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without a sound science base. Instead, assumptions are based on propaganda and worst-case scenarios.

This legislation requires EPA to modernize the laws governing pesticide use, using science-based data and evaluations. This will ensure that American consumers will continue to receive the world’s safest food supply, and still allow those agricultural producers that provide food and fiber the means to do so.

This bill will also require EPA to establish and administer a program for tracking the effect of regulatory decisions of U.S. agriculture as compared to world trends. Producers in other countries often do not face the regulatory nightmare American producers do. This will provide a measure for that different and the impact it has on agricultural producers.

Additionally, this bill will establish a permanent Pesticide Advisory Committee including food consumers, environmental groups, farmers, non-agricultural pesticide users, food manufacturers, federal and state agencies. Such a diverse group will serve all interests and maintain a safe food supply.

I thank Mr. HAGEL for sponsoring this fine bill and look forward to working with him in its passage. Through it we can work for the good of agriculture and food consumers alike.

ADMINISTRATION’S CONSTRUCTIVE ENGAGEMENT WITH CHINA

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I submit for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a column by Michael Kelly that appeared in the July 28th edition of the Washington Post entitled ‘‘The side you are on.’’

The Senator, for one, has serious questions about the wisdom of President Clinton’s foreign policy as it relates to China. The competence of the Clinton-Gore Administration to protect and advance America’s interest is a regime that seeks to us, has engaged in (1) a massive and perhaps still ongoing campaign to steal America’s most valuable nuclear secrets; and (2) an effort to corrupt the 1996 elections by funneling cash to, principally, the Clinton-Gore campaign and the Democratic National Committee.

We are on the side of a regime that, the administration assures, is becoming more tolerant of political freedom. Is that so? Beijing has repeatedly issued not-so-veiled threats of regime reprimands and pressures Taiwan to appease China. Can it truly be our policy to protect China from Taiwan?

Taiwan is not the bully in this matter. Taiwan deserves America’s commitment to defend it against China’s threats. Our nation should proudly and firmly stand by Taiwan, a blooming democracy where free speech, religious freedom and the benefits of capitalism are practiced and enjoyed. The United States should stand in the future, as it has in the past, for freedom and democracy whenever those great qualities are threatened by the forces of repression.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article ‘‘On The Wrong Side,’’ by Michael Kelly be printed in the RECORD.

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

(From the Washington Post, July 28, 1999) ON THE WRONG SIDE

(As printed in the Washington Post, July 28, 1999)

On the side you are on?

On the one hand, we have Taiwan, which is an ally and a democracy. It is not a perfect ally nor a perfect democracy (but neither is the United States). Formed out of the nationalist movement that lost China to Mao’s Communists, Taiwan increasingly has wished for independent statehood. In recent years, as the island has become more democratic and more wealthy, it has become more aggressive in expressing this wish.

On the one hand, we have China. The People’s Republic is a doddering, derelict empire; that is, at least, the way the bulk of seventh graders perceive it. Taiwan is anything but an ally; in fact, it is a potential danger. It is a former warlord of a regime that has been unable to govern its people in the past. It is a regime that has engaged in human rights abuses that range from the persecution to the torture of political opponents. It is a regime that has engaged in unsanctioned nuclear tests. It is a regime that has engaged in the development of nuclear weapons.

We can work for the good of agriculture and food consumers alike.

ON THE WRONG SIDE

(As printed in the Washington Post, July 28, 1999)

By Michael Kelly

Back in the dead, dark days when the Democratic Party stood for dreams a bit loftier than clinging to power, the labor wing of the party liked to ask a question: ‘‘Whose side are you on?’’ It was a good question because it was an awkward one and an inescapable one. The question presents itselfthose days, awkwardly and inescapably as always, in the matter of Taiwan and China. Whose side are we on?

On the one hand, we have Taiwan, which is an ally and a democracy. It is not a perfect ally nor a perfect democracy (but neither is the United States). Formed out of the nationalist movement that lost China to Mao’s Communists, Taiwan increasingly has wished for independent statehood. In recent years, as the island has become more democratic and more wealthy, it has become more aggressive in expressing this wish.

On the one hand, we have China. The People’s Republic is a doddering, derelict empire; that is, at least, the way the bulk of seventh graders perceive it. Taiwan is anything but an ally; in fact, it is a potential danger. It is a former warlord of a regime that has been unable to govern its people in the past. It is a regime that has engaged in human rights abuses that range from the persecution to the torture of political opponents. It is a regime that has engaged in unsanctioned nuclear tests. It is a regime that has engaged in the development of nuclear weapons.

We can work for the good of agriculture and food consumers alike.

‘‘Albright, Chinese Foreign Minister Hold ‘Very Friendly Lunch.’” The article reads part: Lee’s announcement triggered a ferocious response by Beijing. Washington also criticized it and dispatched a representative to pressure Taiwan to modify its statement.

