

it—what does it profit us to move prematurely on Iraq from Turkey if the end result is that we radicalize a government that is represented by the Islamic Party.

What have we gained?

I will answer the third question, and then conclude. So what should we do? I have argued that out of our self-interest it matters what other nations think. So what should we be doing? I begin by saying, given where we are now, coupled with Saddam Hussein being in material breach—that is a fancy phrase for saying not explaining what he has done with the weapons of mass destruction we know he has—those two things may force us to choose between the better of two not-so-pleasant options.

The option I would choose in this circumstance, if we do not get world support, is that Saddam is in material breach of the latest U.N. resolution. Yesterday's damning report by the U.N. inspectors makes clear again Saddam's contempt for the world and it has vindicated the President's decision last fall to go to the U.N.

The legitimacy of the Security Council is at stake, as well as the integrity of the U.N. So if Saddam does not give up those weapons of mass destruction and the Security Council does not call for the use of force, I think we have little option but to act with a larger group of willing nations, if possible, and alone if we must. Make no mistake about it, we will pay a price if that is the way we go. We will have no option, but we will pay a price, a price that could be significantly reduced if from this moment on we act, in my humble opinion, more wisely.

What should we be doing from this point on? I will be very brief now and expand on this later. One, we should lower the rhetoric. We should not appear to be the petulant nation, wondering why the rest of the recalcitrant world will not act with us, showing our impatience. It does not suit a great nation well. It would not suit my father well, were he alive. It does not suit someone of stature well—and we are a nation of stature.

Two, we should make the case not only privately to our partners by sharing more proof of Saddam's crimes and possessions, but also to our people and in turn to the whole world. Legally, he is in breach, but going to war based on that legal breach will cost us in ways we would not have to pay if we go to war with the rest of the world understanding that there is something there beyond the failure to account.

The third thing we should do is give inspectors more time, for their very presence in Iraq diminishes the possibility of sharing weapons of mass destruction with terrorists or continuing their quest for nuclear weapons. Inspectors are not a permanent solution. We know from our experience of the last decade that Iraq will try to make their mission impossible. We also know that sustaining a massive deployment

of troops is expensive and hard on our men and women in uniform. But right now the inspectors are helping us build support for our policy, both at home and abroad, and we should let them keep working in the near term.

The fourth thing we should do is articulate clearly and repeatedly not only the legal basis for our action, if we must move, but our commitment to stay until we have a stable Iraq, and that means the following: The President should state clearly tonight, we are not acting on a doctrine of preemption, if we act. We are acting on enforcement of a U.N. resolution that is the equivalent of a peace treaty which is being violated by the signatory of that treaty, and we have a right to do that and it is the world's problem. It is not what we hear out of the civilian Defense Department, this cockamamie notion of a new doctrine of preemption which no one understands.

Two, our objective has to be clearly stated as eliminating weapons of mass destruction and not the destruction of Iraq, for that is the President's purpose.

Thirdly, we will in fact participate in nation building; we will seek U.N. support and we will tell the American people what we are asking of them and why, for they have no idea now what is expected of them. They do not know what the costs will be to remove Saddam and they should. They do not know how many troops will have to stay in Iraq to secure the country, and we have estimates, and what it will take to get a representative government that lives up to its international obligations.

Can we count on our friends and allies to share the burden? Can we afford to attack Iraq, fully fund homeland security, cut taxes for the wealthiest Americans, and finish the unfinished war on terrorism in Afghanistan and other places?

These questions should never be excuses for inaction, but they must be answered if we want the American people's support and we want to avoid the mistakes of the past.

I yield the floor.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—H.J. Res. 2

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order, notwithstanding the passage of H.J. Res. 2, in the engrossment of the joint resolution, Senate amendments Nos. 139, 166, 172, and 186 be further modified with the changes at the desk.

