

the part of one of the parties, that finding these witnesses is a Republican problem, that grants of immunity to minor participants will not be approved. How markedly, how strikingly this contrasts with the investigation of Watergate, with Iran-Contra, in which the party whose actions were being investigated cooperated fully in attempting to determine the truth of these allegations.

As we all recognize the vital importance of free and open and fair elections conducted in accordance with the rules, so, it seems to me, we must all recognize the importance of determining whether or not there were serious violations of those existing laws, because if we cannot enforce the law as it exists today, what point is there in debating whether or not we ought to change and tighten those laws? We need the investigations that are being conducted, both here in the Senate of the United States and in the House of Representatives today, to cast light on what actually took place during the course of last year.

We asked for a special prosecutor. We needed the Department of Justice in order to determine whether or not there were criminal violations that should be prosecuted in the criminal courts of the United States. But the classic justification, the rationale for this Senate investigation is the determination of facts: The breadth and extent of the violations of law that took place last year, who the violators were, what consequences the committee of the Senate feels should stem from those violations, and then and only then whether or not there should be additional laws applicable to the next set of elections. This inquiry and this investigation is of vital importance to the American people. The American people deserve to know precisely what took place during the course of the 1996 Presidential election campaign, on both sides; the breadth and the extent of violations of law, who violated the law, and who knew about and benefited from those violations.

I call on all of the Members of the Senate to cooperate to the fullest possible extent in the determination of those facts and express my hope that the results of this investigation will be enlightenment and far better practices in the future.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, yesterday the chairman of the Governmental Affairs Committee began his hearings on the alleged political campaign finance irregularities of 1996. After all that has been written and reported in the press and elsewhere, it is time. Even before these hearings, a lot of facts are already known and how much more these hearings will reveal yet has to be seen. Knowing all the roadblocks that could be posed in these hearings and these investigations, they may reveal very little, or we may be surprised at some of the findings. Nonetheless, the hearings

must move forward. This body and the other body, the House of Representatives, has the unsavory duty to investigate, reveal and inform the American people. I know no one in either Chamber relishes this assignment. To some it tends to polarize, and to some it confirms what they have already known.

John Quincy Adams, who returned to the House of Representatives after serving as President of the United States, in a heated debate over slavery, of which he was an ardent opponent, said, "Duty is ours; results are God's."

The nature of these hearings is different, especially when we talk about campaign financing. This one involves foreign entities attempting to politically infiltrate the American system. That is the concern of all Americans and in particular those of us who have taken the oath to uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States in face of foreign and domestic assault. To do otherwise is just not accepting our sworn duty and our obligation to the American people.

Alexis de Tocqueville, author of "Democracy in America," way back in the early 1800's, wrote that America is great because America is good. When America ceases to be good, it will cease to be great. That is as true today as it was then.

The alleged violations of the 1996 campaign did not start just in 1997. One must remember, back in the fall of 1996, about mid-October, when the Democratic National Committee failed to file its campaign report with the Federal Election Commission—some excuse that the accountants did not have it ready or it was not ready to go. In fact, I don't recall whether it was filed at all until the elections were over in 1996. The point is, could full disclosure be working if there were obvious irregularities? If there were, did they take the attitude, "Why should we file?" Were there campaign activities that could prove embarrassing right before the election? And I would ask, is that not the main purpose of the present laws, full disclosure—full and timely disclosure of campaign activities? Maybe the present law is working. Maybe, under the present law, we know what we know today. We must ponder that.

The China connection has lots of us concerned. In fact, Americans should be outraged at such an allegation, let alone proof. What was going on when John Huang received top security clearance without even a background check, 5 months before he began working at the Commerce Department? Why did this person still have a security clearance when he began working at the DNC? Why did John Huang attend over 100 classified briefings, hold 95 meetings at the White House, have frequent access to the President of the United States? I want to know that. I want to know why it was allowed to happen. The American people deserve to know. And we have the duty to inform them.

It is apparent that inquiry is necessary because it seems to me that this administration was willing to do whatever it took to win an election. The facts that we know now—not allegations but facts—tell us that they broke current and existing laws. Are they above the law? I don't believe so—as none of us are. They inadvertently allowed our national security to be compromised? One has to question that.

