

winningest team in NBA history. Their record of 67–15, the best regular season record in the NBA's Eastern and Western Conference.

Led by coach Phil Jackson, Shaquille O'Neal and Kobe Bryant the Lakers are a formidable opponent. Shaquille O'Neal was named league Most Valuable Player, led the league in scoring and field goal percentage, won the IBM Award for greatest overall contribution to a team, and became just the sixth player in the game's history to be a unanimous selection to the All-NBA First team.

Shaquille O'Neal also was named Most Valuable Player of the 2000 All Star game scoring 22 points and collecting 9 rebounds. And he also dominated the 2000 playoffs scoring 38 points per game in the NBA Finals on his way to winning the Most Valuable Player award.

Another top player was the 21-year-old phenom, Kobe Bryant, who overcame injuries to average more than 22 points a game in the regular season and be named to the NBA All-Defensive First Team. Kobe Bryant's eight point performance in the overtime of game 4 led the Lakers to one of the most dramatic wins in playoff history.

Coach Phil Jackson, winner of seven NBA Championship rings and a playoff winning percentage of .718, has proven to be one of the most innovative and adaptable coaches in the NBA.

And when you add to this terrific trio and strong supporting cast—including Glenn Rice, A.C. Green, Ron Harper, Robert Horry, Rick Fox, Derrick Fisher, Brian Shaw, Devean George, Tyrone Lue, John Celestand, Travis Knight, and John Salley—the recipe for a championship was written.

I also congratulate team owner Dr. Jerry Buss, General Manager Jerry West and all the others who worked so hard to return the championship magic to the City of Angels. But most of all, I would like to congratulate the myriad of Lakers fans who have pulled for this team through it all.

The 1999–2000 Los Angeles Lakers will go down in history with those legendary teams of the past. And we can add the names of Shaquille O'Neal and Kobe Bryant to the tapestry of Laker greats: George Mikan, Wilt Chamberlain, Jerry West, Elgin Baylor, Kareem Abdul-Jabbar, and the incomparable Earvin "Magic" Johnson.

These Lakers demonstrated immeasurable determination, heart, stamina, and an amazing comeback ability in their drive for the championship. They have made the City of Los Angeles and the State of California proud.

The Los Angeles Lakers have started the 21st century meeting the high standards they established in the 20th century. In the years ahead, I have no doubt that this team will add numerous championship banners to the rafters of the Staples Center.

Senator BOXER and I thought it would be fitting to offer this resolution today.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I rise today to salute the new reigning champions of the National Basketball Association—California's own Los Angeles Lakers.

The tradition of greatness continues in Los Angeles. Building on the excellence personified by the likes of Jerry and Wilt the Silt, and later by Magic and Kareem, today's Lakers regained that status by players known around the world by two words: "Kobe" and "Shaq."

What can you say about Shaquille O'Neal? He is the most dominating force in the game today. He was the most valuable player in the All-Star Game, the regular season and the NBA finals.

Kobe Bryant has that creative, slashing style that is pure excitement. The way he fought through tough injuries to spark the Lakers was an inspiration.

And Mr. President, I would like to acknowledge the rest of the Lakers team. The steady hand and championship experience of Ron Harper was crucial. Robert Horry's stifling defense, strong rebounding and opportunistic scoring were key. Rick Fox, whose ten years' experience and clutch three-pointer in the waning moments of Game Six were invaluable. The persistence of Glenn Rice was matched only by the beauty of his jump shot. A.C. Green, who came back to the Lakers for this championship season, reminded us of his original "Showtime" days when he was running the wing with Magic and Worthy. And Brian Shaw and Derek Fisher made big shots and took care of the ball during minutes off the bench. What a team!

Finally, the man who brought all of these elements together, is simply the best of all time—the man they call Zen master, coach Phil Jackson.

The Lakers victories were made more special by the determination of their opponents. Larry Bird and the Indiana Pacers deserve the respect of basketball fans everywhere.

Mr. President, on behalf of millions of adoring Angelenos, California and basketball fans everywhere congratulations to the 2000 World Champion Los Angeles Lakers.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution and preamble be agreed to en bloc, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and that any statements related thereto be printed in the RECORD, with no intervening action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 324) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S. RES. 324

Whereas the Los Angeles Lakers are one of the greatest sports franchises ever;

Whereas the Los Angeles Lakers have won 12 National Basketball Association Championships;

Whereas the Los Angeles Lakers are the second winningest team in National Basketball Association history;

Whereas the Los Angeles Lakers, at 67–15, posted the best regular season record in the National Basketball Association;

Whereas the Los Angeles Lakers have fielded such superstars as George Mikan, Wilt Chamberlain, Jerry West, Elgin Baylor, Kareem Abdul-Jabbar, Earvin "Magic" Johnson, and now, Shaquille O'Neal and Kobe Bryant;

Whereas Shaquille O'Neal led the league in scoring and field goal percentage on his way to winning the National Basketball Association's Most Valuable Player award, winning the IBM Award for greatest overall contribution to a team, and becoming just the sixth player in the history of the game to be a unanimous selection to the All-National Basketball Association First Team;

Whereas Shaquille O'Neal was named Most Valuable Player of the 2000 All Star game, scoring 22 points and collecting 9 rebounds;

Whereas Shaquille O'Neal dominated the 2000, playoffs averaging 38 points per game and winning the Most Valuable Player award in the National Basketball Association Finals;

Whereas Kobe Bryant overcame injuries to average more than 22 points a game in the regular season and be named to the National Basketball Association All-Defensive First Team;

Whereas Kobe Bryant's 8-point performance in the overtime of Game 4 led the Los Angeles Lakers to 1 of the most dramatic wins in playoff history;

Whereas Coach Phil Jackson, who has won 7 National Basketball Association rings and the highest playoff winning percentage in league history, has proven to be 1 of the most innovative and adaptable coaches in the National Basketball Association;

Whereas the Los Angeles Lakers epitomize Los Angeles pride with their determination, heart, stamina, and amazing comeback ability;

Whereas the support of all the Los Angeles fans and the people of California helped make winning the National Basketball Association Championship possible; and

Whereas the Los Angeles Lakers have started the 21st century meeting the high standards they established in the 20th century: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the United States Senate congratulates the Los Angeles Lakers on winning the 2000 National Basketball Association Championship Title.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2001—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 3477 THROUGH 3490, EN BLOC

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, my distinguished colleague, Senator LEVIN, and I are prepared to address a series of amendments which have been agreed to on both sides on the authorization bill for the armed services of the United States.

Consequently, I send a series of amendments to the desk which have been cleared by myself and the ranking member. Therefore, I ask unanimous

consent that the Senate consider those amendments en bloc, the amendments be agreed to, the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table, and that any statements relating to any of these amendments be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. LEVIN. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendments (Nos. 3477 through 3490) were agreed to, en bloc, as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 3477

(Purpose: To set aside \$20,000,000 for the Joint Technology Information Center Initiative; and to offset that amount by reducing the amount provided for cyber attack sensing and warning under the information systems security program (account 0303140G) by \$20,000,000)

On page 48, between lines 20 and 21, insert the following:

SEC. 222. JOINT TECHNOLOGY INFORMATION CENTER INITIATIVE.

Of the amount authorized to be appropriated under section 201(4)—

(1) \$20,000,000 shall be available for the Joint Technology Information Center Initiative; and

(2) the amount provided for cyber attack sensing and warning under the information systems security program (account 0303140G) is reduced by \$20,000,000.

