

country. There will be a proposal that we will have buried in this provision that would exempt the Department of Defense from environmental regulations having to do with water consumption off the immediate adjacency of the properties under control of the Secretary of the Defense, but nonetheless directly affected by it.

I find it sad, because I have long argued on this floor and in communities around the country, that the most effective way to enhance the environment is not passing new rules and regulation, taxes and fees. The most powerful tooling to protect the environment is for the Federal Government to simply lead by example, to model the behavior that we expect from the rest of America.

Here we have a provision that would exempt the largest manager of infrastructure in the world and one, sadly, with a decidedly mixed environmental record, from compliance with its environmental responsibilities. The latest count shows that there are about 150 Department of Defense facilities on the Superfund national priority list and another five proposed for listing. Indeed, I think we can safely assume that the Department of Defense is the largest Superfund polluter in the United States. The last thing we want to do is to grant this important Federal agency with vast environmental impact, sweeping exemption from environmental laws, at least without going through the appropriate legislative process involving the stakeholders having an honest debate with the American public. Yet that is exactly what we are given under this supplemental.

The exemption provision in this bill would not only do irreparable damage to an important eco-system in Arizona, and that is the purpose of this amendment, to deal with the San Pedro River which is slowly being dewatered because of the impacts of the Department of Defense, but this sets a terrible precedent for the effects of the Department of Defense actions on the environment around the country.

Now, I would be the first to admit on occasion there must be accelerated decisions, shortcuts that are necessary for the sake of military necessity. We do not do an environmental impact statement for every bomb we drop, nor should we. However, it is embarrassing that what we are doing today with this provision is to relieve a Department of responsibility for its foreseeable environmental impacts which are under the control of the Department.

The amendment is unwarranted and at the very least premature. Even the Government Accounting Office says the Department of Defense has not done the research and investigation necessary to determine whether such an exemption is justified.

Mr. Speaker, it is yet another example why this House should reject the supplemental appropriation that is coming before us.

□ 2230

### RAISING THE DEBT CEILING

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

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, tonight the House began the debate on the supplemental appropriations bill, a bill that funds the war on terrorism and makes sure that our troops in the field have the necessary equipment and tools they need to win this war. Every Member of this House supports funding the war on terrorism. That is not what the debate was about tonight nor will it be what the debate is about tomorrow, as we continue to debate this supplemental.

The debate tonight was about a provision of the bill that the Republican leadership put in there that would allow an unlimited increase in the statutory debt ceiling. The statutory debt ceiling is a law that provides the maximum amount that our Federal Government can go into debt. It is one of the few tools that we have to promote fiscal responsibility and require fiscal discipline in this House.

The Democrats tonight stood up to tell the American people that we deserve to have an honest and open debate regarding this very critical issue. If we increase the national debt limit by \$750 billion, as Secretary O'Neill has requested, we will be giving this Congress a blank check for uncontrolled spending for ever-increasing debt and for deficits.

It is wrong for us to ask the young men and women in uniform who are sacrificing tonight to fight this war against terrorism to be the very generation that comes home and pays the bills for this war.

The fundamental question before the House tonight was who is going to pay the bill for this war on terrorism. Are we going to pay it as the generation that is able to do so? Are we going to say to the young men and women in uniform, we will let them fight the war and then when they come home and when they are in their good income-earning years they can pay the debt for the war that they fought?

Democrats believe that is wrong. We believe it is wrong to hide an increase in the debt ceiling in this very important supplemental appropriation bill.

We must not use the Social Security trust fund, the American people's retirement fund, to pay for this war. We must not ask that we borrow money from the public to pay for this war. We believe that it is our responsibility today to pay for this war.

The patriotic thing to do as Americans is to be willing to sacrifice along with the men and women in uniform, and the sacrifice that we must pay is we must be willing to pay the bill.

