

(Four trillion, two hundred fifty-seven billion, five hundred twenty-six million).

Ten years ago, April 21, 1988, the federal debt stood at \$2,499,121,000,000 (Two trillion, four hundred ninety-nine billion, one hundred twenty-one million).

Fifteen years ago, April 21, 1983, the federal debt stood at \$1,243,863,000,000 (One trillion, two hundred forty-three billion, eight hundred sixty-three million) which reflects a debt increase of more than \$4 trillion—\$4,275,115,332,463.05 (Four trillion, two hundred seventy-five billion, one hundred fifteen million, three hundred thirty-two thousand, four hundred sixty-three dollars and five cents) during the past 15 years.●

JUSTICE FOR THE PEOPLE OF CAMBODIA

● Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, last week, the mastermind of one of this century's most horrific crimes against humanity died apparently peacefully in his sleep. Pol Pot, founder and leader of the Khmer Rouge, architect of the grisly genocide which claimed at least one million Cambodian lives between 1975 and 1979, died at the age of 73. While some may see Pol Pot's death as final closure on one of the most shockingly brutal and despotic reigns in history, his death should not absolve the international community from seeking justice for the people of Cambodia.

The scars from Pol Pot's four-year reign of terror remain in Cambodia, and on the face of humanity. History will judge us. Did they do enough? Did they do what they could? Did they even care? If those assessments were written today, the community of nations would be found wanting. The fact that Pol Pot lived to his dying day having never been punished for his crimes is the best evidence of that.

When Pol Pot and his Khmer Rouge captured the Cambodian capitol of Phnom Penh in April 1975, he and his lieutenants began a barbaric campaign to exterminate intellectuals, foreigners, bureaucrats, merchants, and countless others who did not fit Pol Pot's vision of a "pure" Cambodia. Many thousands more were forced into slave labor camps, eventually dying from starvation, torture, and disease. I have met some of the survivors of that nightmare who escaped to Thailand and ultimately resettled in the United States, including in Vermont. They are a living tribute to the invincibility of the human spirit.

Four years later in 1979 Pol Pot and the Khmer Rouge were forced from power, but they left behind a ghastly swath of death and carnage that counted at least one million Cambodians dead and a country that to this day is trying to cope with the ghosts of that era. Virtually every Cambodian now alive knows or is related to someone who perished under the Khmer Rouge.

Although Pol Pot was the architect of the killing fields of Cambodia, those

in his inner circle were responsible for carrying out his commands. Many of Pol Pot's chief lieutenants still roam the Cambodian countryside, reportedly along the Thai border. Men like Khieu Samphan, former President of Kampuchea; Nuon Chea, former second in command and someone described as Pol Pot's "alter ego;" and Ta Mok, a Khmer Rouge leader whose portfolio included killing Cambodians who had worked for the old Lon Nol government. Ta Mok was nicknamed "the Butcher."

The wanton killing did not end decades ago. In 1996 British mine clearer Christopher Howes and his Cambodian interpreter, Houn Hourth, were abducted by Khmer Rouge soldiers and later led to a field and shot in the back. According to recent reports of interviews with Khmer Rouge officials, aides close to Pol Pot ordered the killing. Mr. Howes posed no threat to Pol Pot or the Khmer Rouge. He was in Cambodia working to make the country safer for the Cambodian people by helping remove one-by-one the millions of landmines sown in the fields. Today, Cambodia is infested with mines which continue to maim and kill the innocent.

I am encouraged that the Administration appears ready to seek some formal mechanism to bring to justice key members of Pol Pot's inner circle. A number of possible approaches have been suggested, including a war crimes tribunal for Cambodia like the existing tribunal for the former Yugoslavia, or an international penal tribunal that includes Cambodian participation. These ideas and others merit further discussion as we examine appropriate ways to seek justice for the Cambodian people.

The United Nations has also named a three-person team to investigate the remaining Khmer Rouge leaders. This too, is an encouraging sign.

Whatever it takes, we must not let the fact that Pol Pot eluded justice diminish our resolve to apprehend and punish the members of his inner circle who are also guilty of crimes against humanity. History will judge us harshly if we turn our backs now.

I ask unanimous consent that two editorials be printed in the RECORD.

The editorials follow:

[From The New York Times, April 17, 1998]

POL POT ESCAPES JUSTICE

Pol Pot, elusive to the end, died just as the world finally seemed to be serious about bringing him to justice. No punishment, however, could have fit the evil he committed. From 1975 to 1979, Pol Pot's Khmer Rouge wiped out a large fraction of Cambodia's people, and left the rest with a country submerged in violence and pain.

