that SSA will process fee payments to attorneys in a timely fashion. The legislation we are introducing today simply seeks to put that reasonable expectation into law. H.R. xxxx would prohibit the Social Security Administration from charging an attorney the 6.3 percent assessment unless the attorney has represented the claimant for her fee for payment within 30 days of the award of past-due benefits to his or her client. Without this common-sense legislation, SSA would be permitted to charge the 6.3 percent assessment without regard to how long the agency takes to process attorneys' fee payments.

As necessary as this legislation may be, it is not all that is required of this and future Congresses. We in Congress must also remain vigilant and ensure that the new administrative assessment imposed by the Work Incentives Improvement Act does not deter attorneys from representing disability claimants. Given the complexities of the disability determination process, if claimants are unable to secure professional legal representation, the results could be disastrous.

Claimants without professional legal representation appear to be far less likely to receive the benefits to which they are entitled. For example, in 1998, 57.6 percent of claimants represented by an attorney, but only 35.7 percent of those without one, were awarded benefits at the hearing level. As mandated by the Work Incentives Improvement Act, the General Accounting Office will examine the impact of this new administrative assessment upon claimants' access to legal representation. If the GAO finds that the assessment does impair claimants' access, I fully expect that, consistent with the conference agreement on the Work Incentives Improvement Act, Congress will revisit this issue once more.

In closing, I look forward to working with Chairman SHAW on this piece of legislation in the same bipartisan manner that characterized our successful efforts last fall on the Work Incentives Improvement Act and again this spring on the repeal of the Social Security retirement earnings test. With this sort of collaboration, I am certain that we can pass this legislation with bipartisan support. Once more.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to recognize and join in the celebration of the Make-A-Wish Foundation's 20th Anniversary. In its twentieth year, the Make-A-Wish Foundation is a non-profit organization that fulfills the wishes of children fighting life-threatening illnesses. This organization provides once in a lifetime experiences to children, under the age of 18, who may not have the rest of their childhood left to fulfill their wish. Born out of a wish made by a seven-year-old fighting Leukemia in Arizona, the Make-A-Wish Foundation has grown to 80 chapters in the United States and 20 international affiliates on five continents and is the largest wish granting foundation in the world. In its twenty years of existence, the Make-A-Wish Foundation has granted wishes to over 66,000 children worldwide. The Make-A-Wish Foundation of the Mid-Atlantic, Inc., in particular, helps to serve children in my district as well as other children throughout the entire state of Maryland.

The Make-A-Wish Foundation has granted wishes to children as simple as trips to Disney World and other amusement parks to meeting their favorite entertainer or role model. One young man from my district had his wish fulfilled when he met South African leader and political figure Nelson Mandela. He remarked that there was no better way to learn about blacks and whites living together in peace than to learn firsthand about the life of someone so oppressed yet as unbroken as Mr. Mandela.

The Make-A-Wish Foundation gives children that are fighting life-threatening illnesses a positive break from a world of doctors, hospitals and medicine. I salute the Make-A-Wish Foundation's volunteers and supporters who work to make wishes come true not only in Baltimore City and Baltimore County, but literally all over the world. Congratulations on 20 years of making wishes come true.

Mr. ORTIZ. Mr. Speaker, today I pay tribute to a South Texas educator, Anita Hinojosa, who will retire in July after 31 years in vocational and adult education. Anita helped make Corpus Christi a better place by virtue of her lifetime commitment to education.

After working as a home economics teacher after graduating from Texas A&M University at Kingsville, and as a consultant, Anita became the Vocational Education Coordinator while also working as an adjunct Professor of Occupational Education at Corpus Christi State University.

In 1990, she became the Career and Technology Education Director for the Corpus Christi Independent School District, the position she will soon leave to enjoy retirement. During the course of her work here, she has supervised some of the most important programs available at CCISD, those programs that work with those who need special training because of their age or special circumstances.

