

make their reintegration into a unified Iraq problematic at best. Arab Sunnis, fearing retaliation from the long-oppressed Shiite majority, may use the Sunni-dominated Iraqi military to keep the Shiites from gaining power. And while the overthrow of Saddam Hussein would involve the likely end to the Iraqi Republican Guard, the regular Iraqi army may remain to play a critical role in a post-Saddam Iraq. Yet the Iraqi army may become a den of coup-plotters; after all, Iraq endured a succession of bloody coups from 1953 until Saddam Hussein's ascent to power in the late 1970s.

Our military planning should be guided by an awareness that how Saddam's regime falls will shape the Iraq that follows. At some point the American people will need to know the nature and extent of America's commitment to a post-Saddam Iraq. How long will our troops be on the ground in Iraq? What material and financial resources will we be asked to provide to Iraq? What responsibility will the United States have to maintain peace in the region? What help will we get from our allies in rebuilding Iraq?

President Bush has exercised great leadership at a critical time in our history. I am proud to be a part of the debate we are having today in this chamber, which is a powerful demonstration of our democratic institutions. Ours is a nation that is slow to anger. Americans abhor war. I vote in support of this resolution, but hope and pray that the President, united with Congress, will succeed in averting war.

There is no question in my mind that we must disarm Saddam, and that time is running out. Clearly, there are risks involved. But I believe the risks of doing nothing are far greater.

I yield that floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the cloture motion is vitiated on Senate Joint Resolution 45.

The clerk will read the joint resolution for the third time.

The joint resolution was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now proceed to the consideration of House Joint Resolution 114.

The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A joint resolution (H.J. Res. 114) to authorize the use of United States Armed Forces against Iraq.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read House Joint Resolution 114 for a third time.

The joint resolution was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the joint resolution pass?

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 77, nays 23, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 237 Leg.]

YEAS—77

Allard	Edwards	McCain
Allen	Ensign	McConnell
Baucus	Enzi	Miller
Bayh	Feinstein	Murkowski
Bennett	Fitzgerald	Nelson (FL)
Biden	Frist	Nelson (NE)
Bond	Gramm	Nickles
Breaux	Grassley	Reid
Brownback	Gregg	Roberts
Bunning	Hagel	Rockefeller
Burns	Harkin	Santorum
Campbell	Hatch	Schumer
Cantwell	Helms	Sessions
Carnahan	Hollings	Shelby
Carper	Hutchinson	Smith (NH)
Cleland	Hutchison	Smith (OR)
Clinton	Inhofe	Snowe
Cochran	Johnson	Specter
Collins	Kerry	Stevens
Craig	Kohl	Thomas
Crapo	Kyl	Thompson
Daschle	Landrieu	Thurmond
DeWine	Lieberman	Torricelli
Dodd	Lincoln	Voinovich
Domenici	Lott	Warner
Dorgan	Lugar	

NAYS—23

Akaka	Durbin	Mikulski
Bingaman	Feingold	Murray
Boxer	Graham	Reed
Byrd	Inouye	Sarbanes
Chafee	Jeffords	Stabenow
Conrad	Kennedy	Wellstone
Corzine	Leahy	Wyden
Dayton	Levin	

The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 114) was passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the preamble is agreed to.

Under the previous order, S.J. Res. 45, as amended, is indefinitely postponed.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—S. 3009

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 619, S. 3009, a bill to provide a 13-week extension for unemployment compensation, and that the bill be read the third time and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. LINCOLN). Is there objection?

Mr. NICKLES. Madam President, reserving the right to object—and I shall object—this is not a 13-week extension, it is a 26-week extension, plus an additional 7 weeks for some States. It changes the threshold. It costs \$17 billion. A clean extension would be \$7 billion.

I will be happy to work with my colleagues to come up with something more reasonable and affordable. This bill before us, S. 3009, is not. Therefore, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to a period for morning business, with Senators allowed to speak for up to 5 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CARPER). Without objection, it is so ordered.

ASSISTANCE TO AFGHANISTAN

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, it is now just more than a year since our Armed Forces started Operation Enduring Freedom in Afghanistan. This is a fitting time to look back at what we have accomplished, and ahead at the challenges that remain.

