

BURR) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 251

Whereas at approximately 7:00 P.M. on June 18, 2007, a tragic fire started at the Sofa Super Store in Charleston, South Carolina;

Whereas despite the flames that engulfed the building, the brave men and women of the Charleston Fire Department (Department) fulfilled their duty by rushing inside as others fled for their lives;

Whereas the fire quickly grew out of control and trapped 2 store employees inside;

Whereas the firefighters attempted to punch through the building walls in a selfless effort to save the lives of these employees;

Whereas the roof of the building collapsed, trapping the firefighters inside;

Whereas Captain William "Billy" Hutchinson, a 30-year veteran of the Department, lost his life in the fire;

Whereas Captain Mike Benke, a 20-year veteran of the Department, lost his life in the fire;

Whereas Captain Louis Mulkey, an 11-year veteran of the Department, lost his life in the fire;

Whereas Engineer Mark Kelsey, a 12-year veteran of the Department, lost his life in the fire;

Whereas Engineer Bradford "Brad" Baity, a 9-year veteran of the Department, lost his life in the fire;

Whereas Assistant Engineer Michael French, a 1½-year veteran of the Department, lost his life in the fire;

Whereas Fire Fighter James "Earl" Drayton, a 32-year veteran of the Department, lost his life in the fire;

Whereas Fire Fighter Brandon Thompson, a 4-year veteran of the Department, lost his life in the fire;

Whereas Fire Fighter Melven Champaign, a 2-year veteran of the Department, lost his life in the fire;

Whereas the extraordinary courage and sacrifice of these firefighters reflects the spirit of South Carolina, as well as the spirit of our great Nation;

Whereas the United States has not experienced such a devastating loss of firefighters since the horrific events on September 11, 2001; and

Whereas a grateful Nation mourns the loss of these heroes and vows that their sacrifices were not made in vain: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) honors William "Billy" Hutchinson, Mike Benke, Louis Mulkey, Mark Kelsey, Bradford "Brad" Baity, Michael French, James "Earl" Drayton, Brandon Thompson, and Melven Champaign, who lost their lives in the course of their duty as firefighters, and recognizes them for their bravery and sacrifice;

(2) extends its deepest sympathy to the families of these 9 brave heroes;

(3) honors all the firefighters and other public servants who contributed to battling the fire; and

(4) pledges to continue to support and to work on behalf of the firefighters who risk their lives each day to ensure the safety of all Americans.

SENATE RESOLUTION 252—RECOGNIZING THE INCREASINGLY MUTUALLY BENEFICIAL RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE REPUBLIC OF INDONESIA

Mr. BOND (for himself and Mr. INOUE) submitted the following reso-

lution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 252

Whereas the historical ties between the United States and the Indonesia go back to the period of Indonesian struggle for independence and the early years of its independence in 1945;

Whereas the constitutionally required "free and active" foreign policy of Indonesia has largely resulted in a close relationship with the United States, and this relationship reflects the growing connections between the developed and the developing world;

Whereas, following the effects of the Asian financial crisis in 1998, Indonesia has instituted numerous democratic reforms, including—

(1) amending the country's constitution in order to be more democratic and transparent;

(2) holding the country's first ever direct presidential election in 2004 and direct, nationwide local elections starting in 2006; and

(3) giving the judicial branch independent administrative and financial responsibility for all courts in 2004;

Whereas the government of President Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono, the first directly elected President of Indonesia, is strongly committed to strengthening the country's democracy and remains focused on developing good governance and promoting and protecting human rights, civil liberties, a free press, and a vibrant civil society;

Whereas the Government of Indonesia continues to reform its military in accordance with internationally accepted democratic principles;

Whereas Indonesia signed a peace agreement in August 2005 ending the conflict in Aceh, met its obligations under the agreement, oversaw the return of normalcy to Aceh, and held free, transparent, and peaceful elections for local government leaders in December 2006;

Whereas the Government of Indonesia has worked and continues to work toward peaceful solutions to other internal conflicts, including Papua, with concern for the welfare and security of the entire population;

Whereas, in parallel with the recovery of Indonesia's economic and political stability following the 1998 Asian financial crisis, the country has regained its pivotal role in the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) and continues to work toward a secure, peaceful, and vibrant Southeast Asia, particularly by proposing successfully the ASEAN Security Community, the ASEAN Economic Community, and the ASEAN Socio-cultural Community;

