

Mrs. LINCOLN, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. TALENT, Mr. BUNNING, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. ENZI, Mr. SMITH, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. DOMENICI, and Mr. CRAPO):

S. Res. 140. A resolution designating the week of August 10, 2003, as "National Health Center Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 215

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 215, a bill to authorize funding assistance for the States for the discharge of homeland security activities by the National Guard.

S. 269

At the request of Mr. JEFFORDS, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 269, a bill to amend the Lacey Act Amendments of 1981 to further the conservation of certain wild-life species.

S. 528

At the request of Mr. BINGAMAN, the name of the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 528, a bill to reauthorize funding for maintenance of public roads used by school buses serving certain Indian reservations.

S. 910

At the request of Mr. AKAKA, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 910, a bill to ensure the continuation of non-homeland security functions of Federal agencies transferred to the Department of Homeland Security.

S. 982

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the names of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. FEINGOLD) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. DODD) were added as cosponsors of S. 982, a bill to halt Syrian support for terrorism, end its occupation of Lebanon, stop its development of weapons of mass destruction, cease its illegal importation of Iraqi oil, and hold Syria accountable for its role in the Middle East, and for other purposes.

S. 983

At the request of Mr. CHAFEE, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 983, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize the Director of the National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences to make grants for the development and operation of research centers regarding environmental factors that may be related to the etiology of breast cancer.

S. 1000

At the request of Mr. GRAHAM of South Carolina, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1000, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to revise the age and service requirements for eligibility to receive re-

tired pay for non-regular service; to provide TRICARE eligibility for members of the Selected Reserve of the Ready Reserve and their families; to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow employers a credit against income tax with respect to employees who participate in the military reserve components and to allow a comparable credit for participating reserve component self-employed individuals, and for other purposes.

#### STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. CORZINE (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. COCHRAN, and Mrs. LINCOLN):

S. 1035. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to reduce the age for receipt of military retired pay for nonregular service from 60 to 55; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. CORZINE. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce a bill that would reduce the retirement age for members of the National Guard and Reserve from 60 to 55. This change would allow 93,000 reservists currently aged 55 to 59 to retire with full benefits and would restore parity between the retirement systems for Federal civilian employees and reservists.

In the interests of fairness, the United States must act quickly to restore parity between the retirement age for civilian Federal employees and their reserve counterparts. When the reserve retirement system was created in 1947, the retirement age for reservists was identical to the age for civilian employees. At age 60, reservists and government employees could hang up their uniforms and retire with full benefits. However, since 1947, the retirement age for civilian retirees has been lowered by 5 years, while the reserve retirement age has not changed.

The disparate treatment of Federal employees and reservists would have been serious enough had the nature of the work performed by the reserves not changed substantially over the past five decades. But America has never placed greater demands on its ready reserve than it does now. More than 200,000 reservists are serving their country in the war against terrorism at home, abroad, and in the conflict with Iraq. America's dependence on our ready reserve has never been more obvious, as reservists are now providing security at our Nation's airports and air patrols over our major cities. As Charles Cragin, the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense, recently noted, "The nature and purpose of reserve service has changed since the end of the cold war. They are no longer weekend warriors. They represent almost 50 percent of the total force."

With call-ups that last several months and take reservists far from home, serving the Nation as a reservist has taken on more of the trappings of active duty service than ever before. The recent conflict has only further

underscored the demands placed on the National Guard and Reserve. Before the war on terrorism began, reservists were performing about 13 million man-days each year, more than a 10-fold increase over the one million man-days per year the reserves averaged just 10 years ago. These statistics, the latest numbers available, do not even reflect the thousands of reservists who have been deployed since September 11 nor do they take into account the number of reservists who have been deployed in the current military action against Iraq. There is little doubt there will be a dramatic increase in the number of man-days for 2002 and 2003. In my view, with additional responsibility should come additional benefits.

The Department of Defense typically has not supported initiatives like this. The Department has expressed concern over the proposal's cost, which is estimated to be approximately \$20 billion over 10 years, although CBO figures are not yet available. However, I am concerned that the Department's position may be shortsighted.

At a time when there is a patriotic fervor and a renewed enthusiasm for national service, it is easy to forget that not long ago, the U.S. military was struggling to meet its recruitment and retention goals. In the aftermath of September 11, defense-wide recruitment and retention rates have improved. However, there is no guarantee that this trend will continue. Unless the overall package of incentives is enhanced, there is little reason to believe that we will be able to attract and retain highly-trained personnel.

Active duty military personnel have often looked to the reserves as a way of continuing to serve their country while being closer to family. With thousands of dollars invested in training active duty officers and enlisted soldiers, the United States benefits tremendously when personnel decide to continue with the reserves. But with reserve deployments increasing in frequency and duration—pulling reservists away from their families and civilian life for longer periods—the benefit of joining the reserves instead of active duty has been severely reduced. The more we depend on the reserves, the greater chance we have of losing highly trained former active duty servicemen and women. The added incentive of full retirement at 55 might provide an important inducement for some of them to stay on despite the surge in deployments.

Enacting this legislation will send the clear message that the United States values the increased sacrifice of our reservists during these trying times. The legislation has been endorsed by key members of the Military Coalition, including the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Air Force Sergeants Association, the Air Force Association, the Retired Enlisted Association, the Fleet Reserve Association, the Naval Reserve Association, and the National