

continue, because it does nothing to rein in DOE's ever-present search for something to do, someplace to spend the taxpayers' hard-earned dollars. There would be nothing to stop the extravagant, taxpayer-funded foreign excursions, or the use of tax dollars to investigate reporters and their stories, or the other wasteful spending that has become all too common at the Energy Department.

The Department would be left to operate mostly as it has in the past—free to pursue its own supposed manifest destiny through expansion, reinvention, and constantly redefining its missions. That kind of freedom has allowed DOE's budget to grow 235 percent since 1977, even in the absence of another energy crisis like the one that led to its creation.

At a time when the people are demanding a balanced budget and justification for every dollar spent by the Federal Government, can any of us in good conscience claim that business as usual at the Department of Energy is how the taxpayers ought to be served?

Mr. President, in presenting its budget to Congress, DOE's chief financial officer testified last week that the document demonstrates a new commitment to streamlining its operations. "More than ever," he said, "American citizens are holding us accountable for superior results with increasingly limited resources. The Department of Energy is meeting these expectations. We are improving our process efficiency and effectiveness."

Mr. President, whether or not DOE is meeting these expectations is a question clearly open to debate. I believe they are falling short, way short. And I am afraid that improving process efficiency and effectiveness will not ensure accountability or solve the fundamental problems that rack the Department of Energy.

President Clinton's budget feeds DOE's problems through more spending. But when will the big spenders here realize that the time-honored Washington tradition of throwing money at a problem does not make the problem go away—that it only perpetuates the status quo and aggravates the damage?

Mr. President, I believe the solution lies in less spending and ultimately, elimination of the Department of Energy. Without a specific and defined mission to guide it, the agency will remain a taxpayers boondoggle for years to come, a burden the taxpayers are no longer willing to bear.

Mr. President, I yield the floor, and 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. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

THE SITUATION IN BURUNDI

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I bring to the attention of my colleagues Burundi, a small Central African country. There are 6 million people who live in Burundi. Each week, a civil insurgency tightens its grip on this poor African nation, causing the deaths of hundreds of people. The killing frenzy in Burundi has barely touched international headlines, as it has been dwarfed by the calamities striking Israel and Bosnia. But consider the situation if it were to occur in the United States. The United States has a population of about 260 million. Sliding the scale to the figures of the United States, we would see 30,000 Americans dying a week; 1,560,000 a year. Burundi, my colleagues, is on the brink of national suicide.

The hostilities in Burundi are between the Tutsi-controlled army and Hutu rebels. The current turmoil is the fallout of the explosion of tensions between Tutsi's and Hutu's in 1993. That year, the country's first popularly elected President, a Hutu, was assassinated. In the chaotic aftermath of his death, tens of thousands of Burundians were killed, hundreds of thousands were displaced. Today, Burundi is ruled by a coalition of moderate Hutus and Tutsis who agreed to share power through the mediation of U.N. Secretary General's former special representative, Ambassador Ahmedou Abdallah. The moderates who lead this Government have tried to contain the violence. Their efforts, however, continue to be threatened by extremists on both sides.

A breakdown in Burundi could have catastrophic effects in the country, the region, and in the international community. The world witnessed at great length the tragedy that wrecked Rwanda 2 years ago. Rwanda shares the ethnic makeup of Burundi and is just barely coming to grips with the horror it endured. A collapse in Burundi could crack the fragile peace now established in Rwanda and even worse, could trigger a regional genocide. The international community cannot afford to sit back and watch another egregious slaughter.

The international community, with leadership from the United States, can help. First, we should support last Saturday's meeting of African leaders in Tunis. This meeting was brokered by former President Jimmy Carter. Second, there must be diplomatic efforts to persuade the extremists on both sides that violence is not a credible option. If violence resumes, the United States, in conjunction with its European allies, should be prepared to impose an arms embargo, block international financial transactions by Burundi's extremists and stop all trade with Burundi with the exception of humanitarian relief. And third, we, the Congress, should stand behind the State Department, the U.S. Agency for International Development, and private American voluntary and relief projects whose programs promote peace and national reconciliation.

