

One of the most vivid reminders of the importance of the flag is the Battle of Iwo Jima during World War II some 53 years ago. On the fourth day of the battle, after our troops fought their way onto the beaches and over dangerous terrain, six men raised a United States flag on the highest ridge on Mount Suribachi. That was February 23, 1945, but the battle raged on until March 15, 1945. During those weeks of fighting, the flag served as an inspiration for our troops to keep pressing forward to victory.

Many times, American soldiers have put their lives on the line to defend what the flag represents. We have a duty to honor their sacrifices by giving the flag the Constitutional protection it deserves.

Since we will not be able to turn to this amendment in the closing days of this session, this issue will have to wait for the next Congress. We must not be deterred. I am firmly committed to fighting for this amendment until we are successful.

HEALTH PROFESSIONS EDUCATION PARTNERSHIPS ACT OF 1998

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I am pleased to report that, after years of waiting, families facing the tragedy of alcohol-related birth defects can finally expect a coordinated federal response to their needs. The Fetal Alcohol Syndrome and Fetal Alcohol Effect Prevention and Services Act, which has been included as part of S. 1754, the Health Professions Education Partnerships Act, will establish a national task force to address FAS and FAE, and a competitive grant program to fund prevention and intervention for affected children and their families.

The Fetal Alcohol Syndrome and Fetal Alcohol Effect Prevention and Services Act was introduced as S. 1875 earlier this year and, with today's Senate passage, will be cleared for the President's signature. It is a modest measure, but its implications—in terms of children saved, families saved, and dollars saved—are dramatic.

Alcohol-related birth defects, commonly known as Fetal Alcohol Syndrome (FAS) and Fetal Alcohol Effect (FAE), wreak havoc on the lives of affected children and their families. The neurological damage done by fetal exposure to alcohol is irreversible and extensive, undercutting normal intellectual capacity and emotional development. A child with FAS or FAE may be unable to think clearly, to discern right from wrong, to form relationships, to act responsibly, to live independently.

The complicated and debilitating array of mental, physical, and behavioral problems associated with FAS and FAE can lead to continual use of medical, mental health, and social services—as well as difficulty learning basic skills and remaining in school, alarming rates of anti-social behavior and incarceration, and a heightened

risk of alcohol and drug abuse. FAS is the leading cause of mental retardation in the United States.

And it is 100 percent preventable.

FAS is completely preventable, yet, each year in the United States, some 12,000 children are born with FAS. The rate of FAE may be 3 times that. Researchers believe these conditions are often missed—or misdiagnosed—so the actual number of victims is almost certainly higher.

The incidence of FAS is nearly double that of Down's syndrome and almost 5 times that of spina bifida. In some Native American communities, one of every 100 children is diagnosed with FAS.

It has been more than 30 years since researchers identified a direct link between maternal consumption of alcohol and serious birth defects. Yet, the rate of alcohol use among pregnant women has not declined, nor has the rate of alcohol-related birth defects. In fact, both are increasing over time.

The Centers for Disease Control (CDC) reported a sixfold increase in the percentage of babies with FAS born between 1980 and 1995. This increase is consistent with the CDC's finding that rates of alcohol use during pregnancy, especially the rates of "frequent drinking," increased significantly between 1991 and 1995. These findings defy the Surgeon General's warning against drinking while pregnant as well as a strongly worded advisory issued in 1991 by the American Medical Association urging women to abstain from all alcohol during pregnancy. Clearly, we need to do more to discourage women from jeopardizing their children's future by drinking while pregnant.

In addition to the tragic consequences for thousands of children and their families, these disturbing trends have a staggering fiscal impact. The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention estimates the lifetime private and public cost of treating an individual with FAS at almost \$1.4 million. The total cost in terms of health care and social services to treat all Americans with FAS was estimated at \$2.7 billion in 1995. This is an extraordinary and unnecessary expense.