AMENDMENT NO. 3478

(Purpose: To authorize the establishment of United States-Russian Federation joint center for the exchange of data from early warning systems and for notification of missile launches)

On page 462, between lines 2 and 3, insert the following:

SEC. 1210. UNITED STATES-RUSSIAN FEDERATION JOINT DATA EXCHANGE CENTER ON EARLY WARNING SYSTEMS AND NOTIFICATION OF MISSILE LAUNCHES.

(a) AUTHORITY.—The Secretary of Defense is authorized to establish, in conjunction with the Government of the Russian Federation, a United States-Russian Federation joint center for the exchange of data from early warning systems and for notification of missile launches.

(b) SPECIFIC ACTIONS.—The actions that the Secretary jointly undertakes for the establishment of the center may include the renovation of a mutually agreed upon facility to be made available by the Russian Federation and the provision of such equipment and supplies as may be necessary to commence the operation of the center.

AMENDMENT NO. 3479

(Purpose: To provide back pay for persons who, while serving as members of the Navy or the Marine Corps during World War II, were unable to accept approved promotions by reason of being interned as prisoners of war)

On page 239, after line 22, insert the following:

SEC. 656. BACK PAY FOR MEMBERS OF THE NAVY AND MARINE CORPS APPROVED FOR PROMOTION WHILE INTERNED AS PRISONERS OF WAR DURING WORLD WAR II.

(a) ENTITLEMENT OF FORMER PRISONERS OF WAR.—Upon receipt of a claim made in accordance with this section, the Secretary of the Navy shall pay back pay to a claimant who, by reason of being interned as a pris-

oner of war while serving as a member of the Navy or the Marine Corps during World War II, was not available to accept a promotion for which the claimant was approved.

(b) PROPER CLAIMANT FOR DECEASED FORMER MEMBER.—In the case of a person described in subsection (a) who is deceased, the back pay for that deceased person under this section shall be paid to a member or members of the family of the deceased person determined appropriate in the same manner as is provided in section 6(c) of the War Claims Act of 1948 (50 U.S.C. App. 2005(c)).

(c) AMOUNT OF BACK PAY.—The amount of back pay payable to or for a person described in subsection (a) is the amount equal to the excess of—

(1) the total amount of basic pay that would have been paid to that person for service in the Navy or the Marine Corps if the person had been promoted on the date on which the promotion was approved, over

(2) the total amount of basic pay that was paid to or for that person for such service on and after that date.

(d) TIME LIMITATIONS.—(1) To be eligible for a payment under this section, a claimant must file a claim for such payment with the Secretary of Defense within two years after the effective date of the regulations implementing this section.

(2) Not later than 18 months after receiving a claim for payment under this section, the Secretary shall determine the eligibility of the claimant for payment of the claim. Subject to subsection (f), if the Secretary determines that the claimant is eligible for the payment, the Secretary shall promptly pay the claim.

(e) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary of Defense shall prescribe regulations to carry out this section. Such regulations shall include procedures by which persons may submit claims for payment under this section. Such regulations shall be prescribed not later than six months after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(f) LIMITATION ON DISBURSEMENT.—(1) Notwithstanding any power of attorney, assignment of interest, contract, or other agreement, the actual disbursement of a payment under this section may be made only to each person who is eligible for the payment under subsection (a) or (b) and only—

(A) upon the appearance of that person, in person, at any designated disbursement office in the United States or its territories; or

(B) at such other location or in such other manner as that person may request in writing.

(2) In the case of a claim approved for payment but not disbursed as a result of operation of paragraph (1), the Secretary of Defense shall hold the funds in trust for the person in an interest bearing account until such time as the person makes an election under such paragraph.

(g) ATTORNEY FEES.—Notwithstanding any contract, the representative of a person may not receive, for services rendered in connection with the claim of, or with respect to, a person under this section, more than 10 percent of the amount of a payment made under this section on that claim.

(h) OUTREACH.—The Secretary of the Navy shall take such actions as are necessary to ensure that the benefits and eligibility for benefits under this section are widely publicized by means designed to provide actual notice of the availability of the benefits in a timely manner to the maximum number of eligible persons practicable.

(i) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term “World War II” has the meaning given the

term in section 101(8) of title 38, United States Code.

AMENDMENT NO. 3480

(Purpose: To provide for full implementation of certain student loan repayment programs as incentives for Federal employee recruitment and retention)

On page 415, between lines 2 and 3, insert the following:

SEC. 1061. STUDENT LOAN REPAYMENT PROGRAMS.

(a) STUDENT LOANS.—Section 5379(a)(1)(B) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in clause (i), by inserting “(20 U.S.C. 1071 et seq.)” before the semicolon;

(2) in clause (ii), by striking “part E of title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965” and inserting “part D or E of title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1087a et seq., 1087aa et seq.)”; and

(3) in clause (iii), by striking “part C of title VII of Public Health Service Act or under part B of title VIII of such Act” and inserting “part A of title VII of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 292 et seq.) or under part E of title VIII of such Act (42 U.S.C. 297a et seq.)”.

(b) PERSONNEL COVERED.—

(1) INELIGIBLE PERSONNEL.—Section 5379(a)(2) of title 5, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“(2) An employee shall be ineligible for benefits under this section if the employee occupies a position that is excepted from the competitive service because of its confidential, policy-determining, policy-making, or policy-advocating character.”.

(2) PERSONNEL RECRUITED OR RETAINED.—Section 5379(b)(1) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking “professional, technical, or administrative”.

(c) REGULATIONS.—

(1) PROPOSED REGULATIONS.—Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the Office of Personnel Management (referred to in this section as the “Director”) shall issue proposed regulations under section 5379(g) of title 5, United States Code. The Director shall provide for a period of not less than 60 days for public comment on the regulations.

(2) FINAL REGULATIONS.—Not later than 240 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director shall issue final regulations described in paragraph (1).

(d) ANNUAL REPORTS.—Section 5379 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(h)(1) Each head of an agency shall maintain, and annually submit to the Director of the Office of Personnel Management, information with respect to the agency on—

“(A) the number of Federal employees selected to receive benefits under this section;

“(B) the job classifications for the recipients; and

“(C) the cost to the Federal Government of providing the benefits.

“(2) The Director of the Office of Personnel Management shall prepare, and annually submit to Congress, a report containing the information submitted under paragraph (1), and information identifying the agencies that have provided the benefits described in paragraph (1).”.

AMENDMENT NO. 3481

(Purpose: To make available \$33,000,000 for the operation of current Tethered Aerostat Radar System (TARS) sites)

On page 58, between lines 7 and 8, insert the following:

SEC. 313. TETHERED AEROSTAT RADAR SYSTEM (TARS) SITES.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Failure to operate and standardize the current Tethered Aerostat Radar System (TARS) sites along the Southwest border of the United States and the Gulf of Mexico will result in a degradation of the counterdrug capability of the United States.

(2) Most of the illicit drugs consumed in the United States enter the United States through the Southwest border, the Gulf of Mexico, and Florida.

(3) The Tethered Aerostat Radar System is a critical component of the counterdrug mission of the United States relating to the detection and apprehension of drug traffickers.

(4) Preservation of the current Tethered Aerostat Radar System network compels drug traffickers to transport illicit narcotics into the United States by more risky and hazardous routes.

