

very exciting, necessary provisions, some provisions where all Americans taxpayer will receive back part of the overpayment they paid in.

We have made a dent in the death taxes. We fixed the marriage penalty—eventually, with a start immediately, and a myriad of other provisions in there that will affect the lives of literally every person in the United States.

I thank the chairman of the committee who has been a part of the last great tax relief that was done as well as this great tax relief.

I thank the chairman and my colleagues who worked on and supported this measure.

I yield the floor.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. President, I also associate myself with the remarks of the Senator from Wyoming commending Senator ROTH and the Finance Committee for their work on this very important landmark tax relief legislation the Senate passed today. I believe, in taking the step we did today, in lowering the tax burden upon the American people from 21 percent of GDP to 20 percent of the gross domestic product, we have taken a modest but a very important step in providing relief to all Americans. I commend the Senate today, and the staff, and ask the President to reconsider his proposed veto.

#### MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate now 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.

#### BALKAN HISTORICAL PARALLELS

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, yesterday the Committee on Foreign Relations held a remarkable hearing on the prospects for democracy in Yugoslavia. Testifying were two of the Administration's top Balkan experts, two leading representatives of the non-governmental organization community with wide and deep experience in the Balkans, the executive director of the Office of External Affairs of the Serbian Orthodox Church in the United States, and a courageous woman from Belgrade who chairs the Helsinki Committee for Human Rights in Serbia.

One of the many topics raised during this hearing was the question of the correctness of the decision of the United States to refuse to give reconstruction assistance—as distinct from humanitarian assistance—to Serbia as long as Slobodan Milosevic remains in control in Belgrade. I completely support the Administration's policy in this matter, which, I am certain, comes as no surprise to any of my colleagues.

Since on this very day President Clinton and more than forty other world leaders are meeting in Sarajevo to discuss a so-called Balkans Stability

Pact, which would deliver reconstruction assistance on a regional basis, I thought it would be appropriate at this time briefly to discuss two alleged historical parallels, one of which I believe is fallacious, the other which I would assert is directly applicable to the current situation.

At yesterday's hearing it was asserted that there was a moral imperative for NATO countries to offer reconstruction aid to Serbia just as after World War II the United States included Germany in its Marshall Plan assistance.

Mr. President, I would submit that this intended parallel falls short in several respects. First of all, in spite of twelve brutal years of criminal Nazi rule, post-war Germany still had the democratic tradition of Weimar as a basis for rebuilding its political system, with several prominent surviving leaders. Nothing like that exists in Serbia today. There are no Serbian Konrad Adenauers or Kurt Schumachers.

Secondly, the United States made as preconditions for Marshall plan assistance adherence to democracy, free-market capitalism, and cooperation with neighboring countries. Needless to say, the Serbia of Slobodan Milosevic would qualify on none of those grounds.

Finally, in order to guide post-war Germany toward democracy, the victorious allies occupied the country, dividing up responsibility into four zones. The Soviets quickly made clear their intention to impose communism in what became East Germany, and Stalin pressured the East Germans and other satellite countries to refuse the offer of Marshall Plan aid. In the U.S., British, and French zones of Germany, however, hundreds of thousands of troops and civilian officials essentially ran political life until the Federal Republic of Germany was established in 1949, and allied troops have remained until today.

It may well be that in order to bring Serbia into the family of democratic nations just such an international occupation would have to happen, but it is simply not in the cards.

So, Mr. President, the alleged parallel of today's Serbia with post-war Germany is totally inappropriate.

There is, however, a historical parallel chronologically much closer to today, which is, in fact, an appropriate one. That is the case of the Republika Srpska, one of the two entities of Bosnia and Herzegovina.

After the Dayton Accords were signed in late 1995 and the two entities—the Bosniak-Croat Federation and the Republika Srpska—were established, the Congress of the United States put together a reconstruction assistance package. Because of the brutal crimes of the Bosnian Serbs under Radovan Karadzic from 1992 to 1995, the legislation excluded the new Republika Srpska, then under Karadzic's control, from any reconstruction assistance ex-

cept for infrastructural projects like energy and water, which spanned the inter-entity boundary line with the Federation. That meant that in the immediate post-Dayton period the Federation received about ninety-eight percent of American development assistance to Bosnia.

Largely as a result of this policy, the Federation's economy immediately began to recover from the war, while the Republika Srpska, under Karadzic's control in the town of Pale, stagnated.

But our policy has not been one exclusively of sticks; there have also been carrots. If localities in the Republika Srpska cooperated with Dayton implementation, the U.S. Agency for International Development was prepared to channel assistance to them. USAID lays down strict conditions in contracts with the individual localities. The policy is not perfect, and it is carefully monitored by Congress. But, in general, it has worked, and it has had positive results.

People in the Republika Srpska saw the economic resuscitation of the Federation and noticed the assistance that a few of their own localities were receiving. They compared this modest, but undeniable economic progress with the persistent, grinding poverty of most of the Republika Srpska, led by Karadzic and his corrupt, criminal gang in Pale, which had been effectively isolated. The indicted war criminal Karadzic was finally banned from political life, but one of his puppets took his place.

No matter how ultra-nationalistic or even racist many of the people in the Republika Srpska were, most of the population caught on pretty quickly that their future was an absolute zero as long as their current leaders stayed in office.