I am reminded of a young Army private from Midland, SD, whom I met in Uzbekistan last February. He had gone to Uzbekistan just after completing a tour of duty in Bosnia, foregoing leave, because, he told me, that is where our country needed him.

I am certain that each member of this body knows someone from his or her State who has made a contribution to our successful effort in Afghanistan. On behalf of every member of the Congress and the American people, let me say how proud and grateful we are for those efforts.

Our military quickly and effectively accomplished its objective of removing the repressive Taliban regime. The challenge before us now is whether we can promote peace and economic and political stability as effectively as we waged and won the war. I am pleased to see the senior Senator from Vermont on the floor. I am wondering if he would engage in a brief colloquy with me on the subject of our humanitarian and reconstruction efforts in Afghanistan.

Mr. LEAHY. Yes, I would.

Mr. DASCHLE. As our colleagues know, Senator LEAHY is the Chairman of the Foreign Operations Subcommittee. Two weeks ago, I listened with interest to the Senator's speech on Iraq, part of which he rightly dedicated to the situation in Afghanistan. Afghanistan is our first, and most visible effort in the war on terrorism. The eyes of the region and the world are watching whether we are willing to do what is needed to follow through in Afghanistan. I would like Senator LEAHY to, once again, share his views on the developments in Afghanistan.

Mr. LEAHY. I thank the distinguished majority leader for his question. Much has been accomplished in Afghanistan over the course of the last year. The brutal Taliban regime has been vanquished to the ash heap of history. Thousands of Afghans have returned to their homes, and our humanitarian efforts have raised the standard of living of many Afghans.

We have spent billions to win the war. I fear, however, that unless we dramatically increase our efforts there we could lose the peace. The humanitarian situation in Afghanistan remains critical. Thousands of people are still homeless and as winter comes, so too will the very real threat of widespread hunger, even famine. Afghans whose homes were mistakenly bombed have not been helped. There are reports

that some Afghans are starting to return to refugee camps in Pakistan. It is a very dire situation.

We have a moral duty to help the people of Afghanistan. Beyond that, there are critical U.S. interests at stake in ensuring that this country becomes peaceful and prosperous. That's why I was pleased when, earlier this year, President Bush called for a Marshall Plan for Afghanistan.

I commended him for that important announcement, but since that time we have not seen the resources put behind these statements. No one is asking the Administration to spend 13 percent of the entire federal budget, as we did with the original Marshall Plan. But the Administration did not even ask Congress for a single cent for Afghanistan in its budget for fiscal year 2003. The Foreign Operations Subcommittee was advised informally that the Administration planned to spend \$98 million for relief and reconstruction activities in Afghanistan. The Subcommittee felt that this amount was still insufficient to adequately address the needs in Afghanistan, and provided \$157 million, an additional \$59 million.

I would also add that the Senate is not alone in its concern for the situation in Afghanistan. Just yesterday, I received a letter from the President of CARE, a non-partisan, relief organization with significant operations in Afghanistan, which stated:

President Bush has committed the United States Government to work "in the best traditions of George Marshall" and help the people of Afghanistan rebuild their country. For this goal to be achieved, CARE believes that the international community, led by the United States Government, must do two things. We must provide at least \$10 billion in reconstruction funding over the next five years, and we must respond positively to the requests of the Afghan Government to expand the International Security Assistance Force beyond Kabul as part of a comprehensive plan to improve security for all Afghans

This letter goes on to say that a CARE report, "finds that the U.S. Government has actually exceeded its one-year Tokyo pledge of \$297 million, primarily in the form of humanitarian assistance. Our concern, however, is that the Administration, to date, has not made any long-term commitment to Afghan reconstruction."

Mr. DASCHLE. I thank the Senator from Vermont. There is clearly still much to be done in Afghanistan.

Mr. LEAHY. I agree with the majority leader. As I have said over and over, it is one thing to topple a regime, but it is equally important, and sometimes far more difficult, to rebuild a country to prevent it from becoming engulfed by factional fighting. If such nations cannot successfully rebuild, there is a real risk that they will once again become havens for terrorists.

