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 the development of common standards. 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)(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.
$360 million for Croatia, which in each case combined the Supplemental and 2001 request. Our assistance to the go-
government in Montenegro is a lifeline as they struggle to address mounting po-
itical and economic pressure applied by the regime in Belgrade. Within the last few weeks we have seen an escala-
tion of political violence which can be traced to Belgrade including the assas-
sination of a presidential bodyguard and an attack on a member of the po-
itical opposition. We need to be clear about U.S. support for the embattled
Montenegrin Government.

Croatia’s recent elections renew pros-
spects for real reforms and real growth, which I expect our funding help encour-
age. I commend the new government for making serious commitments to
allow for the return of refugees, sus-
pend for exterminators. Donor support for
and press forward with political and
economic reforms. To give the new gov-
ernment some leverage, the bill in-
cludes those commitments as bench-
marks for releasing our assistance.

As the Croatian provisions illustrate,
this bill is not just about spending. It
is fundamentally about account-
ability—we must have more confidence
that the resources we commit will, in
fact, achieve results.

U.S. resources cannot singlehandedly
rebuild, rehabilitate, reform, or de-
velop a nation, but we can assure that
aid is effectively administered and we
must guarantee our partners—including
other donors, recipients, and non-
government organizations—all share
the burden and share our commitment
to free market economics and democ-

cy.

I think it is pretty clear in Kosovo we
are off track. Last year, we ear-
marked for Kosovo was $1.17 billion
with the requirement that our pledge
would not exceed 15 percent of the total com-
mitted by European and other donors.
We also made clear we would not as-
sume any responsibility for major in-
fracstructure reconstruction. The Initial
affect of this conditionality was posi-
tive, and the Secretary of State was
able to determine that other donors
pledged enough to meet at least 85 per-
cent of the resource requirements. Un-
fortunately, those pledges have been slow to materialize. Donor support for
roads, clinics, schools, utilities, courts,
and industry is imperceptible.

Instead of supporting an effort to
build up Kosovo, we are building up a
U.N. bureaucracy—and a pretty incom-
petent one at that. UNMIK is like a
huge Macy’s Thanksgiving Day float—
bloated and detached—drifting far
above the crowd—fluttering in a con-
fetti cloud of rulings, edicts, ordi-
nances, and injunctions.

Few would argue with point to a single meaningful accomplish-
ment. Instead, they suggest Serb rule has been supplanted by the United Na-
tions—a more benign influence, per-
haps, but every bit as indifferent and
irrelevant to real Kosovar needs.

And, we were duped by the lion’s share for this waste. For months, the
committee has been besieged by re-
quests to release funds because of ur-
gent shortfalls and gaps other donors
have failed to fill.

We are making the same mistake we
made in Bosnia. And it isn’t just the
U.N.’s failure. Within weeks of setting
up a mission, AID set off on a course to
fund large-scale contracts with groups
that had no local experience or no in-
ciliation to build up and to leave be-
hind a strengthened local civic society.

To address these problems, the bill
structures new conditions on our sup-
port for Kosovo. This year, we have
modified language so that U.S. actual
expenditures do not exceed 15 percent of the pledged resources by all donors. And, we require that 50 percent
of all resources flow through local non-
government organizations which know
what they are doing and have the only,
real prospect of making a difference at
the community level.

Turning to Russia, the new Putin
government is untested in many re-
spects, but not in its ability to wage a
ruthless war against civilians in Chechnya. After creating 440,000 refu-
gees, Moscow not only is limiting ac-

cess by international relief workers,
they have stonewalled international
attempts to allow investigations of al-
leged war crimes and atrocities.

The Clinton administration has made
a bad situation worse. Not only did
they refuse to vote in support the U.N.
Human Rights Commissioner’s call for
an international investigation and tri-
bunal, the Bureau of Refugees and the
U.S. Embassy in Moscow have rejected
requests to support the courageous
relief workers operating in the region.
The Department argues they don’t want
to encourage groups to enter un-
safe areas. This is both disingenuous
and unjust—these groups are already
in Chechnya and Ingushetia desperate for
attention. What the administra-
tion refuses to admit is they simply
don’t want to challenge or upset the
Russians. This is a dangerous, long-
standing pattern which compromises
our values and our interests.

Russia’s war against the Chechen
people makes me wonder what kind of
democracy the administration has
helped fund with more than $5 billion
in assistance.

Over the years, and including admin-
istration veto threats, we have tried—
and often failed—to establish bench-
marks and conditions on U.S. aid to
Russia. This year, we have conditioned
further support to the Russian Govern-
ment upon certification that the Putin
government is allowing relief workers
unimpeded access in Chechnya and
Ingushetia. We also require certifi-
cation that the Russian Government is
fully cooperating with international
investigations of war crimes and atroc-
ities committed in Chechnya and relief
in a regional strategy to substanti-
ately increase aid to Bolivia, Ecuador,
and Peru. I felt the administration’s
singular focus on Colombia guaranteed
that the production and trafficking
problem would simply be pushed across
the border. The bill’s regional emphasis
on interdiction and development keeps
Colombian traffickers from becoming a
moving target. We more than doubled
the regional request of $76 million and
provided $260 million.

