

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

would run around \$14 billion. Section 4 of the Defend America Act states:

The Secretary of Defense shall develop for deployment an affordable and operationally effective national missile defense system which shall achieve initial operational capability by the end of 2003.

The decision on what is affordable and effective is left up to the Secretary of Defense. What I would like to know is how CBO estimated a national missile defense system whose components are unknown. It seems to me that the CBO approach was somewhat like a family deciding they are going to buy a house and being told by a real estate agent that it will cost them anywhere between \$40,000 to \$4 million. That is the range.

That is true, houses come in many prices. There are two-bedroom homes and then there are the mansions and the couple's decision would come down to what they need and what they can afford. Those are the same guidelines we need to use here. What does the United States need to protect its citizens, and how can it best be done and how can we achieve this protection in an affordable manner?

Outlining these estimates are a good way to avoid a serious debate on a most serious issue. The American people deserve better, because we are talking about the safety and security of their children and their grandchildren and themselves.

You would not know, if you follow some of the press coverage of this issue, that the cold war is over.

We do not need a so-called space shield to defend against an attack of thousands of missiles. We do, however, need to defend the American people against the much more limited threat of an accidental launch or an attack by rogue and terrorist regimes, such as North Korea and Iran, who are acquiring a limited, but deadly, capability to deliver weapons of mass destruction with ballistic missiles.

As President Clinton's former Director of Central Intelligence testified, the threat of ballistic missiles is growing and the administration is not addressing this frightening reality. This is President Clinton's former Director of the CIA.

In his testimony before the House National Security Committee, James Woolsey stated:

Ballistic missiles can, in the future they increasingly will, be used by hostile states for blackmail, terror, and to drive wedges between us and our allies. It is my judgment that the administration is not currently giving this vital problem the proper weight it deserves.

Through budgetary scare tactics and skewed analysis, the administration is trying to confuse this issue and avoid answering the central question of whether or not the American people should be protected. By seeking to proceed to the Defend America Act today, I hope to move beyond rhetoric and misinformation to a serious debate on a critical matter affecting the future security of all Americans.

I believe the number one responsibility this Government has to its citizens is to provide them with protection. That is what the Defend America Act is all about.

So, again, let me repeat the question: If you had an incoming ballistic missile and you ask somebody in my State or any State, What should the President do, they would say, "Shoot it down." And your response would have to be, "We cannot. We have no defense."

I suggest those who say it is a decade away go back and look at some of the predictions made in the past. I believe we have that obligation. When we talk about the cost, \$14 billion is a lot of money, but so would be the human cost and any added cost if some rogue state or some accidental launch directed a missile toward the United States.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 1635

Mr. DOLE. I now ask unanimous consent that the Senate turn to the consideration of calendar No. 411.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. DOLE. Let me identify that as S. 1635, the "Defend America" bill.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I now move to proceed to S. 1635 and send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 411, the "Defend America" bill:

Bob Dole, Strom Thurmond, John Warner, Trent Lott, Bob Smith, Rick Santorum, Jesse Helms, Kay Bailey Hutchison, Dan Coats, Dirk Kempthorne, John McCain, Jon Kyl, Pete V. Domenici, Bill Cohen, Lauch Faircloth, Ted Stevens.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the cloture vote occur at 2:15 p.m. on Tuesday, June 4, and that the mandatory quorum under rule XXII be waived.

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

Mrs. HUTCHISON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

INTERSTATE STALKING

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I have just been informed that the Democratic side is not going to be able to clear the interstate stalking bill to-

night. I ask that they do everything possible to see if tomorrow, when we are in session, if we can do what is necessary to clear this bill. It could really make a difference if we can pass it tomorrow, even if there is an amendment and we need to have that cleared with the House, if it is a sincere amendment. I would certainly like to work with the other side to put that on and try to get it cleared by the House next week so we can pass this expeditiously.

It really might make the difference for a victim in this country who has had no remedy. It really might make life better for some child who is a victim who has no remedy. Mr. President, I think it is incumbent on us to be sincere in our efforts when we are dealing with something that is clearly bipartisan. I do not think that it should be held up unless there is a very good reason.

Most of the Senate has looked at this bill. The Judiciary Committee passed it very easily. It passed unanimously in the House, and I just hope whoever has a hold on this bill will let it go. It is a good bill, it is a simple bill, and the timing really could make the difference in someone's life in this country. It would be worth it if we could clear it tomorrow.

Thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. THURMOND addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina.

THE DEFEND AMERICA ACT OF 1996

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I am proud to be a principal cosponsor of the Defend America Act of 1996. This legislation will fill a glaring void in United States national security policy by requiring the deployment of a national missile defense system by 2003 that is capable of defending the United States against a limited, accidental, or unauthorized ballistic missile attack.

Mr. President, ironically, most Americans already believe that we have such a system in place. This assumption is understandable since, under the Constitution, the President's first responsibility is to provide for the defense of the American homeland. Unfortunately, the current President has decided that this obligation is one that can be indefinitely delayed. In my view, the time has come to end America's complete vulnerability to ballistic missile blackmail and attack.

The President and his supporters in Congress have argued that there is no threat to justify deployment of a national missile defense system. This is simply not true. The political and military situation in the former Soviet Union has deteriorated, leading to greater uncertainty over the control and security of Russian strategic nuclear forces. China's recent use of ballistic missiles near Taiwan, and veiled threats against the United States, clearly demonstrates how such missiles can be used as tools of intimidation