(b) AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—Of the amount authorized to be appropriated by section 301(20) for Drug Interdiction and Counter-drug Activities, Defense-wide, up to \$33,000,000 may be made available to Drug Enforcement Policy Support (DEP&S) for purposes of maintaining operations of the 11 current Tethered Aerostat Radar System (TARS) sites and completing the standardization of such sites located along the Southwest border of the United States and in the States bordering the Gulf of Mexico.

AMENDMENT NO. 3482

(Purpose: To make available, with an offset, \$7,000,000 for procurement, Defense-Wide, for the procurement and installation of integrated bridge systems for naval systems special warfare rigid inflatable boats and high-speed assault craft for special operations forces)

SEC. 142. INTEGRATED BRIDGE SYSTEMS FOR NAVAL SYSTEMS SPECIAL WARFARE RIGID INFLATABLE BOATS AND HIGH-SPEED ASSAULT CRAFT.

(a) INCREASE IN AUTHORIZATION FOR PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE.—The amount authorized to be appropriated by section 104 for procurement, Defense-wide, is hereby increased by \$7,000,000.

(b) AVAILABILITY OF AMOUNT.—Of the amount authorized to be appropriated by section 104, as increased by subsection (a), \$7,000,000 shall be available for the procurement and installation of integrated bridge systems for naval systems special warfare rigid inflatable boats and high-speed assault craft for special operations forces.

(c) OFFSET.—The amount authorized to be appropriated by section 103(4), for other procurement for the Air Force, is hereby reduced by \$7,000,000.

AMENDMENT NO. 3483

(Purpose: To authorize, with an offset, \$5,000,000 for research, development, test, and evaluation Defense-wide for Explosives Demilitarization Technology (PE603104D) for research into ammunition risk analysis capabilities)

On page 48, between lines 20 and 21, insert the following:

SEC. 222. AMMUNITION RISK ANALYSIS CAPABILITIES.

(a) AVAILABILITY OF AMOUNT.—Of the amount authorized to be appropriated by section 201(4) for research, development, test, and evaluation Defense-wide, the amount available for Explosives Demilitarization Technology (PE603104D) is hereby increased

by \$5,000,000, with the amount of such increase available for research into ammunition risk analysis capabilities.

(b) OFFSET.—Of the amount authorized to be appropriated by section 201(4), the amount available for Computing Systems and Communications Technology (PE602301E) is hereby decreased by \$5,000,000.

AMENDMENT NO. 3484

(Purpose: To permit members of the National Guard to participate in athletic competitions and to modify authorities relating to participation of such members in small arms competition)

On page 200, following line 23, add the following:

SEC. 566. PREPARATION, PARTICIPATION, AND CONDUCT OF ATHLETIC COMPETITIONS AND SMALL ARMS COMPETITIONS BY THE NATIONAL GUARD AND MEMBERS OF THE NATIONAL GUARD.

(a) PREPARATION AND PARTICIPATION OF MEMBERS GENERALLY.—Subsection (a) of section 504 of title 32, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking “or” at the end of paragraph (2);

(2) in paragraph (3)—

(A) by inserting “prepare for and” before “participate”; and

(B) by striking the period at the end and inserting “; or”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(4) prepare for and participate in qualifying athletic competitions.”.

(b) CONDUCT OF COMPETITIONS.—That section is further amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(c)(1) Units of the National Guard may conduct small arms competitions and athletic competitions in conjunction with training required under this chapter if such activities would meet the requirements set forth in paragraphs (1), (3), and (4) of section 508(a) of this title if such activities were services to be provided under that section.

“(2) Facilities and equipment of the National Guard, including military property and vehicles described in section 508(c) of this title, may be used in connection with activities under paragraph (1).”.

(c) AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—That section is further amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(d) Subject to provisions of appropriations Acts, amounts appropriated for the National Guard may be used in order to cover the costs of activities under subsection (c) and of expenses of members of the National Guard under paragraphs (3) and (4) of subsection (a), including expenses of attendance and participation fees, travel, per diem, clothing, equipment, and related expenses.”.

(d) QUALIFYING ATHLETIC COMPETITIONS DEFINED.—That section is further amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(e) In this section, the term ‘qualifying athletic competition’ means a competition in athletic events that require skills relevant to military duties or involve aspects of physical fitness that are evaluated by the armed forces in determining whether a member of the National Guard is fit for military duty.”.

(e) CONFORMING AND CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.—(1) The section heading of such section is amended to read as follows:

“§504. National Guard schools; small arms competitions; athletic competitions”.

(2) The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 5 of that title is amended by striking

the item relating to section 504 and inserting the following new item:

“504. National Guard schools; small arms competitions; athletic competitions.”.

AMENDMENT NO. 3485

(Purpose: To amend title 5, United States Code to provide for realignment of the Department of Defense workforce)

On page 436, between lines 2 and 3, insert the following:

SEC. 1114. EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY FOR VOLUNTARY SEPARATIONS IN REDUCTIONS IN FORCE.

Section 3502(f)(5) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking “September 30, 2001” and inserting “September 30, 2005”.

SEC. 1115. EXTENSION, REVISION, AND EXPANSION OF AUTHORITIES FOR USE OF VOLUNTARY SEPARATION INCENTIVE PAY AND VOLUNTARY EARLY RETIREMENT.

(a) EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY.—Subsection (e) of section 5597 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking “September 30, 2003” and inserting “September 30, 2005”.

(b) REVISION AND ADDITION OF PURPOSES FOR DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE VSIP.—Subsection (b) of such section is amended by inserting after “transfer of function,” the following: “restructuring of the workforce (to meet mission needs, achieve one or more strength reductions, correct skill imbalances, or reduce the number of high-grade, managerial, or supervisory positions in accordance with the strategic plan required under section 1118 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001).”.

(c) ELIGIBILITY.—Subsection (c) of such section is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), by inserting “objective and nonpersonal” after “similar”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following: “A determination of which employees are within the scope of an offer of separation pay shall be made only on the basis of consistent and well-documented application of the relevant criteria.”.

(d) INSTALLMENT PAYMENTS.—Subsection (d) of such section is amended—

(1) by striking paragraph (1) and inserting the following:

“(1) shall be paid in a lump-sum or in installments;”;

(2) by striking “and” at the end of paragraph (3);

(3) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (4) and inserting “; and”; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

“(5) if paid in installments, shall cease to be paid upon the recipient’s acceptance of employment by the Federal Government, or commencement of work under a personal services contract, as described in subsection (g)(1).”.

(e) APPLICABILITY OF REPAYMENT REQUIREMENT TO REEMPLOYMENT UNDER PERSONAL SERVICES CONTRACTS.—Subsection (g)(1) of such section is amended by inserting after “employment with the Government of the United States” the following: “, or who commences work for an agency of the United States through a personal services contract with the United States.”.

SEC. 1116. DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE EMPLOYEE VOLUNTARY EARLY RETIREMENT AUTHORITY.

(a) CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT SYSTEM.—Section 8336 of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (d)(2), by inserting “except in the case of an employee described in subsection (o)(1),” after “(2);” and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(o)(1) An employee of the Department of Defense who, before October 1, 2005, is separated from the service after completing 25 years of service or after becoming 50 years of age and completing 20 years of service is entitled to an immediate annuity under this subchapter if the employee is eligible for the annuity under paragraph (2) or (3).

“(2)(A) An employee referred to in paragraph (1) is eligible for an immediate annuity under this paragraph if the employee—

“(i) is separated from the service involuntarily other than for cause; and

“(ii) has not declined a reasonable offer of another position in the Department of Defense for which the employee is qualified, which is not lower than 2 grades (or pay levels) below the employee’s grade (or pay level), and which is within the employee’s commuting area.

