

in commemoration of their 50th anniversary; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. SPECTER (for himself, Mr. AKAKA, and Mr. SMITH):

S. Res. 68. A resolution designating April 9, 1997, and April 9, 1998, as "National Former Prisoner of War Recognition Day"; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. LOTT:

S. Con. Res. 14. A concurrent resolution providing for a conditional adjournment or recess of the Senate and the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. TORRICELLI:

S. Con. Res. 15. A concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the United States support the accession of Taiwan to the World Trade Organization; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. DOMENICI:

S. Con. Res. 16. A concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal years 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, and 2002; to the Committee on the Budget.

S. Con. Res. 17. A concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal years 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, and 2002; to the Committee on the Budget.

By Mr. LAUTENBERG (for himself and Mr. D'AMATO):

S. Con. Res. 18. A concurrent resolution recognizing March 25, 1997, as the anniversary of the Proclamation of Belarusian independence, and calling on the Government of Belarus to respect fundamental freedoms and human rights; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. HATCH, and Mr. COCHRAN):

S. 482. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to partially exclude from the gross estate of a decedent the value of a family-owned business, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

THE FAMILY BUSINESS AND FAMILY FARM PROTECTION ACT OF 1997

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, today I am proud to be introducing the Family Business and Family Farm Preservation Act of 1997, which will provide urgently needed estate tax relief to our Nation's family-owned businesses and farms. It is no accident that this is my first bill as a Member of the U.S. Senate, for I fervently believe that small, family enterprises hold the key to our economic growth and prosperity and that Government policies must promote and not undermine their continued existence.

Simply put, the extremely high estate tax rates make it very difficult for many families to pass their businesses on to the next generation—the very opposite of what Government policy should be. After allowing for what is essentially a \$600,000 exemption, an amount which has not been increased in a decade, the marginal rates that effectively apply for estate tax purposes range from 37 to 55 percent, higher than any other generally applicable Federal tax rates. Adding insult to injury, some of what we leave to our chil-

dren has already been subject to income taxation, and the combined effect of income and estate taxes can be a tax bite as high as 73 percent.

It should come as no surprise that when a family business or farm is left to the sons and daughters of the owner, the estate often lacks the cash to pay the tax. A 1995 Gallup survey found that one-third of the owners of family businesses expect that some or all of the company will have to be sold to satisfy estate tax liabilities. That this actually comes about is reflected in the experience of the inheritors of such businesses, 37 percent of whom reported that they had to shrink or restructure the enterprises solely to meet estate tax obligations.

Mr. President, behind these statistics are the stories of hard-working Americans whose life's work is dismantled by a confiscatory tax. One of those stories was recently told to me by Judy Vallee of Cumberland, ME. In 1933, her father opened a restaurant in Portland and worked hard over time to expand the business into a chain of 25 restaurants along the east coast. When the father died in 1977, the family was left with a staggering estate tax bill of about \$1 million. Lacking the cash to pay the tax, they had to take on partners outside the family, totally restructure the company, and arrange to pay the tax in installments. Unfortunately, even these measures were not enough, and they ultimately had to liquidate the business at fire-sale prices.

Ironically, Judy Vallee now finds herself in the very same situation, but this time as a business owner and not a potential heir. When the original business was liquidated, she managed to purchase one of the restaurants in her own name, which she has now developed into a prosperous enterprise. Eager to leave the restaurant to her son and desperate to ensure that history does not repeat itself, she has spent a small fortune on life insurance to enable her son to enjoy the fruits of her own hard work.

Mr. President, jobs are the primary worry of Maine people, and often overlooked in this debate is the negative effect of the estate tax on employment. Let me give you an example. A potato bag manufacturer in northern Maine, the area I'm originally from, has told me that he would be able to expand his operation and hire more people were it not for the money he has to spend on estate planning and life insurance. In another instance, the owner of a Maine trucking company made the painful decision to sell the business to a large, out-of-state corporation rather than leaving it to his children and forcing them to assume a large debt to pay the estate tax. Not only was he compelled to abandon what he and his father before him had spent their lives building, but making matters worse, the new corporate owner moved the administrative operations out of State, costing Maine 50 good jobs.

