

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