Anita currently oversees the following programs: Adult Basic Education; Alternative High School Center; Summer Training and Education Program (STEP); Pregnancy, Education, and Parenting; Guidance and Counseling; Instructional Technology; and several at-risk programs.

I ask my colleagues to join me today in commending a special patriot, one who spent a lifetime in pursuit of education and teaching, Anita Hinojosa.

Mr. CAUFIELD. Mr. Speaker, today I pay tribute to a South Texas educator, Anita Hinojosa, who will retire in July after 31 years in vocational and adult education. Anita helped make Corpus Christi a better place by virtue of her lifetime commitment to education.

After working as a home economics teacher after graduating from Texas A&M University at Kingsville, and as a consultant, Anita became the Vocational Education Coordinator while also working as an adjunct Professor of Occupational Education at Corpus Christi State University.

In 1990, she became the Career and Technology Education Director for the Corpus Christi Independent School District, the position she will soon leave to enjoy retirement. During the course of her work here, she has supervised some of the most important programs available at CCISD, those programs that work with those who need special training because of their age or special circumstances.

Anita currently oversees the following programs: Adult Basic Education; Alternative High School Center; Summer Training and Education Program (STEP); Pregnancy, Education, and Parenting; Guidance and Counseling; Instructional Technology; and several at-risk programs.

I ask my colleagues to join me today in commending a special patriot, one who spent a lifetime in pursuit of education and teaching, Anita Hinojosa.
I want to commend Mr. Jay Caulfield for his selfless commitment to the students and to the entire educational community. His distinguished career has been a shining example for all.

FLOYD D. SPENCE NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2001

SPEECH OF
HON. MARK UDALL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 7, 2000

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4205) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2001 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strength for fiscal year 2001, and for other purposes.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Defense Appropriations bill for fiscal 2001. I believe that a strong and effective defense system is vital to the future of this country. I believe that we must do all we can to potential threats in this new post-Cold War environment and to prepare for the possibility that these threats might require a military response. But I question the price that this bill is asking us to pay to achieve these goals.

My concerns about this bill have to do with priorities. By that, I mean I think the priorities among the programs funded in the bill are wrong. But, even more importantly, I think the sheer size of the bill reflects an imbalance between military spending and other important priorities.

First, the big picture: At $15.8 billion over FY2000 appropriated levels, the President's budget request for defense programs in FY2001 indicates the importance of defense spending for this Administration. But—not content with a bill that met the President's request for $60 billion in weapons procurement as well as to fully fund missile defense and other major weapons systems—the Republicans want more.

The bill we will vote on today appropriates $4 billion more than the budget request, and $22.4 billion more than last year's appropriated levels. Along with defense funds provided in the recently passed Military Construction Appropriations bill and funds expected to be provided in the FY2001 Energy and Water Appropriations bill, total defense appropriations this year come to about $310 billion—more than $4.5 billion over this year's budget request.

With this defense bill alone appropriating more than half of the discretionary funds available to Congress, it is clear to me that something is wrong with our priorities. The President's budget balanced increases in defense with increases in funding for education, health care, national parks, science, environmental protection, and other non-defense programs. What the Republicans have done is to increase defense spending even more, all at the expense of domestic programs that are so important to the citizen of this country.

Second, there are the bill's own priorities: Not only would this bill provide too much, but it also would provide too much of the wrong thing. I can't support funding F-22 production when the Appropriations Committee's own Survey and Investigations staff reported that a December 2000 date for beginning production is premature, and when the GAO recommended that six, not ten, planes be built, which could save as much as $828 million.

Nor can I support funding for national missile defense procurement until the technology has been proven and until we've come to some agreement with our allies as to how to proceed. We must not view national missile defense as a substitute for arms control efforts. I believe Congress should primarily be encouraging further reductions in global nuclear weapons, while examining the need for, timing of, and feasibility of national missile defense within a global arms-control context. I don't believe that we should be doing anything more than examining these questions at this time.