Maine's experience is common throughout our Nation. The Gallup sur-

vey found that 60 percent of business owners reported that they would add to their work forces were it not for the estate tax. Two studies mentioned in a Wall Street Journal editorial last month quantified the job losses caused by this levy—one put it at 150,000 and the other at 228,000. In a word, the harm is widespread.

My bill would give relief to small businesses. It would raise the amount effectively excluded from the tax from \$600,000 to \$1,000,000, which probably does little more than compensate for inflation during the past decade. While \$600,000 understandably seems like a considerable sum, the fact is that many small businesses require investment in complex or heavy equipment which easily exceeds that threshold. Referring to a machine essential to his business, the owner of a Maine sawmill recently asked me, "What are my sons supposed to do? Sell the debarker to pay the tax?" There is no justification for this legal Catch 22, under which the second- or third-generation business owner can only pay the tax by selling assets essential to running the business.

My legislation would also lower the effective tax rate for the next \$1.5 million from 55 to 27.5 percent and would increase from 10 to 20 years the time during which family businesses could pay the tax on an installment basis.

These measures are not designed to provide relief to large enterprises. Rather, the beneficiaries, Mr. President, will be enterprising Americans, many of whom risk their life savings and work at their factories, mills, offices, and farms 7 days a week to build a small business, with the reasonable expectation that their Government will let them pass it along to their children.

Prior to becoming a Member of the Senate, I ran Husson College's Family Business Center in Bangor, ME. I would share with you two lessons I learned from that experience. First, those family business owners who understand the estate tax cannot comprehend why the Federal Government imposes a tax that undermines the very type of activity it says it wishes to encourage. Second, many small business owners do not take the extreme measures required to prepare for the estate tax, often with devastating and totally unexpected consequences for their families.

Why do I call these measures extreme? In the Gallup survey, the respondents estimated spending an average of more than \$33,000 over 6½ years on lawyers, accountants, and financial experts to help plan and prepare for the estate tax. The cost is not only monetary, for the average number of hours spent in the planning process was 167.

As currently designed, the estate tax represents bad public policy. In my State, it is the 30,000 small businesses, many of them family owned, which provide most of the new employment opportunities, and it is these businesses which will account for two-

thirds of the new jobs in the future. By discouraging the development and expansion of family enterprises, the estate tax stands as the enemy of job creation and economic growth.

Mr. President, it is time for our actions to match our rhetoric. If we believe in promoting family businesses, as we say we do, and if we believe in promoting family farms, as we say we do, we must change a tax policy which takes the family out of the family business and family farm. Mine is not a call for Government assistance or for special treatment. Mine is a call to reform an unfair, destructive, and confiscatory tax.

By Mr. ROBB (for himself and Ms. MIKULSKI):

S. 483. A bill to fully fund the construction of the Woodrow Wilson Memorial Bridge; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

THE WOODROW WILSON MEMORIAL BRIDGE FULL FUNDING ACT

• Mr. ROBB. Mr. President, I introduce legislation that responds to an urgent situation facing the Capital region—the crumbling Woodrow Wilson Bridge. I am pleased to be joined in this effort by my distinguished colleague from the other side of the Potomac, Senator MIKULSKI. The bridge is already a major bottleneck for travelers on Interstate 95, and in 7 years the current bridge will probably need to be closed as unsafe for travel.

It is with this knowledge that Congress created the Woodrow Wilson Memorial Bridge Authority in 1995 to hasten the selection, design, and replacement of the old bridge. The replacement bridge has now been selected, and construction will begin in late 1998 or 1999.

Last Thursday, the Washington Post joined the chorus calling for action to fund the bridge, and I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the Post editorial, "Fixing a Dangerous Bridge," be included in the RECORD. The Post points out that the Clinton administration's \$400 million funding proposal is wholly inadequate, that it wouldn't buy three lanes at yesteryear prices. I wholeheartedly agree.