Whereas the Government and people of Indonesia have endured several terrorist bombings, have shown resilience in the fight against international terrorism by apprehending and bringing to justice numerous perpetrators, and remain open to international cooperation in this area;

Whereas the Government of Indonesia, together with the Governments of Malaysia and Singapore as fellow littoral states and user-countries, has maintained and is further strengthening efforts to secure the important international shipping lane in the Malacca Strait;

Whereas, as shown in international fora, the Government of Indonesia remains committed to addressing the problems related to the control of the spread of weapons of mass destruction;

Whereas the Government of Indonesia has deployed a military battalion to support the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL) peacekeeping operations, and as the world's largest Muslim democracy, has made important contributions to the facili-

tation of various dialogues among Islamic factions in the Middle East; and

Whereas, though the Government of Indonesia has shown significant progress in the areas of democracy, good governance, human rights, and counter terrorism, there remains much to be done and many reforms yet to be implemented: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes the progress made by the Government of Indonesia in its efforts to promote democracy;

(2) expresses ongoing support for further democratic reform in Indonesia and the efforts of the Government and the people of Indonesia toward developing good governance;

(3) encourages the Government and the People of Indonesia to continue working to ensure the promotion and protection of human rights, civil liberties, a free press, and a strong civil society in Indonesia; and

(4) encourages the President, the Secretary of State, and other officials of the United States Government to continue assisting the Government of Indonesia in its efforts to promote democracy and ensure the liberty and welfare of the people of Indonesia.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, as a Member of the Senate who has traveled every year to Southeast Asia and met frequently with government leaders from that region when they visited the United States, I believe America has great interests in that region, and that we need to pay more attention here in Washington, DC and across the Nation, to our allies and partners in Southeast Asia.

This region, economically, politically, strategically important, it is our 5th largest in total volume trading partner. Serving as a cornerstone to SE Asia and the lynchpin to its stability, prosperity and security lie in Indonesia.

When I have asked leaders from all over Southeast Asia how they are doing, they always include a reference to Indonesia. Indonesia is the world's largest Muslim country and as a democracy, that makes it the largest Muslim democracy as well.

On the darker side, it is also a key country in what many in the intelligence community, and I agree, is the second front in the war on terror that we confront. It is home to the Islamist terrorist group, Jemah Islamiya, which next to al-Qaeda, is one of the greatest threats to American security and peace in the world.

Indonesian President Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono has been executing an ambitious agenda for anti-corruption, political and economic reform. He represents Indonesia's best hope for continuing down a path towards stability, prosperity, pluralism, democracy and security. Such a path is not only in our own economic interests, but is also essential to control the terrorist threat and the reach of al-Qaeda and Jemah Islamiyah in Southeast Asia.

Since the fall of President Suharto, the Indonesian people have elected three new presidents, impeached one, and experienced several peaceful transfers of power. They have held direct elections of a president. They have amended their constitution in order to

be more democratic and transparent. They have given the judicial branch independent administrative and financial authority. They continue to reform their military in accordance with democratic, civilian-controlled principles.

They have recently provided a battalion to support the UNIFIL forces in Lebanon; and Indonesia was recently cited by Freedom House as Southeast Asia's only truly "free" nation.

But despite all the progress being made, we in Congress seem to continue to look for every transgression to put our relationship on hold and move it backwards.

The truth is that as a country, Indonesia has made truly remarkable progress in a very short period of time. As such, they deserve continued support and engagement, not restrictions and retractions.

We should recognize the accomplishments of the Indonesian people and encourage them in their pursuit of a successful transformation to a democratic nation.

This is why I, along with my distinguished colleague Senator INOUE, am proud to introduce a resolution recognizing Indonesia's accomplishments and the increasingly mutually beneficial relationship between Indonesia and the U.S.

As an archipelago of over 200 million people, if Indonesia were superimposed over the top of the United States, it would span from Florida to Alaska. The size of Indonesia and the fact that they have 17,000 islands at low water, 13,000 at high tide, presents a tremendous challenge in defending its borders and dealing with potential terrorist activities on its distant islands or remote jungles.

The Indonesian armed forces are a necessary partner in this battle. When Jemaah Islamiah bombed the Bali nightclub in 2002, killing 202 people, Indonesia's military, policing and intelligence capabilities were in poor condition. Of late however, Indonesia's security forces have "gained the upper hand," according to the Economist, June 16th, 2007 with the capture and arrest of some of Jemaah Islamiah's top commanders.

