

[From the Carter Center East Timor Weekly Report No. 9, Sept. 13, 1999]

INDONESIAN ARMED FORCES CONTINUE CAMPAIGN OF MURDER, VIOLENCE, AND MASSIVE FORCED DEPORTATION IN EAST TIMOR AS MILITIAS TERRORIZZE TIMORESE REFUGEES IN WEST TIMOR

The Carter Center is encouraged by the decision of the Indonesian government to allow the deployment of an international peace-keeping force in East Timor. However, the Indonesian military and police, with the assistance of their militia surrogates, continue to murder and terrorize the people of East Timor, destroying buildings and infrastructure and forcibly expelling tens of thousands of unarmed civilians from the territory. The city of Dili, the capital of East Timor, has been almost completely destroyed over the past week, and reports from other parts of the territory indicate widespread destruction, looting, and murder. It is clear that the Indonesian armed forces are executing a deliberate, planned campaign under the direction of senior military commanders to destroy and forcibly depopulate East Timor.

In West Timor armed pro-integration militias are now operating with official support, openly terrorizing the more than 100,000 East Timorese refugees who have been forced over the border. Those displaced by the violence, both in East Timor and West Timor, now face the threat of malnutrition and disease as domestic and international humanitarian efforts are hampered by militia and military activity and Indonesian government efforts to block access to refugee camps.

Carter Center staff and observers, forced at gunpoint to evacuate Dili Sept. 5 and now reporting from several locations throughout Indonesia, have confirmed the following through eyewitness accounts from reliable sources:

Refugees fleeing East Timor have been subject to extreme intimidation and acts of violence. The Carter Center has confirmed that pro-integration militia members murdered approximately 35 young men traveling on the Dobon Solo ferry from Dili to Kupang on Tuesday, Sept. 7, and dumped their bodies overboard.

In the attack at Bishop Belo's compound last week, militiamen hacked to death with machetes some 40 refugees in the courtyard while TNI soldiers fired into the bishop's residence from the street. A military ambulance later came and removed all but two of the bodies.

In an Indonesian television interview, Rui Lopez, a militia leader, admitted that Indonesian civilian police and military officials in Suai, East Timor, held a meeting before announcement of balloting results and were given instructions to attack UNAMET offices, burn the town of Suai, and drive the population into West Timor.

There are now more than 100,000 refugees from East Timor in West Timor and on the islands of Flores and Alor, and estimates of the total number of people displaced from the territory range from 120,000 to 200,000 (nearly one-fourth of the entire population). Refugees have been transported by Indonesian military ships and aircraft to a number of locations within Indonesia, including Irian Jaya, Ambon, Sulawesi, Surabaya, and Bali, some of which are thousands of kilometers from East Timor.

Pro-integration militias are now active throughout West Timor, particularly in the towns of Atambua and Kupang. Eyewitnesses report that militia members have entered refugee camps with lists of names of supporters of independence, and that a number

of individuals have been removed from camps or executed in the camps of militiamen. Militia members armed with automatic weapons also have been seen stopping and searching vehicles in central Kupang and driving looted UNAMET vehicles in and out of the provincial police headquarters.

The Indonesian military and police have prevented international aid workers, journalists, and observers from visiting refugee camps in West Timor and from interviewing Timorese refugees.

Eyewitnesses report that the Indonesian military and police have joined in the looting and destruction of Dili. Indonesian soldiers and police officers have frequently sold looted food and other basic necessities to refugees under their control at exorbitant prices.

It is now apparent that militia violence has been targeted at political, social, and religious leaders, and a number of priests and nuns have been murdered during militia and military attacks on churches sheltering those seeking refuge from the violence.

PRESIDENT GRANTS CLEMENCY TO THE FALN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. FOSSELLA) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FOSSELLA. Mr. Speaker, last Friday culminated a very rough week, indeed a rough few weeks and a rough 24 years for some families across America, because some individuals associated with the FALN, the most notorious terrorist group to set foot on American soil, had engaged in a reign of terror across America in the 1970's and 1980's and claimed responsibility for 130 bombings that killed innocent people, that maimed innocent people, that in part had no remorse or offered no apologies for the damage that they created or for the victims that they made. They were set free on Friday, back into society because our White House offered these terrorists clemency, in other words, a get-out-of-jail-free card.

