

hard. What is happening in our society today is people are working hard at the very bottom levels. I think the least we can do in this incredible economic climate that so many of us are benefiting from is to raise that minimum wage, save Medicare, help our seniors, pay down the debt, help the future, pass these safety provisions so our kids are safe in school, and pass a Patients' Bill of Rights. We have a watered down bill in the Senate but they are going to pass a good one in the House. Get them into conference and pass it, bring it out.

Finally, campaign finance reform is so important. Of all these issues I have mentioned, I am sad to say our majority leader has only put one on the agenda for his must-do list. That is campaign finance reform. I am glad it is there. It is there because there was a threat to shut down this place if it wasn't on there, but I am glad it is on the list. All of these other things are not there.

What is worse, when you look at the most important thing the Republican majority wants to do, it is going to hurt all these other things, because it is a huge tax cut of \$800 billion that is going to help the people at the upper echelons and hurt everyone else. There won't be any money for Medicare. There won't be any money to save that program. There won't be any money to pay down the debt so we can be good to our grandchildren and their children. There won't be anything for education. There won't be anything for the environment.

I say to my friends, let's do what the people want us to do. Let us take care of business.

There was an extraordinary field poll done in California. I think it is very instructive, and it is amazing in the scope of what it said.

It said that more than 80 percent of the people of California agreed with the President's approach to the budget, which, as we know, is to take that surplus and use a third of it for tax cuts for the middle class, a third of it for Medicare, and a third of it for education, the environment, health research. Now, this means the majority of Republicans agree with the President on this point.

I think we have a golden opportunity to come together on issues that mean a lot to the people: school safety, a Patients' Bill of Rights, campaign finance reform, raising the minimum wage, saving Medicare, paying down the debt, targeted tax relief to the middle class, not to those at the very top who are doing very well.

And the reason I shared the survey with you on the poverty in Los Angeles is that while the economy is terrific and is going very well in California, the gap between the rich and the poor is growing mightily. Those of us who care about our fellow human beings cannot turn our backs on this, regardless of our party, because it is a recipe for problems in the future.

Mr. President, I thank you for your indulgence. I know my colleague, Senator DORGAN, has a lot to say on these and other matters. Again, I compliment my friends who are taking the lead on the East Timor situation. We have unfinished business to do. Let's get it done and do it across the party aisle and go home proud of our accomplishments.

I yield the floor.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the order of the Senate on July 22, the Senate having received H.R. 2670, the Senate will proceed to the bill, all after the enacting clause is stricken, the text of S. 1217 is inserted, H.R. 2670 is read the third time and passed, the Senate insists on its amendment, requests a conference with the House, and the Chair appoints Mr. GREGG, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. DOMENICI, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mrs. HUTCHISON of Texas, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Ms. MIKULSKI, and Mr. BYRD conferees on the part of the Senate.

(The text of S. 1217 is printed in the RECORD of July 27, 1999)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota is recognized.

THE COMPREHENSIVE NUCLEAR TEST BAN TREATY

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, on October 6, 7, and 8, there will be a meeting in Vienna, Austria. It will be among countries that have ratified something called the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty. That treaty is embodied in this document I hold in my hand.

Now, what is the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty? It is a treaty negotiated by a number of countries around the world; 152 countries, in fact, have signed the treaty and 44 countries have ratified the treaty. It is a treaty designed to prohibit any further explosive testing of nuclear weapons anywhere in the world, at any time, under any condition.

This treaty ought to be an easy treaty for this country and this Senate to ratify. But we have not done so. At a time when India and Pakistan explode nuclear weapons literally under each other's chins—these are two countries that don't like each other—at a time when we have evidence of more proliferation of nuclear weapons into the hands of countries that want access to nuclear weapons with which to, in some cases, defend themselves, perhaps in other cases to terrorize the rest of the world, this country ought to be exhibiting leadership. It is our moral responsibility to provide leadership in the world on these issues. This country ought to provide leadership on the issue of the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty.

We have not ratified this treaty. At the meeting in Vienna, countries that have ratified it will participate in discussing the implementation of this treaty, and this country will not be an active participant. Great Britain, Belgium, Germany, Canada, Italy, Norway, Poland, and France will be but we will not. We are the largest nuclear superpower on Earth and we have not ratified this treaty.

What about nuclear weapons and nuclear war? I was in the presence of a nuclear weapon recently at a military installation. If you stand a foot or two away from a nuclear weapon and look at it, it is a relatively small canister-looking device that, upon explosion, will devastate portions of our Earth.