Mr. DASCHLE. I would like to ask the Senator from Vermont if the Congress provided additional funding for Afghanistan in the Supplemental Appropriations bill that was passed earlier this year. Isn't it true that the

Congress fully funded the Administration's request for a range of activities in Afghanistan during fiscal year 2002? And weren't you subsequently told by officials in the State Department and USAID that this request was not nearly enough to address some of the most acute problems in that country? And isn't it true that the Congress added \$94 million for humanitarian, refugee, and reconstruction assistance to Afghanistan, only to be told later by the President that he would not provide this additional assistance to Afghanistan?

Mr. LEAHY. That is correct. Now, some relief organizations have already been told that they may have to shut down programs for lack of funds. This is happening in a country that desperately needs the most basic staples such as water, education and medical care.

I agree with those who point out that many other nations have yet to fulfill pledges of assistance to Afghanistan. But, if the President is serious about a Marshall Plan, and I believe he is right, then we need to do much more to help rebuild that country.

Mr. DASCHLE. I agree with the Senator. We need to find additional resources for humanitarian efforts in Afghanistan, but I know that the Senator, like me, is concerned about the deteriorating security situation. For months, in the form of letters to the Administration and amendments here on the Senate floor, we have been urging the President to expand the International Security Assistance Force beyond greater Kabul. Coalition forces provide much needed security throughout the country, but significant concerns remain, highlighted by the assassination attempt on President Karzai just last month. I know that the Senator agrees with me that expanding ISAF could play a central role in improving this worsening security situation.

Mr. LEAHY. I strongly agree with the Majority Leader and thank him for this colloquy.

REVISED ALLOCATION TO SUBCOMMITTEES FOR FISCAL YEAR 2003

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, on Thursday June 27, the Committee on Appropriations, by a unanimous roll call vote of 29 to 0, approved the allocation to subcommittees for fiscal year 2003.

On Wednesday July 26, after Congress adopted the conference report to accompany H.R. 4775, the fiscal year 2002 supplemental appropriations bill, I submitted a revised allocation which was modified primarily to conform outlays to the outcome on the supplemental.

Today I submit a revised allocation which has been modified, primarily, to reduce outlays for each subcommittee to reflect the President's decision to release none of the contingent emergency appropriations in the supplemental. In addition, the allocation re-

flects final decisions on the conference report on defense and military construction appropriations bills.

These revised allocations were prepared in consultation with my dear colleague, Senator STEVENS, the distinguished ranking member of the Committee, who stands with me committed to presenting bills to the Senate consistent with the allocations.

Furthermore, we remain committed to oppose any amendments that would breach the allocations.

SENATE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS—REVISED FY 2003 SUBCOMMITTEE ALLOCATIONS, DISCRETIONARY SPENDING

(\$ millions)

Subcommittee	Budget authority	Outlays
Agriculture	17,980	18,195
Commerce	43,475	42,937
Defense	354,830	348,828
District of Columbia	517	582
Energy & Water	26,300	25,835
Foreign Operations	16,350	16,443
Interior	18,926	18,547
Labor-HHS-Education	134,132	126,321
Legislative Branch	3,413	3,467
Military Construction	10,499	10,071
Transportation	21,600	61,984
Treasury, General Gov't	18,501	17,970
VA, HUD	91,434	96,945
Deficiencies	10,132	13,366
Total	768,089	801,491

Revised on October 10, 2002.

RETIREMENT OF SENATOR JESSE HELMS

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. President, I rise today in tribute to Senator JESSE HELMS, who as we know is retiring from the U.S. Senate at the end of this Congress.

Simply put, the name "JESSE HELMS" has become a household name because he has never been afraid to stand by his principles. Indeed, throughout his five terms in the Senate, Senator HELMS has been a passionate voice for those ideals by which he has lived his life.

And that is a critical distinction—Senator HELMS has not only propounded certain values and philosophies, he has also lived them. He has always enjoyed the kind of unique credibility that comes from integrity—a personal quality that Senator HELMS has carried with him from his very first days in Monroe, NC.

This is a man for whom service is a higher calling, a commitment not only reflected by his years in elective office, but also—and at least as importantly—by his service in the Navy from 1942 to 1945. One cannot help but feel that Senator HELMS later brought the reality of that experience significantly to bear in his legendary work on matters of international import.

When I first came to Congress in 1979, I of course knew of Senator HELMS. And as I worked in the House on State Department authorizations over the years as well as a variety of global issues as a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee and Ranking Member of the International Operations Subcommittee, I became even more familiar with his profound interest in, and impact on, international affairs.