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 atmospheric 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?