

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.

When I came to the Senate, I became a freshman member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the Chair of the International Operations Subcommittee. Throughout that time—and ever since Senator HELMS has been relentlessly gracious to me, as he had been whenever we had worked together on various conference committees back when I was in the House.

Here in the Senate, we worked hand-in-glove on the State Department reauthorization, and I appreciated the opportunity he gave me to chair a full committee hearing with then-Secretary Albright on the issue of intelligence sharing with the U.N. in the wake of our involvement in Somalia.

That was a serious concern that he and I shared—how would we protect U.S. intelligence information, particularly in light of the intelligence breach that had taken place in Somalia, where the U.N. had documents they should not have had which were also not properly secured. Issues brought to our attention during that hearing with Secretary Albright were eventually incorporated into the State Department bill.

During my tenure on the Foreign Relations Committee, I worked with Senator HELMS on the reorganization of the State Department, which was passed in 1998. As Chair of the International Operations Subcommittee I also introduced legislation in 1995 to create Terrorist Lookout committees in our embassies. With the help of Senator HELMS, this bill was incorporated in the State Department Authorization Act of 1996–1997, that was subsequently vetoed.

In the wake of 9/11, I re-introduced this legislation with Senator HELMS as a cosponsor and worked with him to seek its inclusion in the USA PATRIOT Act passed last year. With his support, this bill has finally become law as part of the Enhanced Border Security and Visa Entry Reform Act.

Of course, it will come as no surprise that we didn't agree on all the issues. But it can truly be said he has left his mark on the global landscape. And that includes his introduction of legislation last year to prevent mother-to-child transmission of HIV infection—a goal I share by providing \$700 million in international emergency AIDS spending.

It is also true that agreement is not the test of friendship or respect in this body—nor should it be. Indeed, this body was founded on the ideals of debate and deliberation among men and women of good conscience who feel strongly about the pressing matters of the day.

I appreciate his candor, his friendship, and his service to North Carolina, America and indeed the world. On the occasion of his retirement, I would like to extend my best wishes to him, as well as his wife Dorothy with whom he has such a special and loving relationship. Senator HELMS will truly be missed, but most assuredly never forgotten.

TRIBUTE TO SEN. STROM THURMOND

Mr. SHELBY. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to South Carolina Senator STROM THURMOND, an institution unto himself who has served with distinction in the U.S. Senate for almost a half-century. Senator THURMOND is the longest-serving member in the history of the Senate and the second Senator in history to cast 15,000 votes. During his tenure, Senator THURMOND has been an enduring witness to history, presiding over the chamber during a tremendous transformation of the American landscape. During this time, Senator THURMOND has steadfastly remained responsible to the voters of South Carolina, who have returned him to the chamber time and time again. Senator THURMOND's enduring legacy will continue on well beyond his retirement at the end of the 107th Congress.

Senator THURMOND was born in 1902, in Edgefield, SC. His early years were spent as an Army reservist, teacher, superintendent and lawyer. Senator THURMOND won election to the South Carolina State Senate in 1933, representing his home district of Edgefield for the next five years. Senator THURMOND then became a Circuit Judge of South Carolina, just as the clouds of war descended over Europe. Never one to shy away from his duty to his country, Senator THURMOND sought and received an exemption to return to military duty. On June 6, 1944, he landed in Normandy on D-Day with the 82nd Airborne Division at the age of 42. For his service in World War II, Senator THURMOND earned eighteen decorations, medals and awards, including the Purple Heart, Legion of Merit with Oak Leaf Cluster and Bronze Star for Valor. He returned to South Carolina a war hero, and was elected Governor of the Palmetto State in 1946. In 1954, Senator THURMOND was elected to the United States Senate, becoming the first, and so far, the only politician elected to the Senate as a write-in candidate.

Senator THURMOND has dedicated his life to preserving, defending and participating in our democracy. He attended the Democratic National Convention in 1932 and voted for Franklin D. Roosevelt. Sixty four years later, he attended the Republican Convention and voted for Bob Dole. In fact, Senator THURMOND was a Democrat for thirty two years and has been a Republican for the past thirty eight. Through it all, he has managed to remain relevant, active and a force on the national scene. Just two years ago, he played a critical role in helping to line up Republican support for George Bush in the South Carolina primary, helping to secure his nomination for President of the United States.

Senator THURMOND's countless achievements and awards are a testament to his distinguished career in public service. He holds thirty four honorary degrees, is in the South Carolina Hall of Fame, and is a recipient of

the Presidential Citizens Award, Presidential Freedom Award, as well as other major awards from American Legion, VFW, DAV, AMVETS, the National Guard, Army and Navy associations, farm groups, business groups, education groups and several foreign countries.

It is with great admiration for Senator THURMOND's longevity and service that I commend him for his distinguished career in Congress. No one in the history of the Senate can say that they gave more of their life to this body, and while his presence may be gone after the 107th Congress, his spirit will forever remain a part of this chamber. I wish he and his family all the best in the future.

THE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE'S 100TH VOTE IN 15 MONTHS ON JUDICIAL NOMINATIONS

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, today marks the 15-month anniversary of the reorganization of the Senate Judiciary Committee following the change in the Senate majority last summer. This week also became another milestone as the Judiciary Committee voted on the 100th judicial nominee of President George W. Bush. This historic demonstration of bipartisanship toward this President's judicial nominees has been overshadowed by partisan attacks in this very chamber and in the press.

I have worked diligently along with the other Democratic Senators on the Judiciary Committee to hold a record number of hearings for this President's district and circuit court nominees during the past 15 months and to bring as many as we could to a vote this year. Given all of the competing responsibilities of the committee and the Senate in these times of great challenges to our Nation, hearings for 103 judicial nominees, voting on 100, and favorably reporting 98 is a record of which the Judiciary Committee and the Senate can be proud. We have transcended the relative inaction of the prior 6½ years of Republican control by moving forward on judicial nominees twice as quickly as our predecessors did. Indeed, the Senate has already confirmed more judicial nominees in 15 months than the Republican-controlled Senate did during its last 30 months. More achieved, and in half the time.

The raw numbers, not percentages, reveal the true workload of the Senate on nominations and everyone knows that. Anyone who pays attention to the federal judiciary and who does not have a partisan agenda must know that. In addition, Democrats have moved more quickly in voting on judicial nominees of a President of a different party than in any time in recent history. Led by Majority Leader DASCHLE, the Democratic majority in the Senate has confirmed 80 judicial nominees, including 14 circuit court nominees, for a President of a different party, in just 15 months since the reorganization of the Judiciary Committee. In comparison,