

Judge Barry's reputation is well known and she has excellent credentials. In 1983, she was nominated to a federal district court judgeship by President Reagan, and since being confirmed for that post she has compiled an impressive record and become a nationally recognized expert on a wide range of criminal and civil law matters.

Her knowledge of criminal law led Chief Justice Rehnquist to appoint her to chair the Committee on Criminal Law of the Judicial Conference of the United States, a position she held from 1993–1996. Additionally, the Federal Judicial Center asked her to make an instructional videotape called "How to Try a Complex Criminal Case" and that tape is played for all new district court judges at their orientation seminar.

In the area of civil law, Judge Barry has issued many important rulings including a decision that Blue Cross was required to pay for a bone marrow transplant for a terminally ill young girl who would have died without the procedure.

New Jersey residents are particularly proud of her decision holding New York City responsible and in contempt for failing to obey a court order designed to prevent garbage and medical waste from New York's Fresh Kills Landfill from drifting onto New Jersey's shore. Not only do her judicial colleagues hold her in high regard, Judge Barry is also well-respected by the many attorneys who have appeared before her. They praise her command of the law, her professional demeanor, and her razor-sharp wit.

As a result of her tenure in the U.S. attorney's office, her 16 years of outstanding service at the district court level, and her legal expertise, Judge Barry is well-prepared for elevation to the circuit court. In fact, she has already sat on the Court of Appeals—by designation—and has written several opinions.

Mr. President, I highly recommend Judge Barry for elevation to the third circuit. As some of my colleagues may know, the third circuit is currently facing a judicial emergency, and the appointment of Judge Barry will help.

To further address this crisis, I hope that the Judiciary Committee will soon take up the nomination of another excellent candidate for the third circuit, Judge Julio Fuentes. I would also be remiss if I did not point out that the elevation of Judge Barry will create another vacancy on the District Court of New Jersey, and so it would be essential that the committee move forward with the nomination of Faith Hochberg to that court.

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. President, I rise today in support of Judge Maryanne Trump Barry's confirmation to the Third Circuit Court of Appeals. As a member of the Senate Judiciary Committee, I have followed Judge Barry's nomination closely as it has moved through the confirmation proc-

ess. During this time, I have been impressed by her candor, intelligence, and qualifications for the position. She has moved through the process quickly, and I believe the overwhelming support for her nomination is evidence of her ability to ultimately fulfill the obligations of serving on the Third Circuit.

Those who know Judge Barry, and have had the pleasure of working with her, have spoken openly of her integrity and thorough knowledge of the law. Some have highlighted her decency, while others have focused upon her razor-sharp wit. However, everyone has agreed on one point—Judge Barry has developed a reputation as a skilled jurist with a judgment and temperament that are highly respected by her peers. The other members of the Senate Judiciary Committee agreed with this assessment, and I was pleased that Judge Barry's nomination was passed out of the Committee by voice-vote on July 29th.

For those who are unfamiliar with Judge Barry's distinguished career, she has graduated with Master's and law degrees from Columbia and Hofstra Universities respectively. Judge Barry first worked for the U.S. Attorney's Office in New Jersey and quickly rose through the ranks. She served as Chief of the Appeals Division, and then as a first assistant to the U.S. Attorney. At the time, Judge Barry was the highest-ranking female prosecutor in any major U.S. Attorney's Office in the country.

In 1983, Judge Barry was appointed to the U.S. District Court by President Reagan. For almost 16 years, she has served as a pragmatic and vocal presence on the bench in Newark, New Jersey. As a former President of the Association of the Federal Bar of the State of New Jersey, Judge Barry has had a tremendous impact on policy across the State. She currently serves on its advisory board, and continues to be highly regarded for her insights and opinions. Judge Barry has consistently impressed me as an extraordinary woman, and one who will continue to distinguish herself. I urge my colleagues to support her confirmation to the Third Circuit Court of Appeals.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Maryanne Trump Barry, of New Jersey, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Third Circuit?

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now return to legislative session.

The Senator from Washington.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, with respect to the Interior appropriations

bill, there will be a vote on or in relation to the Bryan amendment and the second-degree Wyden amendment tomorrow morning at 10:30.

