

floor, and he certainly has been persistent, and today at least he has taken the floor criticizing the President for what he has not done.

The minority leader just finished reading the statement in the Chamber that describes accurately the circumstances of the filing on behalf of the President, and it categorically rejects the assertions just made by the Senator from Iowa. But it is an even-numbered year. We all know what that means. And being President certainly means you are subject to criticism. I understand that, as do others who serve in public office. I believe the American people understand all of us have things about us that are positive, things that are not so positive perhaps. None of us are perfect.

This President, like President Bush and President Reagan, President Carter and others before them, I suspect, resides in the White House trying to figure out how to do the best job he can to move this country forward and serve the best interests of this country.

It is easy to be critical. I hope all of us would understand that the job of the President of the United States is a tough job. It is tough for Republicans and tough for Democrats. This is a country with a lot of good and a lot of opportunity, and I hope all of us can work together to help this President and future Presidents realize that opportunity.

NATIONAL MISSILE DEFENSE

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I take the floor to say that it appears to me we may be talking about National Missile Defense or the Defend America Act very soon. Perhaps it will even be laid down before we finish tonight so there is a cloture vote when we come back. I am not sure.

I want to observe—and I have done this for years that I have been in Congress—that we just finished a budget in which there was a lot of talk about reducing the Federal deficit, the need to reduce Federal spending, and the Defend America Act, or the National Missile Defense Program, is a program, according to the Congressional Budget Office, that just to build—not to operate, just to build—will cost between \$30 billion and \$60 billion. Now, the operational costs will be much, much greater than that.

It seems to me the funding question ought to be posed and ought to be answered by those who bring a spending program to the floor of the Senate that says let us spend up to an additional \$60 billion more on a program that I do not think this country needs because the National Missile Defense Program, or the Defend America Act, will not truly be an astrodome over our country that will defend us against incoming missiles. It presumes that we should build a defense against ICBM's in the event a rogue nation would launch an ICBM with a nuclear tip against our country, or in the event there is an ac-

cidental nuclear launch against our country.

Of course, a nuclear device might very likely come from a less sophisticated missile like a cruise missile. We have thousands and thousands and thousands of cruise missiles proliferating this world. They are much easier to get access to. A nuclear-tipped cruise missile is a much more likely threat to this country than the ICBM, or perhaps a suitcase and 20 pounds of plutonium and the opportunity to turn it into a nuclear device, or perhaps a glass vile no larger than this with the most deadly biological agents to mankind.

Of course, we will spend \$60 billion on a star wars program, at the end of which it will be obsolete and will not protect this country against that which we advertise we need protection.

We had an ABM system built in North Dakota. Billions and billions of dollars in today's money went into that in northeastern North Dakota. It was declared mothballed the same month it was declared operational. In other words, the same month they declared operational a system which they said we desperately needed they decided would no longer be needed, and it sits up there as a concrete monument to bad planning. It was an expenditure of the taxpayers' money that, in my judgment, need not have been made.

Now we are told that we have the need for a national defense program, or Defend America Act, of some type that will defend us only against a very narrow, limited threat, not a full-scale nuclear attack from an adversary, because it will not defend us against that, will not defend us against a nuclear attack of cruise missiles. It cannot do that. It will not defend us against a nuclear attack by a terrorist nation putting a nuclear bomb in a suitcase in the trunk of a Yugo car, a rusty old Yugo at a dock in New York City. But we are told \$60 billion to build and how many tens of billions of dollars to operate is what is necessary.

I say to those who will bring that to the floor, while you do that, please bring us a plan telling us who is going to pay the tax to build it. Where are you going to get the money? Who is going to pay the tax? And then describe why that is necessary and the fact when you get done you have not created the defense for America you say you are going to create.

There are many needs that we have in this country in defense. Many remain unmet. This kind of proposal ranks well down, in my judgment, in the order of priorities. If it is technologically feasible to be built to protect this country, it ranks well down in the order of priorities. My hope is that we will have a full, aggressive, interesting debate on this because it is not a debate about pennies. It is a debate about a major, sizable spending program, new spending program at a time when we are trying to downsize and at a time when we are talking about the need to control Federal spending.

