I want to commend Mr. Jay Caufield 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 DE- FENSE 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. 4202) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2001 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths 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 protect our national security. I believe that we must address the 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 achieving 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 to meet 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 consider the 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 includes a 3.7 percent pay increase for mili- tary personnel, and that the bill includes im- portant 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 inter- national responsibilities. We may be more se- cure 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 awarded theice pack while submerged. Using special ice detecting sonar, the Nautilus started maneuvering around the icebergs. It would not succeed in this attempt or the next one in June of 1958.

The same cannot be said for the third at- tempt, 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 Serv- ice 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 Ten- nessee, 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 Ten- nessee in 1985, 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 An- derson. 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 accomplish- ments.

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