

bill making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1577

At the request of Mr. BAYH his name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1577 proposed to H.R. 2466, a bill making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. GRAHAM the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BOND) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1577 proposed to H.R. 2466, supra.

AMENDMENT NO. 1600

At the request of Mr. MURKOWSKI the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. THOMAS) was added as a cosponsor of Amendment No. 1600 intended to be proposed to H.R. 2466, a bill making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. MURKOWSKI the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) was withdrawn as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1600 intended to be proposed to H.R. 2466, supra.

AMENDMENT NO. 1603

At the request of Mrs. HUTCHISON the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SHELBY) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1603 proposed to H.R. 2466, a bill making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. GRAMM his name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1603 proposed to H.R. 2466, supra.

**SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION
55—ESTABLISHING OBJECTIVES
FOR THE NEXT ROUND OF
MULTILATERAL TRADE NEGOTIA-
TIONS**

Mr. BAUCUS submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Finance:

S. CON. RES. 55

Whereas obtaining open, equitable, and reciprocal market access will benefit both the United States and its trading partners;

Whereas eliminating or reducing trade barriers and trade distorting practices will enhance export opportunities for American industry, agricultural products, and services;

Whereas strengthening international disciplines on restrictive or trade-distorting import and export practices will improve the global commercial environment;

Whereas preserving existing rules that prohibit unfair trade practices is a necessary adjunct to promoting commerce;

Whereas expanding trade will foster economic growth required for full employment in the United States and the global economy;

Whereas growth in international trade has immediate and significant consequences for sound natural resource use and environmental protection, and for the practice of sustainable development;

Whereas the World Trade Organization is the single most important mechanism by which global commerce is regulated; and

Whereas the United States will host the World Trade Organization Ministerial Meeting in Seattle in November 1999; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring),

SECTION 1. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

It is the sense of Congress that the executive branch of the Government should pursue the objectives described in this concurrent resolution in any negotiations undertaken with respect to the next round of multilateral trade negotiations at the World Trade Organization Ministerial Meeting in Seattle, Washington.

SEC. 2. AGRICULTURE.

The negotiating objectives of the United States with respect to agriculture should be the following:

(1) To eliminate all current and prohibit all future price subsidies and export taxes.

(2) To negotiate stronger disciplines on state-owned trading enterprises, including cross-subsidization, reserved market share, and price undercutting.

(3) With respect to tariffs, to pursue zero-for-zero or harmonization agreements for products where current tariff levels are so disparate that proportional reductions would yield an unbalanced result.

(4) To target peak tariffs for reduction on a specific timetable.

(5) To eliminate all tariffs that are less than 5 percent.

(6) To negotiate an agreement that binds all tariffs at zero wherever possible.

(7) To phase out all tariff rate quotas.

(8) To eliminate all market-distorting domestic subsidies.

(9) To eliminate technology-based discrimination of agricultural commodities.

(10) To negotiate agriculture and nonagriculture issues as a single undertaking, with full implementation of any early agreement contingent on an acceptable final package.

(11) To reach agreements to eliminate unilateral agricultural sanctions as a tool of foreign policy.

SEC. 3. SERVICES.

The negotiating objectives of the United States with respect to services should be the following:

(1) To achieve binding commitments on market access and national treatment.

(2) To achieve broad participation from all World Trade Organization members in the negotiation of any agreement.

(3) To proceed on a “negative list” basis so that all services will be covered unless specifically listed.

(4) To prevent discrimination based on the mode of delivery, including electronic delivery.

(5) To negotiate disciplines on transparency and responsiveness of domestic regulations of services.

SEC. 4. INDUSTRIAL MARKET ACCESS.

The negotiating objectives of the United States with respect to industrial market access should be the following:

(1) To pursue zero-for-zero or harmonization agreements for products where current tariff levels are so disparate that proportional reductions would yield an unbalanced result.

(2) To target peak tariffs for reduction on a specific timetable.

(3) To eliminate all tariffs that are less than 5 percent.

(4) To negotiate agreements that bind tariffs at zero wherever possible.

(5) To achieve broad participation in all harmonization efforts.

(6) To expand the Information Technology Agreement product coverage and participation.

(7) To make duty-free treatment of electronic transmissions permanent.

(8) To negotiate short timetables for accelerated tariff elimination in sectors identified in prior international trade meetings, particularly in environmental goods.

SEC. 5. OTHER TRADE-RELATED ISSUES.

The negotiating objectives of the United States with respect to other trade-related issues should be the following:

(1) To achieve broad participation in Mutual Recognition Agreements (MRA's) on product standards, conformity assessment, and certification procedures.

(2) To expand the scope of the Government Procurement Agreement and make it part of the World Trade Organization undertaking.

(3) To strengthen protection of intellectual property, including patents, trademarks, trade secrets, and industrial layout.