“(B) For the purposes of paragraph (2)(A)(i), a separation for failure to accept a directed reassignment to a position outside the commuting area of the employee concerned or to accompany a position outside of such area pursuant to a transfer of function may not be considered to be a removal for cause.

“(3) An employee referred to in paragraph (1) is eligible for an immediate annuity under this paragraph if the employee satisfies all of the following conditions:

“(A) The employee is separated from the service voluntarily during a period in which the organization within the Department of Defense in which the employee is serving is undergoing a major organizational adjustment.

“(B) The employee has been employed continuously by the Department of Defense for more than 30 days before the date on which the head of the employee’s organization requests the determinations required under subparagraph (A).

“(C) The employee is serving under an appointment that is not limited by time.

“(D) The employee is not in receipt of a decision notice of involuntary separation for misconduct or unacceptable performance.

“(E) The employee is within the scope of an offer of voluntary early retirement, as defined on the basis of one or more of the following objective criteria:

“(i) One or more organizational units.

“(ii) One or more occupational groups, series, or levels.

“(iii) One or more geographical locations.

“(iv) Any other similar objective and non-personal criteria that the Office of Personnel Management determines appropriate.

“(4) Under regulations prescribed by the Office of Personnel Management, the determinations of whether an employee meets—

“(A) the requirements of subparagraph (A) of paragraph (3) shall be made by the Office, upon the request of the Secretary of Defense; and

“(B) the requirements of subparagraph (E) of such paragraph shall be made by the Secretary of Defense.

“(5) A determination of which employees are within the scope of an offer of early retirement shall be made only on the basis of consistent and well-documented application of the relevant criteria.

“(6) In this subsection, the term ‘major organizational adjustment’ means any of the following:

“(A) A major reorganization.

“(B) A major reduction in force.

“(C) A major transfer of function.

“(D) A workforce restructuring—

“(i) to meet mission needs;

“(ii) to achieve one or more reductions in strength;

“(iii) to correct skill imbalances; or

“(iv) to reduce the number of high-grade, managerial, supervisory, or similar positions.”

(b) FEDERAL EMPLOYEES’ RETIREMENT SYSTEM.—Section 8414 of such title is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)(1)(B), by inserting “except in the case of an employee described in subsection (d)(1),” after “(B)”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(d)(1) An employee of the Department of Defense who, before October 1, 2005, is separated from the service after completing 25 years of service or after becoming 50 years of age and completing 20 years of service is entitled to an immediate annuity under this subchapter if the employee is eligible for the annuity under paragraph (2) or (3).

“(2)(A) An employee referred to in paragraph (1) is eligible for an immediate annuity under this paragraph if the employee—

“(i) is separated from the service involuntarily other than for cause; and

“(ii) has not declined a reasonable offer of another position in the Department of Defense for which the employee is qualified, which is not lower than 2 grades (or pay levels) below the employee’s grade (or pay level), and which is within the employee’s commuting area.

“(B) For the purposes of paragraph (2)(A)(i), a separation for failure to accept a directed reassignment to a position outside the commuting area of the employee concerned or to accompany a position outside of such area pursuant to a transfer of function may not be considered to be a removal for cause.

“(3) An employee referred to in paragraph (1) is eligible for an immediate annuity under this paragraph if the employee satisfies all of the following conditions:

“(A) The employee is separated from the service voluntarily during a period in which the organization within the Department of Defense in which the employee is serving is undergoing a major organizational adjustment.

“(B) The employee has been employed continuously by the Department of Defense for more than 30 days before the date on which the head of the employee’s organization requests the determinations required under subparagraph (A).

“(C) The employee is serving under an appointment that is not limited by time.

“(D) The employee is not in receipt of a decision notice of involuntary separation for misconduct or unacceptable performance.

“(E) The employee is within the scope of an offer of voluntary early retirement, as defined on the basis of one or more of the following objective criteria:

“(i) One or more organizational units.

“(ii) One or more occupational groups, series, or levels.

“(iii) One or more geographical locations.

“(iv) Any other similar objective and non-personal criteria that the Office of Personnel Management determines appropriate.

“(4) Under regulations prescribed by the Office of Personnel Management, the determinations of whether an employee meets—

“(A) the requirements of subparagraph (A) of paragraph (3) shall be made by the Office upon the request of the Secretary of Defense; and

“(B) the requirements of subparagraph (E) of such paragraph shall be made by the Secretary of Defense.

“(5) A determination of which employees are within the scope of an offer of early re-

tirement shall be made only on the basis of consistent and well-documented application of the relevant criteria.

“(6) In this subsection, the term ‘major organizational adjustment’ means any of the following:

“(A) A major reorganization.

“(B) A major reduction in force.

“(C) A major transfer of function.

“(D) A workforce restructuring—

“(i) to meet mission needs;

“(ii) to achieve one or more reductions in strength;

“(iii) to correct skill imbalances; or

“(iv) to reduce the number of high-grade, managerial, supervisory, or similar positions.”

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—(1) Section 8339(h) of such title is amended by striking out “or (j)” in the first sentence and inserting “(j), or (o)”.

(2) Section 8464(a)(1)(A)(i) of such title is amended by striking out “or (b)(1)(B)” and “(b)(1)(B), or (d)”.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE; APPLICABILITY.—The amendments made by this section—

(1) shall take effect on October 1, 2000; and

(2) shall apply with respect to an approval for voluntary early retirement made on or after that date.

SEC. 1117. RESTRICTIONS ON PAYMENTS FOR ACADEMIC TRAINING.

(a) SOURCES OF POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION.—Subsection (a) of section 4107 of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking “or” at the end of paragraph (1);

(2) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (2) and inserting “; or”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(3) any course of postsecondary education that is administered or conducted by an institution not accredited by a national or regional accrediting body (except in the case of a course or institution for which standards for accrediting do not exist or are determined by the head of the employee’s agency as being inappropriate), regardless of whether the course is provided by means of classroom instruction, electronic instruction, or otherwise.”

(b) WAIVER OF RESTRICTION ON DEGREE TRAINING.—Subsection (b)(1) of such section is amended by striking “if necessary” and all that follows through the end and inserting “if the training provides an opportunity for an employee of the agency to obtain an academic degree pursuant to a planned, systematic, and coordinated program of professional development approved by the head of the agency.”

(c) CONFORMING AND CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.—The heading for such section is amended to read as follows:

“§ 4107. Restrictions”.

(3) The item relating to such section in the table of sections at the beginning of chapter 41 of title 5, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“4107. Restrictions.”

SEC. 1118. STRATEGIC PLAN.

(a) REQUIREMENT FOR PLAN.—Not later than six months after the date of the enactment of this Act, and before exercising any of the authorities provided or extended by the amendments made by sections 1115 through 1117, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a strategic plan for the exercise of such authorities. The plan shall include an estimate of the number of Department of Defense employees that would be affected by the uses of authorities as described in the plan.

(b) **CONSISTENCY WITH DOD PERFORMANCE AND REVIEW STRATEGIC PLAN.**—The strategic plan submitted under subsection (a) shall be consistent with the strategic plan of the Department of Defense that is in effect under section 306 of title 5, United States Code.

(c) **APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES.**—For the purposes of this section, the appropriate committees of Congress are as follows:

(1) The Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Governmental Affairs of the Senate.