Those who bring this to the floor of the Senate have an obligation to tell us how it is going to be paid for. The announcement of this so-called Defend America Act was made at a press conference recently, and the question was asked: Where do you get the money for this? And the answer at the press conference by Members of the Senate was: Well, we will leave that to the experts.

No, it will not be left to the experts. This Congress will have to decide who pays for a new Federal spending program that will cost \$60 billion plus and after being built will not in fact defend this country against a nuclear attack.

There are many needs that we have in our defense system in this country. Some worry that we are in a circumstance where we will decide to downsize in defense too much: We will be unprepared to meet an adversary; we will be unprepared to meet a threat.

I understand that. I understand this country has gone through this in previous periods, and I do not want us to be in that position. But I also understand that in every area of the armed services there are weapons programs that simply seem to have a life of their own and they tend to build and build, and they become not so much a justifiable program that is necessary to defend our country, but they become a program that is supported by a range of politicians and corporations and other interests that give it a life of its own, even when it becomes unnecessary or when the science and the technology demonstrate it is not needed.

I hope we will have an aggressive discussion about this, about the threat and about the amount of proposed expenditure, and about who is going to come up with the money, and especially about whether, in fact, this is needed for this country's defense.

Mr. President, I thank you for your indulgence. I yield the floor, and I make a point of order that a quorum is not present.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

THE INTERSTATE STALKING ACT

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I want to talk about a bill that I hope we can clear tonight in the Senate because it is a very important bill that will begin to protect the victims of stalking all over this country. You know, we did not really know much about stalking until the last few years. That is because it was a hard crime to pin down. Stalking is threats. It is harassment. It is the constant terrorizing of a victim, whether the act that is said would be done is actually perpetrated or if, sometimes, it is not. But whether it is or is not, it is a very tough thing for a

victim to continue to be in fear, to wonder, "Am I going to have someone stick a knife in my back? Am I going to be able to walk in my neighborhood without fear? Am I going to be able to go to sleep at night without fear?"

Then, in fact, we have found that the victims of this stalking actually become victims sometimes. When Congressman ED ROYCE and I started working on this we had a press conference in which we had some incredible stories of stalking victims. A woman from California who was constantly threatened, who moved to Florida to escape this stalking from this person that she really did not know and who was clearly demented—she moved to Florida and one night did become a victim. The person broke into her home and threatened her with a knife. She did get away without injury.

But then there was the stalking victim whose husband was outside with his wife and she was shot to death, he was shot, and this was from a person who had constantly threatened his wife. So they could have prevented it if there had been some way to do it, but, in fact, there was no way to do it because stalking was not a crime until recently.

Now we have the situation in which you have the stalking in one State, the person moves to another State, and they do not have the coverage in the other State because the actual harassment was in the first State and when it happened in the second State you had to establish it. The Interstate Stalking Act will make it a Federal crime to cross State lines to do the State crime of stalking. It does not make stalking a Federal crime, but it does make crossing State lines to do it, when it is a crime, a crime. That would give protection to the woman who moved from California to Florida. It will give protection to more of the people who have had the terrorizing experience of being constantly barraged by threats from another person. Many people in public life have had this experience. It is a scary thing to happen. To live in fear most of the time, or some of the time, is something we do not have to put up with in our society.

This is a bill that passed unanimously in the House a couple of weeks ago. It was passed out of the Judiciary Committee today on a very bipartisan basis. I thank Senator HATCH and Senator BIDEN for expeditiously having hearings on this bill and putting it through the committee. Now I am very concerned because I thought this would be a bill that would not cause any problem and I would, of course, like to see it go through tonight because I think the President will sign this bill. I think the President is going to see the need for this bill. I think if he can sign it before we come back from the Memorial Day recess, that that might save a life. It might save a victim from being harassed. It really might help a victim. If it helps one victim in this country, then why not do it?