Burundi represents a great opportunity for the world community to exercise preventative diplomacy. The United States should do its share of constructive engagement and assist in heading off a regional genocide before it is too late.

TRIBUTE TO DIANE KASEMAN

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, I am proud to pay tribute today to a dear friend to me and my wife, Elizabeth Ann, Diane Kaseman. Diane is a longtime employee of the Senate Service Department, where her friendliness, dedication, and charming personality have become familiar to many Members of this body and our staffs. Unfortunately for us, she will be retiring from her position in the Service Department after an incredible 43 years of service to the U.S. Congress.

Diane Kaseman is one of those individuals who takes extreme pride in her work and who truly loves the Senate as an institution. She and her loyal canine pets have become welcome sights to the many hundreds of staff members who routinely seek assistance from the Service Department. She never fails to express genuine concern when one of us, our spouses, or our staff members is under the weather. Her kind words and thoughtful notes never fail to improve our spirits.

Diane is a Rochester, NY native, and began her Capitol Hill career as a receptionist for the late Congressman and Senator Kenneth Keating of New York. She began work on March 27, 1953. Eventually, she moved over to the Senate, where she served on the staff of former Kentucky Senator John Sherman Cooper. Since then, she has served under 11 Senate Sergeants-at-Arms, working with the service and computer facilities.

Not surprisingly, Diane has devoted much of her time over the years to volunteer and community service activities. Early on in her career, she helped establish the Senate Staff Club. Since its founding in 1954, it has sponsored a wide variety of social, civic, and philanthropic projects. She served as the organization's first treasurer. Today, it has over 3,000 members.

One of the Staff Club's major activities has been its blood donor drives, begun in 1978. Diane has been a driving force behind this campaign and has dedicated many hours of hard work and energy to see that the Senate meets its goals. My wife has worked with Diane on many of these blood drives.

In 1981, she received the Sid Yudin Award, which recognized "her dedication to the well-being of her coworkers and for the generous expenditure of her time, talent, and personal resources in the service of the congressional community." These few words are perhaps the best that can be offered to summarize her outstanding career and selfless service.

Diane Kaseman is truly a Senate institution who will be sorely missed

after she leaves the Senate at the end of this month. I join my colleagues in thanking her, commending her, and wishing her all the best as she embarks upon a well-earned retirement.

THE BAD DEBT BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, at the close of business Friday, March 22, 1996, the Federal debt stood at \$5,062,405,341,134.69.

On a per capita basis, every man, woman, and child in America owes \$19,139.65 as his or her share of that debt.

EVENTS IN ASIA

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I rise today as the chairman of the Subcommittee on East Asian and Pacific Affairs to briefly address two events which transpired in Asia over the weekend, one which bodes well for the continued growth and vitality of democracy in Asia and one which, unfortunately, does not.

First, as I'm sure my colleagues are by now aware, despite unprecedented military threats and vituperative media pressure from the People's Republic of China, the people of Taiwan have elected Lee Teng-hui as their President. The election, aside from its practical result, was important for several reasons. First, for the first time in its almost 5,000 year history, China—or, more precisely, a portion thereof—has elected its paramount leader in a free, fair, and open democratic election. With the election, the ideals of human rights and representative democracy—which some in Asia, especially authoritarian regimes, have argued are peculiarly Western inventions with little or no applicability in their region—have taken a dramatic step toward universality.

Second, Taiwan's electorate clearly demonstrated to Beijing that its bellicose campaign of threats and intimidation was ill-conceived and ineffectual. Rather than diminishing support for President Lee, as Beijing and the PLA had hoped, the People's Republic of China's recent round of missile tests and live-fire military exercises seems only to have served to solidify his support; President Lee won with some 54 percent of the vote. In other words, the People's Republic of China's plans backfired, much as I and others of my colleagues predicted. I would hope that they come away from the past month having learned that the best course is not one of brazen threats, but open bilateral dialog across the Taiwan Strait.