So today my distinguished colleague, Senator MIKULSKI and I are introducing the Woodrow Wilson Bridge Full Funding Act to ensure the bridge is completed quickly and funded without tolls. Our legislation authorizes full Federal funding for building the new bridge.

This proposal is forward-looking. Today, area roads are already terribly congested. Only Los Angeles has more traffic. And over the next few decades, traffic congestion is expected to increase by 70 percent. The Woodrow Wilson Bridge is a bottleneck today because it is old and narrow. Ten years from now we'll still have a bottleneck if, because of inadequate Federal funding, we're forced to put toll booths on the bridge. We need full funding now to keep tomorrow's traffic moving.

Full funding for the bridge is also important for the environment—this metropolitan area has been classified by the EPA as a nonattainment area because of its poor air quality. Traffic congestion contributes significantly to this pollution. For that reason, I've supported mass transit initiatives like commuter rail service and the Metro system, higher fuel economy standards, alternative-fuel vehicles, and transportation alternatives such as telecommuting. These initiatives, while important, are only part of the solution. We also need to keep traffic moving to reduce the amount of time vehicles stand idling and adding to the smog problem in this region. Full funding for the Woodrow Wilson Bridge replacement will not solve the congestion problems in northern Virginia, but it will help.

Finally, my proposal is also reasonable. The Woodrow Wilson Bridge is part of the interstate highway system. Comparable interstate projects, including the nearby Baltimore's Fort McHenry Tunnel have received 90 percent Federal funding, despite the fact the projects are owned by the individual States. The bridge, on the other hand, is wholly owned by the Federal Government. Moreover, as a recent opinion piece in *Car & Travel* put it, the bridge is "a major gateway to our Nation's Capital." It's time for the Federal Government to pay its share.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of my legislation be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 483

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Woodrow Wilson Memorial Bridge Full Funding Act".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that—

(1) traffic congestion imposes serious economic burdens on the metropolitan Washington, D.C., area, costing each commuter an estimated \$1,000 per year;

(2) the volume of traffic in the metropolitan Washington, D.C., area is expected to increase by more than 70 percent between 1990 and 2020;

(3) the deterioration of the Woodrow Wilson Memorial Bridge and the growing population of the metropolitan Washington, D.C., area contribute significantly to traffic congestion;

(4) the Bridge serves as a vital link in the Interstate System and in the Northeast corridor;

(5) identifying alternative methods for maintaining this vital link of the Interstate System is critical to addressing the traffic congestion of the area;

(6) the Bridge is—

(A) the only drawbridge in the metropolitan Washington, D.C., area on the Interstate System;

(B) the only segment of the Capital Beltway with only 6 lanes; and

(C) the only segment of the Capital Beltway with a remaining expected life of less than 10 years;

(7) the Bridge is the only part of the Interstate System owned by the Federal Government;

(8)(A) the Bridge was constructed by the Federal Government;

(B) prior to the date of enactment of this Act, the Federal Government has contributed 100 percent of the cost of building and rehabilitating the Bridge; and

(C) the Federal Government has a continuing responsibility to fund future costs associated with the upgrading of the Interstate Route 95 crossing, including the rehabilitation and reconstruction of the Bridge; and

(9) the Federal Government should provide full funding for construction of the replacement Bridge.

SEC. 3. FULL FUNDING OF BRIDGE.

(a) INTERCHANGES.—Section 404(5)(F) of the Woodrow Wilson Memorial Bridge Authority Act of 1995 (Public Law 104-59; 109 Stat. 629) is amended by inserting "interchange," after "roadway,".

(b) FUNDING.—Section 104(i) of title 23, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking "From" and all that follows through "final engineering" and inserting "The Secretary shall obligate sums made available under paragraph (3) for final engineering and construction"; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

"(3) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated out of the Highway Trust Fund (other than the Mass Transit Account) for fiscal years 1998 through 2004 such sums as are necessary to carry out this subsection.".