(2) The Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Government Reform of the House of Representatives.

AMENDMENT NO. 3486

(Purpose: To provide for a blue ribbon advisory panel to examine Department of Defense policies on the privacy of individual medical records)

On page 270, between lines 16 and 17, insert the following:

SEC. 743. BLUE RIBBON ADVISORY PANEL ON DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE POLICIES REGARDING THE PRIVACY OF INDIVIDUAL MEDICAL RECORDS.

(a) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—(1) There is hereby established an advisory panel to be known as the Blue Ribbon Advisory Panel on Department of Defense Policies Regarding the Privacy of Individual Medical Records (in this section referred to as the “Panel”).

(2)(A) The Panel shall be composed of 7 members appointed by the President, of whom—

(i) at least one shall be a member of a consumer organization;

(ii) at least one shall be a medical professional;

(iii) at least one shall have a background in medical ethics; and

(iv) at least one shall be a member of the Armed Forces.

(B) The appointments of the members of the Panel shall be made not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(3) No later than 30 days after the date on which all members of the Panel have been appointed, the Panel shall hold its first meeting.

(4) The Panel shall select a Chairman and Vice Chairman from among its members.

(b) **DUTIES.**—(1) The Panel shall conduct a thorough study of all matters relating to the policies and practices of the Department of Defense regarding the privacy of individual medical records.

(2) Not later than April 30, 2001, the Panel shall submit a report to the President and Congress which shall contain a detailed statement of the findings and conclusions of the Panel, together with its recommendations for such legislation and administrative actions as it considers appropriate to ensure the privacy of individual medical records.

(c) **POWERS.**—(1) The Panel may hold such hearings, sit and act at such times and places, take such testimony, and receive such evidence as the Panel considers advisable to carry out the purposes of this section.

(2) The Panel may secure directly from the Department of Defense, and any other Federal department or agency, such information as the Panel considers necessary to carry out the provisions of this section. Upon request of the Chairman of the Panel, the Secretary of Defense, or the head of such department or agency, shall furnish such information to the Panel.

(3) The Panel may use the United States mails in the same manner and under the

same conditions as other departments and agencies of the Federal Government.

(4) The Panel may accept, use, and dispose of gifts or donations of services or property.

(5) Any Federal Government employee may be detailed to the Panel without reimbursement, and such detail shall be without interruption or loss of civil service status or privilege.

(d) **TERMINATION.**—The Panel shall terminate 30 days after the date on which the Panel submits its report under subsection (b)(2).

(e) **FUNDING.**—(1) Of the amounts authorized to be appropriated by this Act, the Secretary shall make available to the Panel such sums as the Panel may require for its activities under this section.

(2) Any sums made available under paragraph (1) shall remain available, without fiscal year limitation, until expended.

AMENDMENT NO. 3487

(Purpose: To expand the authority of the Secretary of Defense to exempt geodetic products of the Department of Defense from public disclosure.)

On page 353, between lines 15 and 16, insert the following:

SEC. 914. EXPANSION OF AUTHORITY TO EXEMPT GEODETTIC PRODUCTS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE FROM PUBLIC DISCLOSURE.

Section 455(b)(1)(C) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking “or reveal military operational or contingency plans” and inserting “, reveal military operational or contingency plans, or reveal, jeopardize, or compromise military or intelligence capabilities”.

AMENDMENT NO. 3488

(Purpose: To make available, with an offset, an additional \$2,100,000 for the conversion of the configuration of certain AGM-65 Maverick missiles)

On page 31, after line 25, add the following:

SEC. 132. CONVERSION OF AGM-65 MAVERICK MISSILES.

(a) **INCREASE IN AMOUNT.**—The amount authorized to be appropriated by section 103(3) for procurement of missiles for the Air Force is hereby increased by \$2,100,000.

(b) **AVAILABILITY OF AMOUNT.**—(1) Of the amount authorized to be appropriated by section 103(3), as increased by subsection (a), \$2,100,000 shall be available for In-Service Missile Modifications for the purpose of the conversion of Maverick missiles in the AGM-65B and AGM-65G configurations to Maverick missiles in the AGM-65H and AGM-65K configurations.

(2) The amount available under paragraph (1) for the purpose specified in that paragraph is in addition to any other amounts available under this Act for that purpose.

(c) **OFFSET.**—The amount authorized to be appropriated by section 103(1) for procurement of aircraft for the Air Force is hereby reduced by \$2,100,000, with the amount of the reduction applicable to amounts available under that section for ALE-50 Code Decoys.

AMENDMENT NO. 3489

(Purpose: To set aside for the procurement of rapid intravenous infusion pumps \$6,000,000 of the amount authorized to be appropriated for the Army for other procurement; and to offset that addition by reducing by \$6,000,000 the amount authorized to be appropriated for the Army for other procurement for the family of medium tactical vehicles.)

On page 25, between lines 13 and 14, insert the following:

SEC. 113. RAPID INTRAVENOUS INFUSION PUMPS.

Of the amount authorized to be appropriated under section 101(5)—

(1) \$6,000,000 shall be available for the procurement of rapid intravenous infusion pumps; and

(2) the amount provided for the family of medium tactical vehicles is hereby reduced by \$6,000,000.

AMENDMENT NO. 3490

(Purpose: To set aside funds for the Mounted Urban Combat Training site, Fort Knox, Kentucky, and for overhaul of MK-45 5-inch guns)

On page 58, between lines 7 and 8, insert the following:

SEC. 313. MOUNTED URBAN COMBAT TRAINING SITE, FORT KNOX, KENTUCKY.

Of the total amount authorized to be appropriated under section 301(1) for training range upgrades, \$4,000,000 is available for the Mounted Urban Combat Training site, Fort Knox, Kentucky.

SEC. 314. MK-45 OVERHAUL.

Of the total amount authorized to be appropriated under section 301(1) for maintenance, \$12,000,000 is available for overhaul of MK-45 5-inch guns.

AMENDMENT NO. 3485

Mr. VOINOVICH. Mr. President, on June 6th, Senator DEWINE and I introduced legislation to help the Department of Defense move ahead towards addressing their future workforce needs. Our bill, the Department of Defense Civilian Workforce Realignment Act of 2000, gives the Department of Defense the necessary flexibility to adequately manage its civilian workforce and align its human capital to meet the demands of the post-cold war environment.

The amendment that Senator DEWINE and I are offering today adds the modified language of our bill to this DOD authorization bill so that the U.S. military can more adequately prepare for tomorrow's challenges.

Mr. President, before I speak on the amendment itself, I would like to discuss the human capital crisis that is confronting the Federal Government. Since July of last year, the Oversight of Government Management Subcommittee, which I chair, has held six hearings on federal workforce issues. Some of the issues we have examined include management reform initiatives, Federal employee training needs and the effectiveness of employee incentive programs.

One point that I have emphasized at each of these hearings is that the employees of the Federal Government should be treated as its most valued resource. In reality, Mr. President, Federal employees and human capital management have been long overlooked.

In fact, this past March, Comptroller General David Walker testified before the Oversight Subcommittee that the government's human capital management systems could earn the GAO's “high-risk” designation in January 2001. While there are several reasons

why the Federal Government's human capital management is in such disarray, there are suggestions that an improper execution of government downsizing has played a larger role than has been previously recognized.