(4) To complete the harmonization of rules of origin.

(5) To strengthen prohibitions against mandatory technology transfer under the Trade-Related Investment Measures Agreement.

(6) To broaden agreements on customs-related issues to facilitate the rapid movement of goods.

(7) To make permanent and binding the moratorium on tariffs on electronic transmissions.

(8) To establish a consensus that electronic commerce is neither exclusively a good nor exclusively a service, and develop rules for transparency, notification, and review of domestic regulations.

(9) To reach a global agreement on liberal treatment of digital products in a technologically neutral manner.

(10) To negotiate an agreement for determining when multilateral environmental agreements are consistent with the principles of the World Trade Organization.

(11) To undertake early review of potential environmental impacts of all global agreements with a view toward mitigating any adverse effects.

(12) To reach agreement that goods and services produced by forced, prison, or child labor are not protected by international trade rules.

(13) To establish a mechanism for joint research and between the World Trade Organization and the International Labor Organization (ILO).

(14) To institute explicit procedures for inclusion of core labor standards in the country reports of the World Trade Organization Trade Policy Review Mechanism.

SEC. 6. WORLD TRADE ORGANIZATION INSTITUTIONAL ISSUES.

The negotiating objectives of the United States with respect to World Trade Organization institutional issues should be the following:

(1) To reach agreement not to implement any new trade restrictive measures during the 3-year negotiating period beginning with the Seattle Ministerial Meeting.

(2) To broaden membership in the World Trade Organization by accelerating accessions.

(3) To shorten the timeframes of dispute resolution.

(4) To increase transparency, citizen access, and responsiveness to submissions from nongovernmental organizations.

(5) To strengthen disciplines governing the coverage and implementation of free trade agreements.

(6) To reach an agreement to cooperate with the International Monetary Fund, the International Bank for Reconstruction and

Development, United Nations organizations, and international economic institutions in trade-related policy matters.

SEC. 7. ISSUES NOT OPEN TO NEGOTIATION.

In all negotiations, the United States Trade Representative should ensure that the negotiations do not weaken existing agreements or create opportunities for the imposition of new barriers in the following areas:

- (1) Dumping and antidumping.
- (2) Competition policy.
- (3) Investment.
- (4) Textiles and apparel.

SEC. 8. TRANSMITTAL OF RESOLUTION.

The Secretary of the Senate shall transmit a copy of this concurrent resolution to the President.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I send a concurrent resolution establishing U.S. goals for the next round of global negotiations in the World Trade Organization to the desk.

In 1994, seven hard years of talks culminated the Uruguay Round Agreement creating the WTO. The United States can point with pride to the results of American leadership on trade. Among the agreement's notable results were beginning new countries into the rule-based trade regime; establishing an institution for ongoing trade talks and dispute resolution; and addressing some key issues for the first time.

The 1994 WTO agreement left unfinished business in two of these key issues: agriculture and services. WTO members committed to return to the table in January 2000 to address barriers in these sectors, the so-called "built-in agenda." It will be a major challenge. Trade-distorting domestic agricultural programs are politically sensitive, especially in the European Union, the world's biggest offender in this area. In services, efforts to open up trade run into difficult questions of domestic regulation and investment.

Over the past several months, Mr. President, WTO members have submitted proposals for dealing with agriculture, services, and many other issues in a new global round of negotiations, to be launched in Seattle this November when the United States hosts the third WTO Ministerial Meeting. I have read some of these proposals, including the proposals submitted by the Administration, and I have compared them two what I hear from various groups around the country.

I have concluded that the U.S. proposals are timid and lack specificity. I am very concerned about this. We can't build a strong global economy without a strong set of trade rules. We can't address emerging issues such as biotechnology and electronic commerce, areas where the United States has a commanding lead, unless we supply a concrete vision of the future. We won't reach our goals unless we can state our goals clearly. We need a clear set of goals for this round of trade talks. The American people expect us to show leadership in this area. Our trading partners expect America to show leadership, too.

We in the Congress have a constitutional responsibility in this regard.

The resolution I am submitting today fulfills our obligation by giving the Executive Branch specific goals for the upcoming round of negotiations.

Mr. President, I would like to summarize briefly the main points of this resolution. It deals not only with agriculture and services, but also with manufactured products, institutional concerns, and a variety of other trade-related issues.

AGRICULTURE

America's farmers compete very effectively when world markets are not distorted by government intervention. Eliminating these distortions is not only good for the farm community, it will benefit U.S. consumers and our trading partners. It will stimulate demand for agricultural output, demand which American farmers are prepared to satisfy. My resolution instructs the Administration to seek elimination of export subsidies and trade-distorting domestic subsidies, to seek substantial tariff reductions, and for the first time to impose discipline on State Trading Enterprises.

