

JOHN F. KENNEDY, JR., CAROLYN BESSETTE KENNEDY, AND LAUREN BESSETTE

Mr. DORGAN. Madam President, the Senator from Alaska has offered, on behalf of Senator DASCHLE and Senator LOTT, a resolution dealing with the issue of the apparent tragedy that has befallen John F. Kennedy, Jr., Carolyn Bessette Kennedy, and Lauren Bessette.

I want to make a comment about that because I know that, along with most Americans, this weekend when we heard the news of the disappearance of John F. Kennedy, Jr., along with his wife and sister-in-law, most of us were quite shocked and deeply saddened by the news.

This was a young man whose life had such bright promise. He was born the son of a young, new President of the United States. That President's life was cut short by assassination just 3 years into his term.

I and countless thousands of other young Americans were inspired by John F. Kennedy, by his energy and by the passion and ideals of his administration. The experience of being in high school and college and watching the emergence of this new, energetic, young President on the scene in this country was something that inspired many young Americans towards public service. That includes my early interest in public service.

When John F. KENNEDY was assassinated, I think most of us who were called to public service, or at least were called to an interest in public service back in that period, believed there was kind of an unfinished nature to the legacy of his administration and his Presidency. I think many thought over the years that this young man, John F. Kennedy, Jr., was in some way destined to complete that legacy of public service.

Now another tragedy has visited this family, that has already given so much to this country, and has taken from us this wonderful, unique young man. I want to join with all of my colleagues in extending our sympathies to our colleague, Senator Kennedy, to the entire Kennedy family, and to the Bessette family. This is a very difficult time for all of them. I know all Members of the Senate probably already have individually sent those messages to that family.

I have said on other occasions in the Senate, that there is a lot of public debate that goes on that people see between Members of the Senate and they tend to think there is a lack of personal relationships that exists in the Senate. Nothing could be further from the truth. When something happens to the family of a Member of the Senate, others here whose life's work brings us all together, care deeply.

When I lost a daughter a few years ago, I recall Senator HATCH sending me a white Bible and coming to visit with me. Senator BYRD sent me one of the most beautiful pieces of prose I have

ever received, and so many other Senators expressed their sympathies. That is the way it is in the Senate. I know Senator KENNEDY and his family are going through a very difficult time, and our entire country reaches out to them now to express our deepest and most profound regrets and sympathies.

COMPREHENSIVE TEST BAN TREATY

Mr. DORGAN. Madam President, I want to discuss an item of very significant importance that has brought me to the floor of the Senate several times and brings me here again today. That is the issue of the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty.

I earlier mentioned President John F. Kennedy. President John F. Kennedy was very interested in a comprehensive nuclear test ban treaty. I want to describe why that is the case and relate it to the comments made by my colleague dealing with China in which he talked about accountability and responsibility. I agree with those terms and in most cases with the use of those terms on the floor of the Senate.

It was 54 years ago last Friday that the first nuclear explosion took place on this Earth; the first nuclear bomb was detonated 54 years ago last Friday. Virtually everything changed because of it.

Following the detonation of a nuclear device it was used to end the Second World War. Eventually nuclear weapons led to a cold war with the Soviet Union in which both sides began to stockpile thousands and thousands of nuclear bombs and nuclear weapons of various types. Presidents of the United States started talking about the need to stop the proliferation of nuclear weapons, to keep them in as few hands as possible among the countries of the world. Many countries aspired to have nuclear bombs, nuclear weapons. However, it was obviously in the interests of the safety of humankind to try to keep nuclear weapons out of the hands of those who aspired to have them.

President Eisenhower, in May of 1961, spoke about a ban on testing nuclear devices. If you can't test a nuclear device, you don't know whether you have one that works. A test ban effectively means that anyone who claims to have a nuclear weapon cannot claim to have a nuclear weapon that works because they will never know.

That is the value of a ban on testing, a ban that was aspired to as long ago as President Dwight D. Eisenhower, who said the following:

Not achieving a test ban would have to be classed as the greatest disappointment of any administration, of any decade, of any time and of any party.

He left office deeply disappointed that even in those early days long before the buildup of nuclear weapons existed so aggressively across the world, he was profoundly disappointed at not getting the test ban.