By Mr. DEWINE (for himself, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. BOND):

S. 484. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the establishment of a pediatric research initiative; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

THE PEDIATRICS RESEARCH INITIATIVE ACT OF 1997

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, I introduce legislation that will increase our Nation's investment in pediatric research.

THE PROBLEM

Children under the age of 21 represent 30 percent of the population—and yet, the NIH devotes only somewhere between 5 and 14 percent of its budget to their needs.

Just as there has been a recognition in recent years that women and minorities have been neglected in research efforts nationwide, there's a growing consensus that children deserve more attention than they are getting.

THE SOLUTION

The bill I am introducing today would help us begin to remedy this lack of research into children's health. This legislation would create a Pediatric Research Initiative within the Office of the Director of NIH to encourage, coordinate, support, develop, and recognize pediatric research. The bill would authorize \$75 million over the next 3 years for this initiative. Last year, we received a \$5 million downpayment in the appropriations process, and we look forward to working with the appropriators to continue on the path toward the necessary level of funding.

This is a crucial investment in our country's future—and one that will produce a great return. If we focus on making our children healthy, we'll set the stage for a healthy citizenry 60 to 70 years into the future.

This initiative will also promote greater coordination in children's health research. Today, there are some 20 Institutes and Centers and Offices within NIH that do something in the way of pediatrics. In my view, we need to bring some level of coordination and focus on these efforts.

In developing this initiative, I have made sure that it gives the Director of NIH as much discretion as possible. The money has to be spent on outside research, so that the dollars flow out to the private sector—but it can go toward basic research or clinical research, at the discretion of the Director.

This bill does not create a new Office, Center, or Institute. It proposes spending for research, not infrastructure.

This initiative has the support of the pediatric research community in children's hospitals and university pediatric departments all over the country. It has been endorsed by the National Association of Children's Hospitals, the American Academy of Pediatrics, the Association of Medical School Pediatric Department Chairmen, the American Pediatric Society, Children's Hospitals and University Medical Centers, the Juvenile Diabetes Association, Advocates for Children With Special Conditions, Pediatric Academy Societies, Association of Ohio Children's Hospitals, Children's Hospital Affiliates of the Missouri Hospital Association, Children's Hospital Association of Texas, Federation of Children's With Special Health Care Needs, and Family Voices.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I rise today in strong support of Senator DEWINE's effort to establish a pediatric research initiative within the Office of the Director at the National Institutes of Health [NIH].

To achieve real progress in improving the health of our Nation's most vulnerable and valuable resource—our children—we must strengthen public investments in pediatric research; enhance Federal coordination among the NIH Institutes to ensure quality multidisciplinary research in areas of scientific progress; develop new incentives for investment in pediatric clinical trials; support new ways to treat children with special conditions; and develop information to promote safer and more effective use of prescription drugs for children.

The opportunity for scientific progress in combating and preventing illnesses and diseases affecting children has never been greater. To assist the NIH in strengthening its pediatric research efforts, I, along with other members of the Labor, HHS, and Education Appropriations Subcommittee, successfully secured \$5 million for the NIH Office of the Director to begin this

new pediatric research initiative last year.

Senator DEWINE's legislation builds upon that down payment, and I look forward to working with other Members of the Senate in ensuring passage of this effort.

Although health care spending for children is only a fraction of total health care spending, we must not turn our backs on the health care needs of our children. Pediatric research offers potential savings in health care costs as well as substantial benefits to the well-being of children for a lifetime. Moreover, pediatric research contributes to new insights and discoveries in preventing and treating illnesses and diseases among our country's adult population.

Let me close by saying that this bill complements legislation I introduced last week which will provide surveillance, research, and services aimed at the prevention of birth defects, the No. 1 killer of babies. We currently know the causes of about 30 percent of all birth defects. With the enactment of a pediatric research initiative and the Birth Defects Prevention Act of 1997, we will shed new light on the causes of birth defects as well as numerous other diseases, illnesses, and other health factors afflicting our Nation's children.