Leading the fight against terror is Indonesia's new police unit 88, which was set up with the help of American and Australian Security forces. Among the terrorists captured was Abu Dujana, one of Indonesia's most wanted terrorists. Dujana apparently took over as military leader of JI when their former leader and bomb maker, Azahari Husin, was in 2005 killed and had earned the dubious honor of being named the most wanted terrorist in the country. And over the last 12 months, the Indonesians have captured or killed 47 terrorists, including several key leaders.

The article also went on to say. . . .

No large-scale attacks have taken place since 2005. With the help of their Australian and American counterparts, Indonesia's na-

tional police have greatly improved their tracking of militants and have rounded up some of JI's top leaders.

In the recent past, there have been various forms of restrictions on our relations with the Indonesian military in light of terrible abuses that were committed by the TNI in East Timor. However, our reinstatement of military relations and the restoration of International Military Education & Training or IMET, has resulted in continued positive trends.

It is interesting to note that the current President, when he was a military leader, was in the last class of IMET leaders from Indonesia to come to the United States. He, in his own person, demonstrates the appreciation of civilian control. Some in this body and the other body want to impose new restriction to hinder, not help, the productive influence our military can and has had on the TNI.

We must expand and continue to improve our relations with the TNI, not restrict and retract. IMET provides for adherence to the Code of Military Justice, civilian of the military, respect for human rights, and proper treatment of population principles that should be instilled in military forces.

Further, IMET establishes important relationships and alliances among our military leaders and commanders of friendly foreign forces. It assures they understand how to conduct military or relief operations together. and, it keeps the U.S. engaged in a region where China is increasingly, extending its influence. When I visited the North Western province of Aceh, right after the Tsunami, the fact that their military had not trained with us caused us great military operational difficulties.

Some in Congress apparently want to reimpose sanctions on IMET participation because of the past and perceived military abuses, but as Walter Lohman, Director of Asian Studies at the Heritage Foundation, has said:

accountability for past human rights abuses and the proper role of the militia are legitimate. But the United States needs to get to a point where it addresses these concerns with the same respect it affords other democratic partners, like the Europeans or the Japanese

Many leaders in that region have told me, privately, they believe U.S. active engagement and association with their countries is essential to stop China from extending hegemony over the region. Whether China is viewed as a threat or an opportunity, they are actively courting their neighbors in SE Asia; They are sending official trade missions, signing trade agreements and investing their large reserves in securing sources of energy and natural resources. Make no mistake about it, they are aggressively building up a military force navy capable of extending beyond the straits of Taiwan.

The opportunities and the challenges related to China seeking to extend its influence over Southeast Asia should concern us both economically and mili-

tarily. States of Southeast Asia, notably Indonesia, Singapore, and Malaysia, control the important Malacca Straits; Straits through which one quarter of all the shipping in the world passes and one half of the petroleum products carried by ocean-going vessels pass.

Beyond those interests, it remains my thesis that we should pay attention to Southeast Asia—particularly Indonesia—as the second front in the war on terrorism.

Indonesia represents the best hope for fostering a moderate Islam that recognizes the true peaceful nature of that religion in opposition to the radical terrorist-inspiring versions of Islam.

With Southeast Asia and its large Muslim population, we have an opportunity through constructive forms of engagement; to ensure they become a solid foundation for peace, security and economic prosperity in this critical part of the world. Whether it is more peace corps volunteers, education initiatives, leadership exchanges, IMET or sending Navy ships such as the USS Mercy and USS Peleliu on humanitarian missions to the region.

We can do it without the need for massive military actions such as those we have undertaken in Afghanistan and Iraq to root out the terrorists and in those cases, the governments that harbored them. In other words, more sandals on the ground now, will prevent having to put boots on the ground in future.

I urge my colleagues to support countries like Indonesia in their path towards peace, democracy and pluralism, as opposed to restricting and pushing them towards more radical, terrorist-inspiring versions of Islam.