It may well be that that will be the last contested matter in connection with this appropriations bill other than the disposition of the Hutchison amendment. I am not entirely certain of that at this point. But we are close to having agreed-upon managers' amendments both with respect to legislative matters and with respect to money matters, with the exception of the motion to reconsider the invocation of cloture.

For that reason, this is a notice and a request to Members that if they have other matters they wish debated, or if they have other matters they wish brought to the managers' attention, they should do so very promptly. We will not in the managers' amendment dispose of all the amendments which were reserved, but I think we probably will be able to take care of all of those that look as if they would be otherwise brought up and voted on.

We are tantalizingly close to finishing. But, of course, we will not finish or go to third reading under the present circumstances at least until after disposition of the motion to reconsider the motion to invoke cloture, and that motion will certainly pass, and there will be at least one more vote on cloture itself.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, thank you very much.

I would just like to comment upon the vote the Senate has just taken on whether to shut down debate on the Hutchison amendment. I thank very much those colleagues who voted against that cloture motion. I think it is very important that the light and the truth be shone upon this matter. I think the way to do it is to have more discussion.

I just want to say to the Senate that when I made my 2½-minute presentation, it is always very difficult to say everything in your heart in 2½ minutes. But I said the reason I am doing this—there is no other reason in the world for me to be delaying a vote on an amendment—is that I love the Senate too much to see it be a party to such a scheme by just 5 percent of the oil companies to essentially rob this Treasury of millions and millions of dollars.

This is the fourth time that Senator Hutchison has attempted to pass this rider. It never had a Senate vote before. This is the first vote in any way about the Hutchison amendment.

By the way, I know that some people who voted aye on the cloture motion will vote with me on the substance. I am looking forward to that.

But the bottom line is, when we look at this closely, we see a number of things—that most of the oil companies are doing the right thing on their royalty payments. Ninety-five percent of

them are doing the right thing. They pay the appropriate royalty when they drill on Federal lands, onshore or offshore, and they send that check over to the taxpayers. You know where the funds go—right into the Land and Water Conservation Fund and Historic Preservation Fund to be used for environmental purposes for the upkeep of our parks and for the upkeep of our historical monuments. We all know from both sides of the aisle that we need to do more for our parks and open space.

As a matter of fact, there are bipartisan proposals to pass legislation to do that. Yet at the same time, too many people seem willing to shut their eyes to a raid on the Treasury that would lower the revenues to the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

You have to ask yourself why the oil companies are so interested in this. I think the answer is in the Record. There have been several whistleblowers who have come forward who have stated in the most eloquent of terms that when they were working for the oil companies, the companies purposely undervalued the oil so that they could pay fewer dollars of royalty payments.

As USA Today says, what if we all woke up one day and said: You know, I don't think I am paying a fair amount of rent. Forget about the contract I signed with my landlord. I am just going to cut it back.

It wouldn't be too long before that tenant was out on the street, and rightly so. If he or she signed an agreement, they have to pay it.

What if one of us decided not to pay our mortgage and just say, let's take 10 or 20 percent off the top? The answer is, if we did that on a continual basis, the banker would take over our home, and rightly so, because we signed an agreement.

The oil companies have signed an agreement. They have signed an agreement with the Federal Government, and 95 percent of them are doing the right thing, but 5 percent of them are not.

The Interior Department wants to make sure that those 5 percent do the right thing by clarifying the rules that govern these royalty payments. The Hutchison amendment would stop the Interior Department in its tracks from trying to collect the fair royalties.

I have used another analogy in this debate before. If somebody came running through the Senate Chamber with a big sack of money that he had just stolen from the Treasury, every one of us on both sides of the aisle would stop that individual. Frankly, this is no different.

How do I know that?

The whistleblowers have told us so under penalty of perjury that they sat around and said: Let's undervalue this oil and "wait for the day of judgment." That is what one of the whistleblowers actually said.

How else do we know there is cheating going on?

Look at all the settlements that the oil companies are agreeing to with the various States all throughout our country on this matter. They don't want to go to court. They are afraid they are going to lose because the whistleblowers will get out there—because the facts are there. So they are settling for millions of dollars.

Ironically, Mr. President, I think I even sent it to your office on Friday, two more big oil companies are settling this week for over \$100 million rather than take their weak case to the court.

