIELD, who was the chairman of this subcommittee and the ranking member. We would trade off on those roles every time the Congress would change. That was a very productive and most pleasant relationship as well. So this committee and its staff and its work are some of the most pleasant and most productive times I have had in this Congress. I thank all for giving me that chance.

Mr. President, I am pleased to join with the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. DOMENICI] in presenting to the Senate the Energy and Water Development appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1997 beginning October 1, 1996. This bill, S. 1959, an original bill reported by the committee on July 16, 1996, was approved by a unanimous vote. Yesterday, the House of Representatives passed H.R. 3816. The markups in the House and Senate subcommittees and committees occurred simultaneously, rather than our normal process or House acting first and our waiting receipt of the House bill.

At the outset, I want to commend the chairman of the subcommittee, Senator DOMENICI. He has done an excellent job in putting this bill together, under very difficult budgetary constraints and circumstances. He is an outstanding Member of the Senate and I am pleased to work with him in connection with this bill and on other matters.

I also want to thank the distinguished Senator from Oregon, Senator HATFIELD, the chairman of the full Committee on Appropriations. Senator HATFIELD and I had probably one of the longest running twosomes in the Appropriation Committee on the Energy and Water Subcommittee, I having chaired on and off for a number of years, and Senator HATFIELD having chaired on and off for a number of years, and having rotated as ranking minority member. We. always shared a productive, pleasant, bipartisan, and always, I think, the kind of relationship that Senators seek and glory in when it is present. I treasure his friendship and appreciate the cooperation and assistance given to me.

Mr. President, the Senator from New Mexico has presented the committee recommendations and explained the major appropriations items, as well as the amounts recommended, so I will not undertake to repeat and elaborate on the numerous recommendations. Instead I will just have a few brief remarks summarizing the bill.

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The bill supplies funds for water resources development programs and related activities, of the Department of the Army, civil functions—U.S. Army Corps of Engineers' Civil Works Program in title I; for the Department of the Interior's Bureau of Reclamation in title II; for the Department of Energy's energy research activties—except for fossil fuel programs and certain conservation and regulatory functions—including atomic energy defense activities in title III; and for related independent agencies and commissions, including the Appalachian Regional Commission and Appalachian regional development programs, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, and the Tennessee Valley Authority in title V.

602(B) ALLOCATION FOR THE BILL

The Energy and Water Development Subcommittee allocation under section 602(b)(1) of the budget act total $20,308,000,000 in budget authority and $20,202,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 1997. Of these amounts the Defense discretionary allocation is $11,600,000,000 in budget authority and $11,233,000,000 in outlays. For domestic discretionary the budget authority allocation is $8,708,000,000 and the allocation for outlays is $8,969,000,000. The committee recommendation uses all of the budget authority allocation in both categories, so there is no room for add-ons to the bill. Therefore, any amendments to add will have to be offset by reductions from within the bill.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

Mr. President, the fiscal year 1997 budget estimates for the bill total $20,648,952,000 in new budget obligational authority. The recommendation of the committee provides $20,735,645,000. This amount is $86,693,000 over the President's budget estimates and about $800 million over the appropriations amounts for the current fiscal year 1996. The large increases in the bill over last year are principally associated with the Defense activities and related Defense programs—what we refer to at 050 national defense accounts. Domestic discretionary spending continues to decline especially in the Department of Energy domestic discretionary functions.

Mr. President, I will briefly summarize the major recommendations provided in the bill. All the details and figures are, of course, included in the Committee Report No. 104–320, accompanying the bill, which has been available since July 17.

TITLE I, ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS

First, under title I of the bill which provides appropriations for the Department of the Army Civil Works Program, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, the recommendation is for a total of

new budget authority of $3,455,623,000, which is $89 million over fiscal year 1996 and $163 million more than the budget estimate.

The committee received a large number of requests for various water development projects including many requests for new construction starts. However, as the chairman has stated, due to the limited budgetary resources, the committee could not provide funding for each and every project requested. The committee recommendation does include a small number of new studies and planning starts but no new construction starts. The committee has deferred without prejudice new construction starts and hopes to fashion a small package of new projects before this bill is completed. Because of the importance of some of these projects to the economic well-being of the Nation, the committee will continued to monitor each projects progress to ensure that it is ready to proceed to construction when resources become available. As the committee report points out, the committee recommendation does not agree with the policies proposed by the administration in its budget.

TITLE II, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

For title II, Department of the Interior Bureau of Reclamation, the recommendation provides new budget authority of $852,788,000, which is $9 million more than the budget estimate and about the same amount as for fiscal year 1996.

TITLE III, DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Under title III, Department of Energy, the committee provides a total of $16.1 billion. This amount includes $2.750 billion for energy supply, research and development activities, an appropriation of $42.2 million for uranium supply and enrichment activities, offset fully by gross revenues; $220.2 million for the uranium enrichment decontamination and decommissioning fund, $1 billion for general science and research activities, $200 million from the nuclear waste disposal fund for a total of $400 million for civilian nuclear waste activities when the $200 million appropriated under the defense activities is included, and $6.4 billion for environmental restoration and waste management—defense and nondefense.

