

The Preparing Students for a High-Tech World Act will extend the opportunity to benefit from exemplary programs like Rio Rancho to our nation's students by increasing the academic rigor and integration of career and technical education programs; developing pathways to postsecondary education and high-skill, high-wage careers; forging alliances among secondary schools, postsecondary institutions, and business and industry designed to address local and regional workforce needs; ensuring that teachers have the knowledge and skills to teach effectively in career and technical education programs; and encouraging the establishment of small, personalized, career-themed learning communities.

These three bills will ensure that we develop the skilled workforce that is essential to building a strong and dynamic economy and to maintaining our country's ability to compete in a global marketplace. This legislation would have substantial spill-over benefits for the communities that adopted these strategies. It would improve science and technology education at the schools in the area. It would increase the employment opportunities for the students that participated in these programs. It would establish more cooperative linkages between the business, schools, and the one-stop shops, and it would enhance economic development in the region.

Along with developing a better trained workforce, we must also create the jobs for them to fill. As I mentioned earlier, Taiwan and Sandia have done an excellent job in demonstrating the competitive advantages of a science park. Given that they act as a critical element in diffusing technology into our national industries, I think that a fourth element of our response to new S&T challenges would be for the Federal government to take a stronger and more coherent role in supporting such parks. Some science parks are locally supported by their states, while others may apply for grants from the Economic Development Administration within the Department of Commerce. These existing sources of support are helpful but it appears to me that it would make good sense to develop a more focused grant program to help jump-start the development of science parks, which is why I have introduced the Science Park Administration Act of 2004. If passed, the federal funds in this bill would be cost matched by States. A loan program to assist in land acquisition and infrastructure development for these parks would be established. And various tax incentives would be provided, including credits for employees trained locally, and adjustment of depreciation schedules for high-end equipment to reflect actual product life-cycles.

I hope that I have provided some positive steps we can take to face the increasingly competitive world we live in. Congress and the administration

need to find the will and the resolve to meet these challenges head-on. I look forward to working with my colleagues in doing so, and in helping to ensure the competitive strength of our Nation.

ESTIMATE FOR S. 894

Mr. SHELBY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Congressional Budget Office cost estimate for S. 894, the Marine Corps 230th Anniversary Commemorative Coin Act, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, DC, June 22, 2004.

Hon. RICHARD C. SHELBY,
Chairman, Committee on Banking, Housing,
and Urban Affairs, U.S. Senate, Wash-
ington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Congressional Budget Office has prepared the enclosed cost estimate for S. 894, the Marine Corps 230th Anniversary Commemorative Coin Act.

If you wish further details on this estimate, we will be pleased to provide them. The CBO staff contact is Matthew Pickford. Sincerely,

ELIZABETH ROBINSON
(For Douglas Holtz-Eakin, Director).
Enclosure.

S. 894—*Marine Corps 230th Anniversary Commemorative Coin Act*

S. 894 would authorize the U.S. Mint to produce a \$1 silver coin in calendar year 2005 to commemorate the 230th anniversary of the United States Marine Corps. The legislation would specify a surcharge of \$10 on the sale of each coin and would designate the Marine Corps Heritage Foundation, a nonprofit entity, as the recipient of the income from the surcharge. CBO estimates that enacting S. 894 would have no significant net impact on direct spending over the 2004–2009 period.

Sales from the coins that would be authorized by S. 894 could raise as much as \$5 million in surcharges if the Mint sells the maximum number of authorized coins. However, the experience of recent commemorative coin sales suggests that receipts would be about \$3 million. Under current law, the Mint must ensure that it does not lose money producing commemorative coins before transferring any surcharges to a recipient organization. CBO expects that those receipts from such surcharges would be transferred to the heritage foundation in fiscal year 2006.

S. 894 contains no intergovernmental or private-sector mandates as defined in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act and would not affect the budgets of state, local, or tribal governments.

On March 22, 2004, CBO transmitted a cost estimate for H.R. 3277, the Marine Corps 230th Anniversary Commemorative Coin Act, as ordered reported by the House Committee on Financial Services on March 17, 2004. The two pieces of legislation are similar and our estimates of implementing each bill are the same.

