

other international forums. Often, we acted in close cooperation with France, in particular since President Mitterrand's highly welcome decision to declare a nuclear test moratorium in 1992. These efforts were combined on 11 May with the decision by the international community to extend the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty [NPT] for an unlimited period—an important element for the safety of our two countries.

Neither Australia nor any other country has the right to define France's security; however, given the circumstances, the French will certainly permit me to explain why, in our view, France's action is not good for France or for the world.

We believe that these tests endanger our efforts to preserve the effectiveness of the NPT and to achieve universal membership. For the unlimited extension of this treaty it was decisive that a "declaration of principles and goals on nonproliferation and disarmament" was simultaneously negotiated and adopted by all states involved, including the nuclear states.

This declaration announced the speedy conclusion by 1996 at the latest—of a comprehensive nuclear test ban treaty. And until such a treaty comes into effect the nuclear states have committed themselves to "extreme restraint."

However, "extreme restraint" regarding nuclear tests hardly applies to a program of eight tests. France's decision will certainly make many non-nuclear states wonder about the honesty of all nuclear states.

This will harm the treaty's credibility, which must be preserved if some states, which have not yet signed it, are to be persuaded to do so.

The decision will also increase the problems in the negotiations on a comprehensive nuclear test ban treaty. Despite President Chirac's gratifying statement that France will sign such a treaty, there is the serious danger that the very difficult treaty negotiations that we are facing in Geneva will become even more difficult.

In particular France's position as a responsible and leading power in the world means that any new French test will play into the hands of potential arms dealers and that any test will make many of those countries hesitate whose support we need to conclude a comprehensive treaty.

We know the arguments for France's nuclear capacity and the strategic dimensions of a nuclear power very well. We argue not merely on the basis of emotions when we say that the biggest responsibility for us all is the one to keep alive the hope for a nuclear-free world, which was born when the Cold War ended. The burden of this responsibility rests most heavily on the nuclear states, particularly after the unlimited extension of the NPT.

And in view of the nuclear experiences in Europe, the biggest challenge for leadership certainly is right in front of Europe's own door. The damaged Chernobyl reactor may have been encased in a sarcophagus, but there are still another 20 reactors with similar design flaws on the territory of the former Soviet Union. Dozens of nuclear powered submarines of the former Soviet fleet are now idle. Nuclear material and nuclear expert knowledge are leaking from the former Soviet Union into illegal markets.

These dangers, as well as the stocks of dismantled nuclear weapons and contaminated areas, are not precisely banished by the development of further nuclear weapons capacities. But France's top international skills in nuclear science and technology could help. How much more respect would France gain and how much more useful would it be if the country were not to concentrate its skills and energy on countering a purely hypothetical threat but on meeting a real threat!

I do not doubt that the Australians want to make it known in France that their attitude is in no way determined by hostility toward the French people or the French nation. Our opposition specifically refers to the French Government's decision to resume the nuclear tests in the Pacific.

In the past Australia's attitude was sometimes understood as an expression of some kind of Anglo-Saxon hostility toward France. However, Australia is certainly not an Anglo-Saxon enclave in the Asia-Pacific region. As the many French who live in Australia can confirm, Australia is a rich multicultural society, in which half of the immigrants come from Asian countries. It is clear that many of these French inhabitants of Australia think that the French Government should rescind its decision.

If they live on Australia's east coast, they know that there is an enormous difference between studying a map of the Pacific in Europe and actually living on the shores of the ocean in Sydney or Brisbane or Auckland. The map shows these places to be far away from Mururoa. However, if one lives in these places, one knows that the South Pacific—no matter how gigantic it is constitutes a single environment and links everyone who participates in it.

The community spirit that the Pacific Ocean gives us is similar to the one given to France by the idea of "Europe." It is the fundamental reason for our opposition to France's decision to resume the tests and for the fact that Australia and its partners in the South Pacific Forum will not stop emphatically presenting our views to the French Government and conveying to the French people, if we can, the depth of our feelings.

Mr. President, it is my understanding that Senator AKAKA intends to introduce an amendment to the Department of Defense authorization bill this week expressing the sense of the Senate that France must abide by the current international moratorium on nuclear test explosions, and refrain from proceeding with its announced intention of conducting a series of nuclear tests in advance of a comprehensive test ban treaty. I support that amendment, and hope that the French will reconsider their position on conducting these tests and that the CTBT will be signed by the end of next year.

DEFECTIONS FROM IRAQ

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, as many of my colleagues may have heard, there have been dramatic developments in the Middle East today.

Two major Iraqi government figures—both members of Saddam Hussein's circle of power—have defected from Iraq and are now in Jordan.

One of the defectors, Lt. Gen. Hussein Kamel Hassan, was in charge of military industrialization in Iraq. The other, Lt. Col. Saddam Kamel Hassan, was in charge of Saddam Hussein's guards. Both—this is really the curious thing—coincidentally, are married to daughters of Saddam Hussein and are thus his sons-in-law.

The development is significant for a number of reasons. Just last week, Ambassador Madeleine Albright testified to the Foreign Relations Committee that Saddam's base of support has been

shrinking. Today's events illustrate that point in an extraordinary way. On a more fundamental level, the defections demonstrate the soundness of United States containment policy toward Iraq, which is designed in part to encourage internal change. It is still too early to assess how the defections will affect Saddam's grip on power; it is clear, however, that there is considerable turmoil in Baghdad's inner sanctum.

As a final note, Mr. President, I would like to add a word of appreciation for Jordan's King Hussein. It is no small gesture for King Hussein to welcome the defectors and provide them safe haven. As unpredictable as Saddam Hussein can be, the King's actions could well provoke an Iraqi response.

President Clinton has said that the United States stands ready to support the King, who by today's actions has shown true courage in defiance of Saddam. I support the President's statement and join him in expressing gratitude to King Hussein.

THE BAD DEBT BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, the skyrocketing Federal debt, which long ago soared into the stratosphere, fueled by bureaucratic hot air, is sort of like the weather—everybody talks about it but almost nobody did much about it until immediately after the elections last November.

But when the new 104th Congress convened in January, the U.S. House of Representatives quickly approved a balanced budget amendment to the U.S. Constitution. On the Senate side, all but one of the 54 Republicans supported the balanced budget amendment—that was the good news. The bad news is that only 13 Democrats supported it. Since a two-thirds-vote—67 Senators—is necessary to approve a constitutional amendment, the proposed Senate amendment failed by one vote. There will be another vote either this year or next.

Here is today's bad debt boxscore:

As of the close of business Wednesday, August 9, the Federal debt—down to the penny—stood at exactly \$4,942,218,005,858.98 or \$18,760.74 for every man, woman, and child on a per capita basis.

THE MYSTERIOUS V-CHIP

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, there's been a lot of hype recently about the so-called V-chip.

President Clinton has endorsed the chip, touting it as an antidote to the gratuitous violence and sexual innuendo that now permeate prime-time television. A majority of the Senate has voted to require that every new television set contain the V-chip. And the House of Representatives has joined the V-chip bandwagon, by including a V-chip mandate in the recently passed telecommunications bill.