

(G) from Washington, D.C., President Abraham Lincoln labored to preserve the Union and the Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr. led an historic march that energized the civil rights movement, reminding America of its promise of liberty and justice for all; and

(H) The Government of the United States must continually work to ensure that the Nation's capital is and remains the shining city on the hill.

(3) PURPOSE.—The purposes of this section are to—

(A) designate the year 2000 as the "Year of National Bicentennial Celebration for Washington, D.C.—the Nation's Capital"; and

(B) establish the Presidents' Day holiday in the year 2000 as a day of national celebration for the 200th anniversary of Washington, D.C.

(b) NATION'S CAPITAL NATIONAL BICENTENNIAL.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The year 2000 is designated as the "Year of the National Bicentennial Celebration for Washington, D.C.—the Nation's Capital" and the Presidents' Day Federal holiday in the year 2000 is designated as a day of national celebration for the 200th anniversary of Washington, D.C.

(2) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that all Federal entities should coordinate with and assist the Nation's Capital Bicentennial Celebration, a nonprofit 501(c)(3) entity, organized and operating pursuant to the laws of the District of Columbia, to ensure the success of events and projects undertaken to renew and celebrate the bicentennial of the establishment of Washington, D.C. as the Nation's capital.

AMENDMENT NO. 1276

(Purpose: To establish a remedial education pilot program in the District of Columbia in the District of Columbia public schools)

On page 49, between lines 13 and 14, insert the following:

SEC. 148. \$4,000,000 from local funds shall be available for the establishment of a remedial education pilot program in the District of Columbia public school system to remain available through fiscal year 1999, of which \$3,000,000 shall be used to create a one-year pilot program for the implementation of a remedial education program in reading and mathematics for the 3 lowest achieving elementary schools in the District of Columbia public school system (as to be determined by the District of Columbia public school system's Board of Education) and the training of teachers in remediation instruction at the targeted schools and \$1,000,000 shall be used to establish a continuing education program for all teachers in the District of Columbia public school system. The General Accounting Office shall report to Congress on the effectiveness of the pilot program funded by this section at the end of fiscal year 1999.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendments are agreed to en bloc.

The amendments (Nos. 1271, 1272, 1273, 1274, 1275, and 1276) en bloc were agreed to.

Mr. FAIRCLOTH. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LOTT. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the vote scheduled at 12:15 now occur at 12:30.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LOTT. For the interest of all Members, there has been a meeting at the White House that went a little over time and there are a number of Members involved. They will be here by 12:30, so the vote will be at 12:30.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business, notwithstanding the upcoming vote, for 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

BOSNIA

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, I rise today to voice my concern regarding actions last night in Bosnia. NATO forces, of which we constitute the major part, have again seized several Bosnian Serb radio transmitters because they were hostile to the peace-keeping goals of our forces.

No doubt that was the case. I have no question about that. But I suggest that were we at war and the issue more clear such action would be more than warranted. But we are not, Mr. President. We are trying to implement the Dayton accords, and as such I am concerned this action is not only questionable but may very well be counterproductive.

What did the stations do to warrant this action? They said bad things about the SFOR troops and our mission, and they tampered, apparently, with an hour-long program taped by Louise Arbor, head of the International War Crimes Tribunal.

The good news, Mr. President, is that no violence has occurred yet in regard to the seizure. But I remind my colleagues that the last time we did this our troops were stoned and we quickly returned the station. But we made the Serbs promise not to interfere with pro-Moslem or pro-SFOR messages. Is anyone really surprised, Mr. President, that the Serbs did not live up to that promise?

First question: Now what? Do we have a plan this time? Do we intend to monitor and control all of the media in Bosnia to ensure that only messages that meet our criteria are heard by the people of Bosnia? Is that what the NATO mission has become—one-sided and totally controlled by NATO? Will we put NATO media and our intelligence personnel, let's be frank about it, in charge to produce programs that fit our mission? Are we shining the light of truth into Serb darkness or are we holding a censorship flashlight?

