

Arizona be permitted to speak for 5 minutes as in morning business, and the Senator from Nebraska for 5 minutes immediately thereafter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator from Arizona is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GRAMM. Could we have order, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will come to order so the Senator from Arizona can be heard.

The Senator from Arizona.

UNITED STATES MILITARY ACTION AGAINST IRAQ

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, this morning we learned that Iraq fired a surface-to-air missile at American F-16's patrolling the no-fly zone over what has now become an imaginary Kurdish safe haven in northern Iraq. This latest challenge to the safety of American pilots and to the credibility of American security guarantees in the Persian Gulf region comes on the heels of Saddam Hussein's rejection of United States warnings not to repair his air defense systems damaged by our cruise missile strikes in southern Iraq.

The necessity of further United States military action against Iraq is now obvious. And by his actions, Saddam Hussein has made the strongest argument for a disproportionate U.S. response of considerably greater military significance than our military action last week.

Furthermore, Saddam's aggressive challenges to the United States, and his success in reasserting his control in northern Iraq as his troops and the troops of his new Kurdish allies, the KDP, completed their conquest of the region on Monday, reveal the critical importance of curbing the Clinton administration's tendencies to rhetorical inconsistency in defining its objectives, disingenuous explanations of its policy choices, and exaggerated claims of success.

Our strikes last week were in response to Iraq's conquest, in alliance with the KDP, of the Kurdish city of Irbil. But by striking targets in the south, the administration chose not a disproportionate response to Iraqi aggression, but a minimal response that was disconnected from the offense it was ostensibly intended to punish. As one administration official put it: " * * * We know that we did the right thing in terms of stopping Saddam Hussein in whatever thoughts he might have about moving south and in letting him know that when he abuses his people or threatens the region, that we will be there. * * * we really whacked him."

Evident in that statement are the three harmful administration tendencies cited above. Our stated purpose to stop Saddam's abuse of his people was quickly overridden by, in the words of another administration official, the judgment that "we should not be involved in the civil war in the

north." And while administration officials at first suggested that our strikes in southern Iraq would affect Iraq's action in the north, they now emphasize that the strikes were intended only to serve our strategic interest in restricting Saddam's ability to threaten his neighbors from the south.

It is clear now that the erosion of coalition unity, evident in Turkey and Saudi Arabia's refusal to allow United States warplanes to undertake offensive operations from bases in those countries, had a far more important influence on our choice of targets and the level of force used than administration officials have admitted.

Most importantly, the President's claims that our strikes were successful in achieving their objectives are belied by the events of this week. By what measurement can we assert that Saddam has been persuaded to treat his people humanely; that he has been compelled to abide by U.N. resolutions and the terms of the cease-fire agreement; that the containment of Iraq has been further advanced; and that the United States and our allies are strategically better off since we fired 44 cruise missiles at Iraqi air defense systems in the south?

Since those strikes, Saddam's Kurdish allies have achieved a complete victory in the north, and Saddam has regained control of an area from which he has been excluded for several years. Kurdish refugees are again flooding across the border. Saddam, in utter contempt for U.S. warnings, has begun repairing the radar sites we struck last week. He, at least temporarily, split the Desert Storm coalition. And in violation of the cease-fire agreement and U.N. Security Council resolutions, he has fired missiles at U.S. planes patrolling an internationally established no-fly zone. As successes go, this one leaves much to be desired.

Clearly, Iraq's attempted downing of American planes requires a military response from us. I have little doubt that the President will order a response. Given that Iraq's action represents a challenge not just to the United States, but to the international coalition responsible for enforcing the no-fly zone, I would expect that we will have greater cooperation from our allies than we experienced last week. Thus our ability to take the disproportionate, truly punishing action which is clearly called for under the circumstances should not be limited by the consequences of our failure to maintain coalition unity.

Decisions about the dimensions of our response are, of course, the President's to make. I pray that he will choose wisely.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska is recognized for 5 minutes.

THE COMPREHENSIVE TEST BAN TREATY

Mr. EXON. Although there are many important things the U.S. Senate is in

the process of doing right now, I want to pause for just a moment, if I might, to bring to my colleagues attention that yesterday, history was made at the U.N. General Assembly. After nearly 3 years of intense negotiations at the 61. Nation Conference on Disarmament, the world community reached an agreement on a treaty to ban nuclear weapons testing. This Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, strongly supported by all five declared nuclear states, was overwhelmingly adopted by the U.N. General Assembly on a vote of 158 to 3 with 5 abstentions, clearing the way for world's nations—actual and potential nuclear states alike—to sign the agreement later this month.

After over 40 years of nuclear weapons testing and more than 2,000 detonations, this valuable tool in stemming nuclear weapons proliferation is finally within reach. In order for the treaty to enter into force, each of the world's 44 nations identified as possessing nuclear weapons or the research capability necessary to develop them must sign the comprehensive test ban agreement. As my colleagues are aware, India has led a high-profile campaign to prevent this from happening and frustrate the will of the world community to close the nuclear weapons Pandora's box. This temporary setback should not diminish, however, the significance of yesterday's truly historic vote. I am confident that India will see the wisdom of halting the spread of nuclear weapons and sign the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty before too long. In the meantime, mankind can celebrate the fact that for the first time in history, the world's superpowers have agreed to end the testing of nuclear weapons forever.

Many of our allies played critical roles over the past 3 years in making passage of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty a reality. But I wish to take this opportunity to praise President Bill Clinton for his leadership on the issue of the Test Ban Treaty and nuclear weapons proliferation. The United States has been a world leader in halting the spread of nuclear weapons technology during the tenure of the Clinton administration. The earlier extension of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty and now the completion of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty are important milestones in the history of arms control, and the President deserves a great deal of credit in making it happen.

