

men, and awarding retroactive compensation to them is a simple way to express our gratitude for their service. For these reasons I stand today to recognize Mr. Baker, Mr. Carter, and Mr. THOMAS, and support retroactively compensating them for their accomplishments.●

#### JUVENILE CRIME

● Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, a few weeks ago in Nashville, three armed teenage thugs struck the youngest member of my staff with a pistol, robbed, and terrorized him. All three have lengthy juvenile records. Two were convicted of armed robbery at age 14 and served time in a juvenile facility. Last month, over the vehement objection of the prosecutor, both were released early for good behavior. It took these juveniles less than a month to rearm and commit another violent crime.

In Tennessee over the past 4 months, we have had a string of senseless murders which have left Tennesseans in a state of shock, fear, and confusion. One incident, for which arrests have been made, is the tragic story of the four members of the Lillelid family of east Tennessee. They were car-jacked at a rest stop on Interstate 81 and later found executed in a ditch, with multiple gunshot wounds to the head and chest. The mother, father, and 6-year-old daughter all died, while the 2-year-old son was shot twice, but survived. The police have arrested six people in connection to the murders—four adults and two juveniles—all are under 20 years of age.

This pointless tragedy is just one of many recent stories which have riveted the attention of people across Tennessee. The death of Charlie Thoet as he was closing a restaurant just outside of Nashville in January; the murder of Steve Hampton and Sarah Jackson as they were opening another establishment in February; the triple homicide of Robert Santiago, Robert Allen Sewell, and Andrea Brown and the attempted murder of Jose Alfredo Ramirez Gonzalez at a fast food restaurant in March; and the most recent incident, the murders of Michelle Mace and Angela Holmes at an ice cream shop just last week, have left many across Tennessee questioning our society and its lack of respect for human life. All of these victims were hard working people with families and friends, hopes and dreams whose lives were brought to an end in a brutal, violent, senseless fashion.

Mr. President, I want to be very clear that in no way do I mean to suggest that all of these unsolved murders were caused by juveniles. However, the two cases first mentioned were cases with juvenile and very young adult offenders. And violent juvenile crime is growing across this country. From 1985 to 1994 arrest of juveniles for all serious violent offenses increased 75 percent; arrest for homicides increased 150 per-

cent; and arrests of juveniles for weapon possession increased 103 percent. These statistics coupled with the fact that there will be a large increase in the number of juveniles early in the next century—by 2005 the number of males 14-17 will increase 25 percent—means that we are about to face a crime epidemic the likes of which this country has never experienced. The Justice Department estimates that in the next 13 years juvenile arrests for violence crimes will more than double and juvenile arrests for murder will increase by 45 percent.

So what do we do? Currently, less than 10 percent of juvenile offenders commit far greater than half of all juvenile crimes. Rather than adopt a shotgun approach, we need to focus our efforts to make it harder for this small portion of the population to continually commit crimes. In addition, it has been proven time and time again that adult repeat offenders often begin as juvenile repeat offenders and that the severity of the crimes only increase. We must interrupt the cycle of violence while the offender is still a juvenile.

I believe that the most important step we can take is make sure that these young people understand that there are consequences for their actions. In Tennessee, usually a juvenile will have been convicted of three crimes before he or she is considered for juvenile detection. I think we all realize that if these kids are caught doing something 3 times then that means they have probably done it closer to 20 times. I believe that a vital element in deterring crime is the certainty of punishment for first and second offenses. Juvenile offenders must know for certain that they are responsible and will be held accountable for their actions.

Criminals must also serve their entire sentence. If the teenagers, who attacked my staffer a few weeks ago, had served their full sentences, then that crime would never have happened. We do not have enough resources to capture and arrest every criminal several times. Once our police officers have put their lives on the line to catch a criminal, and our overworked, underpaid prosecutors have obtained a conviction, it is inexcusable for that criminal not to serve his or her full sentence.

There are other steps we can take to make sure it is easier for law enforcement and the courts to send a strong message to juvenile offenders. Most Americans would probably be surprised to learn that in most areas juveniles are not fingerprinted and their record of violent crimes are not weighed at all in adult criminal proceedings. They may also not be aware that in most States there is a minimum age for a juvenile to be bound over to adult court.