So, the Governmental Affairs Committee is fulfilling a constitutional responsibility by conducting oversight to find out whether the current laws have been adhered to, of which we know some of them were not.

It is their duty to discover what laws were broken, and then we can decide what can be done to improve enforcement of those laws.

This is about money laundering, illegal foreign contributions and unlawful receipts of campaign funds within Federal buildings. There is credible evidence out there that indicates this administration was engaged in all of these violations.

It is my hope, Mr. President, that these hearings will get all the facts out in the open for the American people. I commend Senator THOMPSON and committee members for assuming that responsibility. It is an awesome responsibility and one that is not taken lightly by any Member of the U.S. Senate or the U.S. House of Representatives. It is time that we proceed to get this out in the open and let the American people judge what is right and what is wrong.

THE VERY BAD DEBT BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, at the close of business yesterday, Tuesday, July 8, 1997, the Federal debt stood at \$5,354,619,850,034.63. (Five trillion, three hundred fifty-four billion, six hundred nineteen million, eight hundred fifty thousand, thirty-four dollars and sixty-three cents)

One year ago, July 8, 1996, the Federal debt stood at \$5,154,104,000,000. (Five trillion, one hundred fifty-four billion, one hundred four million)

Five years ago, July 8, 1992, the Federal debt stood at \$3,971,809,000,000. (Three trillion, nine hundred seventy-one billion, eight hundred nine million)

Ten year ago, July 8, 1987, the Federal debt stood at \$2,326,070,000,000. (Two trillion, three hundred twenty-six billion, seventy million)

Fifteen years ago, July 8, 1982, the Federal debt stood at \$1,076,916,000,000 (One trillion, seventy-six billion, nine hundred sixteen million) which reflects a debt increase of more than \$4 trillion—\$4,277,703,850,034.63 (Four trillion, two hundred seventy-seven billion, seven hundred three million, eight hundred fifty thousand, thirty-four dollars and sixty-three cents) during the past 15 years.

BIDDING FAREWELL TO HIS EXCELLENCY, AMBASSADOR GALLAGHER

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I would like to offer some brief comments, if I may, regarding a good friend to many of us here who will be returning to his country in the next few days. I speak of Dermot A. Gallagher, Mr. President, the current Ambassador of Ireland to the United States.

Mr. President, Dermot Gallagher can leave the United States with pride in the work that he has done for his Government and his country.

I have had the privilege, Mr. President, of working closely with Dermot over the last 6 years, as many of us have. It has been an extremely positive experience, and I have come to consider Dermot not only a competent diplomat, but a good friend, and a good friend to this country. Without doubt, Dermot Gallagher is a consummate professional, an able and talented diplomat, and an individual who has served his country with skill and grace. And in no small measure, he has been assisted in that process by his lovely wife Maeve who has been a partner in this endeavor of theirs over the last number of years.

It goes without saying that Ambassador Gallagher has had an extraordinarily busy and productive tenure as Ireland's Ambassador in Washington. From early 1994 until the present, Ireland, and particularly the Northern Ireland peace process, have been front-burner issues for the Irish, the British, and our own Government.

Naturally, Dermot Gallagher has been in the thick of all of it. He has been an effective spokesman for his Government with the State Department, the White House, and the Congress. He has also been enormously helpful, I might point out, Mr. President, to those of us who have been actively involved in trying to get the peace process back on track in that country following the tragic decision of the IRA last year to break the August 1994 cease-fire.

Ambassador Gallagher may be returning home to Dublin, but I am confident he will remain actively involved in many of the same issues with which he has become so intimately knowledgeable. I say this because Ambassador Gallagher will be returning to Dublin to assume the position of Second Secretary General within the Department of Foreign Affairs, where he will continue to play a major role in Anglo-Irish issues, especially in the Northern Ireland peace process.

Given the recent events in Drumcree, where once again violence erupted, Mr. President, in connection with the annual Orange Order parade season, he will have his work cut out for him. Dermot will play a critical role in advising the newly elected Irish prime minister, Bertie Ahern, on the most effective policies for the Irish Government to pursue in order to restore a climate of trust, peace, and reinvigo-

rate the currently stalled peace process.