Going back nearly 40 years to an address by John F. Kennedy, he said something about nuclear weapons. In fact, he quoted Nikita Khrushchev:

Since the beginning of history, war has been mankind's constant companion. It has been the rule, not the exception. Even a nation as young and as peace-loving as our own has fought through eight wars. A war today or tomorrow, if it led to nuclear war, would not be like any war in history. A full-scale nuclear exchange, lasting less than 60 minutes, with the weapons now in existence, could wipe out more than 300 million Americans, Europeans, and Russians, as well as untold numbers elsewhere. And the survivors, as Chairman Khrushchev warned the Communist Chinese, "the survivors would envy the dead." For they would inherit a world so devastated by explosions and poison and fire that today we cannot even conceive of its horrors.

This country and Russia have 30,000 nuclear weapons between them. Other countries want nuclear weapons, and they want them badly. To the extent that any other country cannot test nuclear weapons, no one will know whether they have a nuclear weapon that works. No one will have certainty that they have access to nuclear weaponry. That is why the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty is so critical.

Now, where is it? Well, it is here in the Senate. It has been here 716 days, with not even 1 day of hearings. Not one. Virtually every other treaty sent to the Senate has been given a hearing and has been brought to the Senate floor and debated and voted upon. The issue of the proliferation of nuclear weapons and the stopping of explosive testing of nuclear weapons is not important enough to be brought to the Senate floor for a debate. It has been over 700 days. Not 1 day of hearings.

In October, this country, which ought to be the moral leader on this issue, will not be present as a ratified member at the implementing meetings for this treaty. Shame on us. We have a responsibility to do this. There are big issues and small issues in this Congress. This is a big issue and cannot be avoided.

Now, I am not here to cast aspersions on any Member of the Senate. But I waited here this morning to have the majority leader come to the floor—and he was not able to come to the floor—to describe the agenda this week. When

he comes to the floor, I intend to come to the floor and ask him when he intends to bring this treaty to the floor. If he and others decide it will not come to the floor, I intend to plant myself on the floor like a potted plant and object. I intend to object to other routine business of the Senate until this country decides to accept the moral leadership that is its obligation and bring this treaty to the floor for a debate and a vote.

In a world as difficult as this world is, when countries such as India and Pakistan are detonating nuclear weapons, it is inexcusable, when so many other countries are trying to gain access to nuclear weapons for themselves, that this Senate, for over 2 years, has not been willing or able to allow a debate on a treaty as important as is this treaty. The banning of nuclear explosive testing all around the world at any time, anyplace, anywhere is critically important for our future, for our children, and for their children.

Now, my colleagues know—at least I hope some know—that I am fairly easy to work with. I enjoy the Senate. I enjoy working with my colleagues. I think some of the best men and women I have had the privilege of working with in my life are here on both sides of the aisle. I have great respect for this body. But this body, in some ways, is very frustrating as well because often one or two people can hold up something very important. In this circumstance, I must ask the majority leader—and I will today when given the opportunity when he is on the floor—when will we have the opportunity to debate this Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty.

That meeting in October should not proceed without this country providing a leadership role. The only way that can happen is for us to have ratified the treaty. China and Russia have not ratified the treaty; that is true. They are waiting on this country. India and Pakistan are now talking about detonating more nuclear weapons; that is true. They are asking others to implore one or the other to ratify this treaty. Both countries are waiting for this country's leadership. What kind of credibility does this country have to go to India and Pakistan and say to them, "You must ratify this treaty," and when they turn to us to say, "Have you?" we would say no? Somehow, the Senate could not, in 700 days, even hold 1 day of hearings on the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty.

We have to do better than that. I am sorry if I am going to cause some problems around here with the schedule. But frankly, as I said, there are big issues and there are small issues. This is a big issue. And I am flat tired of seeing small issues around this Chamber every day in every way, when the big issues are bottled up in some committee and the key is held by one or two people. Then we are told: If you do not like it, tough luck; you don't run this place. It is true, I don't run this

place, but those who do should know this is going to be a tough place to run if you do not decide to bring this issue to the floor of the Senate and give us the opportunity to debate a Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty. This will not be an easy road ahead for the Senate if you decide that this country shall not exercise the moral leadership that is our responsibility on these matters.

If I might with the remaining minute or so mention an editorial in the Washington Post from yesterday, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY A TEST BAN TREATY?

The proposed nuclear test ban treaty has been around so long—for 50 years—and has been so shrouded in political foliage that many people have forgotten just what it entails. The current debate about it centers on the Clinton administration's differences with the Russians on the one hand and with the Republicans on the other. But in fact the appeal of the treaty is a good deal simpler and more powerful than the debate indicates. This treaty would put an end to underground nuclear tests everywhere; tests above ground already are proscribed either by treaty or by political calculation. Its merits shine through.