Crime, especially juvenile crime, is a problem for which our entire community must find the solution. Parents, teachers, law enforcement, judges, social services, and, yes, the business

community as well, must play integral roles. I am very interested in a new project just getting underway in Memphis, TN, which will do just that. The Shelby County Tennessee Juvenile Offender Transition Program is an innovative new plan for a supervised, independent living center for juvenile offenders aimed at reducing recidivism and assisting youth to obtain the skills necessary to break the cycle of crime and to make the transition into a productive adulthood. The program includes education and vocational training requirements tailored to each participant, coupled with a highly structured mentoring program with area universities and a business sponsorship which includes part-time employment during the program with the prospect of employment after completion of the program or tuition reimbursement for continued education. The juveniles have to serve their entire sentence, but this program will give the juvenile court an alternative to sending these young people back to the neighborhoods and the problems where we know they will only get in trouble again and end up back in our courts and our prisons. It is not the solution to all of the problems we face with juvenile crime, but this is an innovative, new approach to assist some of our young people, those who we might be able to help, in making a positive change. The program calls on all aspects of our communities to find solutions and I believe that these efforts deserve our support.

Mr. President, I believe that it is time to take a long hard look at the areas I have highlighted and consider long overdue reforms to the juvenile justice system. There is consensus on several issues from both Republican and Democrats, and therefore, I think it is time for the U.S. Senate to address this most pressing concern of the American people.●

#### ADAM J. PLATZNER

● Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, I rise today to acknowledge Adam J. Platzner. Adam arrived at the Kind & Low-Heywood Thomas School [KLHT] in September 1994—sophomore year. Almost immediately following his arrival he was elected by his classmates to the Student Government as a case representative. He was appointed by the Student Government president to the position of direction of Student Government Development. He was also appointed chairman of the Constitution Committee. In these posts he not only raised money but he also supervised the formation of, and coauthored the new Student Government's constitution. Through his efforts the students now have representation on the board of trustees' committees. In the middle of April 1994, Mr. Platzner among other things, founded and was elected chairman of the Political Union. He was also elected vice president of the Student Body and chairman of the Student Council. Adam Platzner

was chosen to represent the school as the ambassador to the Hugh O'Brien Youth Foundation's annual conference.

The following year—junior year—Mr. Platzner raised funds and chaired the Student Council. He was also selected to sit on the board of trustees' education committee—2-year term—and elected president of the Model United Nations Organization. Adam Platzner won the Outstanding Delegate Award at the Ivy League Model United Nations Conference, as well as the class prize for his hard work, leadership, and dedication in the city of New Rochelle, NY. Mr. Platzner was appointed to the Youth Court.

During his senior year he continued to lead the KLHT Political Union forward. In the beginning of the year he was appointed to lead Students Against Driving Drunk. It was in decline and Mr. Platzner's job is to turn it around. Adam Platzner continues to be a dedicated member of the KLHT community. •

#### EUROPEAN UNION BANANA TRADE INEQUITY

• Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, I join today with my friend and colleague from Hawaii, Senator AKAKA, to congratulate Ambassador Charlene Barshefsky and her staff at the Office of the U.S. Trade Representative on their outstanding work to date in the World Trade Organization [WTO] action involving the European Union [EU] banana policy. On March 18, 1997, a neutral WTO panel charged with reviewing the banana case issued a detailed interim report finding the EU regime to be in violation of over 20 WTO principles. This represents more violations in a single case than has ever before been found in the history of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade and WTO dispute settlement.

Although narrow in scope, the one implication I am obliged to mention first relates to U.S. banana production. Hawaii has produced bananas commercially for almost 160 years. Bananas are Hawaii's seventh leading agricultural crop by value and show considerable promise for expansion and export. This growth potential is extremely important as Hawaii makes a critical transition from a large plantation style agricultural base in sugar and pineapple to a diversified crop base featuring a very wide range of tropical and subtropical products. While Hawaii is a small producer of bananas by global standards, the distortions to global banana trade caused by the EU banana import regime have taken a decisive toll on Hawaiian producers in the form of depressed producer prices. If the EU's panel report is adopted as expected, it will have a leveling effect on the prices received by Hawaii banana growers.

