

tubes that can have military and civilian applications. . . . When United Nations weapons inspectors were allowed into Iraq after the 1991 Gulf war, they compiled long lists of chemicals, missile components, and computers from American suppliers.

Mr. President, sadly, there is no new precedent in our Government using our citizens' tax dollars to finance the purchase of weaponry for antidemocratic, antihuman rights, and unstable foreign nations only to see their short-term friendship disappear and to have them become enemies to the United States and the Western World. What is truly shocking here, however, is that the very possession of chemical and biological weapons of mass destruction, which is the justification for a new war in Iraq and which places in jeopardy the safety of American families, American communities, and American military personnel, is, in large measure, the consequence of decisions made by the Reagan and Bush administrations.

As we speak, tens of thousands of U.S. gulf war veterans continue to suffer from exposure to chemical agents over a decade ago. We in Congress debate whether and how to inoculate hundreds of thousands, if not millions, of Americans to protect them from biological weapons that their own Government helped create in Iraq.

It is one thing that our Nation would have provided cluster bombs and conventional weaponry to Saddam Hussein—it no doubt seemed important and strategically helpful to the purpose of stabilizing the Middle East during the 1980's. But how can members of this Senate look members of our military in the eye—and I include my own son, a sergeant in the 101st Airborne and a veteran of Bosnia, Kosovo and Afghanistan—and acknowledge that these past administrations, albeit without congressional knowledge or consent, allowed Iraq to acquire the anthrax, and bubonic plague viruses?

The circumstance our Nation now faces, from the threats of Iraqi weapons of mass destruction as well as the possibility that these weapons have or will fall into the hands of Al-Qaida or other non-state terrorist organizations, are to a great degree, circumstances of our own making. Obviously, no American administration has ever supported terrorism against our own people, though interfering with Iraq's use of these weapons against many of its own people was apparently not a matter of first concern to the U.S.

The lesson should be clear—to the extent that the U.S. arms the world, it undertakes a risk that those weapons could be used against our own citizens. While helping proven democratic allies to defend themselves will always be a legitimate role for the U.S., it is hard to imagine a lesson driven home more profoundly than we find today that arming non-democracies is a much greater risk, and arming non-democracies with weapons of chemical and biological warfare capability is an outrageous and utterly unacceptable risk

to the U.S. and the world. It may be impossible for our Nation to avoid reaping what is has sown in the past, but this administration, this Congress and the American people must be united now in committing never again to be even a unwitting instrument of chemical, biological or nuclear terror in the world.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

#### EXTENSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that morning business be extended until the hour of 2 p.m., with the time equally divided between the majority and minority leaders or their designees, and that Members be permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

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

#### NOMINATION OF JOHN SNOW TO BE TREASURY SECRETARY

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I come to this Chamber to state my support for John Snow's nomination as the Treasury Secretary. In the 20 years I have known John, I have found him to be honest, capable, and up to the challenge of heading our Nation's Treasury Department. While John and I have not always agreed on issues, I have never found him to be disagreeable. I am confident he will be a valuable member of the President's Cabinet and will work well with Members of Congress.

As a business leader, a public servant, an academic, John has proven he has the ability to lead our Nation's economic recovery and spur economic growth. I look forward to working with John on our Nation's economic challenges, and I urge a rapid report and consideration of his nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

#### DROUGHT "DAVID"

Mr. NELSON of Nebraska. Mr. President, today I will address a different subject than has been addressed this morning. The Senate recently passed a disaster assistance package consisting of \$3.1 billion to aid those affected by the worst drought since the Dust Bowl years of the 1930s. Some have referred to this package as drought disaster relief. I cannot quite call it drought relief because it does not really provide drought relief. It may provide some arid condition relief and some oasis assistance, but I cannot bring myself to call it real drought relief, for two reasons: No. 1, because \$3.1 billion is inadequate. It is not enough. No. 2, it does not do enough for farmers and ranchers who are actually suffering the losses due to the devastating drought.

I decided to give the drought a name, and I gave it the name "David" to give

it an identity like other natural disasters and to show that this drought, the same as a hurricane, required immediate emergency Federal assistance.

Several of my colleagues wore Drought David ribbons that I distributed to them to remind all Senators of the severe impact of the drought, and I thank those who proudly wore them. Back home, the newspaper Journal Star in Lincoln thought my proposal to name the drought was worth asking readers to submit their suggestions, and many creative suggestions were submitted but one stood out.

For Shannon Sutherland of Lincoln, the drought summons up thoughts of the devil in hell. Among her suggestions was "The Devil's Bull's Eye" in reference to the drought maps looking like a bull's eye right over Nebraska. The Journal Star reported that on Monday.

Shannon Sutherland is absolutely right. The Drought Monitor maps do resemble a target with Nebraska in the crosshairs, but our neighboring States share the target, unfortunately.

If we go look at this chart, if that is not a bull's eye, I do not know what a bull's eye would look like. Unfortunately, that bull's eye is right over my hometown of McCook, NE. As we can see, that area has suffered the worst drought conditions in the State of Nebraska.

We are not alone. The darkest brown is where the worst conditions are being experienced, and even though this disaster assistance was passed last week and is now over in the House, the drought continues. I think we have a tendency at times to think when we have passed something, that takes care of it. Well, first, it was inadequate to take care of the past needs, and it certainly is not going to be adequate to take care of the additional needs.

Yet despite my efforts to raise awareness—and others who have attempted to raise awareness—of this drought, the Senate still could not manage to provide comprehensive drought assistance. I have come today to give my fellow Senators another opportunity to hear a message I received from one of my constituents, Bill Lueck of Arcadia, NE, in the central part of the State. His words came in over the weekend. I spoke to him yesterday. His words are a powerful reminder of how the recent drought relief bill fell short. He said:

I have some concerns over the current disaster portion of the omnibus appropriations bill. According to the information I got from the farm bureau, they're considering 42 percent of AMTA payments to farmers. In our area here we have irrigated producers who haven't suffered a loss, who are going to get an additional payment and in the western part of the State our cattle producers out here are hanging on by their fingers. I assumed when they didn't consider the \$6 billion anymore and went to the \$3.1 billion for agriculture disaster aid that would go more to livestock producers. We've got breeding stock on wholesale bull sale that are down \$1,000 average per bull around here.

To Bill Lueck, I say thank you. I could not have said it better myself. I