We know that the posted prices they are paying their royalty on are just made up and they are far less than the market price.

All Interior wants to do is fix the situation.

You will hear the argument: It is a bureaucracy run amok. Let me say this: You could say that about anything. But the facts belie that statement because the Interior Department has held many meetings. By the way, they have opened up their rule for further comment.

All I want to say to my colleagues by way of thanking them for this is that because of your standing with me against this cloture amendment, it means we are going to continue to have the American people focus in on this scam. When they do, they are going to want to know who stood with them or who stood with the vertically integrated oil companies that had been getting away with this robbery.

That is all I want. I don't gain anything out of this. There are lots of oil companies in my State. They are not thrilled. This is not something I do to be popular. But if in your heart you know you are right, and if in your heart you don't want to see the Senate associated with this kind of scam, then you have to stand up and be counted. Many of my colleagues, including Senator DURBIN, Senator FEINGOLD, Senator WELLSTONE, and Senator MURRAY, stood with me and entered statements in the RECORD or stood by my side on the floor of the Senate.

I say to my friend, Senator HUTCHISON, she was the one who wanted a vote on Monday originally. The vote was supposed to be held on Tuesday. I did not object to an earlier vote. A lot of people came back for the vote. Therefore, of course, I insisted we have a vote. We are going to have another vote. This could be from my perspective a very short-lived victory. It is true, they could come up with the 60 votes. But I feel good tonight. We have courage on this floor. This was not an easy vote.

Senator FEINGOLD has taken to the floor. He has shown the biggest contributions have come from oil companies. I understand the power of that. I understand that. It is hard to stand up when these 5 percent—and they are the big ones, the billion-dollar companies—call you on the phone and say: Come on, this is just a procedural matter, stick with us.

What will we have in the end? More delay and a \$66 million loss to the Treasury on top of the \$88 million we have already lost from the Land and Water Conservation Fund. I think if the American people will focus on this, they will thank those colleagues who stood with me today. They are all consumers. They all understand this.

There has been a lot of talk on the floor that oil companies are suffering. I was very strongly in support of helping the oil companies and the steel companies that were in trouble. I am the first one to say we need to give them help. But don't allow 5 percent to cheat the taxpayers. That is a different issue. The interesting thing about royalty payments is they go down when there is a depression in all prices.

Wouldn't it be nice if our rent went down if there was a depression or we lost our job? Wouldn't it be wonderful if our mortgage automatically went down if there was a recession? That is what happens with these royalty payments. They are very fair. They are based on the fair market value of the oil. There is no set price because we want to be fair to the oil companies.

It is a privilege to drill on the people's land. It is a privilege, whether it is offshore or onshore. If it is Federal land, the taxpayers, the American people own that land. We want to make sure we work in a cooperative spirit with those who would like to exploit our resources. Make sure, at the same time, that they are good corporate citizens. What stuns me about this debate is that 95 percent of them are and 5 percent of the oil companies are not.

All the Department of the Interior is saying is: Please, let us straighten this mess out with these 5 percent. It is a lot of money to the Treasury, money that is necessary to keep our parks up, preserve our remaining open space, invest in our historical monuments that this great Nation so cherishes. It is a shame to see these 5 percent of the oil companies—and this is the fourth time this rider is before the Senate—walking off with millions of dollars that belong to the American taxpayers.

Senator HUTCHISON says the Office of Management and Budget is wrong when they say it is a \$66 million loss. The Interior Department says it is a \$66 million loss. The CBO tells Senator HUTCHISON it is about \$11 million. I say it doesn't matter if it is \$11 million or \$66 million. Maybe it is somewhere in between. It is the principle here of millions of dollars that belong to the taxpayers not winding up in the Land and Water Conservation Fund to take care of our natural resources.

Whether this is a victory for those who believe in fairness and justice and truth, if it is a victory that lasts 24 hours, so be it. To me it is an important point. We have made our point. This is not a trivial debate. This is not a trivial argument. As a matter of fact, I think the Senator from Idaho, Mr. CRAIG, was on the floor and said it is a baseless debate. It is far from baseless.

We see that tonight with this vote, however it winds up. This is a divided Senate.