Testing is the principal engine of nuclear proliferation. Without tests, a would-be nuclear power cannot be sure enough the thing would work to employ it as a reliable military and political instrument. Leaving open the testing option means leaving open the proliferation option—the very definition of instability. The United States, which enjoys immense global nuclear advantage, can only be the loser as additional countries go nuclear or extend their nuclear reach. The aspiring nuclear powers, whether they are anti-American rogue states or friendly-to-America parties to regional disputes, sow danger and uncertainty across a global landscape. No nation possibly can gain more than we do from universal acceptance of a test ban that helps close off others' options.

At the moment, the treaty is hung up in the Senate by Republicans desiring to use it as a hostage for a national missile defense of their particular design. This is curious. The obstructionists pride themselves in believing American power to be the core of American security. Why then do they support a test ban holdup that multiplies the mischief and menace of proliferators and directly erodes American power? The idea has spread that Americans must choose between a test ban treaty and a missile defense. The idea is false. These are two aspects of a single American security program, the one being a first resort to restrain others' nuclear ambitions and the other a last resort to limit the damage if all else fails. No reasonable person would want to cast one of these away, least of all over details of missile program design. Those in the Senate who are forcing an either-or choice owe it to the country to explain why we cannot employ them both.

The old bugaboo of verification has arisen in the current debate. There is no harm in conceding that verification of low-yield tests might not be 100 percent. But the reasonable measure of these things always has been whether the evasion would make a difference. The answer has to be that cheating so slight as to be undetectable by one or another American intelligence means would not make much difference at all.

The trump card of those who believe the United States should maintain a testing option is that computer calculations alone cannot provide the degree of certitude about the reliability of weapons in the American stockpile that would prudently allow us to forgo tests. This is a matter of continuing contention among the specialists. But what seems to us much less in contention is the proposition that, given American technological prowess, the risk of weapons rotting in the American stockpile has got to be a good deal less than the risk that other countries will test their way to nuclear status.

The core question of proliferation remains what will induce would-be proliferators to get off the nuclear track. Certainly a "mere" signature on a piece of paper would not stay the hand of a country driven by extreme nuclear fear or ambition. Two things, however, could make a difference. One is if the nuclear powers showed themselves ready to accept some increasing part of the discipline they are calling on non-nuclear others to accept, so that the treaty could not be dismissed as punitive and discriminatory. The other is that when you embrace the test ban and related restraints on chemical and biological weapons, you are joining a global order in which those who play by the agreed rules enjoy ever-widening benefits and privileges and those who do not are left out and behind.

President Clinton signed the test ban treaty, and achieving Senate ratification is one of his prime foreign policy goals. More important, ratification would make the world a safer place for the United States. Much still has to be worked out with the Republicans and the Russians, but that is detail work. The larger gain is now within American reach.

The editorial says the following:

The core question of proliferation remains what will induce would-be proliferators to get off the nuclear track. Certainly a "mere" signature on a piece of paper would not stay the hand of a country driven by extreme nuclear fear or ambition. Two things, however, could make a difference. One is if the nuclear powers showed themselves ready to accept some increasing part of the discipline they are calling on non-nuclear others to accept, so that the treaty could not be dismissed as punitive and discriminatory. The other is that when you embrace the test ban and related restraints on chemical and biological weapons, you are joining a global order in which those who play by the agreed rules enjoy ever-widening benefits and privileges and those who do not are left out and behind.

The point is that this country must demonstrate moral leadership on this issue and must do it now.

Seventy to eighty percent of the American people support the ratification of this treaty. Most American people understand that this issue is about who is going to have access to nuclear weapons in the future. And, incidentally, on the issue of nonproliferation of nuclear weapons, which is about as important an issue as there is for us, this is a baby step. If we can't take the baby step of ratifying this treaty, what on Earth will be the result of tougher, more difficult things we are called upon to do?

This isn't Republican or Democrat. It is a responsibility for all Members of the Senate to say it is outrageous that after 700 days, a treaty that has been signed and sent to the Senate has not been ratified or had one day of hearings. We have an obligation and a responsibility. We, in my judgment, have

a right to expect this be brought to the floor for a debate and a vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

The Senator from Wyoming is recognized.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I think we have 30 minutes assigned in morning business. I want to begin to talk about what I think is a very big issue; that is, the appropriations discussions that will take place on the Interior and related agencies which will start after morning business.

I would like to yield to my friend, the Senator from Arizona.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. We have time reserved for the Senator from Wisconsin. The Chair was alternating back and forth.

Mr. THOMAS. It was my understanding that we had an hour of time and half was ours and half of it was already used.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. They have time remaining. The Senate had a late start.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, if I could be of help, it is my understanding they have 30 minutes and, subsequent to that, Senator REID and I will each have 10 minutes. That is my understanding of the unanimous consent agreement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. KYL. Thank you, Mr. President. I thank the Senator from Wisconsin and I thank Senator THOMAS from Wyoming.