So to those families who have had to endure, for example, like Ms. Diana Berger of Cherry Hill, New Jersey, whose husband was dining in Fraunces Tavern in 1975 like any other American would have been in any other bar or restaurant, Ms. Berger was 6 months pregnant with their first child when her husband was killed. Or Joseph Connor and Thomas Connor. Joseph was 9 years old; his brother was 11. Joseph was celebrating his ninth birthday. His father was in that same restaurant, again out for a business lunch. He never came home to celebrate Joseph's ninth birthday because he was killed by a FALN bomb. Or on December 31, 1982, when this same group of terrorists claimed responsibility proudly for several bombs in downtown New York. Officer Rocco Pascarella of upstate New York lost a leg in that explosion. Officer Richard Pastorella in an attempt to respond to officer Rocco Pascarella, got another call for a bomb threat. He

responded to that bomb threat. He tried to diffuse the bomb. He is blinded for life. He has lost all his fingers on one hand. He has 22 screws in his head, has undergone 13 major surgeries. He will never be the same. His partner that night was Officer Anthony Semft from Long Island, New York, who was blinded in one eye and who is partially deaf.

Those are just a few of the victims of this terrorist organization known as the FALN. They were serving rightly a long time in prison until the President offered them clemency, clemency that they initially rejected and finally accepted. I think this is absolutely the worst thing that we can be doing to send a signal to anybody contemplating terrorism on American soil to set these terrorists free. If anybody sitting at home or anybody in this chamber could imagine if in 10 or 15 years a man by the name of Terry Nichols who is affiliated or associated with the Oklahoma City bombing, who many argue was not actually at the bomb scene, but clearly involved in the conspiracy to kill innocent people, so many families left without children, left without fathers, left without mothers, left without grandmothers, if 10 or 15 years the then President steps forward and offers clemency, can you imagine the outrage across America?

□ 1930

That is the outrage that we are experiencing right here today. That is why so many people cannot fathom how the President reached this decision. That is why a wide range of law enforcement agencies, including the FBI, the Bureau of Prisons, the U.S. attorney's offices in Illinois and Chicago, all recommended against granting clemency. Why? Because this is a wrong signal to be sending to terrorists but, above all, these people killed were part of a killing operation, and to this very day, while they are celebrating their release and while there are some who are calling them heroes, to this very day show no remorse, offer no apologies, offer no contrition for what they did.

Indeed, what they suggest is that the Connor or the Berger family or the Pastarella family or the Pascarella family or the Semft family, they were casualties of war. I hope and pray that these people never get the opportunity to bomb and kill an innocent person ever again.

My prayers and thoughts go out to all of the victims associated with the terror associated with the FALN and may we rue the day if they ever act as they did for 10, 15 and 20 years.

SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH IN THE UNITED STATES AND THE IMPACT IT HAS ON OUR ECONOMY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Under a previous order of the

House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to rise and discuss the issue of scientific research in the United States and the impact that it has on our economy.

The reason I do this is because there currently is an underfunding of scientific research in the budget proposals we have before us and in the appropriations bills which we have passed. I would like to review why that is dangerous for our Nation and why we must increase our spending on scientific research.

Let me first back up a year or two. A previous speaker, Mr. Gingrich, had a keen interest in science and technology and asked the gentleman from Wisconsin, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, chairman of the Committee on Science, to give me the responsibility of reviewing science and technology policy in the United States Government and make recommendations for improvement.

After all, the previous study had been done by Vannevar Bush in 1945 and, although it was outstanding, it is clearly out of date. There has been some excellent science policy work done recently by individuals outside of the government, but our government had not done anything official in that direction.

As a result of our work, after holding a considerable number of hearings, working hand-in-glove with the Speaker and with the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER), we were able to produce a new science policy report. It has just come out in paperback, and it has been very well received by the scientific community. It makes a number of arguments for the importance of scientific research in our Nation and explains what we should do in the way of Federal funding. I believe the recommendations are well founded and should be followed.

I would also like to briefly display the number of letters I received just in the past few weeks from leaders of scientific associations protesting the lack of funding in this year's budget. I have a letter, for example, from Jerry Friedman, President of the American Physical Society; from the American Association for the Advancement of Science; American Association of Engineering Societies; American Astronomical Society; American Ceramic Society; American Chemical Society; American Electronics Associations, which represents one of the bigger industries in our Nation; American Geological Institute; American Institute of Biological Sciences, the Chemical Engineers, the Mathematical Society, et cetera, all expressing the great concern in the scientific world about this particular issue.

Similarly, there was an op-ed piece in the Washington Post just a week ago

by Allan Bromley, outstanding physicist and former presidential science advisor, who has been a leader in the scientific community for many years. The title of his article is No Science and No Surplus, and I would like to at this point enter that into the RECORD.

[From the Washington Post, August 26, 1999]

NO SCIENCE, NO SURPLUS

(By D. Allan Bromley)

America is on a roll. We're balancing the federal budget, reforming welfare and making retirement secure. Sound like a breakthrough in fiscal management? Not exactly. Our awesome economic success can be traced directly to our past investments in science. The problem is, this year's federal budget for science is a disaster, and it compromises our nation's economic and social progress.