The CBO staff contact for this estimate is Matthew Pickford, who can be reached at 226-2860. This estimate was approved by Peter H. Fontaine, Deputy Assistant Director for Budget Analysis.

COST ESTIMATE FOR S. 976

Mr. SHELBY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Congress-

sional Budget Office cost estimate for S. 976, the Jamestown 400th Anniversary Commemorative Coin Act, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, DC, June 25, 2004.

Hon. RICHARD C. SHELBY,
Chairman, Committee on Banking, Housing,
and Urban Affairs, U.S. Senate, Wash-
ington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Congressional Budget Office has prepared the enclosed cost estimate for S. 976, the Jamestown 400th Anniversary Commemorative Coin Act of 2003.

If you wish further details on this estimate, we will be pleased to provide them. The CBO staff contact is Matthew Pickford. Sincerely,

ELIZABETH ROBINSON,
(For Douglas Holtz-Eakin, Director).
Enclosure.

S. 976—*Jamestown 400th Anniversary Commemorative Coin Act of 2003*

Summary: S. 976 would direct the U.S. Mint to produce a \$5 gold coin and a \$1 silver coin in calendar year 2007 to commemorate the 400th anniversary of the founding of Jamestown, Virginia. The bill would specify a surcharge on the sales price of \$35 for the gold coin and \$10 for the silver coin and would designate the Jamestown-Yorktown Foundation (an educational institution of the Commonwealth of Virginia), the National Park Service, and the Association for the Preservation of Virginia Antiquities (a private nonprofit association), as recipients of the income from those surcharges.

CBO estimates that enacting S. 976 would have no significant net impact on direct spending over the 2004–2009 period. S. 976 contains no intergovernmental or private-sector mandates as defined in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act (UMRA), and would benefit the Commonwealth of Virginia.

Estimated cost to the Federal Government: S. 976 could raise as much as \$8.5 million in surcharges if the Mint sells the maximum number of authorized coins. Recent commemorative coin sales by the Mint suggest, however, that receipts would be about \$3 million. The legislation would require the Mint to produce the \$1 silver coin from silver available in the National Defense Stockpile. Based on information provided by the Defense Logistics Agency and the Mint, no silver is available in the stockpile. Hence, CBO estimates that receipts from only the \$5 gold coin would be about \$1.25 million.

Under current law, only two commemorative coins may be minted and issued in any calendar year and the Mint must ensure that it will not lose money on a commemorative coin program before transferring any surcharges to a designated recipient organization. CBO expects that the Mint would collect most of those surcharges in fiscal year 2007 and would transfer collections to the designated recipients in fiscal year 2008.

In addition, CBO expects that the Mint would use gold obtained from the reserves held at the Treasury to produce the gold coin. Because the budget treats the sale of gold as a means of financing governmental operations—that is, the Treasury's receipts from such sales do not affect the size of the deficit—CBO has not included such receipts in this estimate. CBO estimates that S. 976 would provide the federal government with about \$3.5 million in additional cash (in exchange for gold) for financing the federal deficit in fiscal year 2007.

Intergovernmental and private-sector impact: S. 976 contains no intergovernmental

or private-sector mandates as defined in UMRRA, and would benefit the Commonwealth of Virginia.

Previous CBO estimate: On March 22, 2004, CBO transmitted a cost estimate for H.R. 1914, the Jamestown 400th Anniversary Commemorative Coin Act of 2003, as ordered reported by the House Committee on Financial Services on March 17, 2004. The two pieces of legislation are similar and our cost estimates are the same; however, H.R. 1914 would not require the Mint to use silver from the National Defense Stockpile to produce the \$1 silver coin.

Estimate prepared by: Federal Costs: Matthew Pickford; Impact on State, Local, and Tribal Governments: Sarah Puro; and Impact on the Private Sector: Paige Piper/Bach.