This level allowed us to fully fund
Bolivia’s request of $120 million for
both alternative development and
interdiction programs. With an impres-
sive track record in eradication of coca
and alternative development, Bolivia
deserves our continued support as the
government completes the task. The
results in Bolivia are truly note-
worthy, almost to the point of being
astonishing.

Similarly, we nearly tripled the sup-
port for Ecuador while increasing aid
to the Peruvian Government as well.

Fourth and finally, we added $50 mil-
tion to the $93 million request for
Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished senior Senator from Vermont for his gracious comments.

I am very pleased to join my friend from Kentucky, Senator McCONNELL, who is chairman of the Foreign Operations Subcommittee that has done a superb job getting this bill to the floor.

The Appropriations Committee reported this bill on May 9 after very little debate. The fact that it sailed through our committee was a reflection of the bipartisan way the bill was put together. We did everything possible to accommodate the wishes of Senators on both sides of the aisle.

This bill builds upon last year's Senate foreign operations bill. We increased funding for global health programs, which many Senators support.

We increased export assistance. We increased funding for a number of other important programs, that is the good news. But this bill is $350 million below last year's enacted level, and $1.7 billion below the President's 2001 budget request.

We were not able to fully fund several programs that have broad support, such as the Peace Corps, but I expect that more will be done in the conference committee.

The bill also does not respond adequately to the emergency disaster needs in Mozambique, which was devastated by floods earlier this year. We provided only $25 million out of a request of $193 million. I cannot help but compare the billions we have spent to relieve the suffering of people in Bosnia and Kosovo, with our minuscule aid to Southern Africa.

The bill provides only $75 million of the $355 million in emergency supplemental and fiscal year 2001 funding for debt relief for 54 countries, which has bipartisan support in both the House and Senate. This is an international initiative led by the United States. We need to do our share.

We also fell short on the International Development Association, the soft-loan window of the World Bank. We are about $85 million short.

I have some real concerns about the way the World Bank is handling staff complaints of misconduct, such as harassment and retaliation.

I am preparing some proposals for the World Bank to address these problems.

Several Senators, both Democrats and Republicans, have written to me urging more funding for the Global Environment Facility, which supports programs to protect the ozone, reduce ocean pollution, and protect biodiversity. We were only able to provide $50 million, out of a request of $175 million.

Some have complained that the GEF is funding the Kyoto Protocol. Those critics owe it to the GEF to specify which activities they oppose, rather than making vague objections that are not based on facts. We need to find common ground on addressing these critical environmental problems.

Finally, I want to address the emergency funding for Colombia, which was attached to this bill in the conference committee. I want to help Colombia, which is facing threats from left-wing guerrillas, right-wing paramilitaries, and drug traffickers allied with both.

I also have a lot of respect for Colombia's President Pastrana. We are already giving hundreds of millions of dollars to Colombia.

But I cannot endorse a proposal that would vastly increase our military involvement in Colombia that is so poorly thought out and suffers from so many unanswered questions.

Although the administration does not like to talk about it, this is only the first billion-dollar installment of a multiyear, open-ended commitment of many more billions of dollars.

I do not want to talk about it, what can we expect to achieve, in what period of time, how intensifying a war that cannot be won will lead to peace, or what the risks are to hundreds of American military and civilian personnel in Colombia or to Colombian civilians. I have asked the Administration these questions, but their answers are vague at best.

Even the goal is vague. If it is to stop the flow of illegal drugs into the United States, that is wishful thinking.

If it is to defeat the guerrillas, this is not the way to do it. I think the American people deserve better answers before we spend billions of their tax dollars on another civil war in South America.

Having said that, I very much appreciate Chairman McCONNELL's willingness to include a number of conditions on the aid, which have strong bipartisan support. If this Colombia aid passes, these human rights conditions and reporting requirements are essential to ensure that the aid is not misused and that human rights are protected.

As with many other appropriations bills, we are going to need to get a higher allocation if the President is going to sign this bill. But as the Chairman of the Appropriations Committee, Senator STEVENS, has said, this is one step in the process. I believe it is a good start and that we should pass this bill. There is no reason why we cannot wrap it up very quickly.

With the distinguished chairman on the floor, I tell him that on my side of the aisle, I urge anybody who has amendments to get them over here and let us try to wrap this up this morning, so that by early tomorrow afternoon we can go on to a different bill.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I say in response to the suggestion of the Senator from Vermont, I believe we now do have a consent agreement that will allow us to move ahead, not quite as rapidly as the Senator from Vermont and I had hoped.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I must say that the Senator from Kentucky would probably like to do it at the same speed I would but we are both realists in this regard.

Mr. McCONNELL. I believe this will move us toward a completion, hopefully by early evening tomorrow.

Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all first-degree amendments to the pending bill must be filed at the desk by 3 p.m. on Wednesday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.