Walker stated that "(GAO's) reviews have found, for example, that a lack of adequate strategic and workforce planning during the initial rounds of downsizing by some agencies may have affected their ability to achieve organizational missions. Some agencies reported that downsizing in general led to such negative effects as a loss of institutional memory and an increase in work backlogs. Although [GAO] found that an agency's planning for downsizing improved as their downsizing efforts continued, it is by no means clear that the current workforce is adequately balanced to properly execute agencies' missions today, nor that adequate plans are in place to ensure the appropriate balance in the future."

Furthermore, the Comptroller General testified that it appeared that many Federal agencies had cut back on training as they were downsizing; the very time they should have been expanding their training budgets and activities to better ensure that their remaining employees were able to effectively do their jobs.

While the problems associated with the downsizing of the last decade are becoming more apparent, the United States is faced with an even greater potential threat to the Government's human capital situation in this decade—massive numbers of retirements of Federal employees. By 2004, 32 percent of the Federal workforce will be eligible for regular retirement, and an additional 21 percent will be eligible for early retirement. That's a potential loss of over 900,000 experienced employees.

Mr. President, any other public- or private-sector manager who faced the loss of more than half of his or her workforce would recognize that immediate action was necessary to ensure the long-term viability of their business or organization. And over the next few years, the United States must seriously address this growing human capital crisis in the Federal Government workforce. It will not be easy—years of downsizing and hiring freezes have taken their toll, as will a pending retirement-exodus for "baby boomer" Federal employees. Add to that the lure of a strong private sector economy drawing more young workers away from government service, and the Federal Government will only find it harder to attract and retain the technology-savvy workforce that will be necessary to run the government in the 21st Century.

To meet this challenge, Senator DEWINE and I are offering this amendment that will help one critical depart-

ment of our Federal Government—the Department of Defense—get a head start in addressing their future workforce needs. As I stated earlier, this amendment gives the Department of Defense the latitude it needs to manage its civilian workforce as well as reshape its human capital for the 21st century. What the Defense Department is able to accomplish via this amendment may serve as a model for use throughout the government.

During the last decade, the Defense Department underwent a massive civilian workforce downsizing program that saw a cut of more than 280,000 positions. In addition, the Defense Department—like other Federal departments—was subject to hiring restrictions. Taken together, these two factors have inhibited the development of mid-level career, civilian professionals within the DOD.

The extent of this problem is exhibited in the fact that right now, the Department is seriously understaffed in certain key occupations, such as computer experts and foreign language specialists. The lack of such professionals has the potential to affect the Defense Department's ability to respond effectively and rapidly to threats to our national security.

Our amendment will assist the Department in shaping the "skills mix" of the current workforce in order to address shortfalls brought about by years of downsizing, and to meet the need for new skills in emerging technological and professional areas. In testimony before the Oversight Subcommittee, Comptroller General Walker recognized the need for such actions, noting that, "(I)n cutting back on the hiring of new staff in order to reduce the number of their employees, agencies also reduced the influx of new people with the new competencies needed to sustain excellence."

So what will workforce shaping mean to the Department of Defense? In the United States Air Force, workforce shaping will allow the Air Force research labs to meet changing requirements in their mission. For example, at Brooks Air Force Base in San Antonio, they need fewer psychologists and more aerospace engineers; at Rome Air Force Base in Rome, New York, they need computer scientists rather than operations research analysts; and at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base in Dayton, Ohio, they need more materials engineers rather than physicists.

Also, at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, there is a need to move from the mechanical/aeronautical engineering skills that their senior engineers possess to skills that are more focused on emerging technologies in electrical engineering, such as space operations, lasers, optics, advanced materials and directed energy fields. Changing the skills requirements at Wright-Patterson will help the Base meet their needs for the next 10 to 15 years.

The U.S. Army Materiel Command determined that employees at two of its locations—St. Louis, Missouri and Chambersburg, Pennsylvania—possessed the wrong computer skills to meet the Army's new information technology requirements. Switching from COBAL to a more commercially-oriented computer language, the Army found that their employee's skills did not match the new requirements, nor were their skills readily transferable. Subsequently, this mission was contracted to a private company. Almost 450 Federal jobs were eliminated with many of those scheduled for involuntary separation by reduction in force.

If Voluntary Separation Incentive Pay (VSIP) had been available for reshaping and realignment, the Army may have been able to save some of these employees from involuntary separation by using VSIP to increase voluntary separations. The use of VSIP also could have allowed for the retention of Federal jobs since the Army could have provided separation incentives to the COBAL-trained workers and hired new, commercially-oriented technology workers in their place. Instead, the Army contracted with a private company to meet the mission requirement in a timely manner, and the existing workforce was involuntarily separated.

Even so, the most immediate problem facing the Defense Department is the need to address its serious demographic challenges. The average Defense employee is 45 years old and more than a third of the Department's workforce is age 51 or older. In the Department of the Air Force, for example, 45 percent of the workforce will be eligible for either regular retirement or early retirement by 2005.

Wright-Patterson Air Force Base is an excellent example of the demographic challenge facing many military installations across the country. Wright-Patterson is the headquarters of the Air Force Materiel Command, and employs 22,700 civilian federal workers. By 2005, 40 percent of the workforce will be age 55 or older. Another 19 percent will be between 50 and 54 years of age. Thirty-three percent will be in their forties. Only six percent will be age 35 to 39, and less than two percent will be under the age of 34. According to these numbers, by 2005, 60 percent of Wright-Patterson's civilian employees will be eligible for either early or regular retirement.

Although a mass exodus of all retirement-eligible employees is not anticipated, there is a genuine concern that a significant portion of the civilian workforce at Wright-Patterson and elsewhere in the Department of Defense, including hundreds of key leaders and employees with crucial expertise, could decide to retire, leaving the remaining workforce without experienced leadership and absent essential institutional knowledge.

This combination of factors poses a serious challenge to the long-term effectiveness of the civilian component of the Defense Department, and by implication, the national security of the United States. Military base leaders, and indeed the entire Defense establishment, need to be given the flexibility to hire new employees so they can develop another generation of civilian leaders and employees who will be able to provide critical support to our men and women in uniform.

That is the purpose of our amendment. It addresses the current skills and age imbalance in the federal workforce before the increase in retirements of senior public employees begins in the next five years. If we wait for this "retirement bubble" to burst before we start to hire new employees, then we will have fewer seasoned individuals left in the federal workforce who can provide adequate training and mentoring.

Our amendment will allow the Defense Department to conduct a smoother transition by not waiting for these retirements before bringing new employees into the Department over the next five years with the skills the U.S. needs for the future. As they are hired, the new employees will have the opportunity to work with and learn from their more experienced colleagues, and invaluable institutional knowledge will be passed along.

As I was drafting this proposal, I wanted to make sure that those who would be most impacted by it—Department of Defense civilian employees—would have an opportunity to comment on it. I contacted the American Federation of Government Employees and asked them to provide their opinion of this proposal. After thoroughly reviewing it, AFGGE informed me that they did have concerns that the Defense Department might believe this bill authorized them to hire outside contractors to perform work that is currently being done by government employees.

I want to state—emphatically—that this is not the purpose or intent of this amendment. Let me repeat: it is not the intent of this amendment, nor should any intent be construed, to allow the Defense Department to circumvent their obligations to our civilian workforce. The purpose of this amendment is to help the Department "rightsized and revitalize" its civilian workforce, not reduce the number of federal full-time equivalent employees. I encourage management officials at the Department of Defense to work closely with the Department's union representatives on the implementation of this measure.