The result was a reform movement, initially led by Mrs. Plavsic, which legally wrested control from the Pale thugs and moved the capital of the Republika Srpska to Banja Luka. Last year she lost an election, but the government of the Republika Srpska is now led by Prime Minister Dodik, a genuine democrat, who has survived attempts from Belgrade by Milosevic to unseat him, is supported by a multi-ethnic parliamentary coalition, kept the lid on the situation during the Yugoslav air campaign, and now is beginning to implement Dayton.

The situation in Bosnia, as we all know, is far from satisfactory, but real progress has been made. And, back to my original point, in the Republika Srpska we have the real historical parallel of a policy of excluding a government from economic reconstruction assistance as long as it is ruled by an indicted war criminal or his puppet.

I hope this discussion of historical precedents may be helpful as the Senate continues to debate our Balkan reconstruction policy.

## REGULATORY OPENNESS AND FAIRNESS ACT OF 1999

Mr. BURNS. Mr. President I rise today to speak on the Regulatory Openness and Fairness Act of 1999, of which I am an original cosponsor.

This legislation will ensure that the Food Quality Protection Act (FQPA) will carry out its original intent while protecting agricultural producers from unnecessary regulations. The FQPA, enacted in 1996, was put in place to ensure that highest level of food safety. This is a necessary and worthwhile goal. However, the EPA currently makes rulings that are based on data 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 in the U.S.

Additionally, this bill will establish a permanent Pesticide Advisory Committee including food consumers, environmental groups, farmers, non-agricultural pesticide users, food manufacturers, food distributors, pesticide 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. Mr. Kelly asks in his column whether it "strikes anyone as odd" that the Clinton-Gore Administration continues desperately to hand onto its policy of "constructive engagement" with China, even as Beijing breathes fire in response to reasonable statement made by the freely- and fairly-elected President of Republic of China on Taiwan.

This Senator, for one, has serious questions about the wisdom of President Clinton's foreign policy as it relates to China, and the competence of the Clinton-Gore Administration to protect and advance America's interest in this vital region of the world.

In response to statements by Taiwan's President Lee Teng-hui that discussions and talks between Taiwan and China should be conducted on a "special state-to-state" basis, China has repeatedly issued not-so-veiled threats of its intent to use military force against Taiwan unless President Lee retracts his statements.

What was the response of the Clinton-Gore Administration? Let me reference a news story from the July 26th edition of the Washington Post entitled "Albright, Chinese Foreign Minister Hold 'Very Friendly Lunch.'" The article reads in 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 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 nation's policy is 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 and prosperous 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  
(By Michael Kelly)

Back in the dear, dead 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 itself these 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 demo-

cratic 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, desperate despotism, in which a corrupt oligarchy presides, only by the power of the gun, over a billion people who would rather live in freedom. China has always regarded Taiwan as an illegitimately errant province, ultimately to be subjugated to Beijing's rule. In recent years, as China's rulers have found themselves increasingly uneasy on their thrones, they have attempted, in the usual last refuge of dictators, to excite popular support by threatening belligerence against an exterior enemy—in this case, Taiwan.

For two decades, the United States has supported a deliberately ambiguous policy, which says that there should be "one China," but carefully does not say who should rule that China. Ambiguity worked pretty well for a long time, but it is a Cold War relic whose logic has expired, and its days are running out.

Two weeks ago, Taiwan's president, Lee Teng-hui, recognized this reality and said that henceforth Taiwan and China should deal with each other on a "state-to-state" basis. Beijing reacted with its usual hysterical bellicosity. This week, Chinese Foreign Minister Tang Jiaxuan used a session of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations to again threaten Taiwan: "If there occur any action for Taiwan independence and any attempt by foreign forces to separate Taiwan from the motherland, the Chinese people and government will not sit back," Tang said. He added a warning to Secretary of State Madeleine Albright to "be very careful not to say anything to fan the flames" of independence.

Not to worry. Neither Madame Secretary nor anyone else in the Clinton administration has the slightest intention of fanning freedom's flames. Quite the contrary. The administration has reacted to Lee's "state-to-state" remarks by repeatedly reassuring Beijing that the United States is entirely with it in this matter. On Monday Albright made a point of saying that Lee's efforts to back off of his remarks "thus far don't quite do it." So, we are on China's side.

We are on the side of a regime that, the administration's own Justice Department tells 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 intensified the persecution of political dissidents since Clinton began his policy of "constructive engagement" with China. Most recently, Beijing has been hosting old-fashioned Stalinist show trials of democratic dissidents; three organizers of the fledgling China Democratic Party drew sentences of, respectively, 13, 12 and 11 years.

China also continues its campaign to destroy independent religious movements. Accordingly to the group Human Rights in China, the regime arrested 7,410 leaders of the Protestant house-church movement in two months last year. Currently, Beijing is undertaking a countrywide effort to stamp out the spiritual movement Falun Gong. The New York Times reports that more than 5,000 people have been arrested, and 1,200 government officials who are movement members have been shipped off to re-education schools to study Communist Party doctrine.

We are on the side of a regime that forces abortions on women who attempt to give "unplanned" births; a regime that exploits