I ask or behalf of Senator Inouye and myself that the resolution be sent to the desk and ask that it be referred appropriately.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the articles from the June 16th Economist and from Walter Lohman of the Asian Studies Center at the Heritage Foundation.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Economist, June 16, 2007]

WOUNDED BUT STILL DANGEROUS

When Jemaah Islamiah (JI), a South-East Asian Islamist group, bombed nightclubs on the Indonesian island of Bali in 2002, killing 202 people, it exposed the poor state of the country's anti-terrorist intelligence and policing. And the attack did not seem to lead to much improvement. The bombers struck again in 2003, at an American-run hotel in Jakarta, and in 2004 at the Australian embassy there. In 2005 they returned to Bali to attack three tourist restaurants. Of late, however, Indonesia's security forces seem to have gained the upper hand over JI.

No large-scale attacks have taken place since 2005. With the help of their Australian and American counterparts, Indonesia's national police have greatly improved their tracking of militants and have rounded up some of JI's top leaders. This culminated on June 13th with confirmation that they had

arrested Abu Dujana, a JI leader whom police had recently begun to describe as their "most wanted".

Mr. Dujana is said to have fought in Afghanistan and hobnobbed with Osama bin Laden. He is believed to have taken charge of one of JI's military wings, and control of its weapons and explosives, after the death of the group's chief bombmaker, Azahari Husin, in a shoot-out with police in 2005. It has even been suggested that Mr. Dujana is JI's emir, or paramount leader. Another leading figure, Noordin Muhammad Top, is still on the run. But the capture of Mr. Dujana and several other terrorists in recent days follows the discovery of a huge arsenal of guns and bomb-making materials in March. It marks a "very significant" blow against JI, says Sidney Jones, in Jakarta for the International Crisis Group (ICG), a think-tank.

Indonesia's arrests came shortly after Singapore revealed that it was detaining four JI members, arrested between last November and April, and freeing five detained earlier who had "responded positively to rehabilitation". However, the Philippines' army admitted last weekend that another JI leader, known as Dulmatin, suspected of involvement in the 2002 Bali bombs, had again escaped its clutches. The army believes he is hiding in the Tawi-Tawi Islands, off Borneo. He and other fugitives in the southern Philippines are suspected of teaching local Islamist militants how to make bombs.

Indonesia's recent policing successes are a tribute to two new units set up after the 2002 bombings. One, which has stayed out of the spotlight, is an intelligence-gathering taskforce. The other, Detachment 88, is a high-profile anti-terrorist squad, trained by American and Australian federal police in making arrests and gathering forensic evidence. Since their formation Indonesia's terror-fighting capabilities have "come on in leaps and bounds", says Nigel Inkster, an analyst at the International Institute for Strategic Studies in London and until recently the deputy head of the British external-intelligence service, M16. Indonesia's army and its domestic-intelligence agency, BIN, are not much good at anti-terrorism work, says Mr. Inkster, so until the new police units were formed, foreign agencies had no competent Indonesian counterparts.

Despite Detachment 88's successes, Ms. Jones says the unit is too small. When it raids terrorist bases it must rely on help from Brimoh, a poorly trained paramilitary-police unit. In January, for example, the two forces combined to storm a JI hideout on Sulawesi, an Indonesian island plagued by conflict between Muslims and Christians. Fifteen suspected militants and one policeman died. An ICG investigation found that the heavy casualties made local Muslims see extremists as victims. Such incidents are counter-productive, encouraging civilians to shelter JI militants.

Another worry is lenient sentencing by Indonesia's courts. JI's spiritual leader, Abu Bakar Basyir, was let out of jail after serving 26 months of a 30-month sentence for his alleged involvement in the 2002 bombings. The courts later overturned his conviction altogether. The country's prisons, riddled with corruption and incompetence, may serve as recruiting and training centres for JI. Bringing terrorism convicts together in a specially built new jail, as is planned, may simply make the job of JI's "tutors" easier.

For all the success in tracking down JI's military leaders, the group's current plans and the extent of its network remain something of a mystery. Unlike many terrorist groups worldwide, JI lacks an overground political wing to elaborate its demands. A study by the ICG last month reckoned the group may still have around 900 members.

But the scale of its recruitment in universities and Islamic boarding schools is unclear. There are signs that, as its bomb-planting and fund-raising activities are more successfully curbed, the group is simply turning to cheaper and easier forms of terrorism, such as assassinations.

Along with the arrests and the seizure of weapons in March, Indonesian police found a handwritten diagram showing that JI operatives on Java, Indonesia's most populous island, had been reorganised into a sariyah (possibly meaning "platoon"), implying that this was part of a new military structure covering South-East Asia. But there have recently been few signs of activity outside the group's Indonesian heartland. Last week a general in Thailand's military-backed government implied that Cambodian Muslims linked to JI were somehow involved in the insurgency in Thailand's mainly Muslim southern provinces. But he backtracked after the Cambodian government furiously denounced his comments.