President John F. Kennedy got a test ban in place in 1963 dealing with atmos-

pheric tests. The ban on atmospheric tests in 1963 was partially successful. He desired a total ban. He said:

A test ban would place the nuclear powers in a position to deal more effectively with one of the greatest hazards man faces. . . . It would increase our security, it would decrease the prospects of war. Surely this goal is sufficiently important to require our steady pursuit, yielding neither to the temptation to give up the whole effort nor the temptation to give up our insistence on vital and responsible safeguards.

Now, since that time, we have seen more nations achieve the ability to build nuclear weapons and the ability to deliver them. We have seen our country and the Soviet Union stockpile tens of thousands of nuclear weapons. It is quite remarkable, the United States and Russia, together, currently have more than 30,000 nuclear weapons. China has nuclear weapons. The number, to the extent we know, is classified. But, it is a minuscule amount as compared to 30,000. We know from recent events that India and Pakistan both have nuclear weapons. Both have exploded nuclear devices literally beneath each other's chin—and these are two countries that don't like each other. Two countries with a common border, with a great deal of animosity, both testing nuclear devices in a provocative way. Other countries aspire to achieve or to obtain nuclear weapons.

What are we doing about all of this? There is a treaty that has been negotiated over a long period of time—in fact, ultimately over decades—and signed by 152 countries. It is a comprehensive nuclear test ban treaty. That comprehensive nuclear test ban treaty is a treaty which prohibits the testing of nuclear weapons, it bans the explosive testing of nuclear weapons all across this world.

We have had some experience with treaties: arms control and arms reduction treaties, the START I treaty, Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty, SALT I, START II, the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty. A whole series of treaties have been considered and negotiated and ratified by the Senate.

This treaty, the comprehensive nuclear test ban treaty, was negotiated and signed and sent to the Senate a long while ago—665 days ago; 665 days ago a treaty that this country negotiated and signed was sent to the Senate to be ratified.

What has happened with previous treaties? The limited nuclear test ban treaty in 1963 was sent to the Senate and considered in 3 weeks; the Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty in 1972 took 3 months; the ABM Treaty took 10 weeks; the ABM Treaty protocols, 14 months; Conventional Forces in Europe, 4 months; START I, 11 months.

The comprehensive nuclear test ban treaty was sent here over 665 days ago and it has yet to have had a first day of hearings in the Committee on Foreign Relations in the Senate.

Why? Why would a treaty that is so important to this country languish for nearly 2 years without even an hour, not a day of hearings?

We are, as a world, in a much better position than we were some years ago in the middle of the cold war when the Soviet Union and the United States were headlong in an arms race, building and deploying tens of thousands of nuclear weapons. The Soviet Union is gone. The cold war is over. The arms race has largely diminished.

One thing remains constant: Many other countries around the world want to obtain nuclear weapons.

Many countries around the world want to obtain delivery systems to deliver nuclear weapons. They are testing medium-range and long-range missiles. They are trying to find ways to produce or obtain the materials necessary to build a nuclear device. This country, in the middle of all of this, must provide leadership.

It is our responsibility to provide that leadership. We are the remaining nuclear superpower. Russia has nuclear devices to be sure, but Russia is not a world power of the type the United States is at this point. We, as a country, must exert some leadership, and one step in the right direction towards diminishing the opportunities for other countries to achieve reliable nuclear weapons, is to quickly ratify this treaty, the comprehensive nuclear test ban treaty.

The decision of this country to drag our feet is almost unforgivable. It sends a signal to others around the rest of the world—to China, Russia, India, Pakistan and others—that this is not all that important; it is not a priority to the United States. It ought to be. Everybody in this Chamber ought to come to the floor to demand that this be brought before the Senate. It has languished for almost 2 years in the Foreign Relations Committee in the Senate. It ought to be brought to the floor, and we ought to have a debate on it.

In October of this year, the countries who have ratified this treaty will be meeting to discuss implementing the treaty. They will apparently be meeting without the United States as an active participant. It is wrong, in my judgment, for this country to decide that it is not going to provide the leadership necessary on this treaty. The rest of the world looks to us, waits for us, and the Senate is dragging its feet. I understand the committees in the Senate have a great deal of authority and power. I recognize that, but it seems to me there is a compelling national interest that should require this country to lead, and require this Senate to ratify the comprehensive nuclear test ban treaty.

