

world to be adopted. The provisions of the Convention are explained in the accompanying report of the Department of State. The report also sets forth proposed understandings that would be deposited by the United States with its instrument of ratification. The Convention will not require implementing legislation for the United States.

The Convention should be an effective tool to assist in the hemispheric effort to combat corruption, and could also enhance the law enforcement efforts of the States Parties in other areas, given the links that often exist between corruption and organized criminal activity such as drug trafficking. The Convention provides for a broad range of cooperation, including extradition, mutual legal assistance, and measures regarding property, in relation to the acts of corruption described in the Convention.

The Convention also imposes on the States Parties an obligation to criminalize acts of corruption if they have not already done so. Especially noteworthy is the obligation to criminalize the bribery of foreign government officials. This provision was included in the Convention at the behest of the United States negotiating delegation. In recent years, the United States Government has sought in a number of multilateral fora to persuade other governments to adopt legislation akin to the U.S. Foreign Corrupt Practices Act. This Convention represents a significant breakthrough on that front and should lend impetus to similar measures in other multilateral groups.

I recommend that the Senate give early and favorable consideration to the Convention, and that it give its advice and consent to ratification, subject to the understandings described in the accompanying report to the Department of State.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, April 1, 1998.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREE- MENT—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. DOMENICI. Further as in executive session, I ask unanimous consent at 9 a.m. on Thursday, April 2, the Senate proceed to executive session and immediate vote on Cal. No. 461, the nomination of G. Patrick Murphy to be U.S. District Judge for the Southern District of Illinois. I further ask consent immediately following that vote, the Senate proceed to a vote on the confirmation of Cal. No. 462, Michael P. McCuskey to be U.S. District Judge for the Central District of Illinois. I finally ask consent following these votes the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action the Senate then return to legislative session.

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

TEXAS LOW-LEVEL RADIOACTIVE WASTE DISPOSAL COMPACT CON- SENT ACT

Mr. DOMENICI. This is with reference to H.R. 629. I ask unanimous

consent that the Senate now proceed to consideration of Calendar No. 197, H.R. 629.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 629) to grant the consent of Congress to the Texas Low-Level Radioactive Waste Disposal Compact.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

AMENDMENT NO. 2276

(Purpose: To provide a substitute amendment)

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, Senator SNOWE has a substitute amendment at the desk. I ask for its consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. DOMENICI], for Ms. SNOWE, proposes an amendment numbered 2276.

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

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. President, I rise today in strong support of HR 629, the Texas Compact Consent Act of 1997, which addresses the disposal of low-level radioactive nuclear waste for Maine, Vermont and Texas—and to thank the cosponsors of this bill: Senators COLLINS, LEAHY, and JEFFORDS, as well as Senators HUTCHISON and GRAMM of Texas for their invaluable assistance and support.

In 1980, Congress told the states to form compacts to solve their low-level waste disposal problems. Subsequently, Congress authorized a means of establishing these compacts without violating the Interstate Commerce Clause of the U.S. Constitution.

As you can see from the chart behind me, 41 states have now joined together to form nine different compacts across the country. Forty-one states. The compact before us today will simply add three more states to the nation's compact network, and carry out what these 41 other states have already been allowed to do.

As the law requires, Texas, Vermont and Maine have negotiated an agreement that was approved by each state: in the Texas Senate by a vote of 28 to zero, and voice voted in the House; in Vermont, the bill was also voice voted by large margins in both bodies.

In Maine, the Senate voted 26 to 3 to pass the compact; in the House, 131 to 6. In addition, 73 percent of the people in a state-wide referendum approved the Compact. All three Governors signed the bill. And, last October 7th, the House passed the Texas Compact by an overwhelming vote of 309 to 107. Decisive victories on all counts, and by any measure.

So, we have before us a Compact that has been carefully crafted and thoroughly examined by the state governments and people of all three states in-

involved. Now all that is required is the approval of Congress, so that the State of Texas and the other Texas Compact members will be able to exercise appropriate control over the waste that will come into the Texas facility.

Let me be clear: the law never intended for Congress to determine who pays what, how the storage is allocated, and where the site is located. To the contrary: the intent of the law is for states to develop and approve these details, and for Congress to ratify the plan. A quick review of history bears this out—for the nine compacts that have been consented to by the United States Congress, not one of them was amended. Not one of them.

It is very important for my colleagues to know that the language ratified by each state for this Compact is exactly the same language, and if any change is made by Congress, the Compact would have to be once again returned to each state for reratification.

And let me take this opportunity to clear up some other misconceptions about this compact, which are being used by our opponents to cast discredit on this legislation.

The Compact before us does not discuss any particular site for the disposal facility. Let me repeat that—this bill has nothing to do with the location of a facility in Texas, as some would have us believe. It only says that Texas must develop a facility in a timely manner, consistent with all applicable state and federal environmental, health, and public safety laws.

This is being done. The Texas Office State Office of Administrative Hearings is presently conducting several evidentiary hearings at various locations all around the state of Texas to evaluate a proposed site. All voices are being heard, and the state of Texas will decide, as it should.

Opponents of the Texas Compact would have you believe that should we ratify this Compact it will open the doors for other states to dump nuclear waste at a site, in the desert, located five miles from the town of Sierra Blanca, exposing a predominantly low-income, minority community to health and environmental threats.

The truth is that Texas has been planning to build a facility for its own waste since 1981, long before Maine first proposed a Compact with Texas. That is because whether or not this Compact passes, Texas still must somehow take care of the waste it produces.

Further, absent the protection of this Compact, Texas must, I repeat must, open their borders to any other state for waste disposal or they will be in violation of the Interstate Commerce Clause of the U.S. Constitution. The Compact gives Texas the protection that oversight commissioners, mostly appointed by the elected Governor of