For the atomic energy defense activities, there is a total of $11.583 billion comprised of $3.979 billion for weapons activities; almost $6.0 billion for defense environmental restoration and waste management; $1.607 billion for other defense programs and $200 million for defense nuclear waste disposal.

For departmental administration $218 million is recommended offset with anticipated miscellaneous revenues of $125 million for a net appropriation of $93 million. A total of $245.6 million is recommended in the bill for the Power Marketing Administrations and $146.3 million is for the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission [FERC] offset 100 percent by revenues.

A net appropriation of $159.8 million is provided for solar programs, including photovoltaics, wind, and biomass and for all solar and renewable energy, $246.6 million, a decrease of about $20 million less than fiscal year 1996.

For nuclear energy programs, $229.7 million is recommended, of which about $100 million is for termination costs and activities associated with previous decisions ending support for several activities and projects. The recommendation includes $22 million in funds to continue the advanced light water reactor cost-shared program and the committee has provided funds under termination costs to wind up the first-of-a-kind engineering program.

For the magnetic fusion program, the committee is recommending $240 million, which is $15 million less than the budget. An amount of $389 million is included for biological and environmental research and $649.6 million for basic energy sciences.

TITLE IV, REGULATORY AND OTHER INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

A total of $313 million for various regulatory and independent agencies of the Federal Government is included in the bill. Major programs include the Appalachian Regional Commission, $165 million; Nuclear Regulatory Commission, $471.8 million offset by revenues of $457.3 million; and for the Tennessee Valley Authority, $113 million.

Mr. President, this is a good bill. I wish there were additional amounts for domestic discretionary programs in our allocation but that is not the case. A large number of good programs, projects and activities have been either eliminated or reduced severely, because of the allocation, but such action is required under the budget constraints we are facing. I hope the Senate will act favorably and expeditiously in passing this bill so we can get to conference with the House and thereafter send the bill to the White House as soon as possible.

Mr. President, the big disappointment with this bill, as with other bills, is the paucity of resources given to these most important functions of Government. I think it is a real mistake to starve these functions, which are infrastructure, water projects, ports, harbors, flood protection, and water resources, which are the basis of the economy in much of our country. They have been deferred and deferred and deferred, as well as the national labs and science endeavors, which are funded at, I believe, much too low a level. I hope in the next Congress we will find additional funds to do this.

In the meantime, I think we have done a good job under the leadership of Senator DOMENICI in allocating these scarce resources well.

With thanks to my chairman, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I want to repeat—Senator JOHNSTON has completed his opening statement; mine will not take but a few moments—the distinguished majority leader has indicated we will have votes. We know of a couple of amendments. We can call Senator JEFFORDS, and there are a couple of others around. What we are trying to do now, and it is being worked through the offices and I urge Senators' offices to help us, if we want to get a unanimous consent that we are not going to have any votes today, then we need to know what amendments are going to be proposed to this bill. That is what we are waiting for. I once again urge that, and we will be here and will be ready to vote on an amendment that might be offered here shortly.

Mr. President, I am pleased to bring to the floor S. 1959, the energy and water development appropriation bill for fiscal year 1996 for consideration by the full Senate. The Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act is normally one of the first appropriations bills considered by the Senate. However, this year the House experienced some early delays because the Energy and Water Development Subcommittee was provided with an allocation that would appear on its face to be insufficient to take care of the mandates of this bill. As a result, the Senate Appropriations Committee took the unusual step of reporting an original bill in order to speed consideration of this act.

I am pleased to report the House completed consideration of its Energy and Water Development Act earlier yesterday and, indeed, additional resources were given to the committee from the first allocation that caused the delay. The Energy and Water Subcommittee marked up the bill on July 11, and the full committee reported it by unanimous vote last Tuesday, July 16. The bill and report have been available to Senators and their staffs since last Wednesday.

I, first, thank the former chairman of the committee, as I already have, Senator JOHNSTON. I thank Senator HATFIELD for his extraordinary work with reference to this subcommittee and its activities over all the years.

I feel confident we have done a good job this year with the resources that were made available. Indeed, with reference to the Department of Energy and, in particular, the Department of Energy's efforts to continue the cleanup in this country from the atomic years and nuclear bomb development era, that has significant increases to continue that cleanup, but under a regime that is causing more work to be done and the work to be done more efficiently.

In addition, some new projects and some additional money have been provided for the whole new concept that is now being used by the Department to maintain the safety of our nuclear weapons. That new stewardship, the science-based stockpile stewardship program, was a few years in development. It is now about 2½ years old, but

it is receiving the full attention of the three major laboratories that dealt with nuclear weapons and the nuclear deterrent threat.

It is also having its impact on other facilities that we have in this country to maintain our nuclear bombs in a safe and trustworthy manner.