If that is the case, I think you can make a good case that we are enforcing

the peace and we are aggressively establishing media control, then let's not kid ourselves and continue to call our role even-handed peacekeeping.

But here is the second question: What will we do if the Serbs react violently to the seizure? General Clark has stated rightly that we will use lethal force to protect our forces. Is this the issue that will precipitate that lethal force? Is this how we would explain loss of life to the parents of an American man or woman in uniform stationed in Bosnia?

Mr. President, we need to hear from the administration on last night's action and they need to outline the plan to get us out of this tar baby.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

ANOTHER TRAGEDY

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, I rise today to call the attention of my colleagues to a story on the front page of last Thursday's Washington Post. This article tells the story of the beating death of a little 4-year-old girl, a little girl by the name of Monica Wheeler in Washington, DC. Monica was found dead in the bathroom of a man who was an acquaintance of her mother's. The police have ruled her death a homicide. In addition to being severely battered, Monica was suffering from malnutrition and showed signs of genital bleeding.

Now, Mr. President, 3 years ago, one of Monica's siblings, her brother, Andre, then age 2, was also found dead—in the same man's bathroom. That earlier death was ruled at that time an accidental drowning, but the police now are reopening that case.

Mr. President, it is up to the police and the courts to find out the truth about this particular tragedy. But one thing we know for certain is that there are far too many children returned to the care of people who have already abused and battered them, people who should not be allowed to take care of children at all. We know this occurs time and time again across this great country of ours.

Mr. President, every day in America three children actually die of abuse and neglect at the hands of their parents or their caretakers. That is over 1,200 children every year.

And almost half of these children are killed after—after—their tragic circumstances have already come to the attention of local child welfare agencies.

Mr. President, at the end of 1996, over 525,000 children were in foster homes. Over a year's time, it is estimated that over 650,000 children will spend some time in foster homes. Shockingly, 25 percent of the children in the foster care system at any one given point in time will languish in foster care longer than 4 years—25 percent of the kids. Ten percent will be in foster care longer than 7 years.

This problem has been brewing for many years. It is, at least in part, the unintended consequence of a law passed by this Congress in 1980, a law requiring that reasonable efforts be made to reunify families. In practice, this law has resulted in unreasonable efforts, unreasonable efforts, Mr. President, being made to reunite families that are really families in name only, families that simply never should be reunited.

I have been working to change this for almost 3 years now. About 10 days ago, along with Senator CHAFFEE, Senator CRAIG and Senator ROCKEFELLER, I introduced a bill that I hope will represent the culmination of this effort. The PASS Act—the acronym we have given to it stands for the Promotion of Adoption Safety and Support for Abused and Neglected Children Act—would make a difference. It would, Mr. President, save young lives. It would put an end to a tragic policy that has put parents' interests above the health, the safety, and yes, even the survival of innocent children.

Mr. President, it would help child welfare agencies move faster to rescue these children. Every child deserves a better fate than being shuttled from foster home to foster home for years on end. That is why, Mr. President, we are working to pass this important bill.

Once this bill is passed, Mr. President, then let's work together on the next step in the continuing battle for our children's right to live in safe, stable, permanent and loving homes.

Mr. President, the tragedy of this little child who died in Washington, DC, a few day ago, this little 4-year-old girl, Monica Wheeler, should not be repeated. I think we have an obligation in this Congress to move as quickly as possible to change a 1980 law that has done a lot of good but that frankly had an unintended consequence. That unintended consequence is that children, even after there is evidence of abuse, even after there is not just evidence, even after there is overwhelming indication of abuse, children are placed back in homes time and time and time again. One of the reasons that occurs is because of the 1980 law.

We must act, Mr. President, to clarify that law, to clarify the reasonable efforts requirement of the law, so that the safety of children will always be paramount, and that these tragedies will be eliminated.