THE NUCLEAR TEST BAN TREATY

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I just want to talk for a brief bit of time on the Interior appropriations bill and on some matters that are very important to people throughout this country, particularly in the West. But let me begin by making a comment about what the Senator from North Dakota has just said. In fact, he has said that he is going to threaten to bring the business of the Senate to a halt unless he gets his way, and what he wants to do is have a debate on the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty.

There are a lot of important things facing this country. But to quote from the President of the United States, who very recently gave a talk about putting first things first, it seems to me that most of the American people would like to put first things first, and that would include matters such as the continuation of the running of the Government for the next year which would require us to pass appropriations bills to fund the various Departments of the Government, not the least of which is the Department of the Interior which is what we are going to be talking about next. There will be plenty of time to debate the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty.

But in terms of the priority of this country, I think our colleagues need to understand that treaty can't even go into effect until 100 percent of the major countries of the world sign it. There are many countries that haven't signed it. It is going to be years before that treaty goes into effect. There is no rush for the United States to have to take up that treaty.

To be threatened with stopping all business of the Senate until it can debate the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, I hope my colleague will reconsider his position on that. We talk about what I consider to be first things first, and that would be to finish our business here, which is, first of all, to get the appropriations bills passed and sent to the President for his consideration.

INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, one of the appropriations bills we have yet to act upon is the Interior appropriations bill, as Senator THOMAS pointed out. He comes from the State of Wyoming. I come from the State of Arizona. Practically every State west of the Mississippi is significantly impacted by this bill because, as I am sure you are well aware, Mr. President, coming from the State of Montana, more than a third of this Nation's lands are owned by the Federal Government. Most of those are in the western United States. Many of those lands are under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior.

This is an extraordinarily important bill for the people of our States. I just want to discuss one aspect of it that is very important for my State of Arizona and other States in the western United States.

We have a very difficult condition in our national forests now. They have been probably—I think it is not too strong a term—"mismanaged" over the years. It has been a combination of things. It has been the combination of the Forest Service, the Department of Agriculture, the Department of the Interior, the grazing on public lands, the way that fire suppression has taken off, and some other things which have resulted in the condition where, instead of healthy forests of large trees that have great environmental value and value to the other flora and fauna in the forest and which present a relatively safe situation in terms of forest fires, we now have a situation in the West where our forests are literally becoming overgrown.

They are becoming so thick and dense with small-growth trees that:

- (A) They are very fire prone.
- (B) They are not resistant at all to disease and to insects.
- (C) They are not environmentally pleasing at all.
- (D) None of the trees grow up to be very large because they are all competing for the moisture and the nutrients in the soil.

The net result is a situation that is very different from that which pertained at the turn of the century when we had very healthy forests of very large trees that were spaced quite a distance apart, with meadows in between, with a lot of good grass that livestock and wild animals could graze on, and which were not prone to forest fire because the fire would work along the ground when it occurred. It would reduce the fuel load on the ground, but it would never get to be the kind of crown fire we have just seen on television that has been experienced in several States in the West, not the least of which is in California.

You get the crown fires when you have a lot of brush on the ground. You have these small, dense trees and many come under the boughs of the great big trees. The fire starts on the ground and goes right up to the crown of the other trees. We have all seen from those television pictures the explosive power of the fires. It is a horrendous situation. It threatens life and limb as well as the destruction of the forest and all that is within it.

We have to find a way to better manage our forests. We have been for some time urging the Department of Agriculture and the Department of the Interior to work on a management program which essentially involves the thinning of these small-diameter trees, leaving the large-diameter trees—leaving the old growth but thinning out the small-diameter trees, and then doing controlled burns to get rid of the fuel load, and after that letting nature take its course.

We have found from experimentation—primarily through Northern Arizona University, Dr. Walley Covington, and others who have done the research and demonstration projects we have funded—that the trees become more healthy. The pitch content of the trees increases significantly. So they are less susceptible to bark beetles and other kinds of insect damage. The grasses grow up underneath the trees as they didn't do before. The protein content of the grasses is significantly higher. So it is much better grazing for the forest animals. In every respect, from an environmental point of view, it is a better situation than that which pertains today.

This takes money because you have to pay to go in and do the thinning. Each one of these projects requires a substantial amount of money.

So far, the research has been done on small plots of land. But according to the General Accounting Office, we have about 25 to 30 years maximum to treat all of our forests or we are going to be into a contagion situation with very little hope of saving these forests. In fact, we have about 39 million acres of national forest lands in the interior West that are at high risk of catastrophic fire, and only this brief period of maybe 25 years to effectively manage these forests.