By Mr. MCCONNELL (for himself, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. KEMPTHORNE, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. ROBERTS and Mr. BOND):

S. 485. A bill to amend the Competitive, Special, and Facilities Research Grant Act to provide increased emphasis on competitive grants to promote agricultural research projects regarding precision agriculture and to provide for the dissemination of the results of the research projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

THE PRECISION AGRICULTURE RESEARCH, EDUCATION, AND INFORMATION DISSEMINATION ACT OF 1997

• Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, today several colleagues and I are introducing the Precision Agriculture Research, Education, and Information Dissemination Act of 1997.

Earlier this month the Senate Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry began a series of hearings on reforming and reauthorizing agricultural research programs. It is our desire that as we move through this process this legislation will become part of the research reauthorization that is signed into law.

This legislation emphasizes research on precision agriculture technologies. These technologies are very exciting and will enable the United States to maintain and augment our competitive edge in global agricultural markets. The legislation amends the Competitive, Special and Facilities Research Grant Act of 1965 by modifying the National Research Initiative [NRI] to give the Secretary of Agriculture authority to provide research, extension, and

education competitive grants and programs that emphasize precision agriculture technologies and management practices.

This legislation represents a compromise between various interests. The bill is supported by The Fertilizer Institute, National Center for Resources Innovations, Experiment Station and Extension Service Directors, Lockheed Martin, and a consortium of other high technology companies.

An identical bill H.R. 725 was introduced by Congressman LEWIS and Congressman CRAPO on February 12, 1997.

Precision agriculture technologies are rapidly advancing, and it is crucial that the agricultural research community invest in this field of research so that all farmers will be able to benefit. This bill will not only increase the investment in precision agriculture, but it will also emphasize an educational process that will assist all farmers in adopting precision agriculture technologies and applications.

Emerging technologies in production agriculture are changing and improving the way farmers produce food and fiber in this country. New technologies such as global positioning satellites field mapping, geo-reference information systems, grid soil sampling, variable rate seeding and input applications, portable electronic pest scouting, on-the-go yield monitoring, and computerized field history and record keeping are just a few of the next generation technological tools in use today.

Today, these technologies can map these variables and data instantaneously as an applicator or combine drives across the field. In short, each farm field using precision technology becomes a research pilot. And in the down months or winter season a farmer can collect the data from the previous growing season and adjust dozens of important agronomic variables to maximize the efficient use of all the farmers inputs: time, fuel, commercial inputs, seed rate, irrigation—the list goes on and on.

These precision farming tools are already proving to help farmers increase field productivity, improve input efficiency, protect the environment, maximize farm profitability, and create computerized field histories that may help increase land values. Collectively, these and other emerging technologies are being used in an integrated, site-specific systems approach called "Precision Agriculture." Progressive and production minded farmers are already using these technologies. In a decade they may be as commonplace on the farm as air-conditioned tractor cabs and power steering.

Precision farming seems to offer great promise for improving production performance. Inherently, it sounds very appealing to be able to evaluate production conditions on an individual square foot, yard, or acre basis rather than that of a whole field. It would seem that we should be able to treat

any situation more appropriately the smaller the plot we are considering. There have been great strides in predicting productivity on the basis of smaller and smaller units on the ground than we have ever realistically envisioned in the past, measuring yields as we harvest, being able to collect soil samples on a very small pilot basis and prescribe corrective measures on the go. All of these things are possible. They are being done on an experimental basis in many locations. Some producers have adopted the new technology and are using it.

Precision farming is, in its simplest form, a management system for crop production that uses site-specific data to maximize yields and more efficiently use inputs. The technology is quickly gaining acceptance and use by producers, farm suppliers, crop consultants, and custom applicators.

Precision farming links the data-management abilities of computers with sophisticated farm equipment that can vary applications rates and monitor yields throughout a field.

