

**EPA MUST ENSURE THAT ALL STATES LIVE BY THE SAME EMISSION STANDARDS**

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maine (Mr. BALDACC) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BALDACC. Mr. Speaker, I rise to talk about clean air, grandfathered smokestacks in the Midwest, air transport of emissions, and smog in the Northeast.

It is an especially good day to raise this issue. The summer has come to an end and the ozone levels in Maine exceeded Federal standards a dozen days this summer. This did not happen at measuring stations and traffic clogged cities.

I am talking about Port Clyde. It is a fishing village at the tip of a peninsula that juts out from the Gulf of Maine and a good 2 hours from the interstate.

I am talking about the top of Cadillac Mountain. It is the crest of Acadia National Park, and there is not a smokestack in sight. Acadia National Park has had a pollution level this year on par with Philadelphia.

This is all being created by ozone. Ozone is created in a complex chemical reaction due to smokestacks emissions in the Midwest of exempted and grandfathered coal-fired generating plants. And as it travels through the weather patterns into the Northeast, along with the sun and the heat, the combination creates ozone. So as my colleagues may know, Maine is in the downwind of every State, and therein lies the problem. States upwind of the Northeast, which may be in attainment, contribute to the ozone pollution in our region.

With the clean air amendments that were passed in 1990, Congress acknowledged the phenomenon of pollution transport and the political and scientific difficulty of the problem. A mechanism to find a workable solution was created. These tools permitted the EPA to establish the ozone transport assessment group to recommend ways to reduce ozone transport in the Northeast.

From these recommendations, EPA may issue rules requiring States to tighten ozone control to prevent the transport of ozone. These are known as the State implementation plans, or SIP. In addition, individual States may petition the EPA to force States suspected of contributing to their problem to reduce the offending emissions.

I am proud to represent a State that has been a leader in the attempt to reduce ozone pollution, which may be more commonly known as smog. It rises when emissions from power plants and cars combine with heat and sunshine. In the Northeast, we have been reducing our emissions on an average between 2.5 and 2.6 pounds of emissions per megawatt hour, whereas in the

Midwest it is still in excess of 6.6 pounds.

In the Northeast, we have complied with the regulations; we have made the investments. The industries have gone ahead and done what they were supposed to have done, and have been at a competitive disadvantage, but have followed the letter of the law. All we are asking for today, and tomorrow with a dear colleague to Members here in this body, and Members in the Senate that have completed a dear colleague, and signatures to the EPA, is to enforce the regulations which they already have on the books. We are not asking for any new laws. We are not asking for any new approaches. We are simply saying to adhere to the law that is there.

EPA deserves a pat on the back for the work that they have done in bringing this issue to the forefront. They have the administrative capabilities to implement and to finish the action which they started. As a matter of fact, today in a conversation in our office with the EPA, I was told that they have promulgated regulations, which I will submit for the record, which will take effect on November 30, 1999 and will allow for a 2- or 3-month window beyond that time period before they will require the States to have a plan to reduce their emissions so that we can reduce our ozone pollution, so that we can reduce the threat to respiratory asthmatics and others with health conditions not to mention the environmental conditions of our land and our watersheds and the infecting of our crops where we see that the continued pollution is causing tremendous economic and social and health costs to all of our citizens.

This is not just within Maine or within New England. We are looking at the New Jersey shore, an industrial park in Newark; we are looking at the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore, a popular vacation spot on Lake Michigan; we are looking at the remote Door County in Wisconsin, a popular vacation get-away in the Midwest, which has been plagued with twice as many dirty days as Milwaukee; and the Great Smoky National Park South by Atlanta.

So this is a problem that is national in scope. The EPA has the tools to do the work. My colleague, the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN), has initiated legislation, and in working towards that effort, we are going to continue to put the full focus and force on EPA to do their work.

Mr. Speaker, I am providing for the RECORD the information regarding EPA's promulgation of a rule.

The EPA expects to promulgate a final rule based on this proposal on or before November 30, 1999, when the interim stay expires. To address the possibility of any delay of this final rulemaking, however, EPA is also taking comment on an extension of the interim final stay of the April 30 NFR in the

event that EPA needs more time to complete the final rule. The EPA does not expect to need to promulgate such an extension, but if it were necessary, EPA anticipates that a two- or three-month extension should suffice. Providing for a possible extension, if necessary, ensures that the automatic trigger deadlines now in place will not become effective through a lapse in the stay before EPA completes this rulemaking. Under this schedule, the 3-year compliance schedule for source subject to an affirmative finding would still be triggered in time to ensure that the intended emissions reductions are achieved by the start of the 2003 ozone season, as described in the April 30 NFR.

**INTRODUCTION OF THE "FIRST" ACT**

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, almost 2 years ago, the Congressional Caucus on Women's Issues held an important hearing on the subject of brain development from birth to age 3. One witness said something that day that really hit home with me. That witness was Dr. Edward Zigler, the sterling professor of psychology at Yale University, commonly known to all of us as the father of Head Start. Dr. Zigler said that there is nothing more important to a child's development than the bonding between the infant and parents during the first few months after birth.

I remember how I felt listening to Dr. Zigler that day, because I knew how few babies get that kind of start in life. If today's children are lucky enough to have both parents living at home, chances are that both work outside the home, and it is just too hard, if not impossible, for new parents to take time off from work without pay for very long after the birth of a new baby.

I decided right then and there that I would introduce a bill to provide paid family leave to all parents. First, I met with Dr. Zigler, however, and got his support. Since then I have spent 2 years meeting with parents, meeting with parent and child advocates, meeting with doctors, researchers, business and labor representatives, and meeting with my colleagues to figure out what is the best way to provide wage replacement as well as job protection for new parents.