Some do not recognize, and perhaps they choose not even to think about it, but the Department of Energy, whether one likes the Department or not, is, in a sense, doing very major defense work for America. They are the custodians of the nuclear weapons. We all know we are building down from a very high number to a much smaller number of nuclear warheads. Since we have decided as a matter of national policy that there will be no more underground testing, we have decided that this new science-based stockpile stewardship program will be the scientific source of evaluation of our residual nuclear weapons, the ones we are going to keep, to make sure that they are safe and trustworthy.

You know, the American military men from the Navy all the way through—it is those people out there that we are worried about. It is for them that we want to make sure we keep weapons in the highest quality of maintenance. For they are the front line and we want the weapons in their hands to be the very best, in terms of safety and trustworthiness and reliability. That is a big mission.

So, in this bill, as in the defense authorization bill, a significant new asset was added this year, a resource so that the three major laboratories can continue to develop the technologies and techniques and equipment that will be necessary to maintain these weapons without the benefit of the science and technology that would come from underground testing, which is a very big undertaking.

Will it work? We hope so. The greatest scientists in America working at the laboratories are bound and determined to make it work. In fact, they have committed to the Joint Chiefs of Staff that it will work. The Joint Chiefs of Staff have, thus, approved this approach, but they have made it very, very clear that they do not want to abandon the test site in Nevada.

It must be maintained in a readied posture, because if this new approach fails, we will have to verify and secure our weapons performance and trustworthiness through other means.

So at the same time we are moving ahead in a new approach, we have to maintain some of the old. That costs a little bit of extra money, but not an amount that this Senator believes our taxpayers would not willingly pay if the issue is, since we must maintain a nuclear arsenal, let's make sure we maintain it in the best possible way in terms of reliability, trustworthiness, safety, and security. I am sure that as the Department of Energy moves through the next few years with this new approach, there will be plenty of opportunity for this subcommittee, the Armed Services Committee, the Joint Chiefs of Staff and other groups within the executive branch, to make sure that it is being done right.

The Energy and Water Development Subcommittee funds are used not only for the Department of Energy's defense activities, but, obviously, there are three other major activities. The Department of Energy does some nondefense work, and we have to pay for that in this bill. Then we have the Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Engineers.

Let me suggest that we are operating on the nondefense side. We are operating at a freeze level for the corps and the Bureau. The Corps of Engineers, nonetheless, in an overall macrosense, will increase $89 million. Energy supply and research, $22 million and high-energy physics, $20 million. These are programs and activities that are nondefense oriented.

Also, uranium supply enrichment, a minus $29 million; uranium enrichment decontamination and dismantling, a minus $59 million; departmental administration, we have reduced that by $149 million, $37 million more than the Department proposed when they suggested $122 million should be saved at the administrative level of the Department.

We have made some difficult decisions in the nondefense activities. While we have reduced popular programs such as solar and renewables, we have held the line on fusion, high-energy physics, nuclear physics, and biological and environmental research, all very, very important functions for our Nation's future.

There are many who are not even aware that these are taking place within the Department of Energy, but they are, and they are programs that contribute mightily to America's basic science and to the future of our Nation. I am very hopeful that we can fund them adequately as we come out of conference with the House, although I must say that the allocation of resources to the House subcommittee, both for nondefense and for defense activities, is substantially lower than the Senate's. In fact the sum total by which it is lower than ours is almost $1 billion—$900 million. A little over $200 million of that is nondefense work and about $700 million is DOE defense work.

Since we have a firewall, we cannot move the money back and forth in this bill between the defense allocation and the nondefense allocation. So some might want to offer an amendment to take something out of defense and put it in domestic. They should know that is subject to a point of order and will require 60 votes because it violates what the U.S. Senate has agreed for this year as a firewall between defense spending and domestic.

I could go on with a few more discussions of what we are doing here, but let me just talk a minute further about the water resources projects.

Frankly, the U.S. Senate should know that for all that is being said by some in America that we should not be engaged in so many projects of flood protection and Bureau of Reclamation-type activities, the Senators and the States they represent seem to indicate with a very loud voice that they need these projects. We received hundreds of requests either to start projects or to put more money in projects that we have for these two online agencies of the U.S. Government.

The Corps of Engineers, in its civil works program, has a budget authority in this bill of $3,455,623,000, as I indicated, an increase of $89 million.

Title II of the bill funds activities associated with the Department of the Interior's Bureau of Reclamation and the central Utah completion project. Total funding recommended for these activities is $852,788,000. This is a reduction of a little over a half a million dollars from the enacted level and about $8,900,000 above the budget request.

We still have a number of requests in both title I and title 2 with which we have been unable to comply. I must say to Senators, consistent with a starting rule, that we will have no new starts. We have done our very best to be fair and equitable and I believe satisfied many of the requests.

I do not say that Senators request and we grant them their requests. These are projects that go through the professionals in the Department and actually are confirmed to us by them as being worthwhile and the kind of things we ought to be doing.