Mr. President, the capabilities of precision agriculture technologies are rapidly increasing. The economic and environmental benefits of these technologies have not been fully realized. Increasing the use of these technologies and development of complementary new technologies will benefit American agriculture, the U.S. economy and both domestic and global environmental concerns. In Kentucky this type of research can help producers increase their yield while protecting environmental concerns such as water quality. I believe these new high-technology tools can make agriculture better by boosting production, environmental quality and profits. •

By Mr. BROWNBAC (for himself, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. HAGEL and Mr. JOHNSON):

S. 486. A bill to amend the Omnibus Trade and Competitiveness Act of 1988 to clarify the limitation for accession to the GATT and the WTO of foreign countries that have state trading enterprises; to the Committee on Finance.

THE FAIRNESS IN STATE TRADING ACT OF 1997

Mr. BROWNBAC. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Fairness in State Trading Act of 1997. This bill, which is cosponsored by Senators GRASSLEY, HAGEL, and JOHNSON, is a bipartisan approach to addressing the problem faced by U.S. exporters in countries in which state trading enterprises [STE's] dominate the economy.

The Fairness in State Trading Act would subject the import activities of STE's to the jurisdiction of section 1106 of the 1988 Omnibus Trade and Competitiveness Act of 1988, (19 U.S.C. 2905). If this bill passes, the President would have to determine whether the import activities of the state trading enterprises of an applicant to the WTO impede, or are likely to impede, U.S. exports to that country. If the Presi-

dent makes such a determination, the WTO Agreement cannot apply between the United States and that nation until the latter agrees that its STE's will make decisions based exclusively on commercial considerations.

The Brownback bill is designed to ensure that the WTO accession protocol agreements of such countries as China, Russia, and the Ukraine include a provision in which these countries specifically agree that their STE's will make purchasing decisions based solely on commercial considerations. This provision is important because these WTO applicants have indicated that they intend to continue to purchase commodities such as wheat, corn, rice, vegetable oils, and sugar exclusively or almost exclusively through STE's.

Without a strong commitment from these countries to depoliticize their import practices, the United States would only have recourse to GATT article XVII for questionable activities undertaken by China's STE's. In 1995, the GAO determined that article XVII is an ineffective mechanism for policing the activities of STE's, and that the state trading activities of China, Russia, and the Ukraine present problems that article XVII is not capable of addressing.

Weak enforcement of STE activities would enable the STE's of new WTO members to continue to employ a politicized procurement process. Why should the United States be more concerned about the state trading activities of new members of the WTO rather than the activities of current members? Because the state trading activities of current WTO members pale in comparison to the state trading activities of nations such as China, Russia, and the Ukraine.

Import decisions must be made on purely commercial considerations. GATT article XVII is not capable of effectively policing the state trading activities of countries accustomed to a command-and-control economic model. Before we apply the WTO Agreement between the United States and these countries, we must ensure that they agree to depoliticize their import practices.

Kansas, Iowa, Nebraska, South Dakota, and States across the Nation grow the best crops in the world. Exports of these and other U.S. commodities have skyrocketed as tariff and nontariff barriers to these goods have been reduced worldwide. We cannot allow state trading activities to supplant tariff and other nontariff measures as the new barriers to U.S. exports. Let's make sure that U.S. goods can compete on a level playing field in the markets of new members of the WTO before we lock in reductions in our barriers to goods from these countries. Please print statement and bill in the RECORD.

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

S. 486

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Fairness in State Trading Act".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress makes the following findings:

(1) State trading enterprises play a significant role in the economies of several countries that have applied to the World Trade Organization (referred to in this Act as the "WTO").

(2) The General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (referred to in this Act as the "GATT"), and especially GATT Article XVII, does not adequately prevent countries from using state trading enterprises as a disguised barrier to imports from the United States.

(3) The United States economy will be adversely affected by the accession to the WTO of foreign countries that have state trading enterprises that make production or procurement decisions based upon noncommercial considerations.

(4) State trading enterprises have a particularly negative impact on United States farmers.