Again, I thank the people who stood for fairness, who stood with the taxpayers, who stood with the environment, who stood with those who say you have to be a good corporate citizen. That is all we are saying. We expect our citizens to be good. Boy, if they don't pay their taxes, we are after them. And don't have the lawyers that the oil companies have on their side to drag out these arguments in court, month after month—ordinary citizens don't have that. If they don't pay their taxes, they have to explain why. If they don't pay their rent, they better explain why. If they don't pay their mortgage, they better tell the bank why.

We shouldn't have a double standard just because an oil company is powerful, just because an oil company can give millions of dollars of contributions, just because an oil company is influential. This day we stood up for the average person. I hope we do it again. For me, it was all worth it.

I yield the floor.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I think it is very clear that the Senate has seen through all of the rhetoric, through all of the hyperbole, and they have made the right decision on this amendment. I am very proud tonight that if everyone had been here we would have had 60 votes for cloture. As it is, we had 55 votes. The clear will of the Senate is to do the right thing on this issue—not to be led down a path, bringing up issues that are unrelated in order to make a point that isn't relevant to what we are talking about today.

The Senate voted, overwhelmingly, to come to closure and take control of the tax policy of this country. After all, if the Senate doesn't make the tax policy along with our colleagues in the House, are we going to let unelected bureaucrats make decisions that will affect our economy, the jobs of thousands of people, possibly sending them overseas for foreign jobs instead of American jobs? Our Senate colleagues tonight said the Senate of the United States is going to speak on oil and gas tax policy. We spoke very clearly that we want a 1-year moratorium. We hope MMS will do the right thing in giving a simple and fair tax that will be paid by the oil companies for the right to drill on public lands. That is the issue here.

There has been a lot said tonight. First of all, the quote was made from a USA Today article saying that this would be like a lessee saying: I'm not going to pay \$500 a month for this apartment; I'm going to pay \$400 a month even though I agreed to pay \$500 a month.

Actually, it is just the opposite. The oil companies have a contract with the Federal Government. They have met all the criteria that the Federal Government has put down in order to drill

on Federal lands. What the Senator from California has asked that we do is to allow the Mineral Management Service to raise the rent on the apartment in the middle of the month. They are breaking a contract and saying: We are going to raise your taxes right in the middle of the contract.

If we allow that to happen, who will be next? Who is the next person who is going to have a contract and have the price increased in the middle of the contract? Contract rights are part of the basis of the rule of law in this country, and we seem to be blithely going over it as if, "It's a big oil company; we can run over them." That is not the rule of law. We should not be raising taxes in the middle of a contract. It is not right and I hope in the end the Senate will prevail and we will make the tax policy for this country.

No. 2, the Senator from California keeps saying only 5 percent of the oil companies are going to be affected by the MMS-proposed rule. In fact, every company that drills on public lands is affected by this ruling. I want to put in the RECORD the letter that was received on September 13, 1999, by the California Independent Petroleum Association.

Dear Senator HUTCHISON:

The California Independent Petroleum Association represents 450 independent oil and gas producers, royalty owners, and service companies operating in California. We want to set the record straight. The MMS oil royalty rulemaking affects all California producers on federal land. It is false to claim that this rulemaking only affects the top 5 percent of oil producers.

How are California independents affected? The proposed rulemaking allows the government to second guess a wellhead sale. If rejected, a California producer is subjected to an ANS index that adjusts to the wellhead set by the government. Using a government formula instead of actual proceeds results in a new tax being imposed on all producers of federal oil.

I ask unanimous consent the entire letter be printed in the RECORD.

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

CALIFORNIA INDEPENDENT
PETROLEUM ASSOCIATION,
Sacramento, CA, September 13, 1999.

Hon. KAY BAILEY HUTCHISON,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

CIPA SUPPORTS YOUR AMENDMENT TO EXTEND
ROYALTY RULEMAKING AN ADDITIONAL YEAR

DEAR SENATOR HUTCHISON: The California Independent Petroleum Association (CIPA) represents 450 independent oil and gas producers, royalty owners and service companies operating in California. CIPA wants to set the record straight. The MMS oil royalty rulemaking affects all California producers on federal land. It is false to claim that this rulemaking only affects the top 5% of all producers.

