

said no, it was our business; it does matter. We have the resources and the capability, through NATO, together to try to do something to put a stop to it. That has been the effort. Is the effort perfect? No. Have there been mistakes? Of course. But will we, by the judgment of history, be seen as a country and a group of countries attempting to do something in the face of ethnic cleansing, in the face of a ruthless leader who packs people into train cars and hauls them off to an uncertain fate, who, in the words of all of the refugees who have shown up at the border of Albania and Montenegro and other areas, has permitted mass rape and torture and murder against the citizens of Kosovo? Do we understand the consequences of that and the requirement to respond to it? The answer is yes.

But I hope at the end of this chapter, Mr. Milosevic will not be a part of an agreement that leaves him in power. That will not, in my judgment, be finished business.

THE COMPREHENSIVE NUCLEAR TEST BAN TREATY

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I want to talk for a moment about the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty. That is a subject I suppose will glaze over the eyes of many, the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty. I was in my home State of North Dakota last week. The Senate was not in session. We did not have votes. I guess I was in 20 or 25 different communities all across the State, probably at three dozen different events, town meetings and speeches and various things. It will not surprise anyone to learn that the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty did not come up. We talked about farm policy. We talked about virtually every other thing. We talked about water policy, we talked about welfare, but at none of the meetings in which we discussed public issues did anyone raise the issue of the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty.

I want to raise the question about this treaty because the President of the United States signed this treaty 2½ years ago and sent it to the Senate for ratification. This Senate did not hold a hearing on it during the 105th Congress, no hearing at all. It is now 6 months into the new Congress, with no hearing. I, with some of my colleagues, am organizing a letter to the appropriate committee and key people on the committee to say we would like to see movement here. If one Senator opposes this country joining the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty, then bring it out here and let's have that debate. I cannot conceive of significant opposition to a determination by so many countries in the world that we ought to prevent nuclear testing; we ought to have an agreement that we do not want the spread of nuclear weapons to additional countries.

In the past year or so we have seen activities that concern me and many of

my colleagues a great deal. We know how many countries possess nuclear weapons. Among those countries that are understood to possess nuclear weapons we can now add India and Pakistan, because each of them exploded nuclear weapons under each other's noses. These are two countries that do not like each other a great deal. There are great tensions. In fact, yesterday on the news you would have seen shelling on the border between Pakistan and India. Each of these countries exploded nuclear weapons, apparently just to show the other country they possess nuclear bombs.

North Korea is testing medium-range missiles, firing missiles down range. The country of Iran is testing medium-range missiles. Are these things ominous? Of course they are. Terrorist states acquiring delivery mechanisms for long-range missiles and potentially, I assume, to send weapons of mass destruction to other parts of the world; is that an ominous development? You bet it is.

We spent a lot of time here in the Senate talking about a national missile defense; if we could just get a national missile defense put in place in this country so if someone shoots a missile at our country we can go up and hit that bullet with a bullet. I guess we have spent \$100 billion over the years trying to do that. There is not much talk about the other things that have been far more successful, and that is arms reduction and test ban treaties banning nuclear tests, reducing nuclear weapons.

With consent, I hold up here the part that was taken from the wing of a backfire bomber. This is the piece of a wing strut from a backfire bomber which had its wings sawed off at a former Soviet airbase in Priluki, Ukraine. During the cold war, when the Soviet Union was considered our adversary, the only way I could hold up a piece of the wing of one of their bombers was if we had shot the bomber down. So how does it happen I hold up a portion of a wing of a Soviet backfire bomber? That wing was cut off. Why was it cut off? This country helped provide the funds to cut the wings off bombers in the Soviet Union and now Russia and now the Ukraine.

Why did they agree to that? Because we have an arms control reduction agreement in which missiles with nuclear warheads aimed at the United States of America that used to be buried in the ground in the Ukraine are now taken out of the ground and dismantled with the warhead still on. I displayed a picture on the floor of the Senate showing where a missile used to rest in a silo in the Ukraine with the warhead aimed at the United States of America. A sunflower field now exists there. No missile, no nuclear bomb—sunflowers. How did that missile get taken out? How did this backfire Soviet bomber wing get chopped off? We have arms reduction agreements with the Soviet Union, the old Soviet Union,

and now Russia and the Ukraine, and they are working.

We have people here who say: We do not care about those agreements. We want to build a national missile defense system. It doesn't matter what it costs. It doesn't matter whether it will work. We just want to spend the money so we will feel good.

One part of what works in arms control, in my judgment, is the Nunn-Lugar funds which we have spent that accomplished this. The second part, in my judgment, is to pass pieces of legislation that we know make sense for this country's future and for the safety of the world. One of those is the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty. This country needs to pass it. This Senate needs to ratify it. That is the way, as a country, we make judgments about it.

I want to hold up a chart that shows the support for it. This was polling done in a range of States around the country: Oregon, Nebraska, Utah, Ohio, Kansas, Colorado, Tennessee—support for the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty. Look at it. Mr. President, 86 percent in favor to 10 percent in Oregon who believe we should not ratify this treaty. This country signed it; so have many other countries around the world, 152 countries.

This country has a responsibility, in my judgment, to provide leadership, and leadership will mean this Senate ought to ratify it. In order to do that, we must get this treaty out of the committee and get it to the floor and have a debate on it. I urge my colleagues who feel strongly about this to join me and say to the committee it is time, long past the time, when this Senate should ratify the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty.

I will, in coming days, speak again on the floor on this issue and the importance of it. I hope I will be joined by plenty of colleagues who will encourage and urge and push, if necessary, the committee to bring this treaty to the floor. Give us a chance to debate this treaty and give us a chance to produce the votes to ratify this treaty, for this country's sake and for the sake of added security and safety in the world. We must prevent the spread of nuclear weapons. We must prevent the spread of technology that allows the delivery of nuclear weapons. One way to do that, in my judgment, is to prevent additional nuclear testing, and the way to do it is to ratify this treaty.

It is long past the time to do it, and we ought to do it now and we ought to expect that be reported to the floor for debate in the next 2 to 3 months.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

EXTENSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the morning hour be extended for 7 minutes.