There are some good things about the bill. For example, I'm pleased that the measure provides a 3.7 percent pay increase for military personnel, and that the bill includes important provisions to revamp the military health care system, including restoring access for all Medicare-eligible military retirees and creating a plan to implement a permanent health care program for military retirees over 65.

But Mr. Speaker, this bill does not provide a balance between our domestic and international responsibilities. We may be more secure than ever before, but I question whether the country wouldn't be better off if we were to invest more in education, health care, and the needs of our children. We must remember that this nation's strength comes not just from military preparedness, but also from its citizens. Adequate investments in them are just as important as protection for them.

HONORING COMMANDER WILLIAM ROBERT ANDERSON

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN, JR.
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 9, 2000

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, today I honor retired Commander William Robert Anderson for his service to his Country in both the military and the House of representatives.

Commander Anderson distinguished himself in combat and scientific accomplishment during his long career in the submarine service. During World War II, he completed a total of 11 submarine war patrols and earned a Bronze Star for his assistance in the sinking of 17 cargo-carrying crafts and the rescue of a downed aviator.

In May of 1953, Captain Anderson was granted his first command, the submarine U.S.S. Wahoo, and saw even more action during the Korean War. Two years later he would be chosen for another type of command, as head of the Tactical Department at the U.S. Submarine School in New London, Connecticut.

This would not be the end of his sea duty, though. In fact, his most important command and date with history was yet to come. It was actually while Anderson was at the U.S. Submarine School that the United States commissioned its first nuclear submarine, the U.S.S. Nautilus on January 17, 1955.

The potential of this new type of submarine brought a need for more officers trained in nuclear operations. And so, Commander Anderson found himself being called into Rear-Admiral H.G. Rickover's office to interview for the program in January of 1956.

He soon found himself recruiting and awaiting a new command. During this time Rickover asked Anderson to devise a method of study for new officers entering the program. This project eventually evolved into the core study program for all nuclear submarine commanders.

It was on April 30, 1957, that Captain Anderson was ordered to assume command of the U.S.S. Nautilus. His classified mission was to be ready to take his submarine and crew under the Arctic polar ice cap whenever he received the order.

Known as “Operation Sunshine” by the Navy, this project would challenge both Captain Anderson's leadership skills and his nautical training.

No one had ever succeeded in finding a northern sea passage before, and the lack of information and charts on the pack ice, the inability of normal navigational instruments to operate so near to the magnetic North Pole and other instrumentation problems had to be solved and solved—all in the deepest of secrecy.

With the summer of 1957 ending, the crew of the Nautilus made its first attempt to traverse the ice pack while submerged. Using special ice detecting sonar, the Nautilus started maneuvering around the icebergs. It would not succeed on this attempt or the next one in June of 1958.

The same cannot be said for the third attempt, and on August 3, 1958, Captain Anderson and the crew of the Nautilus finally crossed under the North Pole. Upon return to the United States, the entire crew was honored with a ticker tape parade in New York City and Anderson was personally awarded the Legion of Merit by President Eisenhower.

Commander Anderson's career continued to flourish—from his serving as an aide to the Secretary of the Navy, Fred Korth, to his appointment as the Director of the National Service Corps, which would be renamed the Peace Corps in later years by President Kennedy.

In 1960, Anderson was even considered as a possible gubernatorial candidate in Tennessee, but he decided to fulfill his 20 year commitment to the Navy. Upon retirement from the Navy, Anderson was elected as the Representative from the Sixth District of Tennessee in 1965, and he continued to serve his constituents for four successive terms in office before retiring to Virginia.

I, for one, am proud of the accomplishments of my fellow Tennessean, William Robert Anderson. For his diligent and long-standing service to this great Country and the State of Tennessee, I would like to return the honor by paying him this tribute to his great accomplishments.

While Commander Anderson now resides in the great state of Virginia, we Tennesseans still choose to claim him as one of our native sons.