The Khmer Rouge regime was surely the most bizarre in modern history, its philosophy made up of one part Maoism and three parts paranoia. It emptied the cities and marched Cambodians to the countryside to starve on state farms. Having an education, or even wearing glasses, could get one killed as a class enemy. Thousands of Khmer Rouge's own cadres were forced to confess to spying and tortured to death. There is probably no adult in Cambodia today unscarred

by the loss of a close relative. Political life, too, is still poisoned. The nation's spectacular misrule stems in part from the scarcity of educated people and the political habits learned in four years of terror.

The Vietnamese invasion that ousted the Khmer Rouge in 1979 forced Pol Pot and his men into the jungle, where they continue to wage a guerrilla war to this day. Many Khmer Rouge troops have received amnesty and become wealthy and influential members of Hun Sen's Government, including Mr. Hun Sen himself. Pol Pot's death will rob investigators of the chance to try him and to hear about the crimes of Khmer Rouge leaders who are still in positions of power.

Pol Pot, who became a Communist while on a scholarship in Paris in the early 1950's, never apologized. In an interview last October, the only one he had granted since 1978, he said that whatever he had done he did for his country. He disputed that millions had died but acknowledged that hundreds of thousands had. Those killings were necessary, he said, because the Vietnamese wanted to assassinate him and swallow up Cambodia. His conscience was clear.

This was said by an old man so weakened by malaria and stroke that he could barely walk. He always had a gentle manner and soft voice, and in the interview smiled constantly. He did not seem a man who could have presided over the deaths of more than a million people. Three months before the interview, however, the Khmer Rouge put him on trial, not for the crimes of his regime but for his murder of a political rival and the man's family. The camera showed the Khmer Rouge troops watching the trial chanting robotically, "Crush, crush, crush." He, of course, had taught them that. The soft-spoken old man of the interview was a mirage. His disciples showed who Pol Pot really was.

[From The Washington Post, April 17, 1998]

AFTER POL POT

The reported death of Pol Pot in the Cambodian jungle means that one of this century's most egregious mass murderers will not stand trial or be held accountable for his crimes. But it should not mean that Pol Pot's accomplices now will be let off the hook, and it does not mean that other nations with an interest in Cambodia's future should ease their pressure for a restoration of democracy there.

Between 1975 and 1979 more than 1 million and probably closer to 2 million Cambodians were executed or died from the effects of torture, deliberate starvation and brutal overwork. Pol Pot was the nation's communist leader at the time; he presided over the deaths of one-fifth of his population. But he was not alone. According to painstaking documentation assembled by the Cambodia Genocide Project at Yale University (partially funded by the State Department), a standing committee, on March 30, 1976, formally established an integrated national network of extermination centers. These were responsible for an estimated 1 million deaths of people who are now buried in 20,000 mass graves. Eight to 10 members of that committee are still alive and at large.

The tendency on the part of the international community will be to abandon efforts to bring to trial those guilty of crimes against humanity. With Pol Pot gone, attention will fade; some believe his colleagues killed him for just that reason. Moreover, some of Pol Pot's onetime comrades are in league with Cambodia's current leader, Hun Sen. It would make diplomats' jobs easier to let them be. It would also be an affront to justice and to Cambodia's many victims.

The same international fatigue is emerging with respect to Hun Sen, who seized

power in a coup last July. Officials from the United States, Japan, Cambodia's neighbors and other nations will meet in Bangkok on Sunday to decide whether to resume some aid to his regime, at least to help organize an election he wants to hold in July. Hun Sen hopes the election will legitimize his authoritarian rule. Some in Bangkok will want to go forward because Hun Sen has allowed deposed prime minister Prince Ranariddh to return to Cambodia, supposedly a gesture of reconciliation.

But political killings of Ranariddh supporters continue, and no one has been brought to justice for more than 40 past murders; Hun Sen's opponents live in fear and with limited access to the media; no impartial courts or electoral commission exist. Until these conditions change, a credible election is impossible. The United States and its allies should not put themselves in the position of blessing any other kind. •

EARTH DAY 1998

• Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I would like to take the opportunity to address our environment and energy resources this Earth Day 1998.

My perspective is derived from my quarter-century in the United States Senate, wherein I have devoted much of my time to environmental and energy concerns. When I started my tenure here in 1973, the commemoration of Earth Day was three years young. During the ensuing years, I have witnessed great strides towards the improvement of our nation's environment. We are uniquely fortunate to be prosperous enough to consciously choose to promote environmental concerns and conserve resources. This Earth Day 1998 should focus on creating ways to not only continue these improvements in our own country, but also assist other nations in improving their ability to protect the world's environment. The earth is currently the only home we all share.

I would like to think that I have contributed to the continuing United States environmental improvement during my years of public service. I actively participated in the multi-year debate on the 1977 amendments to the Clean Air Act, and I am pleased to say, played a key role in shaping the 1990 amendments which has reaped substantial decreases in air pollutants since the first Earth Day in 1970.