SERVICES

Services comprise almost three quarters of American output. We are a net exporter of services, so increased trade in services will have a positive effect on our current account balance. My resolution instructs the Administration to reach a global agreement that trade in services is *free and open* unless otherwise specified. The current system is that trade in services is *closed* unless otherwise specified. Starting from this principle of openness, the Administration should seek broad participation in an agreement on services trade..

INDUSTRIAL GOODS

To establish a negotiating dynamic broad enough to allow for trade-offs, it is vital that the WTO talks include manufactured products. In this regard, there has been some confusion as to the U.S. strategy. The work begun in APEC to cut tariffs in nine sectors has moved into the WTO. The agriculture community feared that an early agreement to cut tariffs on manufactured products would rob the overall negotiation of the required breadth of issues. My resolution makes clear that this negotiation should be viewed as a single undertaking to be completed in three years. This does not mean that we can have no results on tariffs at the Senate WTO Ministerial. But completing accelerated tariff elimination should be contingent on successfully concluding the entire package, including agriculture and services.

INSTITUTIONAL ISSUES

We now have almost five years of experience with the operation of the Uruguay Round agreement and the WTO. That experience has uncovered some areas for improvement. Chief among these is the need for greater transparency in WTO operations. In the state of Montana, we have a strong tradition of open government which serves

us well. The WTO is a governmental body. The citizens of the nations which compose the WTO have a right to know what it is doing. We also need to speed up the WTO system for resolving trade disputes.

ISSUES NOT FOR NEGOTIATING

There are several issues which the Administration should not include in the overall negotiation. In some cases, including them would most likely weaken the results we obtained in the Uruguay Round. In other case, I do not believe that a global negotiation would benefit the United States. Issues such as textiles and apparel, antidumping rules, competition policy, and investment should not be part of the next round of negotiations.

OTHER TRADE ISSUES: ENVIRONMENT AND LABOR

Finally, Mr. President, my resolution lists a number of specific trade issues which the Administration should address in the next round of trade negotiations. These include questions such as government procurement and electronic commerce. Let me mention two particular matters which are especially important: the environment and labor.

My resolution instructs the Administration to make specific progress in both of these areas. On the environment, it requires an environmental assessment of any new global trade agreement, and a WTO consensus on determining when multilateral environmental agreements are consistent with international trade rules. It also requires tariff reductions on environmental products in order to increase the flow of environmental technology.

As to labor, my resolution requires the Administration to correct a deficiency which has existed in trade law since the United States signed the GATT in 1947: it does not allow countries to treat products made with forced labor or child labor differently. We should all have the right to prohibit such goods from entering our countries. It also calls for joint research between the WTO and the International Labor Organization, and for a regular examination of how WTO members are living up to their 1996 commitment on core labor standards. Rhetoric is not a substitute for action.

GOAL: IMPROVE QUALITY OF LIFE

Let me close, Mr. President, with a word about why this is important to all of us. Since the end of World War Two, we have come a long way in shaping the world economy. When the GATT was signed in 1947, the world was engaged in a bitter debate over fundamental values. The central question was whether national economies should be organized by market forces and open societies or by central government planners. Which is better: democracy or communism? The world now knows the answer to this question with absolutely no ambiguity. Today, anyone who thinks that central planning wins over market forces need only compare Seoul to Pyongyang.

In the past decade, the former Soviet bloc national have struggled to turn from central planning to market forces and citizen participation. Developing countries abandoned bankrupt nations like "import substitution" in favor of market-based solutions. OECD countries deregulated and dismantled trade barriers. New technology, especially information technology, provided the means to take advantage of newly opened markets. Goods and capital move with amazing speed.

Open markets make the global economy more efficient. But there's a distinction between efficiency and equity. Open markets do not make prosperity more fair. Many citizens believe it is not fair enough. They see widening income gaps, job insecurity, environmental damage, a less certain future.

The next round of global trade talks can't make opening markets an end in itself. We no longer have to convince the world that our economic system is more efficient. The task now is to show that our system also improves the quality of their lives. We need to show that our system delivers benefits to them. It has to make them better off. If we fail to do that, we will face a world polarized by poverty as it was once polarized by cold war ideology.

SENATE RESOLUTION 179—DESIGNATING OCTOBER 15, 1999, AS "NATIONAL MAMMOGRAPHY DAY"

Mr. BIDEN submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 179

Whereas according to the American Cancer Society, in 1999, 175,000 women will be diagnosed with breast cancer and 43,300 women will die from this disease;

Whereas in the decade of the 1990's, it is estimated that about 2,000,000 women will be diagnosed with breast cancer, resulting in nearly 500,000 deaths;

Whereas the risk of breast cancer increases with age, with a woman at age 70 years having twice as much of a chance of developing the disease as a woman at age 50 years;

Whereas at least 80 percent of the women who get breast cancer have no family history of the disease;

Whereas mammograms, when operated professionally at a certified facility, can provide a safe and quick diagnosis;

Whereas experts agree that mammography is the best method of early detection of breast cancer, and early detection is the key to saving lives;

Whereas mammograms can reveal the presence of small cancers up to 2 years or more before a regular clinical breast examination or breast self-examination, reducing mortality by more than 30 percent; and

Whereas the 5-year survival rate for localized breast cancer is currently 97 percent; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates October 15, 1999, as "National Mammography Day"; and

(2) requests that the President issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe such day with appropriate programs and activities.