Estimate approved by: Peter H. Fontaine, Deputy Assistant Director for Budget Analysis.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR
FISCAL YEAR 2005

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I supported passage of this year's defense authorization bill because it contains many provisions that our brave men and women in uniform need and deserve. But before I go into the details of why I support this legislation, I must first thank the members of the United States Armed Forces for their service to our country. They are performing admirably under difficult circumstances all over the world. Our soldiers, sailors, airmen, and Marines, along with their families, are making great sacrifices in service to our country. I am voting for this legislation to support these people who are serving the country with such courage.

I strongly support the 3.5 percent across-the-board pay raise for military personnel that this bill provides. We must make sure that our professional military is paid a fair wage. This bill also makes permanent the increase in family separation allowance and imminent danger pay, another important policy for our men and women in uniform. Once again, I was proud to support the expansion of full-time TRICARE health insurance for our National Guard and Reserve. The reserve component is being used more than at any other time since World War II. Forty percent of our troops in Iraq are reserve component troops. These citizen soldiers face additional burdens when they transition in and out of their civilian life and providing them and their families with TRICARE is one way we can ease those burdens.

Another aspect of this bill that I strongly support is the increased funding for force protection equipment. Last year, concerned Wisconsinites contacted my office telling me that they or their deployed loved ones were fighting for their country in Iraq without the equipment they needed. This situation is unconscionable. I have repeatedly pressed the Pentagon to fix this situation and I and my colleagues went a long way in addressing these shortages in the supplemental spending bill for Iraq and Afghanistan. The \$925 million for additional up-armored HUMVEES and other ballistic protection as well as the \$600 million in force

protection gear and combat clothing in this bill above what was in the President's proposed budget further ensures that our troops have the equipment they need to perform their duties on the ground.

I am pleased that the Senate approved my amendment to ensure that the Inspector General for the Coalition Provisional Authority will continue to oversee U.S. reconstruction efforts in Iraq after June 30 of this year as the Special Inspector General for Iraq Reconstruction. The American taxpayers have been asked to shoulder a tremendous burden in Iraq, and we must ensure that their dollars are spent wisely and efficiently. Today, the CPA is phasing out, but the reconstruction effort has only just begun. As of mid-May, only \$4.2 billion of the \$18.4 billion that Congress appropriated for reconstruction in November had even been obligated. With multiple agencies involved and a budget that exceeds the entire foreign operations appropriation for this fiscal year, U.S. taxpayer-funded reconstruction efforts should have a focused oversight effort. My amendment will ensure that the Inspector General's office can continue its important work even after June 30, rather than being compelled to start wrapping up and shutting down while so much remains to be done. This is good news for the reconstruction effort, and good news for American taxpayers.

I also want to thank the chairman and the ranking member of the Armed Services Committee for working with me to accept the amendment that I offered with the Senator from Maine, Ms. SNOWE, which represents a first step toward enhancing and strengthening transition services that are provided to our military personnel. This amendment will require the General Accounting Office, GAO, to undertake a comprehensive analysis of existing transition services for our military personnel that are administered by the Departments of Defense, Veterans Affairs, and Labor and to make recommendations to Congress on how these programs can be improved. This study will focus on two issues: how to achieve the uniform provision of appropriate transition services to all military personnel, and the role of post-deployment and pre-discharge health assessments as part of the larger transition program. I very much look forward to reviewing the results of this study.

The Senate version of the defense authorization bill also includes a provision finally fulfilling a goal for which I have been fighting for years—making sure that every state and territory has at least one Weapons of Mass Destruction Civil Support Team, WMD-CST. I was delighted earlier this year when Wisconsin was chosen as one of 12 States to receive a WMD-CST authorized and appropriated for in FY2004 but I was also disappointed that the President's proposed budget for FY2005 included funding for only 4 of the 11 outstanding teams. I along with 28 of my

colleagues, wrote the Senate Armed Services Committee chairman and ranking member asking them to fully fund all 11 remaining teams. The chairman and ranking member have been very supportive of my efforts in this area over the years and I thank them again this year for funding all 11 remaining WMD-CSTs.