We know FAS and FAE are not "minor" problems. They are prevalent; they are irreversible; they are devastating to the victim and his or her family; and they are a drain on societal resources. We know the word is not getting out—or maybe it's not getting through—that drinking alcohol during pregnancy is a tremendous and senseless risk. We know children with FAS and FAE and their families are not receiving appropriate services, and we are all paying the consequences.

Given what we know about FAS and FAE, our governmental and societal response to date are clearly inadequate. With this legislation, we are finally strengthening that response.

To the extent we can prevent FAS and FAE and help parents respond appropriately to the special needs of their

children, we can reduce institutionalizations, incarcerations and the repeated use of medical, mental health and social services that otherwise may be inevitable. It makes fiscal sense, but, far more importantly, it is what we need to do for the children and families who suffer its impact.

The legislation we are sending to the President will establish a national task force of parents, educators, researchers and representatives from relevant federal, state and local agencies. That task force will tell us how to raise awareness about FAS and FAE—how to prevent it and how to deliver the kinds of services that will enable children and adults with FAS and FAE, and their families, to cope with its devastating effects.

A national task force with membership from outside of, as well as within, the federal government is our best bet if we want to take a realistic look at this problem and address it. The true experts on these conditions are the parents and professionals who deal with the cause and effects of these conditions day in and day out. If we want to respond appropriately, parents, teachers, social workers, and researchers should have a place at the table. A national task force will also provide the opportunity for communities to share best practices, preventing states that are newer to this problem from having to "reinvent the wheel."

In conjunction with the task force efforts, the Secretary will establish a competitive grants program. This \$25 million program will provide the resources necessary to operationalize the task force recommendations by supporting education and public awareness, coordination between agencies that interact with affected individuals and their families, and applied research to identify effective prevention strategies and FAS/FAE services.

Mr. President, responding to the tragedy of alcohol-related birth defects is an urgent cause. I'd like to thank the many concerned parents, researchers, educators, advocacy organizations and federal agencies for their invaluable input on this legislation. I am confident this initiative will deliver profound benefits to the Nation, and I am thrilled to see us moving toward its enactment.

TUG AND BARGE SAFETY

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, I rise today to thank the managers of the 1998 Coast Guard Authorization Act for their help in addressing an issue of great importance in Rhode Island: the safety of the tug and barge industry. The managers' amendment to the Coast Guard Authorization Act that passed the Senate on Monday included a provision that will strengthen the regulation of transportation of petroleum by barges in the waters of the Northeast.

I appreciate the cooperation of Commerce Committee Chairman MCCAIN,

Ranking Member HOLLINGS, Subcommittee Chairwoman SNOWE, and Ranking Member KERRY for incorporating my provision into the bill.

I especially want to thank the co-sponsor of the provision, Senator JOSEPH LIEBERMAN of Connecticut, for his support. We have worked closely on this issue for several years. Senator DODD of Connecticut also lent his support to the effort.

In order to understand why the Chafee-Lieberman provisions are necessary, you must go back to the 1996 disaster when the tug *Scandia* and barge *North Cape* grounded on the coast of Rhode Island. After the accident, the Environment and Public Works Committee, which I chair, reported a bill to improve towing vessel safety, and important elements of the bill were included in the 1996 Coast Guard Authorization Act. My intent in enacting 1996 provisions was to improve safety in the towing industry so as to prevent a repetition of a disaster like the 1996 *Scandia/North Cape* spill in Block Island Sound.

In October, 1997 the Coast Guard issued rules to implement the 1996 towing vessel legislation. I and others concluded that the proposed rules might not prevent a repetition of the *Scandia/North Cape* disaster and asked the Coast Guard to reconsider. The Coast Guard is now reworking the rules and expect to issue an interim final national rule on anchoring and barge retrieval systems in November 1998. They will repropose fire suppression regulations in January 1999.

Senator LIEBERMAN and I also were concerned that the proposed rules did not implement the recommendations of the Regional Risk Assessment Team or "RRAT," which forged a remarkable consensus among Coast Guard District One, the States, the environmental community, and the regulated industry on rules, to improve safety and reduce risks in the waters of the Northeast States.