There has been little recent evidence that JI or, for that matter, al-Qaeda, has a hand in the Thai south's rising violence. But it is just the sort of strife-torn place, full of alienated, angry Muslims, where those seeking to organise jihad find fertile ground. Police have pruned JI's top ranks. But its roots may still be spreading.

[From the Economist, June 16, 2007]

STREET LIFE

Filthy children and fingerless lepers, tapping on car windows and pleading for "paisa, khana" (cash, food), hang around every busy traffic junction and market in Delhi. Begging in Delhi is illegal though few are locked up. But if the authorities have their way, it will soon be wiped out, as part of a big clean-up before the capital hosts the Commonwealth Games in 2010.

Plans to obliterate other familiar features of Delhi ahead of the games are controversial. A ban on some 300,000 stalls selling freshly cooked snacks has enraged well-off foodies and the poor alike. Animal-rights activists protested when hundreds of unruly monkeys were rounded up and shut in cages. A new scheme to herd the city's stray cows into a vast dairy complex will doubtless anger many cow-revering Hindus.

A radical plan to corral Delhi's beggars, in contrast, has provoked little reaction. After an order from the High Court that begging be stamped out, a report commissioned by Delhi's Department for Social Welfare recommends that beggars be rounded up by a special police squad and placed in beggar's homes, which resemble jails more than hostels. The report, by academics at the University of Delhi, also wants the public to be educated about the "evils of alms-giving", which "promotes parasites".

The report entailed the fullest survey ever conducted of Delhi's beggars. It offers revealing insights into their earning potential. Of the 58,570 beggars counted, 5,003 were interviewed in depth. Nearly half the adults earned between 50 and 100 rupees (\$1.20-\$2.40) a day, not much less than the income of many daily wage labourers. About 3% said they earned 100 to 500 rupees a day.

Tales of high-earning beggars have often been used in India to justify intolerance. But the survey also hints at the underlying injustices. One-third of adult beggars were disabled; 88% said they had no skills; almost all were migrants from other parts of India—mostly the poor northern states of Bihar and Uttar Pradesh—and had taken up begging because they could not find work.

More than one-third were under the age of 18, like Mohammed Alam, a ten-year-old orphan, who left Bihar with his aunt and uncle

a month ago. On arriving in Delhi, Mohammed's aunt found a job ironing clothes; the boy, whose polio has left him with a deformed leg and a limp, works a busy traffic intersection for five hours at a stretch, earning between 10 and 20 rupees. The rest of the time he spends at home ("in that park over there"). He has not been to school since he was seven, he says, his small face a complete blank.

[From the Economist, June 16, 2007]

A MUSEUM BOOM

Cities and towns across China are rushing to build museums. These are not the dour edifices of the Mao era that until recent years were the dreary repositories of the nation's historical treasures. Governments, and even some individuals, are lavishing huge sums on vast and exotic new buildings. Sadly, this does not imply a new-found respect for history.

In 1977, a year after Chairman Mao's death, there were only 300-odd museums. Most of them were little more than displays of Communist Party propaganda. Within a decade, say official press reports, the number had grown to nearly 830. By the turn of the century there were more than 2,000 of them. By 2015, officials estimate, there will be around 3,000.

Beijing alone now has at least 131 museums, up from 96 a decade ago. In January the Stalinist-looking National Museum overlooking Tiananmen Square was closed down for a three-year makeover costing \$330m. Last year saw the formal opening of the city's new Capital Museum, which cost more than \$160m. Shanghai is fast catching up. It plans to have 150 museums by 2010, up from 106.

Local governments, caught up in what the Chinese press call a "museum fever", are vying to outdo one other with architectural wonders. Most are paid for out of government budgets. But near the city of Chengdu, in south-western China, a local businessman, Fan Jianchuan, opened a 33-hectare (82-acre) museum complex two years ago. Its exhibits are boldly revisionist, highlighting the contributions made by the Kuomintang, the party's enemy, in the anti-Japanese war of the 1930s and 40s.

Officials worry that the museum boom is getting out of control. The country has a dearth of people qualified to run them. Local governments are often unwilling to subsidise running costs, forcing museums to rely on ticket sales. Prices are often too high for many ordinary townspeople.