This authorization bill addresses the grave threat our nation faces from unsecured nuclear materials. It includes \$409 million for the Cooperative Threat Reduction program and \$1.3 billion for the Department of Energy non-proliferation programs. I was also proud to cosponsor the amendment offered by Senator DOMENICI and Senator FEINSTEIN that authorizes the Department of Energy to secure the tons of fissile material scattered around the world. This bipartisan initiative aims to dramatically accelerate current efforts to secure this dangerous material so that it cannot fall into the hands of those who aim to harm us. Time is of the essence and I was pleased to hear that the administration is fully supportive of this effort through the Global Threat Reduction Initiative.

I also voted for an amendment offered by Senator REED that boosts the Army's end strength by 20,000. Mr. President I did so because it has become clear that the Army is currently overstretched, and I believe that we need to ensure readiness to handle threats in the future. A recent Brookings Institution report says that the military is being stretched so thin that if we don't expand its size, it could break the back of our all-volunteer Army. One does not have to support all of the deployment decisions that brought us to this point today to see that we need to have the capacity to handle multiple crises with sufficient manpower and strength. I do not take lightly the decision to lock in a significant increase in spending. The need is great, however, and the deliberative defense authorization process, not the emergency supplemental process, is the place to do it.

I must note that, unfortunately, this bill has many of the same problems that I've been fighting to fix for years. Once again, we are spending billions upon billions of dollars for weapons systems more suited for the Cold War than the fight against terrorism. I was very disappointed that the Senate did not agree to Senator Levin's amendment that would have used a small percentage of the over \$10 billion authorized for missile defense for critical unfunded homeland defense needs. This amendment, which I cosponsored, would have used \$515.5 million now slated for additional untested interceptors and spent it instead on the top unfunded Department of Defense homeland defense priorities, research and development programs, radiation detection equipment at seaports, and other important defenses against terrorism. Budgeting is about setting priorities and I am sad to say that when

the Senate failed to adopt Senator Levin's amendment, it missed a golden opportunity to adjust its priorities in order to face our country's most pressing threat—the threat of terrorism.

I was disappointed that the Senate failed to reduce the retirement age for those in the National Guard and Reserve from 60 to 55. Our country has placed unprecedented demands upon the Guard and Reserve since September 11, 2001, and will continue to do so for the foreseeable future. Considering the demands we are placing on them, it is time that we lower the Guard and Reserve's retirement age to the same level as civilian federal employees.

Although my support for reducing the reserve component retirement age has been unwavering, because of the significant budgetary impact of this measure I had hoped that Congress would first receive reviews of reserve compensation providing all of the information that we need to address this issue responsibly. I patiently waited for several studies on the issue, including by the Defense Department, but when the studies came out they called for further study. This matter cannot continue to languish unaddressed indefinitely. As retired U.S. Air Force Colonel Steve Strobbridge, government relations director for the Military Officers Association of America, MOAA, put it, "It is time to fish or cut bait." I agree with MOAA's analysis that, "Further delay on this important practical and emotional issue poses significant risks to long-term (Guard and Reserve) retention" and I was proud to vote for the amendment offered by the Senator from New Jersey, Mr. CORZINE.

I also believe that the Senate missed an opportunity to provide a small but needed measure of relief to military families when it failed to adopt my Military Family Leave Act amendment. This amendment would have allowed a spouse, child, or parent who already qualifies for Family and Medical Leave Act, FMLA, benefits—unpaid leave—to use those existing benefits for issues directly arising from the deployment of a family member. The Senate adopted a similar amendment by unanimous consent when I offered it to the Iraq supplemental spending bill. This amendment has the support of the Military Officers Association of America, the Enlisted Association of the National Guard of the United States, the Reserve Officers Association, the National Guard Association of the United States, the National Military Family Association, and the National Partnership for Women and Families.

I regret that a harmful second degree amendment was offered to my amendment and that I was not given the opportunity to have a straight up or down vote. Rather than taking up the Senate's time in a protracted debate about the second degree amendment, I withdrew my amendment so that this important defense authorization bill could move forward. However, the need addressed by my amendment remains

and I will continue to fight to bring some relief to military families that sacrifice so much for all of us.