The team was assembled by the Marine Safety Office in the First Coast Guard District shortly after the *North Cape* spill. The RRAT met for six months and, in February 1997, delivered a report with extensive regulatory recommendations. Regulations were proposed in the following areas: vessel manning, anchors and barge retrieval systems, voyage planning, navigation safety equipment aboard towing vessels, enhanced communications, vessel traffic schemes and exclusion zones, lightering activities, tug escorts, and crew fatigue.

The report was signed by the RRAT Steering Committee members: the Chief of the Marine Safety Division of the First Coast Guard District, the American Waterway Operators (on behalf of the regulated industry), Save the Bay (on behalf of environmental organizations), and the Rhode Island Department of Environmental Management (on behalf of states participating in the RRAT).

The Coast Guard was deeply involved in the RRAT process. The First Coast

Guard District facilitated RRAT meetings, prepared the agendas and minutes, and lent other administrative support to the effort. In June 1997, the First Coast Guard District also forwarded its plan to implement the RRAT recommendations to Coast Guard Headquarters.

It was the expectation of the state, environmental, and industry RRAT participants that the RRAT recommendations for regional regulations would be included as a part of the rule-making to implement the towing vessel safety provisions in the Coast Guard Authorization Act of 1996. This was a reasonable expectation based upon the level of Coast Guard involvement in the development of the consensus RRAT recommendations, which were then endorsed by the Coast Guard Officer charged with marine safety in the RRAT study area.

Unfortunately, the regulations proposed by the Coast Guard in October 1997, did not incorporate the RRAT's recommendations for regional regulations. It also rejected specific RRAT recommendations on anchor and emergency retrieval provisions. Subsequent inquiry by Senator LIEBERMAN and myself revealed that the Coast Guard did not have any future plan to issue the RRAT's recommended regulations.

This decision by the Coast Guard was simply not acceptable. In April 1998, Senator LIEBERMAN and I asked that the Coast Guard immediately issue the regional regulations. This same request was made by many others in New England, including States environmental departments, regional and local environmental organizations, and private citizens in written comments, and at an April 9, 1998, hearing in Newport, Rhode Island.

To its great credit, the Coast Guard has reevaluated its initial rejection of regional regulations. The Coast Guard has embraced the RRAT recommendations, and has been making admirable progress of implementing the RRAT report. I am pleased to report that the Coast Guard will publish a proposed regional regulation in the Federal Register today. Because of its proactive response to the concerns that Senator LIEBERMAN and I raised, the Coast Guard is in position to meet the aggressive deadlines in the Chafee-Lieberman provision in this year's Coast Guard bill.

The Chafee-Lieberman provision, section 311 of the managers' amendment to H.R. 2204, directs the Coast Guard to issue regulations for towing and barge safety for the waters of the Northeast, including Long Island Sound. Section 311 directs the Coast Guard to give full consideration to each of the regulatory recommendations made by the RRAT and explain in detail if any recommendation is not adopted.

Section 311 directly addresses anchoring and barge retrieval systems on a regional basis only. It is my understanding the Coast Guard is planning to issue a nationwide national interim final regulation on the anchor requirement by the end of November 1998. The

amendment gives the Coast Guard the discretion to forego a regional requirement if the national requirement for anchoring and barge retrieval are no less stringent than those required for the waters of the Northeast.

Though not a part of the Chafee-Lieberman provision adopted in H.R. 2204, I wish to address the issue of fire suppression systems on tugboats. The fire on board the *Scandia* was the critical link in the chain of events that led to the grounding of the barge *North Cape* and the resultant oil spill. It is my view that the October 1997 proposed rules badly missed the mark on this issue. The Coast Guard proposal did not require a fire suppression system that would flood the engine room with a gas to extinguish a serious fire. This is a fatal defect in the proposed rule, and is inconsistent with the 1996 Coast Guard Authorization Act.