The museum fad is a refreshing contrast to the culture-destroying ethos of Mao's rule. But the penchant for vandalism still lurks. This week Qiu Baixing, a deputy minister of construction, said historical architecture and cultural sites were being "devastated" by rapid urban construction. He even compared this to the destruction wrought by Mao's Great Leap Forward and Cultural Revolution. The museums may look splendid, but, around them, history is being pulverised.

ADJUSTING TO THE REALITY OF A NEWLY DEMOCRATIC INDONESIA

(By Walter Lohman)

JAKARTA, JUNE 18, 2007—In Washington, inertia often carries the day on even the most anachronistic policy ideas. Congress proved this axiom on June 5 when appropriators in the House of Representatives slashed and conditioned the Administration's request to provide military assistance to Indonesia.

Indonesia today is a large, vibrant democracy and a key piece of the geostrategic puzzle in Asia. It is also among the United

States' most important partners in the War on Terror. Approached wisely, the U.S.-Indonesian relationship embodies a convergence of interests on values, geopolitics, and security that is rare among U.S. relationships in the developing world.

The House Appropriations Subcommittee on State and Foreign Operations has charted a strikingly unwise course. Under the leadership of Representative NITA LOWEY (D-NY), it has covered its collective ears to the history of the last decade and has forged ahead with a policy that ignores reality and the vital American interests at stake in the region.

Military assistance to Indonesia first became a matter of contention in Washington following the Dili Massacre of 1991, in which hundreds of protestors in East Timor were murdered by the armed forces of East Timor's erstwhile ruler, Indonesia. The debate was stoked in 1999 by the scorched earth reaction of Indonesian troops and pro-Indonesian militias to East Timor's overwhelming vote in favor of independence. For good reason, these unconscionable abuses strained relations between the United States and Indonesia.

But since 1999, the world has been turned upside down. An emerging, unstable democracy then, Indonesia is now a flourishing democracy. In October 1999, Indonesia elected a president—albeit indirectly—for the first time in 50 years. Five years later, an astounding 350 million votes were cast in three national elections—including a direct election for president.

The final round of the 2004 presidential election, involving 117 million voters and 77 percent of eligible voters, was the largest single election day in history. Among the many remarkable facets of Indonesia's democracy, the 2004 elections produced 61 women members of the 550-seat lower house and 27 out of 128 in the upper house.

Acknowledging that elections do not necessarily equal democracy, it should also be pointed out that Indonesians have taken to vigorously exercising their civil liberties. There are 16 political parties, hundreds of newspapers and magazines, independent television and radio outlets, and countless web sites commenting on Indonesian politics. Lively political debate reverberates across many forums and media. According to Freedom House, Indonesia is the freest country in Southeast Asia. Symbolic of Indonesia's progress, in 2005, Indonesian President Bambang Susilo Yudhoyono visited the site of the 1991 Dili Massacre to pay his respects. The East Timorese Prime Minister reciprocated by telling his countrymen to "Forget the past and look to the future." Today, Indonesia and East Timor enjoy a close, cooperative relationship due in major part to the effort of former president and independence-hero Xanana Gusmao.

The same week that House appropriators were taking Indonesia to task, in fact, the current president of East Timor, Jose Ramos Horta, was in Jakarta echoing the same sentiment offered by his government in 2005, saying, "The important thing is we don't allow ourselves to be hostage of the past but look forward with courage."

Despite its searing, up-close experience in the 1990s, East Timor has come to peace with Indonesia. Yet, its well-meaning supporters in the U.S. Congress seem unable to acknowledge new realities.

STRATEGIC CONCERNS FOR THE UNITED STATES

Two other things have changed since 1999.

First, the meteoric rise of China has made the presence of a strong, U.S.-friendly ASEAN—the association of 10 Southeast Asian nations on China's strategic doorstep—a critical U.S. interest. Indonesia,

straddling waters that accommodate half of the world's commercial cargo transit, is an important part of U.S. geopolitical calculations in its own right. But, as a nation of 235 million people and 17,000 islands, it is also ASEAN's indispensable power.