Obviously, there is much more I could speak about of an exciting nature that is going on in the science and research part of the Department of Energy. I have just touched the surface of it, but if there are amendments that address any of these projects or programs, we will spend additional time with the Senate explaining why we think the levels of funding in this bill are appropriate and the activities that we have recommended be funded are in the best interest of the United States.

As my ranking member and former chairman said, a lot of this bill is investment, either investment in the water ports of this Nation or the infrastructure of water projects, reclamation projects, flood protection projects and a lot of it is an investment in the Department of Energy, for when you invest in nuclear physics, when you invest in the highest science around to determine what the atom is all about and what the physics of that is, you are investing in the future of mankind and certainly in America's future.

These kinds of funds do not stay in the Department, nor do they go exclusively to laboratories. Much of it goes to the great universities and science activities going on in this country.

So I am very proud of the bill. Let me repeat, many Senators have stopped me on the floor and wanted to know if we are going to vote today.

The answer is, there is a way that we will not have any votes, and that is if Senators will cooperate, as they have been, and tell us whether they have amendments. If they have amendments, we want to list them, and then we will be here part of today to accept any of them that Senators want to offer. Then we will ask in a consent request that on Monday, there also be an opportunity for further offering of those amendments that we have agreed to, with votes on Tuesday, is what I understand on this bill. There may be other votes on Monday, but on this bill, I assume that is going to be the scenario.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. COATS. 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. COATS. Mr. President, I came to the Senate in January 1989. I was not here very long before I realized our State was facing a very difficult problem with the sudden surge of the importation of out-of-State waste. Our capacity to dispose of our own waste was quickly being filled to overflowing, and action needed to be taken.

The State of Indiana Legislature has taken a number of steps to attempt to limit this flow of unwanted waste coming from other States. Yet, each one of their attempts was met by a court challenge, and a challenge that was successful in that it said we were violative of the interstate commerce clause of the Constitution.

In reviewing the court opinions on that subject, we discovered the court said if the Congress specifically and affirmatively grants States the authority to regulate its flow of out-of-State waste, then it would meet constitutional muster. So, I then proceeded to offer legislation on that subject to find a solution to not only our problem but a number of importing States' problems throughout the country.

That was a contentious issue at the time, and it was tied up in filibuster and a whole number of procedural delays. We persisted, and in September of 1990, a modified version of my original amendment passed the Senate by a vote of 67 to 31, as an amendment to the District of Columbia appropriations bill. It was not a partisan issue. It was a bipartisan issue—Democrats and Republicans joined together to pass this legislation.

Unfortunately, in the conference on the appropriations bill in 1990 in October, just before we adjourned for the elections, that provision was stripped. That was the 101st Congress.

In the 102d Congress, early on in that Congress, March of 1992, I introduced new legislation which, after some considerable debate and maneuvering, we managed to pass by an even more overwhelming vote. I was joined by the Senator from Montana in that effort. He was very helpful in allowing us to move forward on that legislation. It passed the Senate in July of 1992 by a vote of 89 to 2. We had addressed a number of the objections that were raised in the original legislation, States that had particular and peculiar problems, and we even worked with the exporting States that were putting the waste into play on an international basis, and satisfied a number of their demands.

In other words, we achieved a balance, a balance between the legitimate needs of those States that found State waste overwhelming their own environmental plans to adequately dispose of their own waste to protect their environment, and we addressed the needs of the exporting States who needed some time to ratchet down their exports, out-of-State exports, and deal with their waste on an intrastate basis. That accommodation resulted, as I said, in that vote in 1992. The support from the Senator from Montana was critical to that success.

Unfortunately, the House failed to act on that legislation, which brought us to the 103d Congress. In February 1993, I again introduced the interstate waste bill, and after considerable negotiations and work, we passed that bill in the Senate, the Coats-Baucus bill, in September 1994. In October, it passed the House and came to the waning days of the 103d Congress, and because of procedural reasons we needed unanimous consent to proceed with that. We moved the legislation through the House, through some very difficult negotiations, got 435 Members of the House to agree to that, and we got 99 Members of the U.S. Senate to agree. Unfortunately, we could not get that last vote. Because we needed all 100 and needed unanimous consent to proceed to the legislation, it failed.

Then the 104th Congress came, and in March 1995 I reintroduced the legislation. In May, on May 16, 1995, on my birthday—I do not think it was a birthday present from the Senate to me, but it happened to fall on that particular date—the Senate passed that new legislation by a vote of 94 to 6. The House subsequently has done nothing.

Now, I am hoping that Members will detect there is a pattern here, that there is a pattern that this issue is not going to go away, and that I will keep introducing that as long as I have voice to speak and the good people of Indiana choose to send me back to the U.S. Senate. This is an issue that is not only important to my State, the people who I represent, but it is important to the Nation.

Given the votes that we have had here in the Senate, a lot of people are wondering, why can't we finalize this? We cannot finalize it now because the House refused to act on it for a number of reasons.

We are not going to give up. The pattern is we will just keep coming back and back and back and back and back until this issue is resolved and we strike the necessary legislation and put it into law, giving States control over their own borders.