In addition, this amendment allows the early retirement and separation pay authorities to be exercised only for workforce realignment, or for purposes specified in this amendment, or as they exist in current law.

We are not seeking to establish a program to address problems of individual employees' performance. Employee performance problems will continue to be handled by managers, who must use the performance management system under existing law—a system that gives affected employees particular procedural and substantive rights.

Further, our amendment stipulates that the offer of early retirement or separation pay may only be used under a consistent and well-documented application of relevant, objective non-personal criteria. Thus, under the amendment, as in existing law, an individual employee may not be "targeted" for early retirement or separation pay for the purpose of providing benefits to or affecting the removal of that employee.

Mr. President, our amendment would also require that, no later than six months after this bill becomes law, the Secretary of Defense shall develop a strategic plan for the exercise of the authorities provided by this amendment, and that these authorities cannot be exercised until that strategic plan has been submitted to Congress. This plan shall be consistent with the strategic plan developed by the Department pursuant to the Government Performance and Results Act.

We further expect that the Department's annual Results Act performance reports will include an assessment of the effectiveness and usefulness of these authorities and how the exercise of these authorities in helping the Department achieve its mission, meet its performance goals, and fulfill its strategic plan. Senator DEWINE and I included this section because during the 1990s, many Federal agencies downsized their workforces without first determining their human resources requirements. The purpose of this section is to make sure that the authorities provided by this act are not exercised haphazardly, but in the context of the Department's strategic plan and future requirements.

As a fiscal conservative, I believe that the monetary cost of this amendment pales in comparison to the costs we will incur if we do not begin to address our human capital issue immediately.

We cannot forget that within five years, hundreds of thousands of federal employees will begin to retire. Most of these future retirees have decades of expertise and vital institutional knowledge, and once they are out of the workforce, so too is their ability to train a new generation of federal workers.

It would be incredibly short-sighted if, in an attempt to save money, we simply wait for these hundreds of thousands of defense employees to retire before we even start to consider hiring their replacements. If we do nothing, I believe we will be left in a position

where the civilian component of the Defense Department will be subject to an "experience gap" that will take years to overcome and which would be measured not in dollars but in diminished national security.

We must give the Department of Defense the tools it needs to bring in new federal employees, with the skills necessary to meet the challenges of tomorrow. While this amendment does not address all of the human capital needs of the Defense Department, it is an important first step and will help ensure that the Department of Defense recruits and retains a quality civilian workforce so that our armed forces may remain the best in the world. It is extremely important to the future vitality of the Department's civilian workforce and the national security of the United States that we address the human capital crisis while we have the opportunity.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, I rise to discuss provisions (Section 906) in the FY 2001 National Defense Authorization Act (S. 2549) aimed at supporting efforts within the Department of Defense to develop a set of operational concepts, sometimes referred to as "Network Centric Warfare," that seek to exploit the power of information and US superiority in information technologies to maintain dominance and improve interoperability on the battlefield. I am very pleased to have been joined in the development of these provisions by my able colleagues, Senators ROBERTS and BINGAMAN. This concept of operations generates increased combat power by networking sensors, decision makers and shooters to achieve shared situational awareness, increased speed of command, higher tempo of synchronized operations, greater lethality, increased survivability, and more efficient support operations. In the words of Vice Admiral Arthur Cebrowski, the President of the Naval War College, "Network Centric Warfare is an embodiment of the emerging theory of warfare for the Information Age."

As we strive to transform our military to meet the challenges and threats of the new century, it is clear that we must make better use of our huge advantages in information technology, sensors, networks, and computing to achieve battlefield dominance. Network Centric Warfare exploits these advantages not only by identifying, developing, and utilizing the best new networking and sensing technologies, but also by adjusting our existing doctrine, tactics, training and even acquisition, planning, and programming to reflect the network centric concepts of operations. A truly networked force can be lighter, faster, more precise, more Joint and more

able to respond to contingencies ranging from peacekeeping to major regional conflicts.

In Joint Vision 2020, the Joint Chiefs of Staff highlight the critical role that information and information systems will play in future operations, stating:

* * * the ongoing "information revolution" is creating not only a quantitative, but a qualitative change in the information environment that by 2020 will result in profound changes in the conduct of military operations. In fact, advances in information capabilities are proceeding so rapidly that there is a risk of outstripping our ability to capture ideas, formulate operational concepts, and develop the capacity to assess results. While the goal of achieving information superiority will not change, the nature, scope, and "rules" of the quest are changing radically.

Information superiority provides the joint force a competitive advantage only when it is effectively translated into superior knowledge and decisions. The joint force must be able to take advantage of superior information converted to superior knowledge to achieve "decision superiority"—better decisions arrived at and implemented faster than an opponent can react, or in a noncombat situation, at a tempo that allows the force to shape the situation or react to changes and accomplish its mission. Decision superiority does not automatically result from information superiority. Organizational and doctrinal adaptation, relevant training and experience, and the proper command and control mechanisms and tools are equally necessary.

The legislation in Section 906 of S. 2549 explores many of the facets of this Joint vision of a networked force and operations.

It is clear that there have been chronic difficulties and deficiencies in our recent military operations, including Kosovo, associated with Service-centric boundaries and segmentation of operational areas by Service, which have resulted in a number of interoperability failures and inefficiencies. Reports have suggested that we continue to have difficulty collecting, processing, and disseminating critical information to our battlefields. These shortfalls, for example, severely limited our ability to make full use of the capabilities of our JSTARS aircraft or to effectively strike mobile targets. Earlier in this session, the Armed Services Committee received testimony concerning Kosovo operations from Lieutenant General Michael Short, the Commander of Allied Air Forces in Southern Europe, where he highlighted improvements made within the Air Force to move targeting information from intelligence assets (for example, U-2s) to some combat aircraft. But he also pointed out the need to expand these efforts.

* * * we need to be able to do that across the fleet, to move information to A-10s and F-16s and F/A-18s and F-14s, everything we have got, * * * to rapidly respond to the emerging situation.

It is also clear that these problems do not all stem from technological de-

ficiencies. In fact, many of the interoperability difficulties that we see today result from force and organizational structures, doctrine, and tactics that have not kept pace with technological change. Admiral James Ellis, the Commander-in-Chief of Allied Forces in Southern Europe, highlighted these problems for the Committee, stating about the Kosovo operation,

There are clearly opportunities for us to, through firewalls and the like, to pass data, * * * that we were not able to during this effort that require attention as well, so that at a staff level as well as at a planning and execution level we have the ability to communicate as freely as we need to in order to ensure that we've got the security and the capability that the alliance is capable of delivering.

The networking of our military assets and the training of our personnel and transformation of our forces to adapt to an information-centric environment will be critical for future military operations. Theater Missile Defense is an excellent example of the need for this type of network centric approach. Given the global proliferation of missile technology and weapons of mass destruction, we are moving toward a robust missile defense capability to protect our warfighters deployed overseas. The Theater Missile Defense mission depends on the seamless linking of multiple Joint assets and on the timely passing of critical information between sensors and shooters. Earlier this year, Lieutenant General Ron Kadish testified that we have got "some long work ahead" to make our various Theater Missile Defense efforts interoperable. We must all work to ensure that we develop the space-based and airborne sensing systems, interoperable networking and communications systems, and Joint operations and organizations needed to perform this vital mission.