I want to bring attention to another element of the Defense Authorization bill that raises concerns for me. The Defense Authorization bill includes language that raises troop caps in Colombia from 400 to 800 military personnel and from 400 civilian contractors to 600. I am disappointed that Senator BYRD's amendment was not approved by the Senate, which would have limited the increases in these caps to 500 military personnel and 500 civilian contractors. I have serious concerns about the increase in these caps to the levels established by the bill. Most importantly, I worry about placing more Americans in harm's way in Colombia. Further deployments bring greater risks to an already overstretched military. We do not want to risk being drawn further into Colombia's civil war—certainly not without a thorough debate that the American people can follow. In addition, many of my constituents and I remain concerned that by raising these caps, the U.S. devotes greater resources to the military side of the equation in Colombia without balancing our approach through greater support for democratic institutions, increasing economic development, and supporting human rights.

There are other provisions in this bill with which I disagree and the Senate rejected a number of amendments that would have made this bill better. However, on balance this legislation contains many good provisions for our men and women in uniform and their families and that is why I will vote for it.

U.S.-AUSTRALIA FREE TRADE AGREEMENT

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I rise today in support of an important free trade agreement that was recently signed between the United States and Australia. Earlier today, I was pleased to join an overwhelming majority of my colleagues on the Senate Finance Committee to report out this agreement favorably, and I am hopeful that within the next day, the full Senate will give its consent as well. This vote not only reaffirms our strong relationship with a close ally but marks an important step forward on our path toward economic recovery.

Since 1994, two-way trade between the United States and Australia has increased 53 percent to nearly \$29 billion. Australia purchases more goods from the United States than any other country, giving the United States a \$9 billion bilateral goods and services trade surplus. Last year alone, my homestate of Oregon exported more than \$257 million in merchandise to Australia. These exports accounted for 2.5 percent of the State total in 2003.

The elimination of trade barriers between the two countries promises to

increase these figures even more. Under the agreement, duties on almost all manufactured goods will be eliminated. This will result in first-year tariff savings of about \$300 million for U.S. manufactured goods exporters. For Western Star—a subsidiary of DaimlerChrysler—located in Portland, OR, this translates to savings of nearly \$2 million a year in eliminated tariffs and duties that currently average \$4,000 per truck exported to Australia. It is estimated that U.S.-Australia Free Trade Agreement will result in approximately \$2 billion of new U.S. exports.

This agreement will also open new doors for U.S. farmers. U.S. agricultural exports to Australia, totaling more than \$700 million last year, will receive immediate duty-free access. This means American farmers will be better poised to compete in a market of over 19 million people. Additionally, food inspection procedures that have posed barriers in the past have been addressed, and substantial safeguards have been written into the agreement to ensure a smooth and stable transition for our domestic meat and dairy industries.

As I come here today, I realize that there are those who still have reservations over the prospects of expanded trade. While the benefits of a more liberalized trade policy are vast, I know that they have not been spread evenly across all sectors. I am confident, however, that the safeguards in this agreement will ensure a stable market for domestic procedures while providing new market access and real consumer benefits. I believe this agreement is good for the United States, and I urge its passage.

REVEREND DONALD J. LONGBOTTOM

Mr. HAGEL. Mr. President, I rise today to thank Rev. Don Longbottom for accepting Senate Chaplain Barry Black's and my invitation to join us in the U.S. Senate and offer the opening prayer. I also would like to recognize his wife, Lori, who has accompanied him to Washington from Nebraska.

Reverend Longbottom is currently the Senior Minister at Countryside Community Church United Church of Christ in Omaha, NE. He ministers to more than 2,000 members of Countryside Community Church in Omaha, including my dear friends Ron and Lois Roskens and former Nebraska Congressman John Y. McCollister and his wife Nan.

In addition to his leadership in faith communities in Kansas, Ohio, and California, Reverend Longbottom continues to dedicate himself to the spiritual and community needs of many Nebraskans. He currently serves on the Board of Directors for the United Church of Christ Nebraska Conference and has taught college courses in Environmental and Business Ethics.