How are California independents affected? The proposed rulemaking allows the government to second guess a wellhead sale. If rejected, a California producer is subjected to an ANS index that adjusts to the wellhead set by the government. Using a government formula instead of actual proceeds results in a new tax imposed on all producers of federal oil.

It doesn't end, if a California producer chooses to move its oil downstream of the well, the rulemaking will reflect many of the costs associated with these activities. Again, to reject costs results in a new tax being levied on the producer.

Senator Hutchison, California producers support your amendment to extend the oil royalty rulemaking an additional year. We offer our support not on behalf of the largest producers in the world but instead on behalf of independent producers in the state of California. Your amendment will provide the needed impetus to craft a rule that truly does affect the small producer and creates a new rulemaking framework that is fair and equitable for all parties.

Again, thank you for offering this amendment. We cannot allow the government to unilaterally assess an additional tax on independent producers. After record low oil prices, California producers are barely beginning to travel down a lengthy road to recovery. To assess a new tax at this time could have a devastating effect on federal production and the amount of royalties paid to the government.

Sincerely,

DANIEL P. KRAMER,
Executive Director.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I submit for the RECORD the very people who are affected are from the home State of the Senator from California, the small producers, the independents who do not have the luxury of big margins. They are very much affected and very concerned about this rule and what it would do to somebody who has a contract, who says: Pull your truck up and I will sell you 1000 barrels of oil. Here is the price, \$12 a barrel.

And the Government says: No, we will not accept the \$12 a barrel, even though they are picking it up right there.

That is exactly what the MMS rule does. So every independent is affected and it is the independents who are having to lay people off in this industry because the oil prices have been so low over the last year that they have not been able to stay in business.

Do you know what happens when somebody shuts down? Every family that is dependent on employment from that small producer no longer has a job, and they may live in a place where it is not easy to find another job. The big oil companies just chose to move overseas where they know what the regulatory environment is. They know it is stable. They do not want to create foreign jobs, but that is what they are forced to do because it is so hard to do business in the United States and especially when an unelected bureaucracy is able to change the taxes in the middle of a contract. That is just not the American way.

I am very proud the people of the Senate spoke clearly tonight, very clearly; 55 Members of the Senate voted to make the tax policy in this country.

Congress did hope we could simplify oil royalty rates. We asked the Mineral Management Service to come forward with a simplified system so everyone would know exactly what the price

would be to drill on Federal lands. Simply, they have failed so far in the proposed rule.

This is the diagram of what will happen if this rule goes into effect against the wishes of Congress that we simplify it so oil companies will know what they owe without question. By the time you go through all of this, how could anyone know for sure what they owed?

Furthermore, the MMS will not allow the ruling for one company on oil royalty rates and the basis for those rates to apply to any other person who is drilling, unlike the IRS, which will give you a ruling letter so you will know this is the precedent, this is the way the IRS will treat this particular fact situation so anyone else with the same fact situation can rely on the precedent and can give IRS that ruling document and know they will be treated the same. That is not the case. The MMS refuses to be bound by the precedents they set themselves, even if the facts happen to be the same. That is not sound policy. That is not fair treatment for the taxpayers and the people doing business and creating jobs in our country.

The Senate has clearly spoken. The question is, Will the Senator from California let the majority rule? Will the Senator from California say 55 Members on both sides of the aisle have voted for Congress to set tax policy and to require the oil companies to pay a fair price for drilling on public lands? That is the question.

The Senate has voted 55, with 5 Members missing—according to the votes that have been taken it will be 60 votes if everyone is here and voting. So we have the vast majority to invoke cloture, and the question is, Will the Senator from California do the honorable thing? She said earlier in this debate she wanted fair treatment of this amendment. Fair treatment means an up-or-down vote on the amendment. So the question is, in the face of the overwhelming majority of the Senate who want to do the right thing, who want fair taxation of our oil and gas industry, will she let the majority rule? She said, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on September 9:

Mr. President, I thank the chairman of the committee for being so gracious in preserving my rights. My friend from Texas and I feel equally strongly on the point, just on different sides. I think each of us wants to have justice done on the amendment.