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

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, as a brief explanation for the necessity for these modifications, in the case of amendment No. 139, the instruction line needed to be corrected. For amendment No. 166, in the version the Senate adopted, two pages were missing. With respect to amendment No. 172, there is a word change. And, finally, with re-

spect to amendment No. 186, language which was supposed to be stricken was not in the version adopted by the Senate. These modifications are solely to correct these inadvertent errors.

The amendments, as further modified, are as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 139, AS FURTHER MODIFIED
(Purpose: To direct the Corps of Engineers to construct a portion of the modified water delivery project in the State of Florida)

At the appropriate place insert the following:

SEC. 1 . MODIFIED WATER DELIVERY PROJECT IN THE STATE OF FLORIDA.

The Corps of Engineers, using funds made available for modifications authorized by section 104 of the Everglades National Park Protection and Expansion Act of 1989 (16 U.S.C. 410r-8), may immediately carry out alternative 6D (including paying 100 percent of the cost of acquiring land or an interest in land) for the purpose of providing a flood protection system for the 8.5 square mile area described in the report entitled "Central and South Florida Project, Modified Water Deliveries to Everglades National Park, Florida, 8.5 Square Mile Area, General Reevaluation Report and Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement" and dated July 2000.

AMENDMENT NO. 166 AS FURTHER MODIFIED
(Purpose: To rename the United States-China Security Review Commission as the United States-China Economic and Security Review Commission, and for other purposes)

On page 713, strike line 23 and all that follows through page 714, line 3, and insert the following:

SEC. 209. UNITED STATES-CHINA ECONOMIC AND SECURITY REVIEW COMMISSION.

(a) APPROPRIATIONS.—There are appropriated, out of any funds in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, \$1,800,000, to remain available until expended, to the United States-China Economic and Security Review Commission.

(b) NAME CHANGE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 1238 of the Floyd D. Spence National Defense Authorization Act of 2001 (22 U.S.C. 7002) is amended—

(A) In the section heading by inserting "ECONOMIC AND" before "SECURITY";

(B) in subsection (a)—

(i) in paragraph (1), by inserting "Economic and" before "Security"; and

(ii) in paragraph (2), by inserting "Economic and" before "Security";

(C) in subsection (b)—

(i) in the subsection heading, by inserting "ECONOMIC AND" before "SECURITY";

(ii) in paragraph (1), by inserting "Economic and" before "Security";

(iii) in paragraph (3)—

(I) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by inserting "Economic and" before "Security"; and

(II) in subparagraph (II), by inserting "Economic and" before "Security"; and

(iv) in paragraph (4), by inserting "Economic and" before "Security" each place it appears; and

(D) in subsection (e)—

(i) in paragraph (1), by inserting "Economic and" before "Security";

(ii) in paragraph (2), by inserting "Economic and" before "Security";

(iii) in paragraph (3)—

(I) in the first sentence, by inserting "Economic and" before "Security"; and

(II) in the second sentence, by inserting "Economic and" before "Security";

(iv) in paragraph (4), by inserting "Economic and" before "Security" and

(v) in paragraph (6), by inserting "Economic and" before "Security" each place it appears.

(2) REFERENCES.—Any reference in any Federal law, Executive order, rule, regulation, or delegation of authority, or any document of or relating to the United States-China Security Review Commission shall be deemed to refer to the United States-China Economic and Security Review Commission.

(c) MEMBERSHIP RESPONSIBILITIES, AND TERMS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 1238(b)(3) of the Floyd D. Spencer National Defense Authorization Act of 2001 (22 U.S.C. 7002) is amended—

(A) by striking subparagraph (F) and inserting the following:

"(F) each appointing authority referred to under subparagraphs (A) through (D) of this paragraph shall—

"(i) appoint 3 members to the Commission;

"(ii) make the appointments on a staggered term basis, such that—

"(I) 1 appointment shall be for a term expiring on December 31, 2003;

"(II) 1 appointment shall be for a term expiring on December 31, 2001; and

"(III) 1 appointment shall be for a term expiring on December 31, 2005;