I wish to convey my personal congratulations to the Government and people of Taiwan, and hope to do so in person to President Lee when I travel to the People's Republic of China and then on to Taipei next week.

Mr. President, in contrast the second issue I'd like to discuss today is not so encouraging. On Sunday at its second plenary session, China's Hong Kong

Preparatory Committee—the body charged by Beijing with overseeing the transition of the British Colony to a Special Administrative Region of the People's Republic of China in 1997—voted by a margin of 148 to 1 to scrap the elected Legislative Council and install in its place an appointed body.

Members of Hong Kong's Legislative Council, or Legco, have traditionally been elected not by universal suffrage but by a narrow group of functional constituencies. In other words, the trade unions had a certain number of votes, the civil service had a certain number of votes, lawyers had a certain number of votes, et cetera. Last year, in a move to increase the representation of the average citizen on the Council, a number of changes were made by the colonial government in the way elections are conducted.

Beijing objected to the changes in the election process, ostensibly because they were made unilaterally by the British; of course, Beijing overlooked the fact that they themselves had refused to seriously negotiate on the issue. However, most observers—correctly I believe—felt that the real reason for Beijing's opposition was that the changes made the Legco even more democratic, a status that they would then be forced to acquiesce to after 1997.

The reason that increased democracy is a problem for the People's Republic of China is fairly obvious; the government presently installed in Beijing is antithetical to democracy. Despite lip service to its promises that it would ensure the continuation of Hong Kong's rights and civil liberties after 1997, the People's Republic of China has taken a number of steps over the last 2 years to call that commitment to democratic norms into serious question. Its opposition to the reconstituted Legco is one of the more visible.

Another is the fate of the lone dissenting vote, by Mr. Frederick Fung, in the 148 to 1 vote tally on the Legco question. As a result of his dissenting vote, the head of the Preparatory Committee—Lu Ping—announced that because of his vote Mr. Fung should be disqualified from the transitional bodies planning Hong Kong's post-1997 government and from any governing role after the British withdraw. What does this petty and vindictive statement say about the People's Republic of China's commitment to democracy; that instead of tolerating dissent the Chinese will seek to punish those who express their opinions and fail to follow the party line.

Actions and statements such as this are not, sadly, surprising. The People's Republic of China has made several moves in the past year to exclude pro-democracy figures from the transition process; it even prevented one pro-democracy legislator from entering China to attend a conference, solely on the basis of his being a critic of the Government in Beijing. I believe that moves like these call into question the

People's Republic of China's commitment to the Basic Law, and its commitment to safeguard the rights of Hong Kong's citizens after retrocession. It would behoove them to remember that each move they make is under very close scrutiny by Hong Kong's—and the world's—commercial community. How Beijing acts will be directly reflected in that community's confidence, or lack thereof, and its willingness to maintain its investments there.

This is the People's Republic of China's reaction.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Thomas, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The nominations received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

REPORT ON THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO ANGOLA—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—PM 134

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

To the Congress of the United States:

I hereby report to the Congress on the developments since September 26, 1995, concerning the national emergency with respect to Angola that was declared in Executive Order No. 12865 of September 26, 1993. This report is submitted pursuant to section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c).

On September 26, 1993, I declared a national emergency with respect to Angola, invoking the authority, *inter alia*, of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 *et seq.*) and the United Nations Participation Act of 1945 (22 U.S.C. 287c). Consistent with United Nations Security Council Resolution 864, dated September 15, 1993, the order prohibited the sale or supply by United States persons or from the United States, or using U.S.-registered vessels or aircraft, of arms and related materiel of all types, including weapons and ammunition, military vehicles, equipment and spare parts, and petroleum and petroleum products to the territory of Angola.