

allowed to visit these wounded in the hospitals, not even the priests. Again, he was unable to give last rites to the dying. He estimated that in the month following the massacre as many people died in the hospitals, either from poor treatment or from torture, as had been killed in the cemetery. He told of hearing eyewitness accounts of mass graves holding as many as 100 corpses in one pit. He said the month following the massacre came to be known as "The Second Massacre."

When asked about the type of human rights abuses that occur today, the priests argued that the fundamental human right of any people is that of self-determination. The people of East Timor have been denied that right for over 20 years and all other rights abuses follow from that fact. They asked me how far the U.S. government and the U.S. people were willing to go in helping East Timor in its struggle for self-determination? They asked why, if the U.S. government says it cares about human rights and cares about human rights abuses in East Timor, it still continues to support the government of Indonesia on its occupation of East Timor?

Emotions around the room continued to rise, both from those telling the stories and those of us listening to them. I was struck by the knowledge that 5 years previously this group would have risked the sudden intrusion of armed ABRI officials, as the priests systematically contradicted everything Indonesian government officials in Jakarta and in Dili had said, the people of East Timor resist integration into Indonesia as strongly now as they did 20 years ago. There is an "ebb and flow" quality to the resistance; the Indonesians gain the upper hand [through various forms of intimidation] and the East Timorese temporarily retreat. When Indonesia seems to lighten up a bit, and the East Timorese "have the courage to shout," the resistance pushes back, but ABRI always comes back again, in a "continuous game." They provided a document listing the exact type and number of troops located throughout East Timor (a translated copy of this document is attached as an appendix to this report) to show us how pervasive and strong the military is there. When asked about Indonesia's argument that it has poured more economic investment into East Timor than into any other province in Indonesia, they responded disdainfully that "the people are not willing to sell their liberty for all the gold in the world."

Finally, I asked the fundamental question I had asked in all the meetings: if it were possible to hold a plebiscite in East Timor, offering a choice of political arrangements from autonomy to integration, how would the people vote? This classical political science-approach to finding a solution was met with hard nosed realism: how can you even hold out this approach to a people who have suffered so much for 20 years? More importantly—and fundamentally—after over 20 years of continued resistance in the face of abuse, even torture and death, have not the people of East Timor already made their preference clear? Does not their resistance itself constitute a referendum? What more proof do you need that the people of East Timor want independence from Indonesia?

To confirm this message, the acting rector of the University of East Timor, handed me a letter at the airport as we were leaving Dili, in full view of my ever-present official escort. By all accounts I have heard, I believe he was probably questioned after we left; one only hopes that his position will protect him from rougher treatment. The letter was written and signed by five university students, and asks the U.S. Congress to support East Timor in its struggle for independence from Indonesia. (A copy of the let-

ter is printed as an annex to this report.) The end of the letter was particularly moving, as it thanked me for coming and hoped that my visit was "independent," because they were concerned that Indonesia sponsored the visits of other delegations in order to "shut their mouth and close their eyes."

#### D. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

By the time of my departure, it was clear to me that the people of East Timor continue to resist the often heavy handed occupation of their island by Indonesia. The resistance takes many forms and, while armed resistance and physical resistance may have diminished, it was evident that the people of East Timor practice an emotional and intellectual resistance that no amount of military pressure will ever be able to suppress.

Yet it was also evident that Indonesia will not, in the foreseeable future, grant East Timor either the autonomy it clearly wants or a process for determining its own future. How, then, can U.S. policy bridge the gulf?

The U.N. can both help and hurt. The U.N. sponsored talks between Portuguese Foreign Minister Gama and Indonesian Foreign Minister Alatas can bring positive results. But these talks run a serious risk of ignoring the views and wishes of the East Timorese themselves. The All-Timorese dialogue offers more hope, although for the moment the political status of East Timor is not on the table for discussion. The best outcome of these two series of talks would be the implementation of confidence-building measures such as some form of autonomy for East Timor; a reduction in Indonesian troop strength; and an increase in the number of East Timorese in leadership positions in Dili.

Progress in any of these areas would, I believe, be welcome in East Timor and would ease some of the stark anti-Indonesian sentiment there. Passions could calm and economic initiatives, such as the coffee project, could develop. Then a compromise solution between the East Timorese and the Indonesians might be found. The key is that the East Timorese themselves must be a part of the solution from the beginning. A deal struck between Portugal and Indonesia or between Alatas and Boutros Ghali, or between Jakarta and Washington will not provide the solution. No true and lasting solution can come without East Timorese input; no solution that is seen as being imposed from above will work.

Indonesia is one of the most important countries in the region and will grow increasingly important. It is evident that the U.S. should have close relations with Indonesia. Both countries have mutual strategic, economic and environmental interests and would benefit from increased cooperation in those areas.