The legislation before the Senate is a bipartisan effort. I am being joined this morning by Senator LEVIN from Michigan, another importing State. I know a number of other Senators here have a vested interest in this issue, and whether they need to come to the floor to discuss this or not, I am not sure. I am confident we can move forward. But, again, we want to make the point that this legislation is not going to go away. My effort is not going to go away. We are going to persist with this until we finalize this.

This is an amendment, with due respect to the chairman and the ranking member of the Energy and Water Appropriations Subcommittee, this is an effort to try to attach it to somewhat relevant legislation so that we can get it into conference and hopefully convince the conferees that this strongly bipartisan, strongly supported effort, after literally years of intense negotiations—with importing States, exporting States, all involved; waste haulers, all involved—we have reached a reasonable agreement that ought to be enacted into law.

I am offering it this morning along with my colleague from Michigan, Senator LEVIN. We do strike an appropriate balance. What we are offering today is exactly the same legislation that the Senate has voted on in this Congress and passed by a vote of 94 to 6. In the interests of time and in the interests of Senators who I know are trying to make plans to travel back to their States for this weekend, and to move this appropriations bill forward, I am going to limit my remarks to this, unless I need to respond to questions or opposition raised on this particular legislation.

I thank the chairman for his tolerance and willingness and his support in this effort to, once again, move this legislation. I yield the floor.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I know Senator LEVIN wants to speak to this very important legislation.

Mr. COATS. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOMENICI. I am happy to yield to the Senator.

AMENDMENT NO. 5092

(Purpose: To provide authority for States to limit the interstate transportation of municipal solid waste)

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, I send the amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. COATS], for himself and Mr. LEVIN, proposes an amendment numbered 5092.

(The text of the amendment is printed in today's RECORD under ''Amendments Submitted.'')

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I think we are willing to accept it.

Mr. DOMENICI. I believe we are willing to accept it. That is what I told the Senator.

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, I will withhold that request at this time.

Mr. DOMENICI. We will have to talk about it. We are working on the premise that if we get all the Senators to agree to the amendments on a list, there would be no votes today. We would like very much to see if we can get that worked out.

That would not preclude the Senator from having a yea and nay vote on Tuesday, although I recommend that he not do that. We are not taking anything away.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator withdraw the request for the yeas and nays?

Mr. COATS. I temporarily withdraw that request.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, once again, I want to say publicly what I told the distinguished Senator from Indiana. We are willing to accept this amendment and take it to conference. It is obvious that, at one time or another, legislation like this has received almost the unanimous support of Congress. Because of that, we will take it.

I want to say to Senators one more time—not those here, but Senators and staff in their offices—who are concerned about what is going to happen for the rest of today, Monday, and Tuesday. We are asking each office to tell us if they have amendments to this bill. We are making some real headway. There are a few offices we have not been able to work this out with. But it is important to get that done. That will define the schedule for the remainder of the day.

I yield the floor.

Mr. LEVIN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan is recognized.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I am pleased to cosponsor the amendment of the Senator from Indiana. He has worked on it so long and hard, and so many other Members of this body, particularly Senator BAUCUS of Montana, the Senators from Louisiana, and so many others, to finally give States and local government some control over the flow of waste both into their jurisdictions and out of their jurisdictions.

The Senate has expressed its will on this issue over and over again—most recently, in May of last year by an overwhelming vote of 94 to 6. The Senator from Indiana has gone through the number of times that the Senate has expressed its will. He has gone through the number of ways in which the vast majority of House Members have expressed their will on this matter in support of this legislation, made necessary by a Supreme Court decision which said it is up to Congress to decide whether or not it wants to give these powers to the State and local governments.

Now, Michigan, my State, my counties, and my townships have plans for waste disposal. They have invested in it. They spent a lot of time with these investments and a lot of money on these investments to dispose of their waste locally. Those plans and those investments are totally disrupted when contracts are entered into without consideration by State, county, or local government of the impact of those contracts for importing waste into those areas, because when you import waste in that way, without consideration of plans, and without consideration of the efforts that local governments have made to dispose of their own waste, it totally disrupts those efforts and those expenditures. It is not right.

States and local governments have a right to do that planning and to make those investments in order to dispose of their own waste and not see their own plans displaced by the import of waste from other places, based on contracts between haulers and those other places.

Our local people should not be dumped on any longer. They should have some control over their own jurisdictions, and over their own land. That is what this issue is really all about. And so I want to commend all the Senators who have been involved in this effort for so many years. It has been truly a bipartisan effort all along. It will continue to be that. It will continue to be made until we finally not just get a bill passed in the Senate, which we have done over and over again, but get the same bill passed by the Senate and the House. And this effort to adopt this amendment on this particular appropriations bill is another statement to the House that we expect action this year.

Here we are with, perhaps, 30 legislative days left in this session. Last year the Senate expressed itself. I, on at least one occasion, have stood up saying I was going to offer this kind of amendment, and have been dissuaded from doing so based on the assurance that there would be efforts made to get the House to act. The House has not acted. There are a few people there who oppose it, who have been able to displace the will of what appears to be a clear majority of House Members.