What I learned is that there is not one best way to meet the needs of new parents. In fact, there are many different opportunities to provide this benefit. Some States are already providing income-protected leave for new parents through their temporary disability insurance plans, such as my State, California. Several other States are looking into using a surplus in their unemployment insurance funds for this purpose. Others would like to

build on the existing Family and Medical Leave Act. That is why I have introduced the Family Income to Respond to Significant Transitions Insurance, or the FIRST Act, which is a companion bill to legislation of the same name introduced by Senator DODD in the other body.

The FIRST Act gives States an opportunity to create paid family leave programs for new parents as well as paid leave for other family needs. The FIRST Act does not tell States how to provide income-protected leave, but it helps them carry out the program of their choice by authorizing \$400 million to share in the cost of providing wage replacement for new parents.

Mr. Speaker, the recent tragedies in our Nation's schools and communities compel me to ask the question, "Who is taking care of our children?" We all know that during those critical first months it should be the child's parents, the child's mom and the child's dad. But families are struggling to make ends meet, and our children are getting left behind.

Sure, the Family Medical Leave Act gives parents the right to take leave when a new baby joins the family. The fact is, however, that a recent study found that nearly two-thirds of the employees who need family and medical leave do not take it because they just cannot afford to give up that income. New parents must not be forced to choose between taking care of their child financially and taking care of their child physically and emotionally. With the FIRST bill we are taking the first step, the step, to answering the question, "Who is taking care of our children?" For new babies, the answer will be, "Their parents."

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks, and to include extraneous material on House Resolution 293.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

#### SALE OF AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES TO TERRORIST STATES IS UNACCEPTABLE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, a number of us have prepared a letter that we will be sending tomorrow, the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN), chairman of the Committee on International Relations; the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ); the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-

LEHTINEN); the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WEXLER); the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTSCH); and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MCCOLLUM). We are certain many others will sign tomorrow.

We have prepared a letter, and we are sending it to the Speaker tomorrow and it reads as follows: "Dear Mr. Speaker, we are deeply concerned about a controversial section of the Senate Agriculture Appropriations Bill which would effectively reverse a quarter century's worth of steadfast resistance to terrorism. Language inserted by Senator ASHCROFT would allow the direct sale of broadly defined agricultural commodities to terrorist States which have American blood on their hands.

"We would have thought that by now Members of Congress would understand the evil of appeasement and danger of conducting business as usual with terrorist governments. Americans continue to suffer attacks by terrorists and die worldwide, yet certain Members of Congress push for trade with and financing for terrorist States. Inclusion in the conference report of this language would underscore a basic lack of commitment to fight terrorism and open the door to broader unrestricted trade with terrorist States.

"The controversial Ashcroft language is not included in the House version of the bill. However, Senate conferees have rejected earnest efforts to compromise and, in doing so, have needlessly made this section increasingly controversial and unacceptable.

"Mr. Speaker, there is more to America than the drive to make money at any cost. Profit from business with terrorist governments is blood money and is simply not acceptable."

Now, according to the State Department's overview of State-sponsored terrorism, the 1998, the latest version available, Cuba, Iran, Iraq, Libya, North Korea, Sudan and Syria are the seven governments that the U.S. Secretary of State has designated as state sponsors of international terrorism. They would be the seven states to which, if this Senate language is passed, is accepted, we could start selling to, and financing would be permitted.

According to the State Department, and I read here, "Cuba maintains close ties to other state sponsors of terrorism and leftist insurgent groups and continues to provide safe haven to a number of international terrorists.

"Iran continues to plan and conduct terrorist attacks, including the assassination of dissidents abroad. It supports a variety of groups that use terrorism to pursue their goals, including several that opposed the Middle East Peace Process, by providing varying degrees of money, training, safe haven and weapons.

"Iraq provides safe haven to terrorists and rejectionist groups, and con-

tinues its efforts to rebuild its intelligence network, which it used previously to support international terrorism. The leader of the Abu Nidal organization may have relocated to Baghdad in late 1998."

□ 2030

Libya harbors suspects in the bombing of the UTA Flight 772, although French authorities agreed to try the six in absentia. Several Middle Eastern terrorist groups continue to receive support from Libya, including the PIJ and the PFLP-GC.

North Korea, though not linked definitively to any act of international terrorism in the last couple of years, continues to provide safehaven to terrorists who hijacked a Japanese airliner to North Korea.

Sudan provides safehaven to some of the world's most violent terrorist groups, including Usama Bin Ladin's al-Qaida, and the Hezbollah, the PIJ, and the ANO and HAMAS.

The Sudanese Government also refuses to comply with the United Nations Security Council demands that it hand over for trial fugitives linked to the assassination attempt against the president of Egypt.

Syria continues to provide sanctuary and support for a number of terrorist groups that seek to disrupt the Middle East peace process.

These are the states which if that Senate language remains in the Committee on Agriculture conference report, if it is included in that conference report, will be eligible for American sales and financing from the United States.

I would remind my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, that it is unreasonable, I would say naive, to assume that there will not be a cost, a political cost, as well as an ethical cost, to be paid for helping terrorists states.

The American people are not naive. The American people are not stupid. The American people are going to reject authorization of American sales and American financing to terrorist states.

I wanted tonight, Mr. Speaker, to take this opportunity to inform my colleagues and the American people through C-SPAN of the urgency of the moment so that they will get in contact immediately with their Members of Congress here in the House and tell them, reject the Ashcroft language, reject the pro-terrorism language that Senator ASHCROFT included in the Senate agricultural appropriations bill, reject the pro-terrorist state language.

The House continues to insist in that rejection. The American people need to make their opinions heard right now.

#### U.S.-SRI LANKA RELATIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COOKSEY). Under a previous order of