The Coast Guard's October 1997 proposal inferred a mandate "to prevent casualties involving barges which are the result of a loss of propulsion of the towing vessel." The 1996 Coast Guard Authorization Act's actual mandate is quite explicit: "The Secretary shall require * * * the use of a fire suppression system or other measures to provide adequate assurance that fires on board towing vessels can be suppressed under reasonably foreseeable circumstances." This is a clear mandate that onboard equipment be able to suppress reasonably foreseeable fires such as occurred on the *Scandia*.

The 1996 statute reflects Congress' judgment that the preferred alternative is to suppress a fire quickly enough so that damage is limited and propulsive power can be restored if interrupted due to fire fighting efforts. A fixed fire suppression system is an option that any vessel master would desire if faced with an engine room fire that could not be controlled by other means.

The proposed regulations used vessel size as a principal criterion, while failing to consider adequately any differential requirements based on the "characteristics, methods of operation, and nature of service" as required by the law, which intentionally omitted size from the list of factors to consider.

Not all towing vessels are the same when considering the imposition of a requirement for a fixed flooding fire suppression system. Specifically, tugboats like the *Scandia* which tow barges on the East Coast of the United States, are essentially seagoing vessels with sealable watertight doors and port holes. Tow boats operating on rivers and inland waterways are not designed for the same type of service. On these inland vessels, engine rooms may be located on the main deck, and they may have conventional doors and windows.

The proposed Coast Guard rule correctly noted that, looking at towing vessels as a whole, certain types of vessels are "constructed with engine rooms that would not be sufficiently

air tight" to be able to use a system that floods the space with a gas to extinguish an out-of-control blaze. This is certainly true in the case of inland tow boats.

Tug boats designed for ocean service such as the *Scandia*, if they are operated in a prudent and seamanlike manner, do have the requisite water and air tightness to use a fixed flooding fire suppression system to good advantage. Congress specifically required that the proposed regulations account for the variations within the commercial towing fleet.

My preference was to simply mandate a fire suppression system for ocean-going tugboats in this year's Coast Guard bill. After hearing the concerns raised by the Coast Guard and colleagues on the Commerce Committee, I will not pursue fire suppression changes this year. I look forward to the Coast Guard's new proposal on fire suppression, which is due for publication in January 1999. I expect it will be a marked improvement over the flawed October 1997 proposal.

In closing, I again thank my colleagues on the Commerce Committee for accommodating my concerns on this issue. I also want to thank the Coast Guard. They could have waited until section 311 became law before starting on the regional regulations. Instead, the Coast Guard, by proposing the regional regulations this very day, has accelerated the date when the Northeast will have the protection it deserves. Finally, I thank my longtime collaborator on oil spill issues, Senator JOSEPH LIEBERMAN of Connecticut, for his steadfast support in this effort.

DARE NOT SPURN RUSSIA

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, the news from Russia remains grim. The Times reported on Saturday:

Rocked by its worst harvest in 45 years and a plummeting ruble, Russia appealed today for relief aid from the European Union. It has also approached the United States and Canada for help.

Clearly Russia is in a perilous—once could say dangerous—state. The grain harvest is down almost 40 percent primarily because of a summer drought in the Volga River and Ural regions. And the financial crisis in Russia has only added to the problems. For example the Times also reports that because payment has not been made "15 ships full of American frozen poultry have delayed unloading their cargo."

What to do? For starters let's not repeat the mistakes of the past. Following the defeat of Germany in World War I, we failed to provide aid to the Weimar Republic as it attempted to sustain a democratic government. The resulting Nazi reign of terror was both devastating and unspeakable.

By contrast, following the defeat of the Nazis in World War II, we adopted the Marshall Plan to rebuild a democratic Germany. From 1948 to 1952, the

United States gave almost \$3 billion a year to fund the Marshall Plan. A comparable contribution in round numbers, given the current size of the United States economy, would be about \$100 billion a year for five years.

Recognize that Russia, no less than Nazi Germany, is a defeated nation—the latter on the military battlefield, the former on the economic battlefield. To keep Russia on the road to democracy and economic reform will require economic aid perhaps on the scale of the Marshall Plan. When you consider what we have been through, a post cold war Marshall Plan does not seem excessive. Particularly since we were able to fund the Marshall Plan at the same time we were threatened by an empire that subscribed to the view that eventually the entire world would succumb to communism.