It is simply time that we again express ourselves as a Senate on this issue, not just speaking into the ether, but speaking directly to the House and saying we are very serious that we want this bill—at least we want consideration of both parts of this bill by the House this year, on both the questions of interstate waste coming into a State and the question of flow control of waste from a State. Both of those subjects are covered in this bill in a balanced way, as the Senator from Indiana has said, in consideration of both importing and exporting States.

Before I yield the floor, I simply again want to thank my good friend from Indiana, and particularly single out the Senator from Montana, who, for so many years, has fought this battle. It will be essential not just to his State, my State, Indiana, Louisiana, and other States, but to all of our States that we finally have some control over our own land, over our own plans, over our own investment for waste disposal. The Senators from Indiana and Montana have been leaders in that effort.

Mr. JOHNSTON. If the Senator will yield. Mr. President, I cosponsored a bill on this subject matter filed by my colleague, Senator BREAUX, a few years ago. Does this differ in any way from that?

Mr. LEVIN. I wonder if I could ask my friend from Indiana, I understand this bill is precisely the same as S. 534, which passed in May 1995 by a vote of 94 to 6, and that that bill is this amendment. That is my understanding.

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, the Senator is correct. The amendment we are offering today is identical, word-for-word, to the legislation that passed this body earlier in this session of Congress.

Mr. JOHNSTON. That was this session?

Mr. COATS. Yes, it was. I can give you the exact date.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Is it the same as we had a few years ago?

Mr. COATS. It has been modified from the original legislation. We have addressed some of the concerns of the exporting States and struck a balance between the timetables, in terms of their ratcheting down the exports, and we made some adjustments on the importing State side. We allow, for instance, local jurisdictions to enter into what are called host agreements. We do not upset those agreements. We don't want to breach any contractual obligations already entered into. We have added flow control language to address that particular issue, also. This is identical to what we passed in 1995 in this Congress.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Well, Mr. President, I commend the Senators for proposing this legislation. Being one of these recipient States of this waste, who has never been able to control this situation, I commend them for coming up with a solution that I believe will work. Of course, the minority will enthusiastically accept the amendment.

Mr. DOMENICI addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico is recognized.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I don't want the sponsors to have any concern about whether the Senator from New Mexico favors this when we go to conference. I favor it 100 percent.

We were a State that was at least threatened with all kinds of external dumping of garbage in our State. We talk about solid waste, but this is not nuclear waste. This is essentially garbage with maybe a little frill on the edges.

So I will take the bill. I want the Senator to know I will take it. I will take it and try to keep it. I think we ought to pass it. Whether our bill gets to the President and gets signed, we

may have that confronting us. We are going to do our share of trying to keep it in conference.

Mr. COATS. If the Senator will yield, I am fully aware of the perils and pitfalls of moving appropriations bills to the executive branch and having the President sign them. I know that is not directly related, although I think it is indirectly related to energy and water.

I appreciate the commitment from the Senator from New Mexico in doing his very best to see if we can add this in an appropriations bill and get it accepted in conference.

As I said, this is not a partisan issue. The President has already indicated that he would sign this particular provision. So this will not be a deal breaker.

If I can get the commitment from the Senator from New Mexico and the Senator from Louisiana that they will fight for this effort in conference and do their best to reflect the Senate position on this, in deference to my colleagues, who I know are seeking to catch planes and wrap up the session, if there are no other votes ordered on this legislation, I will not be the one to scuttle the picnic here. So I will make that commitment to the Senator.

Mr. DOMENICI. I want to make one additional point. I have just received word that Senator CHAFEE wants to come down and speak on the measure. I think it is quite appropriate. He is chairman of the subcommittee of original jurisdiction. We did not intend to vote or accept this in the next few minutes anyway. So if Senator CHAFEE wants to speak, we urge that he come down as soon as he can.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I am happy the Senator from Indiana offered this amendment. He has been committed, including the Presiding Officer, for many years to trying to get this passed.

There has been a development which makes this legislation more imminent. Recently, the city of New York announced that it is going to close its Fresh Kills landfill. Fresh Kills landfill is probably the biggest landfill in this country. They receive 13,000 tons of garbage a day at Fresh Kills landfill in New York. That amounts to 1,200 trucks a day of garbage dumped at the Fresh Kills landfill. That is going to be closed. It will be closed in 2 years. I think it will be phased out ultimately by the year 2001.

That is a problem. It is a problem for a lot of so-called importing States, States that receive other States' garbage. It is a problem because States are having a very difficult time enacting laws providing for incinerators. People do not want incinerators to burn garbage.

This is a major proposal in the State of New York for the State of New York to build a major incinerator in Brooklyn. It has been turned down. It is the old not-in-my-backyard syndrome. Nobody wants an incinerator in their backyard.