But Indonesia also has serious shortcomings in the way it treats the East Timorese and others of its citizens and it is important that, in our dealings with Indonesia, we not ignore or downplay the fact of these serious human rights problems.

When we have an important bilateral relationship with a country in which there are human rights problems, there are those who argue that we should downplay the human rights concerns and focus, instead, on those areas of mutual interest, such as strategic or economic, which can strengthen the relationship. Their theory is that a stronger relationship might encourage more progress on human rights. I do not agree with that approach.

U.S. support for human rights in other countries does matter. All the East Timorese I met told me that foreign pressure, and especially U.S. pressure, had succeeded in moving the Indonesian government. Our ability to effect changes in the human rights poli-

tics of Indonesia and other countries may be limited, but it is important for our nation to make every effort to do so.

I believe we could have a better and closer relationship with Indonesia if the government would take what seem to me to be relatively easy steps. If, for example, they would switch from a "heavy" hand to a "light" hand in East Timor, they would gain improved relations with the U.S. and other countries and would, in my view, lose little.

Quite aside from its policies toward East Timor, Indonesia is quickly approaching a critical point in its political development. President Soeharto's sixth 5-year term in office will end in 1998. While he has been quoted in the press as saying he will not run for a seventh term, most political analysts fully expect him to be in office for life. There is no chosen successor nor established process for succession.

Indonesian citizens cannot change the government by democratic means. The government is still heavily dominated by GOLKAR, the President's party. The government appoints half the members of the People's Consultative Assembly, theoretically the highest authority of the state, and the Assembly in turn elects the President and Vice-President. The military is automatically given 15% of the seats in the National Parliament and while 80% of the Parliament is elected, there are only three legal political parties. Civil liberties, such as freedom of speech and assembly or freedom of the press, are severely restricted.

Indonesia has actively worked to open its economy while keeping its political system relatively closed. Deregulation and moving away from central control has brought tremendous growth and development, of which the Indonesian government is rightfully proud. Could not the same be done in the political sphere?

Indonesia has the potential to be a great nation with world-wide influence. But it will never reach that goal with the anachronistic, authoritarian style of government it currently has. There are limited signs that this system may be loosening. The Court system has taken steps toward functioning independently, but it is not yet truly independent. There are some non-government organizations that criticize government policies, but they still operate in an atmosphere of surveillance and fear of retaliation.

Indonesia should follow the example of Taiwan in the late 1980s and 1990s and take strong steps toward a true democratic system. One important change it could make now would be to legalize the formation of other political parties. The region and even the world has much to gain from a democratic Indonesia. The U.S. should offer assistance and encouragement where ever possible and adopt policies that will help move Indonesia toward that goal.

I hope that Jakarta will take seriously the recommendations in this report, work for a solution that is acceptable to all parties, put the issue of East Timor behind them, move toward democracy, and become the important international power it is meant to be.

#### RETIREMENT OF SENATOR WILLIAM S. COHEN

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, Senator BILL COHEN's decision not to seek reelection at the end of the 104th Congress deprives the U.S. Senate of one of its most respected Members.

Senator COHEN leaves behind a long and impressive career of public service for the people of Maine. With his election to the U.S. House of Representatives in 1973, Senator COHEN represented his constituents from Maine

diligently, and continued his efforts upon his election to the U.S. Senate in 1978.

Mr. President, Senator COHEN has remained a moderate and thoughtful voice in a Senate that is increasingly marked by strident and partisan debate. Senator COHEN has attempted to rise above partisan politics to accomplish what is best for the people of Maine and the Nation. In 1991, Senator COHEN voted to override a veto of an extension of unemployment benefits, at a time when America's families were beginning to feel the effects of an economic recession. In the 103d Congress, Senator COHEN participated in a bipartisan coalition that attempted to overhaul the U.S. health care system, after the administration's efforts were not successful.

During the 104th Congress, I have had the distinct pleasure of working with Senator COHEN in the Centrist Coalition. A group of about 20 Senators, the Centrist Coalition worked to reach agreement on a comprehensive budget alternative to those put forward by President Clinton and the Republican leadership. The plan we developed built upon the suggestions of the National Governors' Association with respect to the Medicaid and welfare programs. It also built in needed flexibility for States, while preserving the social safety net for our Nation's most vulnerable populations. It was the only bipartisan budget alternative that received significant support in the 104th Congress, and I am proud to have been part of that effort.

Mr. President, throughout his political career Senator COHEN has held government officials accountable to the high ethical standards that people expect of their elected leaders, regardless of party affiliation. This was evident during courageous votes he made during Watergate and the investigation of the Iran Contra affair.

Senator COHEN also helped create the independent counsel law, which mandates the appointment of an independent counsel to probe allegations against certain high executive branch officials. Further, Senator COHEN sponsored legislation to require that contacts between lobbyists and Members of Congress are officially reported.