Other U.S. agricultural interests far beyond the banana sector also stand to benefit if the banana panel ruling is adopted in its present form. Farming interests throughout our country, in-

cluding in Hawaii, share a widespread concern that international agreements do not adequately protect them against unfair foreign trading practices, particularly against repeat offenders like the EU. With the banana report now out in preliminary form, we are close to having in hand the most favorable, comprehensive findings ever rendered against a single EU agricultural policy. The Journal of Commerce properly described the ruling as "a welcome signal that the WTO will not simply acquiesce when Brussels requires all member nations to raise their trade barriers to the highest level imposed elsewhere in the union." I request that the Journal of Commerce editorial in which that quote appears, entitled "Ending banana inanity," be included in the RECORD immediately following our remarks today.

Mr. AKAKA. Mr. President, I am pleased to join Senator INOUE in encouraging the U.S. Trade Representative's continued pursuit of this case. The consequences of this interim WTO report are significant—not just for Hawaii, but for the U.S. agricultural community and for U.S. trading interests generally. Ambassador Barshefsky wisely recognized those implications when she joined with numerous other WTO members in calling for a WTO dispute settlement panel to condemn the EU banana import regime.

The WTO panel acknowledged that in an increasingly interdependent global economy, governments will be held accountable for the adverse consequences their trade policies may have on foreign producing sectors, however large or small they might be. Hence, if the banana panel's interim report is adopted, as we expect it to be, small producing interests, such as the banana producers of Hawaii will be entitled under the long arm of the WTO to all rights and interests guaranteed by that treaty. Since the success of small producing interests is a critical aspect of Hawaii's agricultural future, this long arm protection is of great reassurance to us.

Under the new WTO rules, if the banana report is adopted, the EU will face a stark choice: it will either have to dismantle this unlawful regime or face legal WTO trade retaliation. After decades of EU disregard of U.S. agricultural interests, a strict enforcement of that choice should establish an effective model for resolving future disputes with the EU and, equally important, should deter the EU from even engaging in unlawful agricultural policies in the first instance. Restored confidence in international dispute settlement should, in turn, help broaden the general view that trade agreements are a positive force in the promotion of U.S. agricultural trading interests.

The banana report promises to be helpful to U.S. agriculture in still another way. By clarifying the conditions under which agricultural tariff rate quotas [TRQ's] can be administered, the report should prevent countries

from using TRQ's to accomplish the sort of nontransparent, discriminatory and restrictive non-tariff barriers that the Uruguay Round sought to eliminate.

In addition to the favorable precedent being set for American agriculture, the banana report also gives expansive life and coverage to the new WTO agreement governing services. The report found that U.S. service suppliers engaged in the wholesale distribution of fresh fruit have had their conditions of trade adversely affected by the EU regime in numerous ways, always to the direct benefit of EU corporate interests. The measure of U.S. harm as a result of these services violations may exceed \$1 billion, a level well in excess of the harm normally implicated in international dispute settlement actions. By strictly upholding U.S. service supplier interests in this case, the panel has helped ensure meaningful, lasting protection of all U.S. sectors covered by the new international services accord.

In short, if adopted, the WTO banana report will represent an unambiguous win for multiple trading interests throughout our country. We accordingly ask our Senate colleagues to lend all necessary support to Ambassador Barshefsky and her staff to secure adoption and full implementation of this important WTO report.

The editorial follows:

[From the Journal of Commerce, Apr. 11, 1997]

#### ENDING BANANA INANITY

An interim ruling last month by a World Trade Organization dispute panel, calling on the European Union to overhaul its system of banana trade preferences, was a big achievement for the 40 countries—one-third of the WTO's membership—involved in the case. It showed that a rules-based trading system can yield just decisions even in complex and politically charged cases.

The banana case involved a decades-old system of trade preferences that European nations granted their banana producing former colonies in Africa, the Caribbean and the Pacific. For six of those countries, that preferential access left relatively slim quotas for Latin American producers, many of whom market their fruit through U.S.-based Chiquita Brands.

That difficulty was compounded when, in 1993, the EU sought to transform the voluntary preference program adopted by some of its member states into a uniform regime for the entire union. That meant forcing Germany, Belgium, the Netherlands and other EU states to impose caps on banana imports, driving up the price and limiting the supply of the Latin American bananas their consumers prefer.

In principle, the EU could have handled this change in a way that did not discriminate against third countries and break WTO rules. But Brussels took the opportunity to set up a whole new system that favored European banana marketing companies and put Chiquita Brands at a disadvantage. The mechanism was a Byzantine system of import and export licenses, which were made available to European marketers and to the foreign governments willing to cooperate with them.

Four countries—Colombia, Costa Rica, Venezuela and Nicaragua—were made an