SEC. 3. ACCESSION OF COUNTRIES WITH STATE TRADING ENTERPRISES TO GENERAL AGREEMENT ON TARIFFS AND TRADE OR WORLD TRADE ORGANIZATION.

Section 1106 of the Omnibus Trade and Competitiveness Act of 1988 (19 U.S.C. 2905) is amended—

(1) by striking "major foreign country" each place it appears and inserting "foreign country";

(2) in subsection (a), by amending paragraph (1) to read as follows:

"(1) whether state trading enterprises produce or procure a significant share of—

"(A) the goods exported from such foreign country;

"(B) the goods imported into such foreign country; or

"(C) the goods produced domestically in such foreign country; and"; and

(3) in subsection (b)(2)(A)—

(A) by amending clause (i) to read as follows:

"(i) will make purchases and sales in international trade based solely on commercial considerations (including price, quality, availability, marketability, and transportation), and"; and

(B) in clause (ii), by striking ", in accordance with customary practice,".

Mr. HAGEL. Mr. President, I rise today as an original cosponsor of the legislation introduced by my distinguished colleague from Kansas, Senator BROWNBAC. This bill is an important step toward opening foreign markets to American products—especially our agricultural products.

Several countries have State Trading Enterprises that control all imports of certain products. These trading enterprises create a bottleneck in trade—a bottleneck controlled by the Government, not by free enterprise. The result is that foreign politics end up controlling trade decisions, and American exporters get hurt.

This bill would require the United States to oppose membership in the World Trade Organization for any country that has a State Trading Enterprise that refuses to buy our products for reasons other than market conditions. Its purpose is simple: It

gives America leverage against countries that shut out our exporters for political reasons.

This is important for all of America's exporters, who benefit from having a level playing field. It is especially important for American farmers. This bill will give our negotiators an important new tool to use as they oppose the unjustified actions of State trading enterprises around the world. It will help us get American dairy products into New Zealand and American wheat into Canada.

But its most important effect will be in regard to China. China is an enormous and growing market. As China emerges economically, we must do all we can to bring China into the world trading system as a full partner. If we want our exporters to do business in China's emerging market, we need to ensure that China plays by all the rules of trade that govern the rest of the world.

The discussions about China's accession to the World Trade Organization are ongoing. I strongly believe China must accept all obligations that WTO membership entails. That includes letting the market, not the politicians, control its trading decisions. China must dismantle its remaining State Trading Enterprises—especially the enterprise that controls the import of wheat into the country.

American farmers—especially our wheat producers—need full and free access to China's market. This bill gives our trade negotiators a small but important tool to help ensure that will happen.

I urge my colleagues to support it.

By Ms. MIKULSKI (for herself,
Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN, Mr.
INOUE and Mrs. BOXER):

S. 487. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act with respect to employment opportunities in the Department of Health and Human Services for women who are scientists, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

THE HHS WOMEN SCIENTIST EMPLOYMENT
OPPORTUNITY ACT

• Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I introduce the HHS Women Scientist Employment Opportunity Act. What this bill does is quite simple. It will require all agencies within the Department of Health and Human Services to establish policies to ensure employment opportunities for women scientists within the Department. It will ensure a fair break for the many dedicated women scientists serving at the National Institutes of Health, the Center for Disease Control and Prevention, the Food and Drug Administration, and other agencies or offices in the Department. Policies are to be reviewed regularly and revised if necessary.

This bill is about the promoting equality. It is about supporting and advancing the careers of women scientists. It is about our Government leading the way in setting an example

for both academia and industry on career policies for women scientists.

In 1992, it came to my attention that women scientists at the National Institutes of Health were not being treated fairly. Women scientists at NIH indicated that they were not being given research and conference assignments that would help advance their careers. They were not being adequately recognized for their accomplishments. Publication opportunities were limited. Questions were raised about tenure and comparability of pay with male colleagues.