I want to, with one additional chart, point out what was said by Secretary of State Albright:

...this is the longest-sought, hardest-fought prize in arms control. And it is a prize not yet fully won. For American leadership, for our future, the time has come to ratify the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty—this year, this session, now.

I heard my colleague from Alaska talk about Chinese espionage at the

National Labs. That is an unsettling and a very serious issue. It raises all kinds of questions about the safeguarding of nuclear secrets, about how much and what kind of secrets might have been obtained by those who were spying on behalf of another country, and did these secrets allow that country or those countries to build higher yield or smaller nuclear devices.

I do not know the answer to those questions, but the words "accountability and responsibility" were used repeatedly in discussing that issue. Accountability and responsibility—it seems to me those two words are appropriate; in fact, those two words are exactly what we ought to talk about with respect to the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty.

Accountability and responsibility—if this country is responsible, and if this country is going to be accountable for its leadership in the world, the leadership away from the proliferation of nuclear weapons, the leadership toward a safer world, one with fewer nuclear weapons rather than more nuclear weapons, then this country will take the lead now on the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. It is not the case, as some have argued, that the China espionage issue actually undercuts ratification of this treaty. In fact, that issue strengthens the need for this treaty. It strengthens the need for this treaty.

To suggest—and there was a recent article in the Wall Street Journal suggesting there is a linkage—Chinese espionage is why we ought not ratify the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty is nonsense. In fact, these allegations of espionage, in my judgment, underscore why this treaty ought to be ratified and ought to be ratified now.

To the extent that China believes it may have acquired the opportunity for better nuclear warheads, it will never know that unless it is able to test them. And as a signatory to a comprehensive nuclear test ban treaty, it cannot test without violating the treaty.

I will be participating in a press conference tomorrow with others in the Senate during which we will announce a recent public opinion poll that has been done on this issue which shows widespread public support to ratify this comprehensive nuclear test ban treaty. I hope that perhaps with some pressure and some thoughtfulness on the part of all Members of the Senate, we will be given an opportunity to debate and vote on the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty soon.

Again, I understand how this system works, but it is not a system that ought to work in the regular way for something as important as this: limiting the spread of nuclear weapons. This country ought to take the lead in preventing it, and it ought to do so now. It is just plain wrong for the Senate to drag its feet on a treaty of this importance. A treaty negotiated and signed by 152 countries, waiting to be ratified for almost 2 years, and not

even have 1 hour of hearings. That is wrong and everybody in this Chamber should know it is wrong.

I do hope my colleagues will join me in calling for the Foreign Relations Committee in the Senate to bring the comprehensive nuclear test ban treaty before the Senate.

FAMILY FARMING

Mr. DORGAN. Madam President, I have been talking about what I hope the agenda of the Senate will be in the next weeks as we turn from the Patients' Bill of Rights, which consumed all of last week and which was a fairly hard-fought debate. The Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, I hope, will be a part of that.

As I indicated on Friday, I also feel very strongly that the majority leader and others in this Senate must put at the head of the list of items for consideration a piece of legislation that will deal with the emergency needs of family farming.

The economy has collapsed in rural America, and we cannot wait. It requires this Congress to act and act soon. We have a farm bill that is largely bankrupt. It does not provide support during tough times. It pulls the rug out from under family farmers even as market prices have collapse. This Congress must do two things: first, pass an emergency bill; and, second, rewrite the farm program in a way that says to family farmers: You produce food the world needs, we care about that, and we are going to help you across price valleys when they occur.

I will speak more about that later this week. Madam President, I yield the floor.

TREASURY AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 2490) making appropriations for the Treasury Department, the United States Postal Service, the Executive Office of the President, and certain Independent Agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the text of S. 1282, as passed, is inserted and the House bill (H.R. 2490), as amended, is read the third time and passed.

Under the previous order, the Senate insists upon its amendment and the Chair appoints Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. KYL, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. DORGAN, Ms. MIKULSKI, and Mr. BYRD, conferees on the part of the Senate.

MEASURE INDEFINITELY POSTPONED

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order passage of S. 1282 is vitiated and the bill is indefinitely postponed.