Through passage of the Clean Water Act and reauthorization of the Safe Drinking Water Act, the United States of America has vastly improved the quality of its rivers, lakes, and coastal waters, and has the safest drinking water in the world. Communities, while suffering some hardships, have been able to decrease emissions, provide clean, safe public areas for their citizens, and still remain a world economic leader. We have learned that costly regulation is not the solution, but cooperation with and incentives for the business community, as well as providing local control over local concerns, improves everyone's way of life.

It is from the vantage point of my years of service in environmental and

energy issues that I speak today about the divergence in regulation and policy from the best interests of our global climate. Several examples can be gleaned from the recent debates regarding emission standards and the global climate change document which emerged from Kyoto, Japan in December.

Remember, since 1970, air pollution in this country has been steadily declining, despite the fact that the U.S. population has increased by almost 30% and vehicle travel has more than doubled. Now, I believe anyone will tell you they want clean air. However, one must also realize that any environmental improvement comes at some economic cost in our industrialized world. The United States may be responsible for 20 percent of the world's carbon dioxide emissions, but it also responsible for producing 26 percent of the world's goods and services. And we still have some of the most stringent environmental standards around. We need to keep finding ways to improve air quality, while maintaining a standard of living that is envied the world over.

American cities have just recently been able to achieve the stringent air quality standards, and air quality is improving. In my home state of New Mexico, Albuquerque was one of the first U.S. cities to be removed from the list of violators of national carbon monoxide standards. Let's let all communities continue to improve, rather than impose strict and costly new air quality standards before we know that they are based in sound science.

I believe that many of my distinguished colleagues here in the Senate know I have long been a strong proponent of basing governmental decision making on sound science. Indeed, in both the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990 and the Safe Drinking Water Act of last Congress, I fought hard to make sure "sound science" provisions were included in the legislation as a matter of policy. There has been some question about the scientific validity of the global warming theory. Theories do change. It was not all that long ago that my children were being taught in school that we were approaching another ice age.

However, assuming that global climate change is occurring and emissions need to be reduced to improve the global climate, what is the logic of exempting developing countries from any global treaty aimed at reducing those emissions? Many developing countries, like China or India, are predicted to rapidly exceed developed countries' emission levels. Shouldn't every country be bound to reduce their carbon dioxide emissions? Why should this country bear the burden in this inequitable arrangement that will not reduce net emissions levels?

Do not misunderstand me. We all have to live on this planet; we all should live well and live in a clean environment. I do not believe these goals

are contradictory. Progress is not a curse. This nation is blessed to be leaders in Environmental protection and to also enjoy modern conveniences. I do applaud the fact that the climate change debate has focused some attention on looking to alternative and cleaner fuel sources.

I do sometimes find it ironic that those environmental activists who speak the loudest about a dirty environment oppose development of the safest, cleanest energy source available in quantities to sustain our modern needs: nuclear energy.

As we leave the 20th Century and head for a new millennium, we truly need to confront these strategic energy issues with careful logic and sound science.

We live in the dominant economic, military, and cultural entity in the world. Our principles of government and economics are increasingly becoming the principles of the world. We can afford a clean world. As developing countries try to emulate our nation's success, we will find ourselves competing for resources that fuel modern economics.

I have pledged to initiate a more forthright discussion of nuclear policy. We often define environmental debates in terms of "us versus them." When it comes to global environment there is no them. We are all environmentalists. Nobody belittles the fundamental need for clean air and water. Some activists make their cause all-important, from whichever direction they come, and do not focus on what is right or fair. I believe that the emotional response is not always the logical alternative.

As Chairman of the Senate Budget Committee, I have faced criticism from both sides on some of my positions. Now, the President has outlined a program to reduce U.S. production of carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gases below 1990 levels by some time between 2008 and 2012. Unfortunately, the President's goals are not achievable without seriously impacting our economy.

Our national laboratories have studied the issue. Their report indicates that to get to the President's goals we would have to impose a \$50/ton carbon tax. That would result in an increase of 12.5 cents/gallon for gas and 1.5 cents/kilowatt-hour for electricity—almost a doubling of the current cost of coal or natural gas-generated electricity. However, Nuclear energy can help meet the global goal.

I was very disappointed that the talks in Kyoto did not include any serious discussion about nuclear energy. As I have pointed out before, in 1996 alone, nuclear power plants prevented the release of 147 metric tons of carbon, 2.5 million tons of nitrogen oxides, and 5 million tons of sulfur dioxide into the atmosphere. Nuclear power is now only providing 20% of the United States' electricity, but those utilities' emissions of greenhouse gases were 25% lower than they would have been from fossil fuels.