Every day, China becomes a more effective competitor for the region's interests. Particularly since 2002, its focus in Southeast Asia has shifted from its territorial claims in the South China Sea to lavishing the region with diplomatic attention. Without due vigilance, commitment, and wise policy choices, the time is not far off when the U.S. role as guarantor of regional security and stability will be up for grabs. The United States needs friends in the region; and Indonesia, by wholeheartedly embracing universal democratic ideals, has made being friends as easy as any nation in the world.

Second, the United States is six years into waging the good fight on global terrorism. Indonesia and the U.S. share fundamental interests in this war. Indonesians themselves have been victims of terrorism. Terrorists have directed major acts of violence against the country's tourism industry and foreign communities, killing many innocent foreigners as well as Indonesians.

For many years, the terrorists have sought to inflame sectarian divisions in the same way that al-Qaeda has done so effectively elsewhere in the world. Terrorists have also sought to establish training beachheads in Indonesia's far-flung territories. But the terrorists in Indonesia are losing: There have been no major acts of terrorism in Indonesia since October 2005. Moderation is in the DNA of Indonesia's national character. Certainly, there is a battle going on for Indonesia's soul, as is being waged in much of the Muslim world.

But in Indonesia, the extremists are faced with an extraordinarily resilient foe in Indonesia's famously syncretic, diverse, and tolerant culture. Congress can help strengthen the Indonesian government's hand through assistance and partnership, or it can hamper it by caveating its assistance. Indonesia will fight the war against terror without the United States; but American cooperation certainly improves its prospects. It is in the national interest for the United States to be there for its natural partners.

None of this is to suggest that the United States does not have differences with Indonesia. Indeed, Representative Lowey's concerns about accountability for past human rights abuses and the proper role of the military are legitimate. But the United States needs to get to a point where it addresses these concerns with the same respect it affords other democratic partners, like the Europeans or the Japanese.

Limiting and legally conditioning military-to-military relations is not the best way to address differences; it is a page from the past. The recent action by House appropriators is counterproductive and damaging to vital American interests in Asia.

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, I rise today to join Senator BOND in submitting a resolution, which recognizes the mutually beneficial relationship between the United States and the Republic of Indonesia.

Indonesia is the world's fourth most populous country, the third largest democracy, and the most populous Muslim nation. It possesses extensive natural resources, and a considerable amount of trade passes through the straits of Malacca. Without question, Indonesia is a valuable partner to the United States in the global war on terror.

Indonesia has made great strides in continuing to democratize and develop its civil society as well as rule of law, particularly under the leadership of President Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono. This resolution acknowledges many of the Government's positive reforms and encourages the Republic of Indonesia to continue its commitment to human rights, democratic principles, and good governance.

Mr. President, it is my hope that my colleagues will join me in recognizing this very important nation in Southeast Asia.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 40—SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF OBSERVING THE NATIONAL DAY OF HUMAN TRAFFICKING AWARENESS ON JANUARY 11 OF EACH YEAR TO RAISE AWARENESS OF AND OPPOSITION TO HUMAN TRAFFICKING

Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. COLEMAN, Mr. OBAMA, and Mr. LUGAR) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. CON RES. 40

Whereas the United States has a tradition of advancing fundamental human rights;

Whereas because the people of the United States remain committed to protecting individual freedom, there is a national imperative to eliminate human trafficking, including early or forced marriage, commercial sexual exploitation, forced labor, labor obtained through debt bondage, involuntary servitude, slavery, and slavery by descent;

Whereas to combat human trafficking in the United States and globally, the people of the United States and the Federal Government, including local and State governments, must be aware of the realities of human trafficking and must be dedicated to stopping this contemporary manifestation of slavery;

Whereas beyond all differences of race, creed, or political persuasion, the people of the United States face national threats together and refuse to let human trafficking exist in the United States and around the world;

Whereas the United States should actively oppose all individuals, groups, organizations, and nations who support, advance, or commit acts of human trafficking;

Whereas the United States must also work to end human trafficking around the world through education;

Whereas victims of human trafficking need support in order to escape and to recover from the physical, mental, emotional, and spiritual trauma associated with their victimization;

Whereas human traffickers use many physical and psychological techniques to control their victims, including the use of violence or threats of violence against the victim or the victim's family, isolation from the public, isolation from the victim's family and religious or ethnic communities, language and cultural barriers, shame, control of the victim's possessions, confiscation of passports and other identification documents, and threats of arrest, deportation, or imprisonment if the victim attempts to reach out for assistance or to leave;

Whereas although laws to prosecute perpetrators of human trafficking and to assist