"(iii) make all subsequent appointments on an approximate 2-year term basis to expire on December 31 of the applicable year; and

"(iv) make appointments not later than 30 days after the date on which each new Congress convenes;"

(2) RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE COMMISSION.—The U.S.-China Commission shall focus on the following nine areas when conducting its work during fiscal year 2003 and beyond:

(A) PROLIFERATION PRACTICES.—The Commission shall analyze and assess the Chinese role in the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and other weapons (including dual use technologies) to terrorist-sponsoring states, and suggest possible steps which the U.S. might take, including economic sanctions, to encourage the Chinese to stop such practices.

(B) ECONOMIC REFORMS AND UNITED STATES ECONOMIC TRANSFERS.—The Commission shall analyze and assess the qualitative and quantitative nature of the shift of United States production activities to China, including the relocation of high-technology, manufacturing, and R&D facilities; the impact of these transfers on United States national security, including political influence by the Chinese Government over American firms, dependence of the United States national security industrial base on Chinese imports, the adequacy of United States export control laws, and the effect of these transfers on U.S. economic security, employment, and the standard of living of the American people; analyze China's national budget and assess China's fiscal strength to address internal instability problems and assess the likelihood of externalization of such problems.

(C) ENERGY.—The Commission shall evaluate and assess how China's large and growing economy will impact upon world energy supplies and the role the U.S. can play, including joint R&D efforts and technological assistance, in influencing China's energy policy.

(D) UNITED STATES CAPITAL MARKETS.—The Commission shall evaluate the extent of Chinese access to, and use of, United States capital markets, and whether the existing disclosure and transparency rules are adequate to identify Chinese companies which are active in United States markets and are also engaged in proliferation activities.

(E) CORPORATE REPORTING.—The Commission shall assess United States trade and investment relationship with China, including

the need for corporate reporting on United States investments in China and incentives that China may be offering to United States corporation to relocate production and R&D to China.

(F) REGIONAL ECONOMIC AND SECURITY IMPACTS.—The Commission shall assess the extent of China's "hollowing-out" of Asian manufacturing economies, and the impact on United States economic and security interests in the region; review the triangular economic and security relationship among the United States, Taipei and Beijing, including Beijing's military modernization and force deployments aimed at Taipei, and the adequacy of United States executive branch coordination and consultation with Congress on United States arms sales and defense relationship with Taipei.

(G) UNITED STATES-CHINA BILATERAL PROGRAMS.—The Commission shall assess science and technology programs to evaluate if the United States is developing an adequate coordinating mechanism with appropriate review by the intelligence community with Congress; assess the degree of non-compliance by China and United States-China agreements on prison labor imports and intellectual property rights; evaluate U.S. enforcement policies; and recommend what new measures the United States Government might take to strengthen our laws and enforcement activities and to encourage compliance by the Chinese.

(H) WORLD TRADE ORGANIZATION COMPLIANCE.—The Commission shall review China's record of compliance to date with its accession agreement to the WTO, and explore what incentives and policy initiatives should be pursued to promote further compliance by China.

(I) MEDIA CONTROL.—The Commission shall evaluate Chinese government efforts to influence and control perceptions of the United States and its policies through the internet, the Chinese print and electronic media, and Chinese internal propaganda.

(3) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This subsection shall take effect on the date of enactment of this Act.

AMENDMENT NO. 172 AS FURTHER MODIFIED

(Purpose: To provide for the protection of the rights of women in Afghanistan, and to improve the conditions for women in Afghanistan)

On page 397, line 12, delete all after "Fund," through "opportunities" on line 17, and insert in lieu thereof: not less than \$8,000,000 shall be made available for programs to support women's development in Afghanistan, including girl's and women's education, health, legal and social rights, economic opportunities, and political participation: Provided further, That of the funds provided in the previous proviso, \$5,000,000 shall be made available to support activities directed by the Afghan Ministry of Women's Affairs including the establishment of women's resource centers in Afghanistan, and not less than \$1,500,000 should be made available to support activities of the National Human Rights Commission of Afghanistan: Provided further, That one year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State shall submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees that details women's development programs in Afghanistan supported by the United States Government, and barriers that impede women's development in Afghanistan.