I yield the floor and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GRAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROBERTS). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GRAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business for 5 minutes.

LEGAL PROTECTION FOR DATA BASES

Mr. GRAMS. Mr. President, I rise today to make a few remarks about an important issue facing our Nation in the information era—the issue of legal protection of data bases. The U.S. Copyright Office recently released a comprehensive report on the issue of data base protection. I welcome this new information and look forward to both the prompt consideration of the report by Congress and to the introduction of much-needed legislation that will protect the enormous investments of data base producers, to assure scientists, educators, businesses, and other consumers that they will continue to have access to accurate, verifiable information.

The Copyright Office report provides the requisite legal and legislative analysis that Congress needs in order to act in an appropriate and timely manner to respond to the legitimate concerns of all parties.

It is an important step in the process of addressing recent technological and legal developments that have left valuable American data bases vulnerable to unauthorized copying and dissemination.

The report states that it is expected that all member countries of the European Union will implement the European Union's directive on data bases by January 1, 1998—a fact that underscores the international implications of this issue for American data base producers. The directive provides a new form of protection for data bases to supplement copyright law. The directive extends this new protection only to data base producers located in a European Union member state and will not protect data bases originating in the United States until we adopt our own data base protection legislation.

Mr. President, the United States, as the world's leading producer and exporter of data bases of all types, needs legal protection abroad far more than any other nation. Unless the United States adopts this protection, the data bases of U.S. companies will be at risk. Smaller U.S. firms without global operations will be the most vulnerable. The worst-case scenario is that this could potentially force U.S. companies to move their operations out of this country and into countries that offer data base protection. Such a move poses a serious threat to U.S. jobs.

After studying the report, I believe current U.S. law and precedent are insufficient to adequately protect the enormous investment of money and effort that typically goes into creating data bases, both print and electronic. This is especially true given the declining copyright protection afforded to data bases after the Supreme Court's 1990 decision in *Feist*, and the inherent vulnerability of data bases to piracy made easy in the new digital environment.

America's data base producers employ or represent thousands of editors,

researchers, and others who gather, verify, update, format, and distribute the information contained in their data base products. They also invest billions of dollars in hardware and software to manage these large bodies of information.

Mr. President, comprehensive data is indispensable to the successful operation of today's American economy, including information about communications, finance, medicine, law, news, travel, defense, and many other topics. As one of America's leading growth industries—one that generates jobs and supports American families—the information services industry creates a wealth of user-friendly, reliable, and up-to-date information critical to the lives of American citizens. Congress must provide the legal protection that ensures the future viability of the information services industry. Thank you, Mr. President.

I yield the floor.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1998

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

Mr. GRAMM addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas is recognized.

AMENDMENT NO. 1253

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, as I understand it, we have scheduled a tabling motion of the Mack amendment, and Senator MACK himself has moved to table the amendment. I thought it would be timely for me to come over and say a little bit about this amendment.

Let me make it clear that I intend to vote against tabling the amendment. I think this amendment should be debated, and I think it is important to try to outline why. That is the purpose that has brought me to the floor today.

First of all, we are talking about, in the Mack-Graham-Kennedy amendment, an amendment that changes the immigration laws of the country. I remind my colleagues that we are considering the D.C. appropriations bill and, therefore, this amendment has nothing to do with the subject matter of that bill.

Second, I believe that this is complicated legislation, dealing with very complex, very important, and, quite frankly, very emotional issues that ought to be dealt with by the Immigration Subcommittee, by the people who wrote the law that we just adopted last year, and by people who are experts in this area. I do not believe that an amendment that has the sweeping impact of this amendment should be dealt with as a rider to an appropriations bill when, by and large, other than three or four Members of the Senate, nobody has closely examined the pending amendment.

Now, let me outline very briefly what the amendment, in my opinion, seeks to do, and let me also say that I am not a member of the committee that has