

Trustees acting in an advisory capacity and comprising five members with wide experience in the field of human rights. The members serve in their personal capacity and are appointed by the Secretary-General for a renewable three-year term of office on the basis of equitable geographical distribution. Currently, members of the Board of Trustees are Jaap Walkate, Chairman, from The Netherlands; Ribot Hatano from Japan; Elisabeth Odio-Benito from Costa Rica; Ivan Tosevsky from the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia; and Amos Wako from Kenya.

The inadequacy of available resources is a limiting factor in the field of assistance of victims; as a consequence, programmes of assistance are subjected to interruptions. For some 100 organisations the support of the United Nations Voluntary Fund remains essential.

#### HOW DOES THE VOLUNTARY FUND WORK?

The Fund receives projects which focus on providing medical, psychological, economic, social and legal assistance to victims of torture and to members of their families. A few projects also share the objective of organizing training seminars for health professionals specialized in the treatment of torture victims.

Each May, the Board of Trustees makes recommendations on grants to the High Commissioner for Human Rights. Subsequently, in the following month, on the basis of those recommendations, the High Commissioner takes decisions on behalf of the Secretary-General. As a final step, grants are made available at the end of July.

From 1983 to July 1997, the Fund has financed 255 projects for direct assistance to torture victims. From US\$ 2.5 to US\$ 3 million of voluntary contributions received from about 30 Governments and a few individuals are disbursed every year to projects in some 60 countries representative of all the regions of the world. Further information on the activities of the Voluntary Fund can be found in the latest annual reports of the Secretary-General to the General Assembly (UN document A/52/387) and to the Commission on Human Rights (UN documents E/CN.4/1998/37 and Add.1).

	Grants requested (US\$)	Grants awarded (US\$)	Percent granted	Additional amount required (US\$)
1997 .....	6,800,000	1,036,054	44.64	3,765,946
1996 .....	5,618,645	2,535,500	45.1	3,083,145
1995 .....	5,827,645	2,719,680	46.6	3,107,965
1994 .....	5,476,959	3,698,080	67.5	1,778,879
1993 .....	5,289,413	2,111,880	39.9	3,177,533

<sup>1</sup> Each year, the grants awarded correspond to the total amounts which the Board of Trustees is able to recommend to the Secretary-General for allocation. In view of the insufficient contributions received, the Board avoids the practice of carrying forward a reserve from one year to the next. The Secretary-General follows this recommendation by the Board.

As at 30 November 1997 only US\$ 1,174,499 has been paid into the Fund. Provided that the number of grant requested is maintained at the 1997 level, the Fund will need an additional amount of US\$ 5.6 million to meet all requests.

#### SOME PROJECTS RECENTLY SUBMITTED

Torture involves not only physical but also psychological forms, sometimes with long-term sequelae: in this regard, the Fund is supporting a project whose objective is to provide global assistance to formerly disappeared children of victims of torture in Latin America. The organization identifies disappeared children as those born in detention, abducted by security forces and illegally adopted. Once located by the organization, the children may be returned to their biological families. The best interests of the child have to be taken into consideration. This project consists of two main parts: investigation—some 1,030 interviews were carried out in the past year in conjunction with blood tests and analyses of genetic data—and psychological support provided to some 431 persons during 1996. Most of these persons

suffer from sequelae of post-traumatic stress disorder including anxiety, nightmares, depression, as well as affective and intellectual inhibitions and benefit from individual psychotherapy. The number of youths seeking assistance remains high while many children have yet to be found: to date, 172 children still need to be located and 6 who were found have yet to be returned to their biological families.

Another project which was being implemented in Asia in 1996 focused on providing physical and mental relief to torture survivors and their families. Firstly, fact-finding missions on the incidence of torture were carried out establishing that people had been subjected to torture by the police and other law enforcement agencies: this involved methods such as beatings all over the body, kicking them with police boots, applying electric shocks, scalding them with hot water, suspending them by the legs from roofs and inflicting them with bullet injuries. Long-term consequences, apart from obvious physical complaints, were psychological and included phobia, depression, sexual problems and mental disorders. The more commonly occurring complaints were social maladjustments at work, in the family and society in general, through the overall loss of social dignity and a departure from social values. In 1995, 263 victims between 15 and 45 years of age received treatment. The drug therapy included prescription of antipsychotics, physiotherapy as well as psychotherapeutic assistance. Parallel to the main objective of providing physical and mental relief to the victims, the Care Center organized other activities such as seminars on torture for health professionals, missions in collaboration with the national Human Rights Commission in order to establish contact with victims, encourage them to visit the Care Center and prepare a report for submission to governmental authorities asking for justice. The organization also established a legal division which has already successfully assisted in five cases.

In North America, a treatment centre is currently providing clinical services to victims of torture who are now refugees, mainly from Africa and the Caribbean. 167 persons were assisted who had been subjected to rape, electric shocks, deprivation of human needs, as well as being obliged to eat excrement or perform acts of violence or murder often targeting their own family members. The treatment provided ranges from psychiatric and medical examination, to treatment in the form of crisis intervention and support counselling, psychotherapy, physiotherapy, social service, education, medical referrals, social support interpreters and legal assistance. In 1996, the center also established a children's art therapy branch as a medium for treating anxiety and dysfunctions related to traumatic experiences which children were unable to express verbally in the family setting.

The Commission on Human Rights, by its resolution 1997/38 of 11 April 1997, requested that the General Assembly proclaim 26 June a United Nations international day in support of the victims of torture and appealed to all Governments, organizations and individuals in a position to do so to contribute annually to the Fund.●

#### 1998 APRIL QUARTERLY REPORTS

The mailing and filing date of the April Quarterly Report required by the Federal Election Campaign Act, as amended, is Wednesday, April 15, 1998. All Principal Campaign Committees supporting Senate candidates in the

1998 races must file their reports with the Senate Office of Public Records, 232 Hart Building, Washington, D.C. 20510-7116. You may wish to advise your campaign committee personnel of this requirement.

The Public Records office will be open from 9:00 a.m. until 7:00 p.m. on April 15th, to receive these filings. For further information, please do not hesitate to contact the Office of Public Records on (202) 224-0322.

#### REGISTRATION OF MASS MAILINGS

The filing date for 1998 first quarter mass mailings is April 27, 1998. If your office did no mass mailings during this period, please submit a form that states "none."

Mass mailing registrations, or negative reports, should be submitted to the Senate Office of Public Records, 232 Hart Building, Washington, D.C. 20510-7116.

The Public Records office will be open from 8:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. on the filing date to accept these filings. For further information, please contact the Public Records office on (202) 224-0322.

#### REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY—TREATY DOCUMENT NO. 105-39

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, as in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that the injunction of secrecy be removed from the following treaty transmitted to the Senate on April 1, 1998, by the President of the United States: Inter-American Convention Against Corruption (Treaty Document No. 105-39).

I further ask that the treaty be considered as having been read the first time; that it be referred, with accompanying papers, to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed; and that the President's message be printed in the RECORD.

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

The message of the President is as follows:

#### To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith the Inter-American Convention Against Corruption ("the Convention"), adopted and opened for signature at the Specialized Conference of the Organization of American States (OAS) at Caracas, Venezuela, on March 29, 1996. The Convention was signed by the United States on June 27, 1996, at the twenty-seventh regular session of the OAS General Assembly meeting in Panama City, Panama. In addition, for the information of the Senate, I transmit the report of the Department of State with respect to the Convention.

The Convention was the first multilateral Convention of its kind in the

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