AMENDMENT NO. 186

(Purpose: To prohibit the use of funds by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service to impose on the Corps of Engineers certain requirements relating to the Missouri River)

On page 486, between lines 8 and 9, insert the following:

SEC. 1 . MISSOURI RIVER.

It is the sense of the Congress that the member states and tribes of the Missouri River Basin Association are strongly encouraged to reach agreement on a flow schedule for the Missouri River as soon as practicable for 2003.

S-CHIP PROGRAM

Mr. CHAFEE. I have been working for the last several months with a bipartisan group of Members from both the House and Senate to protect funding for the S-CHIP program, which provides critical health care to millions of our children. In my State, over 12,000 children participate in this program. There is strong, bipartisan support for a 2-year S-CHIP proposal developed last fall that would preserve \$2.7 billion in Federal S-CHIP funds that either expired at the end of fiscal year 2002 or will expire at the end of the current fiscal year. Our proposal also establishes a redistribution formula for the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services to use to quickly redistribute unspent fiscal year 2000 funds to those States that have exhausted their allotments and need additional funds.

Under Federal law, CMS is required to redistribute all unspent 2000 funds this year, but there is no Federal requirement on what formula it is to use. CMS is currently holding off redistributing unspent 2000 funds because it is awaiting congressional action. However, a few States, including my own State of Rhode Island, need the redistribution of 2000 funds as soon as possible so they have sufficient funds for the rest of the year to maintain services to the children currently on S-CHIP.

This S-CHIP issue is very time sensitive. State are beginning to plan their upcoming budgets for fiscal year 2004, which starts July 1 in most States. We do not want to distort State S-CHIP spending decisions by making it impossible for States to plan, in determining how much in Federal S-CHIP funds they will have and for how long those funds will be available. Some States may unnecessarily scale back S-CHIP eligibility as a result because they will assume they will have far less in Federal funds available than previously expected.

It now appears that we cannot address this issue in the omnibus appropriations bill. I appreciate the willingness of the chairman of the Finance and Budget Committees, Senators GRASSLEY and NICKLES, to work with me and the other Senators involved to address this issue in both the fiscal year 2004 budget resolution and then to move this legislation quickly in the Finance Committee.

Having said this, I think it is imperative for us to work with CMS so that they can move forward to begin to distribute some of the unspent 2000 funds to States like mine that are facing a serious S-CHIP funding problem.

There is a way to move forward to address the immediate redistribution issue of the unexpended fiscal year 2000 funds. CMS can redistribute some of

the unexpended fiscal year 2000 funds immediately to those States that face shortfalls in the coming months. This can be done administratively. We certainly want CMS to begin to redistribute at least some part of these funds to those States that are relying on this redistribution to maintain their child caseloads. For example, CMS could redistribute 100 percent of half of the unexpended funds now leaving the rest to be redistributed once Congress has acted on this legislation. As we in Congress move ahead to complete action on this full proposal, CMS should move forward on the immediate redistribution issue.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. I am pleased to join my colleagues today in highlighting the need for timely congressional action to secure funding necessary to protect children on the S-CHIP health program. Nearly 21,000 children benefit from this program in my State of West Virginia. The S-CHIP program was created in 1997 with a bipartisan group of members to provide \$40 billion over a 10-year period to extend health insurance to some uninsured children.

Senator CHAFEE and I, along with other Senators, worked last year to develop a proposal that would address the long-term funding shortfall confronting the S-CHIP program over the next several years. While this was not considered last year, in the end, we were able to develop this 2-year compromise with the authorizers in both the House and Senate as a first step towards a long-term solution for S-CHIP's funding issues. The compromise is a very reasonable one, providing assistance both to those States that have spent their allocations and need additional resources to serve their S-CHIP children as well as States that need a bit more time to utilize their S-CHIP allocations.