So incinerators are not getting anywhere, which means that New York has a problem. New York City has a big problem with Fresh Kills closed. Where is all that garbage going to be, 13,000 tons, 1,200 trucks a day?

That is just an example of the problem that we face.

I might say that my State is typical; that is, Montana has wide open spaces. A lot of folks from the East think that is a good place to dump garbage. ''Let's dump it out in the West. They have wide open space out there.''

Regrettably, a major entrepreneur in an Eastern State decided that he wanted to open up a big landfill in Miles City, MT. We in Montana do not want this big landfill in Miles City. He was able to cut a deal with a couple of folks in Miles City to build this landfill, whereas the vast majority do not want this landfill in Montana. The State of Montana could not pass legislation prohibiting this, could not pass legislation limiting the dumping of out-of-State garbage in our own State. Why? Because the Supreme Court says the States cannot do that. It is in violation of the commerce clause of the Constitution.

Very simply, this is a very basic proposal. Basically, we are saying that by the passage of this legislation, with some modifications, the States have the right to say no. They have a right to say no to the shipment of out-of-State garbage being dumped in their State.

We talk a lot around here about local control. We talk a lot around here, ''Gee, let States decide their own destiny, and let local communities decide their own destiny.'' This legislation will allow States to do that. They will be able to say no to the dumping of out-of-State garbage in their own States.

I hope that the House conferees take this provision. It is going to be difficult.

I very much appreciate the statement of the manager of the bill, the chairman of the Budget Committee, Senator DOMENICI, as well as its ranking member of the subcommittee, Senator JOHNSTON, that they will push for this amendment in conference. The trouble is that the House has not looked very favorably on this legislation recently. It is basically because of who is on what committee over in the House and what States are exporting States. It is a problem.

But I urge our Senate conferees to be very vigorous in pushing this amendment in conference, because then, finally, we are going to get this thing enacted.

I can tell you that there are a lot of people in our country who very much want to control their own destiny in a lot of ways, and one way is to be able to say no to the shipment of out-of-State garbage. I have been working with Senator COATS on this for years.

When the Democrats were in the majority, I had the subcommittee that got this legislation passed a couple of years ago. This is very similar to that legislation, this proposal before us.

I very strongly commend the Senator from Indiana for his very, very deep dedication to this issue. I hope we can finally get it passed.

I yield the floor.

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, I would like to add as original cosponsors to the bill Senator SPECTER, Senator BAUCUS, and Senator MCCONNELL.

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

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I am pleased to be an original cosponsor of this amendment that will get a grip on the serious problem of interstate waste. I am also pleased to be working again with Senator COATS on an issue that affects both our States—the unchecked flow of interstate waste.

As you and many of my colleagues are aware, out-of-State waste creates problems for States that are unable to control the amount of trash that is sent across the border for disposal. This imported waste takes up landfill space, which complicates State and local waste planning and requires States to devote valuable resources to the problem other States have neglected. Scarce landfill space in Kentucky should be allocated for Kentuckians, not trash from hundreds of miles away.

During my tenure in this Senate, I have committed myself to resolving this issue and ensuring that Kentucky doesn't become a dumping ground to out-of-State waste. In 1990, and every year since, I have introduced legislation or worked with Senator COATS in crafting language that has ultimately led to the compromise legislation that came so close to passing last year.

In 1990, I introduced S. 2691, a bill to give States the ability to fight long-haul dumping by charging higher fees for disposal of waste coming from other States. This bill passed the Senate with 68 votes.

During the 102d Congress, I introduced S. 197 to once again provide States the authority to impose a fee differential for out-of-State waste. In 1992, Senator COATS and I joined forces and produced comprehensive legislation to provide States the authority to regulate waste. That same year, the Senate passed an interstate waste bill by an overwhelming vote of 88 to 2. Unfortunately, the bill died in the House.

During the 103d Congress, I joined with Senators COATS and BOREN in introducing S. 439. Although the Senate didn't act until late in the session, Congress came extremely close to passing an interstate waste bill. Again, the House stalled long enough to effectively kill the bill on the last day of the session.

Last year, the Senate passed a waste bill, S. 543 which passed 94 to 6. This legislation is a fair proposal that gives communities control of not only their own waste streams, but the flow of trash from other States, it will protect

importing States like Kentucky and Indiana from becoming garbage colonies for States who aren't willing to deal with their own waste problems.

Mr. President, this issue has recently come to the forefront of national news with the announcement of the closure of Fresh Kills landfill in New York. This 3,000-acre monstrosity located on Staten Island receives 26 million pounds of garbage daily. The 48-year-old landfill, known as the world's largest garbage dump, is so enormous that it can actually be seen by orbiting astronauts.

Closure of this facility will necessitate an astounding outflow of garbage from New York City that will be absorbed by States as far away as Kentucky. I, for one, refuse to stand by and allow Kentucky to become a garbage colony.

Unfortunately, the House has absolutely stalled on this issue. Hopefully, with the inclusion of the Coats amendment, interstate waste problems will finally be addressed during a conference with the House of Representatives.