At your house and mine and your business and mine, we understand what it means to balance the budget. We understand that when changed economic

circumstances lower our income, that we have to make adjustments in our budget. We have to cut our spending, and if we need to borrow money, we establish a plan to pay it back. It should be no different in Washington. In Washington we also should pay the American people's bills.

Every Member of this Congress recognizes that the debt ceiling must be raised. In fact, as we speak tonight, Secretary O'Neill is using unusual emergency measures to keep the Federal Government from defaulting on its obligations, by using the retirement funds of Federal employees to prevent a default in Federal obligations.

Even after using every trick in the bag, the tricks will run out by the end of June and the debt ceiling must be raised, but Democrats believe that when we raise the debt ceiling we need at the same time to establish a plan to put us back into a balanced budget. Democrats have offered before the Committee on Rules amendments that would do that in a bipartisan way and those have been rejected.

In the first 7 months of this fiscal year, the Federal deficit is \$66.5 billion. To give my colleagues a picture of how things have changed in Washington, if we go back just 1 year and look at what the budget looked like in the first 7 months of the last fiscal year, we had a surplus of \$165 billion. After having 4 straight years of surpluses in the Federal budget, we are back into deficit spending, and we need a plan to get us back on the road to fiscal responsibility.

Our failure to balance the budget means that we are going to be using the Social Security trust fund to finance this war. That is wrong, and Democrats want a plan to get us back on the right track.

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

(Ms. BROWN of Florida addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Hawaii (Mrs. MINK) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. MINK of Hawaii addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

### CELEBRATING TWO GREAT EVENTS OF HUMAN ACHIEVEMENT

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

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, I come to the House today to celebrate 2 great events of human achievement that are both adjoined that we recently experienced, and those achievements are surrounding a fellow named Eric Lindberg

who is a constituent of mine from Indianola, Washington.

Eric's grandfather was Charles Lindberg, and on May 1 this year, Eric took off from New York in his plane called the New Spirit of St. Louis, a Lancair Columbia 300, and flying alone, 19 hours later, landed, as his grandfather did, at Le Bourget Airport in Paris. A significant event of human achievement, as was his grandfather, Charles Lindberg's, when he took off in his Ryan N-X-211 and landed in Le Bourget after 33 hours.

This is something our Nation appropriately honors Eric for, his achievement in honoring his grandfather, in making a solo crossing of the North Atlantic in a single engine plane, and for that we honor Eric. We honor his spirit. We honor his achievement, but that is really only part of his story of human achievement, and it is only part of the reason that he flew across the North Atlantic.

Because at age 21, and Eric is now 37, Eric started to develop rheumatoid arthritis that pretty well stove him in. It got so bad that a few years ago he really could not work or fly consistently. He had two artificial knee replacements, and he was having real significant problems, but he had some neighbors in the Puget Sound area working for a company called Immunex and those neighbors at the Immunex Corporation, who are now working with the Amgen Group, were working on a product they wanted to develop to help people with rheumatoid arthritis.

After about \$350 million of investment and thousands and thousands of man-hours of a lot of my constituents, some who live on Bainbridge Island where I live, they developed a product called Enbrel. It is a self-injected product. It is what is called a TNF inhibitor. It is a man-made protein, and it works with the immune system to reduce the onset of the symptoms associated with rheumatoid arthritis.

About 2 years ago, Eric started to take Embro, and within 2 weeks he noticed a very significant change in his ability to walk around, get up and do the daily functions of life, and it allowed him, and he will tell my colleagues this because I talked to him today, it allowed him to train and work towards his goal of duplicating Charles Lindbergh's, his grandfather, flight across the Atlantic, which he successfully achieved on May 1.

It really is a story of 2 great spirits of human achievement, one his individual, one flying across the Atlantic in a single engine plane, and two, a group, one of people harnessing the creative genius of this country to develop a product like Enbrel to help Eric train for this particular endeavor.