I share my colleagues' concerns that this issue is a very timely one, and demands fast action on our part. I recognize that the first step is to include the necessary funds for this bipartisan 2-year proposal in the fiscal year 04 budget resolution, and then to consider the specific legislation in the Finance Committee. I would hope that Chairman GRASSLEY and Senator BAUCUS would work to schedule a markup of this proposal as quickly as possible after the budget resolution is approved. We cannot wait to act on this until later this year when it is expected that we would consider broader health care measures. Contrary to what some have said, this is an emergency for our States and uninsured children. I look forward to working with my chairman on the Finance Committee, who deserves credit along with Senator BAUCUS for developing this 2-year approach, to move this proposal through the Congress as quickly as possible.

Ms. SNOWE. I would like to thank my colleagues for their willingness to work with me on restoring funding to the State Children's Health Insurance

Program that is essential to ensuring continued health care coverage for America's children.

For the past week, I have worked with my colleagues to secure this agreement that will restore \$2.7 billion in expired—or soon to expire—S-CHIP funding. This compromise that has been endorsed by our Nation's Governors would ensure that this funding remains in the program and continues to provide children with access to the care that is vital to their healthy development.

I appreciate the willingness of Majority Leader FRIST, Finance Committee Chairman GRASSLEY and Budget Committee Chairman NICKLES to work with us in developing this agreement. Because of their commitment to finding a solution, we are able to move forward with this important policy.

I believe this agreement is the most appropriate way to restore the S-CHIP funding. Because the budget resolution adopted by the House of Representatives does not include adequate budget authority to restore this funding, the floor amendment that I filed to the omnibus appropriations bill would be subject to a budget point of order in the House. Given that this point of order would lie against the provision, the likelihood that the House would strip this during conference is great. In light of these circumstances, I believe this agreement is the most appropriate way to ensure that this funding is restored.

The agreement that was struck would—in exchange for withdrawing the amendments that my colleagues and I filed to the omnibus appropriations bill to restore S-CHIP funding—provide the support of the majority leader and Chairmen GRASSLEY and NICKLES to make necessary changes that will remove the budget hurdles that have prevented this legislation from being enacted.

Specifically, Senator NICKLES has provided his commitment to reallocate through the fiscal year 04 budget process additional budget authority for S-CHIP in fiscal year 03 and fiscal year 04. Senator NICKLES, I am confident that under your leadership, the budget process will move smoothly and expeditiously and that we will be able to speed the adoption of this proposal in both the Senate and House of Representatives.

Further, Chairman GRASSLEY has agreed to move this policy through his committee as soon as the necessary changes are made to the budget allocations. Again, under his strong leadership I am confident that we will get this done.

Finally, Majority Leader FRIST has agreed to place the legislation on the Senate Calendar as soon as it is reported from the Finance Committee.

I might add that while I am aware that this agreement was forged in the Senate, the underlying policy proposal was developed through a bipartisan, bicameral process led by Senators GRASSLEY and BAUCUS last fall. I hope

the House of Representatives will work with us to make the necessary changes to the fiscal year 03 and fiscal year 04 budget allocations and to see this vital policy enacted in a timely manner.

Since 1977, States have made historic progress in their effort to insure low-income children under S-CHIP. In fact, the National Center for Health Statistics just released data this month showing that the percentage of children 17 years of age and younger with health insurance has increased from 86.1 percent in 1997 to 91.2 percent during the first half of 2002. During this same period of time, statistics show the percentage of children insured by Government programs, such as S-CHIP, also increased to 27.2 percent. While these statistics are encouraging, a great deal of work remains if we are to address the critical issues of affordability and accessibility of health insurance, especially as they relate to health care for our children.