So, Mr. President, I know again I speak for all of my colleagues here when I bid Ambassador Gallagher and his wife Maeve and their family a farewell and a thank you for a job very well done. We continue to look forward to working with him in the years ahead.

DEVELOPMENTS IN CAMBODIA CAUSE FOR CONCERN

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, for those of us who follow events in Southeast Asia closely, recent developments in Cambodia are a cause for great concern.

The coup d'etat—and, yes, I employ that term even if the Department of State, for broader foreign policy reasons, does not—staged this week by Second Prime Minister Hun Sen is a terrible setback for that strife-torn country. Tragically, the expression by Mao Tse-Tung that “power grows out of the barrel of a gun” applies nowhere more so than Cambodia. A peace process initiated in 1991, culminating in the Paris peace accords, and manifested most significantly in the 1993 elections is dying.

The investment in that country since the signing of the 1991 accord by the international community of more than \$3 billion, including \$160 million from the United States, has clearly failed to eliminate from Cambodia the intertwining of politics and violence. The removal from power of the Khmer Rouge, one of the most vicious guerrilla movements in history—the very people for whom Cambodia has become synonymous with the image of bloodshed on a monumental scale—has not eliminated from the minds of Cambodia's leaders the notion of “power from the barrel of a gun.”

Mr. President, I am a strong supporter in Congress of facilitating the development of normal political and economic relationships with former adversaries in the Far East. I supported the opening of diplomatic relations with Vietnam and the extension of most-favored-nation trade status to Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos. With many other Members of Congress, I have invested considerable time and effort to helping secure a peaceful and prosperous future for a region that has known decades of warfare unimaginable to most Americans. I can only now fear for the future. The coup by Hun Sen represents a reversal of fortune that will prove, I fear, extremely difficult to resolve. The culture of violence that dominates major factions in Cambodia is alive and well and once again in power.

The response to the coup by the Clinton administration is understandably tempered by the knowledge that we will have to deal with the new regime as a simple fact of life, as well as within a broader regional context. It is that regional context that worries me as

much as the developments inside Cambodia. The visit by Hun Sen to Hanoi immediately prior to his takeover of Phnom Penh sends a chilling message to those of us concerned about the region's future. Whether Vietnam is culpable in the events in Cambodia is an issue that demands, and presumably will receive, serious attention.

The American public remains extraordinarily wary of any involvement by this country in Southeast Asia. That is understandable given the history of United States involvement there as well as memories of the years of terror in Cambodia under the Khmer Rouge. That concern cannot and should not be ignored. That is why I was never under any doubt about the popularity of some of my positions with regard to Southeast Asia. The United States, however, must remain engaged there. It cannot turn its back on a region of great importance to the entire Far East. Conflict in Indochina, during a period when countries circle each other warily over specks in the South China Sea that may or may not be rich in oil and natural gas, can easily have wider implications. We must work to bring peace and stability to Southeast Asia. Both morally and practically, we must stay engaged.

I have met a number of times in the past with Hun Sen. He is a tough individual not vulnerable to intimidation. He is capable of acting as ruthlessly as he deems necessary. His troops have actively sought out Members of Cambodia's elected Parliament with the clear intent of imprisoning those who oppose him and incorporating into his movement those who do not. Cambodia's interior minister was captured and executed. Sam Rainsy, president of the Khmer National Party and a friend of some of ours, expressed the situation appropriately when he asked, only partly rhetorically,

On what ground, following what rule, what law, what article of the Constitution, what legal procedure can the Second Prime Minister unilaterally “dismiss” the First Prime Minister . . . (Only with the backing of his tanks Hun Sen gave to himself the right to dismiss the First Prime Minister and to announce the formation of a new government.)

A reign of terror has been launched and a shadow has fallen over a country now known more for its violence than its awesome natural beauty. Gunfire around the Angkor Wat Temple, revered by Buddhism and universally identified with solemnity, provides a sad contrast that illustrates all too well the tragic fate of Cambodia. The international community, which invested so much time, energy, prestige, and money in establishing in Cambodia a democratic form of government and the opportunity for the same peaceful and prosperous future enjoyed by so many of Asia's countries, can be forgiven if it does not attempt a repeat of its efforts earlier this decade.

The United States should, I believe, work to resolve this crisis and repair the damage. I would be hard-pressed at