Mr. President, we are all grateful for Senator COHEN's dedicated service and tireless efforts in the U.S. Senate. Senator COHEN's distinguished Senate career is a testament to his hard work on behalf of the people of Maine and the Nation. His insightful approach to the challenges we face as a nation will be greatly missed.

#### FAREWELL ADDRESS TO AMERICA

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, all Members of the Senate are faced with difficult decisions almost on a daily basis. The day of my announcement not to seek a fourth term in the Senate—March 29, 1995—was one of the most difficult of my life. By that day, I had

been wrestling with this decision for some time. There had been some health problems, but I was fully confident of running for and winning a fourth term. I have always loved campaigning, and getting back on the trail was a powerful temptation. The reality was, however, that another term would have taken me well beyond the normal age for retirement. I am 75 and would have been 81 by the end of another term. Ultimately, the decision was that the time had come to pass the torch to another generation.

Anyone who has ever held a Senate seat understands the magnitude of this great constitutional responsibility. The Senate is an awesome institution, and the opportunity to serve there is one of the highest honors that can be bestowed upon any individual. For anyone in public life who has attained the confidence of the people to carry out such a responsibility, the decision to leave voluntarily is a difficult one, even when we know that it is best for ourselves, our State, and our Nation. It is a bittersweet decision that stems from a solemn responsibility. Those returning to the 105th Congress already know this; those who will be joining that Congress in the coming days will soon come to that realization.

As Senators, we have to be students of the issues. It is important to be impartial, fair-minded, and willing to listen to opposing views. My decisions and votes have been based upon conscientious beliefs motivated by what I thought was in the best interests of my State and Nation, but sometimes tempered by the views of a sizable portion of my constituency. No doubt, Alabamians and my party were confounded at times, but hopefully, they understood that my positions were based on what I believed to be right.

One of our responsibilities as Senators is to sometimes take stands and positions with which the majority of citizens in our States do not agree. The difficulty of taking such unpopular stands and decisions cannot be overestimated. It can be a wrenching experience, as was the vote on the 1993 budget reconciliation legislation which raised taxes—even though primarily on a small number of wealthy individuals—but which also headed us in the right direction in terms of deficit reduction. This 1993 budget reconciliation bill had been grossly distorted and mischaracterized by its opponents almost beyond recognition. Several courageous Members of Congress who supported it were defeated in the next election. Since then, the economic and budgetary figures and forecasts show that supporting that bill was the right thing for the Nation.

In any case, since our first duty under the Constitution is to our country as a whole, these times and politically difficult situations will inevitably arise. Rather than running away from these stands, Senators have to meet them directly, stand firm, and explain to our constituents why we be-

lieve we are right. Although they might never agree with us, over time, they will understand and respect us for assuming responsibility. This will be even more true in the new Congress, the Congress whose leaders, along with the President sworn in on January 20, 1997, will take the country right into the new century and millennium.

As a member of the Judiciary Committee, I have had to oppose Supreme Court nominees I thought to be ill-suited by temperament or background to serve on the Nation's highest court. On other occasions, I have supported nominees whom I knew not to be popular among my constituents, but who deserved my support.

Despite criticism that the Senate is no longer the great forum for debate and policymaking established by the Founders, there have been many examples of such debate during my tenure. These are times when the Senate as an institution soars, when Members are the statesmen they are elected to be.

One such time was the debate on the resolution authorizing military action in the Persian Gulf in early 1991. It was one of those rare moments when each and every Member had to look deep within his or her soul and go on record telling the American people either why they would allow young men and women to be sent into harm's way without a declaration of war, or why they could oppose the President of the United States and an entire world coalition poised to thwart aggression. As each Senator spoke, you could see and feel the deep emotion that seemed to emanate from the very heart of each speaker. Each decision, each vote, was profoundly personal. Many of us had served in the military and knew something of the horrors of military operations, even if those operations were successful. I know of no one who did not understand the gravity of what we were deciding.

Ultimately, the Senate voted narrowly, 52 to 47, to authorize the use of force to eject Saddam Hussein's army from Kuwait. Despite reservations and uncertainty, I was one of a few from my party who supported the authorization. All we could draw from in making this decision was our own experience and knowledge, our faith in the American Armed Forces, and the collective will of the civilian and military leaders to ensure victory. I would venture that most of us said a private prayer before casting our votes, hoping that we were doing the right thing and that events would vindicate us. I was struck at the sincerity and emotion surrounding this debate, and, as a Senator, was proud to have taken part. I thought to myself that this was the kind of debate the Founders envisioned.

Another one of these dramatic and emotional debates took place on the Senate floor on July 22, 1993. One Senator had offered an amendment to pending legislation to grant an extension of the United Daughters of the Confederacy patent outside the normal