Here are the latest budget numbers: NASA science is slashed by \$678 million; science at the Department of Energy is cut by \$116 million; and the National Science Foundation ends up with \$275 million less than the president requested. Clearly, Congress has lost sight of the critical role science plays in America.

Federal investments in science pay off—they produce cutting-edge ideas and a highly skilled work force. The ideas and personnel then feed into high-tech industries to drive the U.S. economy. It's a straightforward relationship: Industry is attentive to immediate market pressures; the federal government makes the venturesome investments in university-based research that ensures long-term competitiveness. So far, it's been a powerful tandem.

Thirty years ago, the laser and fiber optic cable were born from federal investments in university research. Over time, those two discoveries formed the backbone of a multi-billion-dollar telecommunications industry.

The fusion of university research and industrial development now generates about 5,000 new jobs and contributes a quarter-billion dollars in taxes to the federal coffer every day. It accounts for 70 percent of our economic growth. The result is undeniable. The fusion is primarily responsible for our booming economy and our growing federal surplus. So the consequences of a budget cut to science are equally undeniable: no science, no surplus.

The benefits of the science investment go deeper than just the surplus. Three years ago this month, welfare underwent dramatic reform. No one knew what the fallout from that would be. But the high-tech economy eased the burden. Unemployment was dropping to a 25-year low, and jobs were being created at a record pace. As it turned out, half of those jobs were generated by the high-tech sector.

The legislative challenge before us is patching up Social Security. Again, we'll rely on the science and technology juggernaut. Whether the solution lies in stimulating private investment or in steady federal surpluses, the proposals all rely on a familiar friend—the strength of our nation's booming economy. And while Congress dithers, the public already is taking steps of its own.

Americans hold more than \$5 trillion in communications and technology stocks. Our mutual funds, our 401K plans and IRAs are stuffed full of high-tech investments. The retirement security of Americans now depends upon the steady flow of innovations from technology companies. In turn, those companies rely on the steady flow of discoveries and trained work force generated by the scientific community. No science, no savings.

Scientific research at our universities and national labs is now a foundation of the economy and thereby vital to the success of social legislation. But rather than reinforcing the foundation, Congress is eroding it. That action couldn't come at a worse time.

America's science infrastructure is in decay—aged science buildings on our campuses, dated laboratory equipment, antiquated computers. During the Bush administration, the Office of Science and Technology Policy estimated the cost of rebuilding our science infrastructure at \$100 billion. The Clinton administration has done little to address the problem. The budget Congress is proposing guarantees continued decay.

Congress must significantly increase science funding. Senators recognized the need last week when, with the support of Sens. Trent Lott and Tom Daschle, they passed the Federal Research Investment Act, which calls for doubling the federal investment in science by the year 2010. But appropriators haven't followed through. It's not too late—budgets won't be settled until October.

For the sake of the country, I hope Congress will recognize the significant role science plays in society. Without science, there won't be a surplus.

Mr. EHLERS. The key point is this: when we analyze what is causing our economic boom of the past few years, the first major cause is monetary policy, which has largely been headed by Alan Greenspan; next is tax and regulatory policy, where the Republicans in the Congress have made tremendous improvements; and the final and very vital cause is scientific research. If we analyze the economic development taking place today we will find that over half of all economic development is directly related to scientific research, whether it is the Internet, whether it is medical research, any of the other research projects going on.

Dr. Bromley's thesis is very simple. He says: no science, no surplus. Why? Because the economic boom we are enjoying now, which has resulted in the first surpluses in the Federal Government since 1969, is to a large extent caused by the scientific research that has been done in the last 2 to 4 decades. If we do not continue to do that research, we are doing a grave disservice to our children and grandchildren, because we are condemning them to a United States which will not have as much economic growth and which will not have the resources and the surplus which will enable them to enjoy a good economy as we enjoy it today.

Mr. Speaker, I advocate very strongly that we review the appropriations bills that have passed the House and are before the Senate, and that we make every effort to increase the funding for scientific research.

As it stands now, NASA science is slashed by \$678 million; science of the Department of Energy is cut by \$116 million; and the National Science Foundation ends up with \$275 million less than requested.

I think it extremely important that we review these bills and that we increase funding for scientific research

so that we may continue to enjoy not only the results of the research, but also the economic benefits that will arise from the fruits of that research. I90[H13SE9-402]{H8139}F

CAMPAIGN INTEGRITY ACT OF 1999

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HUTCHINSON) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased this evening to take this opportunity to address a very important subject. Tomorrow this House will once again consider legislation that would improve our campaign finance laws.

I know that my colleagues will say well, we have been here before. In fact, we have been here before many, many times, because this Congress and previous Congresses have considered year after year various forms of campaign finance legislation and none of those have ever passed both Houses, signed by the President and actually become law. So there is a growing frustration and cynicism among the American public.