Today, Albright said that Richard Bush, the U.S. envoy to Taiwan, told Lee “that there needs to be a . . . a peaceful resolution to this and a dialogue. And I think that the explanations offered thus far don’t quite do it.”

Mr. President, this is an amazing as it is outrageous. Rather than defend the Republic of China on Taiwan and its right to live in peace and choose its own form of government, Secretary of State Albright has a “very friendly lunch” with one of the highest ranking members of the repressive communist Chinese regime while one of her assistants reprimands and pressures Taiwan to appease China. Can it truly be our policy to protect China from Taiwan?
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THE U.S. ARMY SCHOOL OF THE AMERICAS

Mr. CLELAND. Mr. President, I rise today to express my continued support for the U.S. Army School of the Americas (SOA), located at Fort Benning, Georgia. Legislation has been introduced by my colleagues both in the House and the Senate which would close the School of the Americas, and last evening the House adopted an amendment to do so. Mr. President, I rise to support the School of the Americas and the vital mission it performs in encouraging diplomacy and democracy within the militaries located in the Americas.

The School of the Americas has been a key instrument of U.S. foreign policy in Latin and Southern America for over fifty years and is the single most important instrument of our National Security Strategy of engagement in the Southern Hemisphere.

The legislation opposing the School has been accompanied by a mountain of communications alleging that this School, operated by the U.S. Army and funded by taxpayers' dollars, is the cause of horrendous human rights abuses in Central and South America. In twelve separate investigations since 1989, the Department of Defense, the Army, the GAO and others have found nothing to suggest that the School either taught or inspired Latin Americans to commit such crimes. Yet, sponsors of these measures reproduce the critics' list of atrocities allegedly committed by a small number of graduates in order to transfer responsibility for these crimes to the backs of the School and the Army rather than to the individuals themselves.

The School is, and always has been, a U.S. Army training and education institution teaching the same tactics, techniques, and procedures taught at other U.S. military training schools and training the very same values that the Army teaches its own soldiers. These U.S. military personnel receive the same training as all graduates of our military schools. To suggest that terrorist activities are taught to students would suggest that we in fact teach terrorist activities to all of our own military personnel. This is assuredly not the case.

The School is commanded by a U.S. Army colonel whose chain of command includes the Commanding General of the U.S. Army Training and Doctrine Command. The School also receives oversight and direction from the Commander-in-Chief of U.S. Southern Command. The School's staff and faculty includes over 170 U.S. Army officers, noncommissioned officers, enlisted soldiers, and Department of the Army civilians. The School counts among its graduates over 1,500 U.S. military personnel including five general officers currently serving on active duty in our military.

I agree completely with critics of the School that "human rights is not a partisan issue," and I further agree that, in the past there were indeed individuals who believed the School's fulfillment of its mission to transmit all of the values we hold dear in our country. In that regard, today, the U.S. Army School of the Americas has the U.S. Army's premier human rights training program. The program has been expanded in recent years in consultation with the International Committee of the Red Cross and Mr. Steve Schneebaum, a noted human rights attorney and a member of the School's Board of Visitors. Every student and instructor at the School receives mandatory human rights instruction and the International Committee of the Red Cross teaches human rights each year during the School's Command and General Staff and Peace Operations course. In 1996, the School taught 900 Latin American soldiers, civilians, and police received human rights instruction at the U.S. Army School of the Americas.

Latin America is currently undergoing an unparalleled transformation to democratic governance, civilian control of the military, and economic reforms along free market principles. Almost every nation in Latin America has a democratically elected government. During this transition, the region's militaries have accepted structural cuts, reduced budgets, and curtailed influence in society. In many cases, their acceptance of this new reality has been encouraged and enhanced by the strategy of engagement of the U.S. and U.S. diplomacy, was a 1986 graduate of the School's Command and General Staff course, and serves as the current Commandant of the School. More recently, in 1997, the President of Ecuador was removed from office, creating a constitutional crisis. Some of the people of Ecuador called for the military to take power, but the military refused. Many of the officers in the high command were U.S. Army School of the Americas graduates. Finally, less than four months ago, the President of Paraguay was impeached for misconduct. Once again, a constitutional crisis ensued. Once again, the military refused to take power, and the military refused. Many of the officers in the high command were U.S. Army School of the Americas graduates, including one general officer who played a key role in the refusal.

I ask each of you to take a careful look at the U.S. Army School of the Americas as it exists today. Look to the future. As stated by the School's critics, "The contentious politics of U.S. foreign policy in Central America in the 1980s are over." I strongly urge you to continue your support of the Army School of the Americas and the U.S. Army.

REGULATORY FAIRNESS AND OPENNESS ACT

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I rise today to signify my support for the introduction of the Regulatory Fairness and Openness Act of 1999.

According to data compiled in the last five years, the State of Washington produces more than 230 food, feed and seed crops; ranks in the top five for the value of organic produce; leads the nation in the production of apples, pear, and cherries, and...