These compelling statistics reinforce the necessity that Congress must act to restore the expiring S-CHIP funds. If we delay, we could jeopardize the substantial progress that has been made since 1997 in increasing the number of insured children in America. It is estimated that without restoration of this funding, almost 1 million children could lose health insurance coverage.

How it works is this—once passed, the policy would restore \$2.7 billion in S-CHIP funding that has either reverted to the Treasury or is scheduled to revert to HHS for redistribution. On October 1, 2002, \$1.2 billion reverted to the Treasury in unspent S-CHIP funding from 1998 and 1999. If we do not recapture this funding, it will be lost to the program. Our agreement allows the States to reclaim this unspent money and provides until the end of Fiscal Year 04 to spend it on health insurance provided by S-CHIP.

It also strikes a compromise between States that have spent all of their 2000 and 2001 allotments, and those that have not, by dividing the funding evenly between them. Those States that have not spent all of their allocations would be able to retain half of their funding, while the remaining States would receive additional allotments from the redistributed funding.

It also rewards those States that used Medicaid to expand access to health care for low-income children prior to the creation of S-CHIP, by allowing them to access some of their S-CHIP funding to serve this population. This compromise has the endorsement of the National Governors Association and children's health advocates from across the country.

In my home State of Maine this proposal would allow the State to keep \$13.24 million in S-CHIP funding and would provide until the end of Fiscal Year 04 to spend it. I don't know about your State, but in Maine \$13.24 million will help provide health care assistance

to a lot of children—children who otherwise would not have access to immunizations, well-baby visits, and yearly checkups.

While my colleagues and I have agreed to forgo the appropriations process as the vehicle to move this package, we certainly have not abandoned our effort to restore the funding. In fact, we are more committed than ever to seeing the S-CHIP funding restored and have added the support of the majority leader and chairs of the Finance and Budget Committees. Adding their endorsement to this effort, which already has garnered strong bipartisan support, will help to speed its passage.

In closing, I would like to highlight a quote from Secretary Thompson when his agency released the positive new data I referenced earlier regarding the level of health insurance for children in our country. He said, "More and more children are getting the health care they need, thanks in large measure to our success in working with States to expand health coverage through the S-CHIP program. We are giving Governors the flexibility they need to continue to expand coverage to more children, and our strategy is paying off for children and parents alike."

This strong endorsement of S-CHIP should act as an impetus to getting this policy enacted and ensuring that we do so in a timely fashion. Again, I appreciate the support of my colleagues and look forward to working with you as we move forward to enact this policy.

Mr. GRASSLEY. I thank my colleagues for their attention to this important children's care policy. They are correct that something must be done to address the funds that have and will revert to the Treasury in the near future. They are also correct to the constraints within the omnibus bill. I strongly support the State Children's Health Insurance Program. It is a program that provides health care for over 16,000 low-income children in my State.

Senators CHAFEE, SNOWE, and ROCKEFELLER are looking to address a necessary maintenance issue within S-CHIP. As Senator SNOWE noted, I worked very closely with Senator BAUCUS, Senator CHAFEE, Senator ROCKEFELLER, Chairman TAUZIN, and Representative DINGELL on a bipartisan, bicameral proposal that would have addressed expired S-CHIP funds.

The proposal reflected a balanced approach to redistributing S-CHIP funding taking into account that some States are spending through their existing allotments and other States are ramping up their programs and will need additional funding in the years to come.

This proposal did not pass the Senate last year, but it is a fair approach to redistributing S-CHIP funds. Unfortunately, I cannot support including this policy at this time. The omnibus is a poor vehicle for this necessary maintenance.

I am sympathetic to the intent of this policy, although this is neither the time nor the place to address this issue. The Senate and the House have an agreement with the administration to keep the omnibus appropriations bill under \$750 billion. The S-CHIP policy costs over \$1.2 billion in budget authority in 2003. An amendment of this nature would break that agreement and that is simply not acceptable. I appreciate the willingness of Senators SNOWE, CHAFEE, and ROCKEFELLER to accept this reality.