If we pass it tonight, it will go straight to the President because the bill is in the form that it passed the House. This should not be a tough bill.

I am asking my colleagues on the Democratic side to clear this bill. We thought that it was cleared. Perhaps it was not. Perhaps they can make a phone call, if someone has a concern on their side. I think we ought to be able to do what is right. This is a bill that ought to pass. It is a bill that has merit. It is a bill that is not controversial or it would have been stopped before now.

So I hope my colleagues on the other side of the aisle will see fit to find out if there is a real problem with this bill. Or if it is a problem with something else, perhaps they will clear this bill, because it might save one life. It might save one person from being victimized and it would be worth it if we could do that.

This is a bill that passed along with Megan's law on the House of Representative's side. Megan's law has already been signed by the President. This will allow victims of any kind of domestic violence harassment or if it is not a domestic partner or a spouse but a stranger who is doing the harassment, it will also provide protection if a person crosses State lines to do that.

Mr. President, I hope it is not too late tonight. I would like to see this bill cleared because it is important. It is the right thing. It is bipartisan and I think there may be something on the other side that could easily be worked out.

I just ask my colleagues on the Democratic side of the aisle to expedite this. We might save a life and it would be worth it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

DEFEND AMERICA ACT

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, yesterday President Clinton acknowledged—belatedly—that the post-cold-war era presents us with new national security challenges. He stated, "The end of communism has opened the door to the spread of weapons of mass destruction * * *." Unfortunately, while the President is finally willing to recognize the threat posed by the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, he remains unwilling to seriously respond to it—with progress, as opposed to pronouncements—on national missile defense.

Most Americans do not know—let me underscore—most Americans do not know that the United States has no defense against ballistic missiles. If you were to ask the average American, in fact to ask anybody in this Chamber unless they are on the Armed Services Committee, they might not know. If you were asked a question, "If a missile, an incoming missile was headed toward Chicago, what should the President of the United States do?" and the people will tell you in these little focus

groups, "Shoot it down"—we can't. We don't have a defense. So, if a rogue state such as North Korea launched a single missile at the United States, we could do nothing to stop its deadly flight towards an American town or city.

In his speech yesterday President Clinton pointed to his \$3 billion budget request for missile defense programs as evidence of a "strong, sensible national missile defense program." This happens to be 21 percent less than the President's own national security advisers proposed in their Bottom-Up review of U.S. defense needs. It is also 30 percent less than what the Senate Armed Services Committee provides in this year's defense authorization bill. In short, it is not enough for a determined and effective effort to defend the American people from the threat of ballistic missiles.

President Clinton attacked the Defend America Act, which I introduced 2 months ago, claiming:

They have a plan that Congress will take up this week that would force us to choose now a costly missile defense system that could be obsolete tomorrow.

This is simply not true. The Defend America Act only forces to commit now to deploy a national missile defense system by the year 2003. The choice of what type of system is left up to the Secretary of Defense who will report back to the Congress on the requirements for an effective ballistic missile defense system. And making a decision to go forward with missile defense now will not, as the President argued yesterday, lead to America deploying an obsolete system.

The programs we currently have in development can serve as the building blocks for a system that meets the missile threat as it emerges. Furthermore, as with the procurement of any weapons system, moving from development to deployment requires lead time. You cannot do it in a week or a year or 18 months. It does not happen overnight. The President's assertions contradict those of his own Secretary of Defense, who recently stated that these technologies "would be quite capable of defending against the much smaller and relatively unsophisticated ICBM threat that a rogue or a terrorist could mount any time in the foreseeable future."

That is the Secretary of Defense.

I would like to address the issue of cost. There has been quite an uproar about a Congressional Budget Office estimate of the cost of deploying a national missile defense system pursuant to the Defend America Act. The CBO stated that total acquisition costs for the year 2010 would range from \$31 billion to \$60 billion, if such a system largely consists of advanced space-based components. However, the Defend America Act does not specify any required components of a national missile defense system to include space-based components. On the other hand, the CBO says that a ground-based system with upgraded space-based sensors