The singular truth is that we were utterly unprepared for the collapse of the Soviet Union. During the 1980s we began a defense build up which resulted in the largest debt the United States has ever known. When the Soviet Union did collapse, we felt broke and unable to launch the kind of economic assistance that we were able to do after World War II.

While we have provided some assistance, it falls far short of Russia's needs and lacks a coherent plan. Such a plan would include technical assistance on tax collections, operations of banks and stock exchanges, protection of property and individual rights to name just a few areas that a country with little or no experience with democracy and free markets might find helpful. Let me emphasize: without real short- and long-term financial assistance none of this technical assistance will be effective or, indeed, welcome.

But the United States cannot do it alone. What would make the countries of Central and Eastern Europe more secure than any military alliance would be membership in the European Union. Unfortunately, our Western European allies have not embraced their eastern neighbors in this way.

Ambassador Richard Holbrooke has explained that to a certain extent, expanding NATO served as a surrogate for EU enlargement. Roger Cohen reports Ambassador Holbrooke's remark in the International Herald Tribune:

Almost a decade has gone by since the Berlin Wall fell and, instead of reaching out to Central Europe, the European Union turned toward a bizarre search for a common currency. So NATO enlargement had to fill the void.

We seem to have stumbled into a reflexive anti-Russian mode. The United States continues to act as though the Cold War is still the central reality of foreign policy, withal there has been a turnover and we now have the ball and it is time to move downfield. For instance, in a Times story on Sunday about the selection of a trans-Caucas oil pipeline, it was reported:

The Administration favored the Baku-Ceyhan route because it would pass through

only relatively friendly countries—Azerbaijan, Georgia and Turkey—and would bind them closer to the West; because it would pull Azerbaijan and Georgia out of the Russian shadow; and because it would not pass through either Russia or Iran, both of which have offered routes of their own.

Is "binding" Azerbaijan and Georgia closer to the West part of a flawed strategy of isolating Russia? We seem clearly headed in that direction with the expansion of NATO. And ignoring George F. Kennan, who lamented the Senate vote on NATO expansion in an interview with Thomas L. Friedman. Commenting on the Senate debate, Ambassador Kennan stated:

I was particularly bothered by the references to Russia as a country dying to attack Western Europe. Don't people understand? Our differences in the cold war were with the Soviet Communist regime. And now we are turning our backs on the very people who mounted the greatest bloodless revolution in history to remove the Soviet Regime.

We would do well to remember these words.

LOW INCOME HOUSING TAX CREDIT

Mr. D'AMATO. Mr. President, about a year ago, the distinguished Senator from Florida, Senator GRAHAM, and I introduced legislation (S. 1252) to increase the amount of low-income housing tax credits allocated to each state to reflect inflation since 1986, and to index this amount to reflect future inflation. Today, we have 64 additional cosponsors. In this time when the conventional wisdom is that everything is supposed to be so partisan in Washington, it is a very good testament about the importance of the low-income housing tax credit that S. 1252 has garnered the bipartisan support of two-thirds of the Senate.

I guess we should not be surprised about this support. The housing credit has become an extraordinarily effective mechanism to encourage construction of affordable housing. Since its creation in 1986, the low-income housing tax credit has successfully expanded the supply of affordable housing and helped revitalize economically distressed areas throughout the United States. The credit has been responsible for almost 900,000 units of housing in the past decade. Nearly all new affordable housing today (98%) is constructed with the help of the credit. Without the credit, these units simply would not be available.

Credits are allocated to each of the states on a formula based on population: \$1.25 multiplied by the number of people in the state. Each state must adopt an allocation plan based on housing needs in that particular state. Then private developers compete for allocation of the limited amount of tax credit. This creates an environment where each state can encourage the type and location of affordable housing it needs. And the competition for limited amounts of credit means that the Federal Government gets more and better