open financial markets. Under such a plan, the United States could immediately sign agreements with the European Union, Switzerland, Norway, and other countries that are offering national treatment. We could then continue to negotiate with other nations, using access to our lucrative American market as a lever to get them to open their own.

There is no question the United States is under strong international pressure to surrender our MFN exemption. Earlier this year, a senior British trade official flew to Washington to pressure United States Treasury officials to sign an agreement in Geneva—regardless of whether it makes sense for the United States. And the head of the WTO argued recently that the United States must make the right decision and sign whatever agreement is on the table when the deadline rolls around.

Proponents of a deal argue that failure to conclude an agreement will weaken the WTO. But that argument is hogwash. To the contrary, the worst thing we could do would be to sign an agreement that sanctions closed markets and unfair barriers. That would weaken support for the WTO far more than failure to reach an agreement in Geneva. The American people rightly expect that free trade must be a two-way street.

In recent days, some have proposed an extension of the talks as one way to deal with the lack of progress. I believe an extension makes sense since it will allow us to build on the progress that has been made to date. I believe strongly, however, that for the United States to maintain its leverage during any extended talks—whether in the multilateral WTO forum, or on a bilateral basis—the United States must exercise its MFN exemption. To do otherwise would remove any incentive for countries such as Korea, which wants to expand in our market, to negotiate in good faith. Exercising our MFN exemption would not require the United States to retaliate against other countries or to, in any way, close off its market. It would merely give us the right to do so at a later date, if we decided it was in our best interest to do so. Granting MFN, on the other hand, would lock our market open—and thereby remove our leverage in the talks.

U.S. negotiators should stand firm. The United States has played the sucker far too many times in international trade negotiations. The stakes this time are simply too high. Handshakes and promises of future action are not good enough. If the final written offers are not significantly better than those on the table today, U.S. trade officials should act in our clear national interest, and walk away from the table.●

RECOGNIZING RECIPIENTS OF THE GIRL SCOUT GOLD AWARD FROM THE STATE OF MARYLAND

● Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, each year an elite group of young women rise above the ranks of their peers and confront the challenge of attaining the Girl Scouts of the United States of America's highest rank in scouting, the Girl Scout Gold Award.

It is with great pleasure that I recognize and applaud two young women from the State of Maryland who are some of this year's recipients of this most prestigious and time honored award.

These young women are to be commended on their extraordinary commitment and dedication to their families, their friends, their communities, and to the Girl Scouts of the United States of America.

The qualities of character, perseverance, and leadership which enabled them to reach this goal will also help them to meet the challenges of the future. They are our inspiration for today and our promise for tomorrow.

I am honored to ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating these recipients. They are the best and the brightest and serve as an example of character and moral strength for us all to imitate and follow.

Finally, I wish to salute their families and Scout leaders who have provided these young women with continued support and encouragement.

It is with great pride that I submit these two names as recipients of the Girl Scout Gold Award.

GIRL SCOUT GOLD AWARD RECIPIENTS

Miranda Jean Buck of Frederick, MD
Carla R. Williams of Union Bridge, MD.●

TRIBUTE TO JEFF DURHAM

● Mr. COATS. Mr. President, when America celebrates its independence, it celebrates the courage and sacrifice of the men and women who defend it—people who pay a price of pain, inconvenience, and danger.

Jeff Durham has shown that courage, paid that price, and earned our thanks.

Millions of Americans were inspired by the dedication and boldness of the team that rescued Scott O'Grady. When Captain O'Grady returned to America, he gave the lion's share of praise to both God and those soldiers who saved him. As a vital part of that dramatic and successful mission, Jeff Durham is an example of courage and commitment.

There is no virtue more generous than courage. It values duty over comfort, honor over safety, others over self. It is the hallmark of heroes.

From moment to moment our Nation depends on people who will stand guard for American interests and American ideals. That is a lonely watch in a dangerous world. It is a privilege to praise someone who fulfilled that duty with such skill and distinction.

Thank you, Jeff, from all of us in Indiana, for serving God and your neighbors by serving your Nation so well.●

PEACEKEEPING AND PEACEMAKING: THE FUTURE CHALLENGE

● Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I was recently privileged to address the convention of the United Nations Association during its conference in San Francisco, coinciding with the celebration of the 50th anniversary of the United Nations. I took the opportunity to make some observations about the past, present, and future of U.N. peacekeeping, and I offer them here for the record.

THE U.N. MISSION: A TREND TOWARD PEACEKEEPING

When we look at the 50-year history of the United Nations, certain facts and trends become evident. One of these is the increasing trend toward peacekeeping. In the first 43 years of its existence, from 1945 to 1988, the United Nations launched 13 peacekeeping missions in places such as Lebanon, the Dominican Republic, the then-Congo, Cyprus, between India and Pakistan, and along Arab-Israeli borders. While the results of these missions were not uniformly successful, the United Nations proved it was able to play an important role in resolving, or at least containing, a number of dangerous conflicts.

And yet, during this period, the United Nations faced certain realities, the largest of which was the superpower rivalry between the United States and the Soviet Union. As conflicts developed, the countries involved were forced, either through external or internal forces, to align themselves with one superpower or the other. In this environment, the United Nations was often left on the sidelines. When United States and Soviet interests collided, each could cancel out the other's initiatives with their Security Council vetoes. When conflicts involved vital United States and Soviet interests, the two powers did not hesitate to take it upon themselves to try to resolve the conflict in their favor rather than seeking a negotiated resolution through the United Nations.

There is no question that the cold war was a time of serious international insecurity. The specter of two superpowers, with weapons of immense destructive capability aimed at each other, competing for influence across the globe, lasted for nearly 45 years, ending startlingly in 1990 with the collapse of the Soviet Union.

Even today, many people share the misconception that the demise of the Soviet Union has created a more secure world. I do not believe that this is necessarily the case.

The cold war, for all its dangers, had the unintended effect of discouraging many smaller countries, nationalities, and ethnic minorities from fighting one another. The danger that any uprising could, and would with certainty, be put down brutally by the Soviet Union, clearly contained insurrections and civil wars in areas like the former Yugoslavia. If Tito were in power