I believe that this is a cause still worth fighting for, that there is a consensus still yet to be maintained and to be gained and I hope that we can do that this Congress; whether it is this vote tomorrow or whether it is later on.

The bill that I am proposing is the Campaign Integrity Act of 1999, which we have worked hard to draft in a fair and bipartisan manner and will address the greatest abuses in our campaign system. I am delighted to have two of my colleagues joining me in this discussion tonight, the gentleman from Montana (Mr. HILL) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY). I want to hear what their views are on this and why this is important for us to address this subject of campaign finance reform, and particularly this bill that we have all cosponsored, the Campaign Integrity Act of 1999.

So I want to express my appreciation to the gentleman from Montana (Mr. HILL), who has done such a tremendous job in showing leadership on an issue that I think is vital to our political process. I know he has been active as a State party chairman in Montana. He understands the political process. He understands the role of parties and candidates, and I am very grateful for his support, and I want to yield to him so he can talk about why this is needed.

Mr. HILL of Montana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUTCHINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. HILL of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Arkansas

(Mr. HUTCHINSON) for yielding, and let me compliment the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HUTCHINSON) for his untiring effort at trying to help reform the campaign finance laws of this country.

We started this process as freshmen in the last Congress, holding hearings, drafting legislation, bringing together Democrats and Republicans in a bipartisan bill, and it was his leadership that helped us accomplish that.

It seems to me that we need to accomplish three things when we are going to reform the campaign finance laws. At least from my judgment, there are some things that are broken in the current system and we need to accomplish some changes.

One of those is that we need to have more competitive campaigns. Over 90 percent of the Members of this House who stand for reelection are reelected election after election after election. Even in the great revolutionary election of the 104th Congress in 1994, nearly 90 percent of the Members who stood for reelection were reelected.

One of the reasons for that is that it is difficult for challengers to raise the resources necessary to have a viable election. In fact, I find it kind of interesting that there are some who helped sponsor legislation similar to this in the last Congress, when they came as freshmen Members who this was their first time in Congress and they had maybe run a challenger's race who are now incumbents, some might say are entrenched incumbents, who do not support campaign finance reform that would allow us to have competitive elections, but I appreciate the gentleman's untiring effort.

The other thing we need to do is deal with the issue of soft money. As the gentleman knows, soft money are large corporate contributions, labor union contributions. It has been the tradition of this country for almost all of this century that large organizations, corporations and labor unions, should not be able to contribute unlimited sums of money to the political process because the view is that they would overwhelm the process. This bill that we are advocating would put restrictions on soft money to the political parties.

The other thing that we need to accomplish when we reform finance laws is to maintain our commitment to the First Amendment. Some people would advocate changes in the campaign finance laws that would have the effect of stifling the competitive thought that is out there; the outside groups and others who want to express themselves about what we do here. So there are some who in closing the soft money loophole want to close the loophole of the First Amendment, the right for people to express their views, and we cannot allow that to happen, too.

So what this bill does is it says to the political parties, the political parties

cannot accept soft money but allows independent groups to be able to continue to express their views about what we do and how we go about doing it and in the process not chilling free speech.

So those three things, this bill does. It protects our First Amendment freedoms, reinforces them. It eliminates the potential problems that soft money and the corrupting influence that that might have on our political parties but it also endeavors to make campaigns competitive again, which is so important to this country.

So I just want to compliment the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HUTCHINSON) for his hard work. This is a good bill. Our colleagues are going to have an opportunity to vote on this this week. I think this is the right alternative to reform our system, and I know that the gentleman has been a strong advocate for that, and I thank him for yielding to me this evening.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Well, I thank the gentleman for his remarks. He is exactly on point, that we do not want to harm the First Amendment and the freedoms we all enjoy in the political process in order to just do something and make a change in the law.

So I believe that we can have a balance, that we can actually stop the flow of soft money into our national political parties; we can stop the greatest abuse; we can still have a significant and critical role that the parties play but still not infringe upon those groups that are out there expressing themselves in election.

Imagine how counterproductive it would be if we burdened these outside groups and said, you cannot participate in the political or we are going to put so many regulations on you that your participation will be really rendered meaningless.

So I do not think that is the direction we want to go. This bill is very balanced. It addresses the abuse in our system, but like the gentleman said, it makes sure that we protect our First Amendment freedoms.

So I am delighted also to have my good friend, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY), here, who has been so outspoken in favor of reform and particularly supportive of the Campaign Integrity Act. So I would just like to yield to him for his comments on this bill.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUTCHINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, first I thank the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HUTCHINSON) for yielding, but also for his leadership on this issue.

As freshmen together 2 years ago, the gentleman played the leadership role in working together, Republicans and Democrats, over a very thoughtful 5-month period, meeting with experts on constitutional law, citizens who felt