I assure my colleagues that I will work with them in the near future to update the S-CHIP redistribution policy in the near future as chairman of the Finance Committee. It is my understanding that Senator NICKLES, the chairman of the Budget Committee, is also interested in a regular order approach and that he is interested in putting money aside in the budget to address the needs of S-CHIP.

With this in mind, I believe the most appropriate way to address this issue is to work with the chairman of the Budget Committee, Senator NICKLES, to secure sufficient funding for this bipartisan S-CHIP proposal and then to address it in the Finance Committee. I will also continue my work with Energy and Commerce Committee Chairman TAUZIN, so the Senate and the House can move forward in a coordinated fashion.

I assure my colleagues that I will work with them once the Budget Resolution for fiscal year 2004 has been adopted to move legislation quickly through the Finance Committee that reflects a bipartisan, bicameral 2-year agreement on S-CHIP.

Mr. NICKLES. I thank Chairman GRASSLEY for bringing this issue to the attention of Senators today. I appreciate the work of Senator SNOWE, Senator CHAFEE, and Senator ROCKEFELLER to resolve this, however I agree that the omnibus appropriations bill is not the appropriate vehicle to address the issue of the S-CHIP redistribution system. The legislation does affect spending for the next fiscal year and, as such must be addressed within the fiscal year 2004 budget resolution. I have spoken with Senator SNOWE and would be happy to work with her to address this issue. I will work closely with Senator GRASSLEY and others as we craft that resolution to secure the funds necessary for the Finance Committee to consider this S-CHIP proposal.

MAKING FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2003

On January 23, 2003, the Senate amended and passed H.J. Res. 2, as follows:

Resolved, That the resolution from the House of Representatives (H.J. Res. 2) entitled "Joint resolution making further continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2003, and for other purposes." do pass with the following Amendment:

Strike out all after the resolving clause and insert:

DIVISION A—AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS, 2003

Making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2003, and for other purposes.

That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2003, and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I

AGRICULTURAL PROGRAMS

PRODUCTION, PROCESSING, AND MARKETING

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Secretary of Agriculture, and not to exceed \$75,000 for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109, \$3,412,000: Provided, That not to exceed \$11,000 of this amount shall be available for official reception and representation expenses, not otherwise provided for, as determined by the Secretary.

EXECUTIVE OPERATIONS

CHIEF ECONOMIST

For necessary expenses of the Chief Economist, including economic analysis, risk assessment, cost-benefit analysis, energy and new uses, and the functions of the World Agricultural Outlook Board, as authorized by the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 (7 U.S.C. 1622g), and including employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), of which not to exceed \$5,000 is for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109, \$12,016,000.

NATIONAL APPEALS DIVISION

For necessary expenses of the National Appeals Division, including employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), of which not to exceed \$25,000 is for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109, \$13,759,000.

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND PROGRAM ANALYSIS

For necessary expenses of the Office of Budget and Program Analysis, including employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), of which not to exceed \$5,000 is for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109, \$7,358,000.

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF INFORMATION OFFICER

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Chief Information Officer, including employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), of which not to exceed \$10,000 is for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109, \$31,275,000.

COMMON COMPUTING ENVIRONMENT

For necessary expenses to acquire a Common Computing Environment for the Natural Resources Conservation Service, the Farm and Foreign Agricultural Service and Rural Development mission areas for information technology, systems, and services, \$133,155,000, to remain available until expended, for the capital asset acquisition of shared information technology systems, including services as authorized by 7 U.S.C. 6915-16 and 40 U.S.C. 1421-28: Provided, That obligation of these funds shall be consistent with the Department of Agriculture Service Center Modernization Plan of the county-based agencies, and shall be with the concurrence of the Department's Chief Information Officer.

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Chief Financial Officer, including employment