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, today I am submitting a resolution designating

October 15, 1999, as "National Mammography Day". I have submitted a similar resolution each year since 1993, and on each occasion the Senate has shown its support for the fight against breast cancer by approving it.

Each year, as I prepare to submit this resolution, I look at the latest information from the American Cancer Society about breast cancer. This year, the news is depressingly familiar: in 1999, an estimated 175,000 women will be diagnosed with breast cancer and an estimated 43,300 women will die of this disease.

In the midst of these gloomy numbers, however, one statistic stands out like a beacon of hope: the 5-year survival rate for women with localized breast cancer is a whopping 97%. Moreover, we already know one sure-fire method for detecting breast cancer when it is at this early, highly curable stage: periodic mammograms for all women over age 40. Periodic mammography can detect a breast cancer almost 2 years earlier than it would have been detected by breast self-examination. The importance of periodic mammography for women's health is recognized by health plans and health insurers, and virtually all of them cover its cost. Low-income women who do not have health insurance can get free mammograms through a breast cancer screening program sponsored by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

Given all this, that modern mammography is highly effective in discovering breast cancer at a very early stage, rarely causes any discomfort, and generally cost nothing, why aren't all women over 40 getting this valuable test every year? One answer is that we are human, and we all forget things, especially as we get older. Even if we remember that we need a mammogram, we often have so many things going on in our lives that we just keep putting the mammogram off for that "less busy" day that never comes. Consequently, we need a "National Mammography Day" to remind us that we need to make sure all the women in our lives don't overlook this crucial preventive service.

How should we use "National Mammography Day" to achieve our goal of fighting breast cancer through early diagnosis? This year, National Mammography Day falls on Friday, October 15, right in the middle of National Breast Cancer Awareness month. On that day, let's make sure that each woman we know picks a specific date on which to get a mammogram each year. I well understand how easy it is to forget do something that comes around only once per year, but for each of us there are certainly some dates that we don't forget: a child's birthday, an anniversary, perhaps even the day our taxes are due. On National Mammography Day, let's ask our loved ones: pick one of these dates, fix it in your mind along with a picture of your child, your wedding, or another symbol

of that date, and promise yourself to get a mammogram on that date every year. Do it for yourself and for the others that love you and want you to be part of their lives for as long as possible.

Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to join me in the ongoing fight against breast cancer by cosponsoring this resolution to designate October 15, 1999, as National Mammography Day.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000

LOTT AMENDMENT NO. 1621

Mr. BOND (for Mr. LOTT) proposed an amendment to the bill (H.R. 2466) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes; as follows:

On page 62, line 10, add the following before the period "Provided, That within the funds available, \$250,000 shall be used to assess the potential hydrologic and biological impact of lead and zinc mining in the Mark Twain National Forest of Southern Missouri: *Provided further*, That none of the funds in this Act may be used by the Secretary of the Interior to issue a prospecting permit for hardrock mineral exploration on Mark Twain National Forest land in the Current River/Jack's Fork River—Eleven Point Watershed (not including Mark Twain National Forest land in Townships 31N and 32N, Range 2 and Range 3 West, on which mining activities are taking place as of the date of enactment of this Act); *Provided further*, That none of the funds in this Act may be used by the Secretary of the Interior to segregate or withdraw land in the Mark Twain National Forest, Missouri under section 204 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1714)"

VETERANS COMPENSATION COST-OF-LIVING ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1999

ROCKEFELLER (AND SPECTER) AMENDMENT NO. 1622

Mr. BROWNBACK (for Mr. ROCKEFELLER (for himself and Mr. SPECTER)) proposed an amendment to the bill (S. 1076) to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide a cost-of-living adjustment in rates of compensation paid to veterans with service-connected disabilities, to enhance programs providing health care, education, and other benefits for veterans, to authorize major medical facility projects, to reform eligibility for burial in Arlington National Cemetery, and for other purposes; as follows:

On page 66, strike lines 9 through 19 and insert the following:

SEC. 101. CONTINUUM OF CARE FOR VETERANS.

(a) INCLUSION OF NONINSTITUTIONAL EXTENDED CARE SERVICES IN DEFINITION OF MEDICAL SERVICES.—Section 1701 is amended—