Legislation was introduced in the 103d and 104th Congresses to address these concerns. I am encouraged that NIH voluntarily adopted some of the provisions outlined in these bills. But, this is only a start. We must continue to address the equity issues and policies impacting career advancement of our best and brightest women scientists. These issues deserve our utmost attention. That is why this bill is so important. It will ensure that the policies are in place to promote career opportunities for women scientists. And, it will ensure that policies are reviewed regularly, that progress is monitored and that policies are revised if necessary.

What I like about this bill is that it addresses a problem in our own backyard. It says we in the Federal Government have a problem, and we are going to fix it. It ensures that our women scientists working at HHS are treated fairly. It serves as a model for the private sector by setting the stage for equity among our career scientists. It shows that we are very serious about equity and fair play in the scientific community. I encourage my colleagues to join me in supporting the HHS Women Scientist Employment Opportunity Act. •

By Mr. KYL:

S. 488. A bill to control crime, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

THE CRIME PREVENTION ACT OF
1997

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I rise to introduce the Crime Prevention Act of 1997. One of the most important responsibilities for the 105th Congress is to pass a tough comprehensive crime measure that will restore law and order to America's streets. Reported crime may have decreased slightly over the past few years, but the streets are still too dangerous. Too many Americans are afraid to go out for fear of being robbed, assaulted, or murdered. In fact, according to the Bureau of Justice Statistics report "Highlights from 20 Years of Surveying Crime Victims," approximately 2 million people are injured a year as a result of violent crime. Of those who are injured, more than half require some level of medical treatment and nearly a quarter receive treatment in a hospital emergency room or require hospitalization.

THE CRIME CLOCK IS TICKING

The picture painted by crime statistics is frightening. According to the Uniform Crime Reports released by the Department of Justice, in 1995 there was: A violent crime every 18 seconds; a murder every 24 minutes; a forcible rape every 5 minutes; a robbery every 54 seconds; an aggravated assault every 29 seconds; a property crime every 3 seconds; a burglary every 12 seconds; and a motor vehicle theft every 21 seconds.

In short, a crime index offense occurred every 2 seconds. And this is just reported crime.

STATISTICS

Again, according to the Uniform Crime Reports in 1994, there were 1,798,785 violent crimes reported to law enforcement, a rate of 684.6 violent crimes per 100,000 inhabitants. The 1995 total was about 40 percent above that of 1985.

Additionally, in 1995 there were: 21,957 murders, a rate of 8.2 per 100,000 inhabitants; 580,545 robberies, a rate of 220.9 per 100,000 inhabitants; 2,594,995 burglaries, a rate of 987.6 per 100,000 inhabitants; 1,099,179 aggravated assaults, a rate of 418.3 per 100,000 inhabitants; and 97,464 rapes, a rate of 37.1 per 100,000 inhabitants.

Further, juvenile crime is skyrocketing. According to statistics compiled by the FBI, from 1985 to 1993 the number of homicides committed by males aged 18 to 24 increased 65 percent, and by males aged 14 to 17 increased 165 percent. In addition, according to the Department of Justice, during 1993, the youngest age group surveyed—those 12 to 15 years old—had the greatest risk of being the victims of violent crimes.

THE HEAVY COST OF CRIME

Aside from the vicious personal toll exacted, crime also has a devastating effect on the economy of our country. To fight crime, the United States spends about \$90 billion a year on the entire criminal justice system. Crime is especially devastating to our cities, which often have crime rates several times higher than suburbs.

A Washington Post article detailed the work of Professors Mark Levitt and Mark Cohen in estimating the real cost of crime to society. According to the article, "[i]nstead of merely toting up the haul in armed robberies or burglaries, Cohen tallied all of the costs associated with various kinds of crime, from loss of income sustained by a murder victim's family to the cost of counseling a rape victim to the diminished value of houses in high-burglary neighborhoods." These "quality of life" costs raise the cost of crime considerably. Cohen and Levitt calculated that one murder costs society on average \$2.7 million. A robbery nets the robber an average of \$2,900 in actual cash, but it produces \$14,900 in "quality of life" expenses. And while the actual monetary loss caused by an assault is \$1,800,