Mr. ROBB. Mr. President, I rise today in support of the interstate waste amendment offered by the Senator from Indiana.

Last Congress, I introduced legislation to give localities the opportunity to restrict the flow of interstate waste into landfills in their communities. In my view, it is essential that local governments be given the authority they need to determine for themselves whether to accept out-of-State waste. I am pleased that S. 534, the legislation which passed the Senate overwhelmingly last year, contained provisions that will help protect communities from being inundated with unwanted garbage generated out-of-State and provide localities with some leverage to deal with landfill developers who seek to dispose of out-of-State trash.

The pending amendment—identical to the one we passed last year—deserves the support of all Members. In my view, it strikes the appropriate balance between importing States and exporting States, and solves a problem which has persisted for too many years. Because this issue deals with interstate commerce, only Congress has the authority to resolve the problem of unwanted out-of-State garbage, as the Senators from Indiana, Michigan, and Montana have discussed. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to reaffirm our support for this legislation, and make passage of this bill a priority during the remainder of this session.

With that, Mr. President, I thank my colleagues and yield the floor.

Mr. COATS. I yield the floor, Mr. President. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BAUCUS. 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. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I see the chairman of the committee and the ranking member on the floor. I mentioned earlier that I very much appreciate the statements by them, if they will urge the House to adopt this amendment.

Might I ask the chairman of the committee, along with the ranking Member, if they will, in pushing this, consult with the chairman of our committee, Senator CHAFEE, as well as the ranking member as you work with the House in attempting to persuade them to adopt the amendment. As we all know, there might be give and take and some modifications. I very much hope that the managers would consult the managers of the authorizing committee.

Mr. DOMENICI. Let me respond. This is not just a Republican bill. So I would say for the Record that we will consult not only with the chairman, but we will consult with the ranking member of the committee of jurisdiction as it moves its way through.

Mr. BAUCUS. I appreciate that. I thank the Senator.

I yield the floor. 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.

FEMALE GENITAL MUTILATION

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I would like to take this opportunity to commend the managers of the bill we passed this morning, the foreign operations appropriations bill. In that measure, one of the amendments accepted by the managers deals with a subject that I have spent many months of my legislative career on. It is an issue that has become easier to talk about, by this Senator, but not easy to talk about. I have spoken a number of times about the issue of female genital mutilation.

I was of course struck last week, Mr. President, when again I read in the Washington Post, and the same article appeared in newspapers around the country, that another young girl died as a result of this barbaric practice. This death occurred in Egypt, an 11-year-old girl.

Mr. President, these brutal, vicious practices take place all over the world. These practices leading to death are not reported often, even though deaths occur frequently. In this instance, the one in the Washington Post last week, the Associated Press:

> An 11-year-old girl bled to death after a botched circumcision performed by a village barber, police officials said today.
>
> The officials said the child, whose name was given only as Sara, died Friday in a Cairo hospital after doctors were unable to stem bleeding.
>
> The girl's clitoris was removed, in line with custom, by a barber in a village in the Nile Delta the day before, when several girls were circumcised during a village celebration. . . .
>
> The government has sought to end female circumcision . . . a ritual aimed at keeping women clean and chaste. It has banned the practice from state medical facilities.

Mr. President, what is this practice that is sweeping the country? It is something that has been in existence for a long time. FGM is the cutting away of female genitals and then sewing up the opening, leaving, many times, only a small hole for urine and menstrual flow. It is performed on children, but it is also performed on girls, and it is also performed on young women, up to age 22 or 23 years old. The initial operation, as indicated in this news article, leads to many health complications, complications that plague these young women most of their lives, if they are fortunate enough to survive the initial cut.

The immediate health risks are not over after a couple of months or even a couple of years after the operation. During childbirth, additional cutting and stitching takes place with each birth, and all this recutting and stitching creates scar tissue and emotional scars that are not seen.

There is no medical reason for this procedure. It is used as a method to keep girls chaste and to ensure their virginity until marriage, and to ensure that after marriage they do not engage in extramarital sex.

In September 1994, I introduced a sense-of-the-Senate resolution condemning this cruel practice and committed at that time to inform my colleagues and the country about this practice. This sense-of-the-Senate resolution was passed. A month later, I introduced a bill to make this procedure illegal in the United States, and called upon the Secretary of Health and Human Services to identify and compile data on immigrant communities that have brought this practice to the United States. I have been joined in this effort by the junior Senator from Illinois, CAROL MOSELEY-BRAUN, and the senior Senator from Minnesota, Senator WELLSTONE. I am happy to report my legislation directing the Secretary of Health and Human Services was passed this year in the omnibus appropriations bill. Another amendment which criminalized FGM in the United States is still pending in the immigration bill.

Mr. President, this barbaric practice is now being conducted in the United States because of the inflow of people from around the world. We have had a report in one California community where there were seven of these practices committed on young women. I hope the conferees working on the immigration bill are allowed to proceed and get this very important bill ironed out, and this provision I direct the Senate's attention to.