If the Senator from California will stick with her commitment that we would have justice done on the amendment, she will allow the majority to rule. The majority has heard the debate on this issue; they have seen through the rhetoric; they have seen that lawsuits are not a part of making a fair rule. They have seen it is the responsibility of Congress to set policy because we do have accountability. We are accountable to the people.

So if the Senator from California means to do justice by the amendment,

as she stated on September 9 in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, she will let us have an up-and-down vote on this amendment and let the majority rule in the Senate.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

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

THE SITUATION IN EAST TIMOR

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, like many of my colleagues, I was pleased yesterday when President B.J. Habibie of Indonesia agreed to work with the United Nations to allow international peacekeepers to restore peace and stability to East Timor. The reprehensible wave of violence that engulfed East Timor in the week following the announcement of the August 30 referendum was inexcusable, and demands the harshest condemnation by the international community.

But, more importantly, the international community must now work to bring an immediate end to the violence in East Timor, protect refugees, safeguard humanitarian aid for displaced persons, and work with Indonesian troops already in East Timor to see to it that they fulfill their mission of protecting the East Timorese.

On August 30, close to 98 percent of the eligible voters of East Timor went to the polls for the United Nations sponsored vote on East Timor's autonomy. This vote was in keeping with the May 5 agreements between Indonesia, Portugal, and the United Nations regarding the future of East Timor.

On September 4, the Secretary General of the United Nations announced the outcome of the August 30 vote, and the results show that the people of East Timor have spoken with a clear voice: 78.5 percent rejected autonomy in favor of complete independence from Indonesia.

Under the May 5 agreements, if East Timor opted for independence, the Government of Indonesia committed itself to a process of peaceful and constitutional change, in which the United Nations would oversee the transition to independence for East Timor.

Unfortunately, following the Secretary General's announcement of the clear, overwhelming, and freely-expressed choice of the East Timor people, anti-independence militias, backed by the Indonesian military and police, began a systematic and organized campaign of terror, violence and intimidation in an effort to overturn the will of the people of East Timor.

The criminal action undertaken by the militias and their backers in the Indonesian military are reprehensible: mass looting, arson, systematic destruction of infrastructure, and most disturbing of all, murder.

According to the United Nations, hundreds, and possibly thousands, have been killed and more than 200,000 people have been forced to flee their homes. There are also reports of mass killings and a systematic campaign of political assassination.

The May 5 Agreements between the Governments of Indonesia and Portugal and the United Nations mandated the popular vote on the offer of autonomy and clearly delegated responsibility for peace and security before, during and after the ballot process to the Government of Indonesia. And the Government of Indonesia freely agreed to take on that responsibility.

Yet, in the face of widespread violence, the Indonesian army and police forces have stood aside and, worse, assisted the anti-independence militias. I, like many of my colleagues, was startled by the Government of Indonesia's unwillingness or inability to control its own military forces and police in East Timor.

Now that the Government of Indonesia has agreed to work with the United Nations to restore peace to East Timor, there is much work to be done.

First, I am heartened by the willingness of the Australian government to lead peacekeeping efforts to restore peace in security to East Timor, by the willingness of the states of ASEAN to participate in this peacekeeping mission, and by the efforts of the United Nations Security Council to engage the Government of Indonesia to address these issues. The United States, along with our partners in the United Nations and the international community, must be responsive to these efforts and provide appropriate assistance.

Second, I believe that it is essential that the international community condemns the acts of violence that have occurred in East Timor in the past week—as it has in Bosnia, Kosovo, Rwanda, and elsewhere—and urge a complete investigation into any criminal acts with those responsible being brought to justice.

Third, now that the Government of Indonesia has agreed to allow international peacekeepers into East Timor, I am hopeful that it will continue to work with the United Nations to implement the August 30th vote and safeguard East Timor's transition to independence. The United States and the international community must remain engaged and involved with this transition, and strongly encourage the Government of Indonesia to make those changes that the people of East Timor in the August 30 referendum overwhelmingly supported.

Lastly, I believe that President Clinton's decision to review U.S. international financial and military assistance to Indonesia in the context of the violence in East Timor was wholly appropriate, and that Jakarta must understand that as much as we value our relations with the people of Indonesia, future U.S. assistance will depend on