In addition to lauding President Clinton's dedication to this important aspect of our national security, I wish to praise the efforts of Secretary of State Warren Christopher, Arms Control and Disarmament Agency head John Holum, and U.S. negotiator to the conference on disarmament Stephen Ledogar.

I wish also to single out the tireless dedication of Senator MARK HATFIELD to the cause of a verifiable Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. As my colleagues know, Senator HATFIELD will be leaving the U.S. Senate at the conclusion

of this session, ending 30 years of distinguished service to his country. I can think of no more fitting way to highlight the last few months of his career than yesterday's treaty approval. Four years ago, I joined him and former majority leader George Mitchell in authoring a law phasing out American nuclear weapons testing and jump-starting international negotiations designed to achieve a permanent test ban. It is, therefore, with a great deal of pride that I herald the action of the General Assembly and look forward to the treaty signing ceremony later this month. I remind the Senate, with Senator Mitchell gone and Senator HATFIELD and myself leaving come January, the continued leadership in this area falls to Senator LEVIN and others to take up the challenge.

Mr. President, I thank the Senate and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired. Who seeks recognition?

Mr. THOMAS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming is recognized.

Mr. THOMAS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KERREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

TREASURY, POSTAL SERVICE, AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1997

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill

Mr. KERREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendment be laid aside just for the consideration of an amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Virginia, Senator WARNER.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 5240

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished managers of the bill, and I thank my two colleagues who, for various reasons, at this point in time have an interest in the floor procedure and have permitted me, as a matter of Senatorial courtesy, to proceed with the following amendment which I send to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. WARNER] proposes an amendment numbered 5240. On page 53, beginning on line 23, strike "and in compliance with the reprogramming guidelines of the appropriate Committee of the House and Senate."

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, first of all, I would like to commend the Ap-

propriations Committee, subcommittee Chairman SHELBY and Senator KERREY for their efforts in including funding for security requirements in both the new construction and repair and alterations categories for the Federal buildings program of the General Services Administration in the fiscal year 1997 Treasury, postal appropriations bill.

The current security environment is uncertain and variable. Unforeseen circumstances, and events can radically change the requirements for security expenditures in real time and at a moment's notice as witnessed by recent tragic events in our Nation.

Current language in the Senate appropriations bill requires compliance with formal reprogramming processes in order to use funds for security purposes. While this requirement is an appropriate check on security expenditures, and I commend my colleagues for their swift action in this area in the past, I remain concerned that during a congressional recess, a delay in the implementation of reprogramming measures for security could impede actions necessary for the immediate protection of our Federal work force.

My amendment would allow GSA to use any funds previously appropriated for repairs and alterations and building operations and rental space to meet minimum standards for security upon notification of the Appropriations Committee of the House and Senate that such a determination had been made.

I would also request that should my amendment be agreed to, clarifying report language be added stating the following:

The Committee has included requested funding for security as a line item in both New Construction and Repairs and Alterations in addition to amounts requested in Basic Repairs. A provision authorizing the use of other repair funds has also been included to ensure that the GSA can respond quickly to safety and security requirements as they are identified. Safety and security concerns are to be addressed as a top priority in using capital funds provided in the bill.

As the chairman of the Subcommittee on Transportation and Infrastructure, with oversight responsibility over the General Services Administration, I have been pleased with GSA's actions to date in meeting an enhanced level of security at GSA controlled buildings and facilities. I would like to commend the Appropriations Committee for actions taken following the Oklahoma City bombing in the fiscal year 1995 legislation, continuing reprogramming efforts approved by both the authorizers and appropriators in fiscal year 1996, and now in the Treasury, postal appropriations bill that we have before us for fiscal year 1997.

I think that all of my colleagues would agree that in light of the new threatening environment we are under, resulting from incidents of domestic terrorism like the Oklahoma City bombing, providing a safe and secure environment for our Federal work forces and visitors to our Federal

buildings should be the highest priority.

That is the intention of this amendment. I am pleased to learn from the distinguished manager, the Senator from Nebraska, it appears it is acceptable. And Senator SHELBY has, likewise, indicated that.

Mr. KERREY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. KERREY. Mr. President, both Senator SHELBY and I have looked at this amendment. We agree it is a good amendment. We appreciate the Senator from Virginia bringing it to our attention, and we are willing to accept it.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I urge its adoption.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The amendment (No. 5240) was agreed to.

Mr. WARNER. Thank you, Mr. President.

I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. KERREY. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending committee amendment, and the Kassebaum amendment thereto, be laid aside in status quo. In explanation of that unanimous consent request, Senator KASSEBAUM is, I believe, in a meeting having to do with the FDA reform. There has been a lot of discussion back and forth about how to handle these two amendments. The Senator from Oregon is here and is continuing to pursue his desire in this effort. He has been willing to have these set aside for now so we can take up other issues, and amendments can perhaps be agreed to, and perhaps other amendments can be debated and voted on, if necessary. We will continue to work to see how we can resolve that. I make that unanimous consent request.

Mr. WYDEN. Reserving the right to object, and I do not intend to object, I just want it understood that I have spent the last couple of hours trying to work, in a bipartisan way, to address this, to address the budgetary concerns. I want the majority leader, Senator LOTT, to understand that I have no interest in prolonging this. I do want to protect the rights of these vulnerable patients and get that done today. But I have no desire to prolong this.

Mr. President, we are going to continue, as the majority leader requested,