

pollution control agencies to protect the public health and the environment. Specifically, it would give them discretion as to whether or not to implement the EPA's August 27, 2003 new source review revisions.

There is no question that our Nation's environmental laws have improved the health, safety and environmental quality of communities across the country. These laws have served us well. Of course, there is always room for improvement, and I am committed to working collaboratively to make sure our environmental laws not only work effectively to bring about environmental and health and safety improvements, but also allow our economy to prosper.

Environmental protection and economic prosperity are not mutually exclusive—in fact, they go hand-in-hand.

However, I'm concerned that the EPA's August revisions tip the balance, and do so in a way that puts the quality of our air at unacceptable risk.

The Clean Air Act allowed for routine maintenance of old, dirty electrical plants and other facilities, while requiring that more extensive changes in these plants would require installation of modern anti-pollution technology. This compromise was intended to allow a smooth transition, not to persist forever. The so-called new source review regulations were designed to draw a line between routine maintenance and the kind of changes that would require the installation of this newer anti-pollution technology.

Some revisions to these regulations might be appropriate. However, the revisions finalized in August, in my opinion, are out of balance. They would allow continued emission of airborne contaminants for many years after such pollution should have become history.

Millions of Americans, including the elderly and young children who are most vulnerable to air pollution, live close to the nearly 17,000 industrial facilities that would be shielded by this radical change in policy. But there would be no incentive for the owners of these facilities to make the investment needed to reduce or prevent continued emission of harmful airborne contaminants.

This is an abdication of the Federal Government's responsibility. But this new policy goes even further. It requires all States to adopt these new regulations in total.

In other words, the new rules would take away the States' legal ability under the Clean Air Act to develop programs that are more protective of health, safety and the environment than required by Federal regulations. This flies in the face of the Clean Air Act and of the principle of State flexibility. Instead of a regulatory "floor" which ensures some minimum level of protection for public health and the environment, these new regulations would create a floor, a ceiling and walls that would hem in every State, every Indian tribe, and every air pollution control agency.

My bill would tear down that structure. It would allow State, tribal, and local officials to decide whether to adopt these new EPA regulations as a "floor," or instead to maintain their current clean air programs—and it reestablishes the principle that these entities can go further to establish more stringent requirements to protect the health and safety of their citizens. They have this option right now under the Clean Air Act, and they should continue to have that flexibility, without fear of Federal

punishment or discouragement. It would be their choice.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that we must continue to make progress in improving our air quality, and we should continue to do so through partnerships between the Federal agencies, the States and Indian tribes. The new EPA rules would undermine those partnerships. My bill would preserve them and allow the Federal Government's partners to do all that they can to protect the public and the environment.

For the benefit of my colleagues, I am attaching a section-by-section digest of the bill.

THE FREEDOM TO ESTABLISH STATE HIGH AIR QUALITY ACT (FRESH AIR QUALITY ACT) SECTION-BY-SECTION

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE

The bill is cited as the Freedom to Establish State High Air Quality (FrESH AIR Quality) Act.

SECTION 2. FINDINGS AND PURPOSE

The bill includes findings related to the August 27 new source review revisions, and states the bill's purpose: "The purpose of this Act is to preserve the ability of States, Indian tribes, municipalities, and air pollution control agencies to protect the public health and the environment by affording them discretion as to whether or not to implement the new source review revisions finalized by the EPA on August 27, 2003."

SECTION 3. PRESERVATION OF STATE AND TRIBAL AUTHORITY

The bill includes the following prohibitions:

(1) No State, Indian tribe, municipality, or air pollution control agency is required to implement or have implemented EPA's new source review revisions.

(2) No revision of a Federal implementation plan pursuant to the new revisions can take effect until the affected State, Indian tribe, municipality, or air pollution control agency notifies the EPA that it agrees to this revision.

(3) If a State, Indian tribe, municipality, or air pollution control agency does not implement the August 27 new source revisions or does not consent to revision of a Federal implementation plan pursuant to the new revisions, it is not subject to sanctions, to the revocation of an approved State implementation plan under the Clean Air Act, or to the imposition of a new or revised Federal implementation plan.

CONGRATULATIONS TO MISS CATHERINE CROSBY, MISS ALABAMA 2004

HON. JO BONNER

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 17, 2003

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, this weekend, in Atlantic City, New Jersey, a young lady from my congressional district, Miss Catherine Crosby, will represent Alabama in the 2004 Miss America Pageant.

A native of Brewton, Catherine is the daughter of Larry and Ann Crosby. A 1998 graduate of T.R. Miller High School, she subsequently received her Bachelor of Arts degree in History from Auburn University in 2002.

Catherine was crowned Miss Alabama on the campus of Samford University in Birmingham, on June 14, 2003, following a week of preliminary competitions. The fifty pageant

participants competed in four areas of competition: interview, in which she received first place honors; swimsuit; evening wear; and talent. As Miss Alabama, Catherine regularly receives State and national recognition and was awarded an \$11,000 scholarship.

Prior to traveling to Atlantic City, Catherine stopped by my office and visited with the other Members of the Alabama Delegation as well. She is as charming and talented as she is beautiful, and I could not help but be impressed with what she has chosen as her pageant platform, "First Vote: America's Freedom to Choose."

This message teaches young people about the importance of voting and works to instill in them the responsibilities and obligations of being good citizens.

Mr. Speaker, Catherine's message could not come at a better time. I trust her words will help open the eyes of many young Americans about the right and privilege of voting . . . one of the many freedoms that, unfortunately, we all-too-often take for granted in this great country.

On behalf of an entire State that will be rooting her on and wishing her well, I salute Miss Alabama Catherine Crosby. I know she will make our entire State—and Nation—proud this Saturday night, and I predict we will be hearing much more from this wonderful young lady in the months and years to come.

CONGRATULATIONS

HON. RON PAUL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 17, 2003

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor John and Geraldine Dettling, a couple with long-standing roots in the 14th congressional district of Texas. Mr. and Mrs. Dettling recently celebrated 60 years of marriage, an incredible milestone that deserves recognition and great respect. The longevity of their marriage serves as an inspiration for all couples today.

John Dettling and Geraldine Wendel met in south Texas more than 6 decades ago. They married in El Campo, Texas in 1943, on the eve of World War II. Less than 1 year later, John left for Europe as a soldier. Like many couples of the era, the war separated the young newlyweds for some time. Happily, John returned from the war safe and sound and they began a long life together. The couple built a home in Wharton, Texas, where they still live today.

Over the years the Dettlings were blessed with 6 children, along with (so far) 11 grandchildren and 6 great-grandchildren. John worked as a barber for 30 years, and then worked as a security guard for 6 years. Throughout the decades Geraldine worked hard at home raising the children; when they were older she embarked on a nursing career. Both enjoy retirement today.

I'm happy to report that the Dettlings' momentous 60th anniversary did not go unnoticed. They renewed their vows at Holy Family Catholic Church in Wharton. Afterward, an anniversary reception was held for the couple at the Wharton County Historical Museum, where they celebrated with family and 200 well-wishers.

Mr. Speaker, in today's transient world the Dettlings stand out as a couple who maintained both their marriage and their local roots