So I would like to honor his achievement that he did; one, to recreate and celebrate the 75th anniversary of his grandfather's great achievement; two, to honor the future of medicine and to give a message of inspiration to the others tonight and today who may be

having medical problems, who may be just an invention away of really getting a life change as Eric experienced.

I know that he wants America to be inspired by the achievements of Immunex and his personal achievement so that we can go forward to harness this creative genius, not only in aeronautics but in biotechnology. As we go forward in a way to try to make drugs available to people at an affordable price, we hope that we can find a way also to inspire people to continue this creative effort that my other constituents who live in the Puget Sound area of Seattle, Bothell, where some of the labs are located, they can be honored as well.

I may also note, too, Eric is associated with a group called the X Project which is a challenge project that has a \$10 million reward for creative geniuses who can put 3 people in space with a privately funded vehicle and do it 2 weeks in a row, and we really appreciate his efforts to create an incentive to have a prize. As he told me, we have had great aeronautic advances either when we have a war or a prize and he is working to have this prize to give people some incentive to get privately into space.

So, again, I want to really commend Eric for his tremendous personal achievement, my friends in Immunex for helping him to make that achievement, and I hope this inspiration will help others go forward.

#### EDUCATION TAX CREDITS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SCHAFFER) is recognized as the designee of the majority leader for half the time remaining until midnight, 40 minutes.

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, it is late here in Washington, but it is not too late to talk about children, and school children, to be even more specific about it. This is an important issue and an important topic. Education is one of the subject matters that I have focused on in my 6 years here in Congress. It is a topic that I devoted quite a lot of time to as a State legislator in Colorado in the 9 years before I came to Congress, something I take quite personally.

I have got 5 children of my own back home, and those that are of school age are in public school right now, and trying to find a way to improve America's education system has been pretty much a perpetual pursuit of mine and something I believe in very firmly and passionately, and I will be talking tonight about education tax credits, which is a central education issue that will be debated this year before the House of Representatives and the Senate also, and something that is very important to our President and, even more importantly, to people around the country.

I would like to invite any of our colleagues who may be monitoring this

proceeding, if they are interested in the topic of education tax credits, I would be happy to yield a little time to them if they are inclined to participate.

Last August, President Bush came to Colorado. He came to my district, as a matter of fact. We went up to the mountains and visited Rocky Mountain National Park, and I had an opportunity to spend a little time with him in the motorcade talking about the issue of education. It is very important to our President, as we all know. It is a topic which he featured prominently in the course of his many campaign issues. It is a topic upon which he built a great record in the State of Texas, and that success, I think, captured the attention of Americans around the country and I believe figured prominently in the successful conclusion of his campaign for election of the presidency of the United States.

In that motorcade, the President and I discussed the topic of education tax credits. We did so because at the time the President's education proposal, the Leave No Child Behind proposal, which became known as H.R. 1, was still pending in the Congress, and to our chagrin, the both of us, the core element of that bill had been taken out by this House and, in fact, it was ripped out of the bill before the bill even had its first hearing. That core element was all about education choice, school choice, leaving at that point really 2 other elements, flexibility to States, and the second element, national testing, intact.

That school choice provision was something that was very important to the President, very important to me. So we talked about tax credits as the next strategy to try to compensate for the failure of the Congress to deliver that core element of the President's proposal for the Nation.

Education tax credits involve reducing the cost associated with paying taxes to those who will make a contribution to education, to those who are willing to invest in America's education system.

□ 2245

And our vision entails a contribution to America's education system in a way that does not discriminate between schools based on who happens to own them.

The vast majority of schools in America are owned by the government and owned in a monopoly structure when it comes to American schooling. That monopoly structure is something that is very heavily guarded, certainly by those who are employed and who are a part of the public education monopoly, but in too many cases that monopoly structure of service delivery abandons children, especially children who need education services the most.

Education tax credits are blind to the ownership of schools and, instead, focus on the children who want and deserve a quality education in America.