After extensive discussions with a variety of Agency and Service officials, I believe that although there are many innovative efforts underway throughout the Department to develop network centric technologies and systems, as well as to establish mechanisms to integrate information systems, sensors, weapon systems and decision makers, these efforts are too often underfunded, low-priority, and not coordinated across Services. In many cases, they will unfortunately continue the legacy of interoperability problems that we all know exist today. To paraphrase one senior Air Force officer, we are not making the necessary fundamental changes—we are still nibbling at the edges.

The legislation incorporated into the Defense bill calls for DoD to provide three reports to Congress detailing efforts in moving towards Network Centric forces and operations.

Section 906(b) calls for a report focusing on the broad development and implementation of Network Centric War-

fare concepts in the Department of Defense. The Secretary of Defense and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff are asked to report on their current and planned efforts to coordinate all DoD activities in Network Centric Warfare to show how they are moving toward a truly Joint, networked force. The report calls for the development of a set of metrics as discussed in Section 906(b)(2)(C) to be used to monitor our progress towards a Joint, network centric force and the attainment of fully integrated Joint command and control capabilities, both in technology and organizational structure. These metrics will then be used in more detailed case studies described in Section 906(b)(2)(E)—focusing on Service interoperability and fratricide reduction.

The legislation also requires the Department to report on how it is moving towards Joint Requirements and Acquisition policies and increasing Joint authority in this area to ensure that future forces will be truly seamless, interoperable, and network-centric, as described in Sections 906(b)(2) (F) through (I). Many view these Joint activities as being critically necessary to achieving networked systems and operations. Unless we move away from a system designed to protect individual Service interests and procurement programs, we will always be faced with solving interoperability problems between systems. For example, strengthening the Joint oversight of the requirements for and acquisition of all systems directly involved in Joint Task Forces interoperability would provide a sounder method for acquiring these systems. We need to move away from a Cold War based, platform-centric acquisition system that is slow, cumbersome, and Service-centric. As part of this review, we ask DoD to examine the speed at which it can acquire new technologies and whether the personnel making key decisions on information systems procurement are technically trained or at least supported by the finest technical talent available. We also need to ensure that Service acquisition systems are responsive to the establishment of Joint interoperability standards in networking, computing, and communications, as well as best commercial practices.

In the operations support area, DoD can follow the example of the private sector—which has embraced network centric operations to improve efficiency in an increasingly competitive environment. Companies as different as IBM and WalMart are both moving to streamline and unify their networks and to make their distribution, inventory control and personnel management systems more modern and information-centric. Successful firms are not only buying the newest technology, they are also changing their operations and business plans to deal with the new

networked environments. Section 906(b)(2)(J) calls for the Department to study private sector efforts in these areas and evaluate their past successes and failures as they can inform future DoD activities.

Section 906(c) describes the second report, which examines the use of the Joint Experimentation Program in developing Network Centric Warfare concepts. Network Centric Warfare is inherently Joint, and the Commander in Chief of Joint Forces Command is in the best position to develop new operational concepts and test the new technologies that support it. The report calls for a description of how the Joint Experimentation Program and the results of its activities are to be used to develop new Joint Requirements, Doctrine, and Acquisition programs to support network centric operations. It also requires the development and description of a plan to use the Joint Experimentation program to identify impediments to the development of a joint information network, including the linking of Service intranets, as well as redesigning force structures to leverage new network centric operational concepts.

The final report, described in Section 906(d), focuses on the coordination of Service and Agency Science and Technology investments in the development of future Joint Network Centric Warfare capabilities. In moving towards a more Joint, networked force we must continue to ensure that we provide our nation's warfighters with the best technologies. We must increase our investments in areas such as sensors, networking protocols, human-machine interfaces, training, and other technologies outlined in Section 906(d)(2)(A), especially in the face of declining S&T budgets. The report requires the Undersecretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics to explain how S&T investments supporting network centric operations will be coordinated across the Agencies and Services to eliminate redundancy and better address critical warfighter, technology, and R&D needs. This is more important than ever as we develop our next generation of weapon systems—better coordination and establishment of common standards in the technology development stages can only help to alleviate future interoperability problems.

The Undersecretary's planning and evaluation of investments in S&T for a network centric force must also address the role of the operator in a network centric system. We must pay more attention to the training of our combat and support personnel so that they can make the best use of information technologies, as well as investing more in research on learning and cognitive processes so that our training systems and human-machine interfaces are optimized.

The investments recommended in the report should also accommodate the incredible pace of change in information technologies that is currently driven by the commercial sector. To address this, Section 906(d)(2)(B) calls for an analysis of how commercially driven revolutions in information technology are modifying the DoD's investment strategy and incorporation of dual-use technologies.

I believe this legislation will help focus the Pentagon and Congress' attention on the need to move our military into a more information savvy and networked force. I hope that these three key reports set forth the needed organizational, policy, and legislative changes necessary to achieve this transformation for decision makers in the military, Administration, and in Congress. I believe that our future military operations must be network centric to preserve our technological and operational superiority. I look forward to receiving plans and proposals to help get us there efficiently and effectively.

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, earlier today, I voted to table Senator MURRAY's amendment to the FY2001 Department of Defense authorization bill. This amendment, which was successfully tabled, would have allowed for the performance of abortion services on our military bases. It is clear to me, Mr. President, that this amendment would have violated the spirit of the Hyde law, which prohibits Government-funded abortions.

Proponents of the amendment attempted to get around this prohibition by requiring that women receiving abortions on military installations pay for their own abortions. But, Mr. President, this simply does not eliminate government involvement in the delivery of abortion services. Military doctors would have to perform the abortions voluntarily, or our Armed Forces would have to contract with private doctors to perform the abortions.

Mr. President, we cannot turn our military bases into abortion clinics. Clearly, the federal government is prohibited from the provision of abortions, and should not be in the business of facilitating any abortion services on our military bases. Our federal government has no role to play in providing abortion services. It is that simple.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, if I may inquire, as I understand it, today the Senate will not further consider the armed services bill; is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. WARNER. I thank the Chair, and I yield the floor.

FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the clerk will report S. 2522 by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2522) making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, the pending bill provides \$13.4 billion for foreign assistance programs. By comparison, last year the Senate voted 97-2 for a \$12.6 billion bill and the President signed a \$13.7 billion bill. Given the budget constraints, the fact that we are just below last year's final level is a tribute to Senator STEVENS' and Senator BYRD's adept management of allocations.

I think the bill strikes a good balance between meeting emerging requirements yet requiring accountability for the funds we make available.

In terms of meeting emerging global needs, we have invested \$651 million in a new, global health initiative which will help ramp up immunizations and combat malaria, tuberculosis, polio, and AIDS. Senator LEAHY deserves special recognition for his efforts to establish this initiative with adequate funding. The committee's interest in health began several years ago when we earmarked \$25 million for polio programs. The administration's initial howls of protest have been silenced since we are on the verge of wiping out the disease thanks largely to the public-private collaboration between the Rotary Club and international donors.

We have a unique opportunity, if not responsibility, to replicate the success of this public-private partnership in other health areas, given recent generous support for vaccination research and programs by pharmaceutical companies and the Gates Foundation.

The bill also increases funding for key countries in the Balkans struggling to accelerate economic and political reforms. The administration requested \$195 million in a supplemental and \$610 million for 2001. Instead of adding to emergency spending, the committee has increased the overall amount made available for fiscal year 2001 to \$635 million rather than add to emergency spending. I do not think the region needs more money so much as it requires better management of American resources. With \$635 million, I think we have more than adequately responded to the needs of the region.

Within this increase we were able to provide \$89 million for Montenegro and