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 tonight. 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

and blackmail. North Korea is developing an intercontinental ballistic missile that will be capable of reaching the United States once deployed. Other hostile and unpredictable countries, such as Libya, Iran, and Iraq, have made clear their desire to acquire missiles capable of reaching the United States. The technology and knowledge to produce missiles and weapons of mass destruction is available on the open market.

It is also important to bear in mind that a national missile defense system can actually discourage countries from acquiring long-range missiles in the first place. In this sense, we should view national missile defense as a powerful non-proliferation tool, not just something to be considered some time in the future as a response to newly emerging threats.

The policy advocated in the Defend America Act of 1996 is virtually identical to that contained in the fiscal year 1996 defense authorization bill, which was passed by Congress and vetoed by the President. Like the legislation vetoed by the President, the Defend America Act of 1996 would require that the entire United States be protected against a limited, accidental, or unauthorized attack by the year 2003. It differs from the vetoed legislation in that it provides the Secretary of Defense greater flexibility in determining the precise architecture for the system.

The Defend America Act of 1996 urges the President to begin negotiations to amend the ABM Treaty to allow for deployment of an effective system. But it also recommends that, if these negotiations fail to produce acceptable amendments within 1 year, Congress and the President should consider withdrawing the United States from the ABM Treaty. Nothing in this legislation, however, requires or advocates abrogation or violation of the ABM Treaty.

Mr. President, it is important to point out that in 1991, Congress approved, and the President signed, the Missile Defense Act of 1991, which established policies similar to those advocated in the Defend America Act of 1996. Like the Defend America Act, the Missile Defense Act of 1991 called for deployment of an initial national missile defense system by a date certain and provided for a follow-on system. Both also urged the President to begin negotiations to amend the ABM Treaty.

Although there are clear differences between the Defend America Act of 1996 and the Missile Defense Act of 1991, I believe that these similarities are worth pointing out. A number of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are now saying that they oppose a policy to deploy by a date certain. But this is what we did in the 1991 Act. Several of these same Senators now also seem to be opposed to any amendments to the ABM Treaty, even though the 1991 Act clearly urged to the President to negotiate such amendments.

Mr. President, it has been asserted that a commitment to deploy a national missile defense system might jeopardize the START II Treaty. But the Missile Defense Act of 1991 was signed into law at the same time that negotiations on the START I Treaty were being concluded. Indeed, at the same time that START I was being finalized, Russian President Yeltsin proposed that the United States and Russia cooperate on a ''Global Defense System''. I find it hard to believe that anything in the Defend America Act would jeopardize START II any more than the Missile Defense Act of 1991 jeopardized START I. Those who make this assertion are simply giving Russian opponents of START II another excuse to oppose the agreement.

Mr. President, opponents of the Defend America Act have also argued that it would lock us into a technological dead end; that in 3 years we may have better technology available to do the job. The fact is that there are no technologies in development other than those identified in the Defend America Act. The Administration's so-called ''three-plus-three'' national missile defense plan relies on the exact same technologies that would be employed if the Defend America Act were passed. The only difference is that under the Defend America Act, development of those technologies would be accelerated. Once again the Administration and its congressional allies are just making excuses for not getting on with the business of defending America.

Mr. President, the last issue I want to deal with is the question of cost. We have heard some rather careless assertions made about the cost of the Defend America Act. It is true that if the Secretary of Defense decided to deploy a constellation of space-based lasers, a constellation of ''Brilliant Pebbles'' space-based interceptors, a constellation of ''Brilliant Eyes'' space-based sensors, and 300 or 400 ground-based interceptors at multiple sites the cost could be as high as $60 billion over the next 15 to 20 years. But Mr. President, under the Defend America Act, the Secretary of Defense could also select a more modest deployment that could be achieved for $5 to $10 billion. The Air Force and the Army both have developed such low-cost proposals. According to the Congressional Budget Office, a system consisting of 100 ground-based interceptors, four new ground-based radars and a constellation of Brilliant Eyes sensors would cost approximately $14 billion over the next 6 years.

These are clearly affordable costs when compared with the costs associated with other major items in the defense budget. An entire national missile defense system could be acquired for less than an additional 20 B–2 bombers. The cost would be about the same for the Corps SAM theater missile defense system, which the administration strongly supports even though we already have four core theater missile defense systems in development to protect forward deployed forces.

In my view, those who assert that we cannot afford an NMD system have simply gotten their priorities wrong. With an annual defense budget of $260 billion to $270 billion, it is irresponsible to argue that we should not spend $1 billion per year on the defense of the American homeland.

Mr. President, let me conclude by saying that the Defend America Act of 1996 is balanced and timely legislation. I understand that opponents of this legislation do not want to allow the Senate to vote on this issue. But the President will not be able to hide from it. If the President's allies in the Senate stand in the way of a vote on the Defend America Act to protect him from having to sign or veto this legislation, the American people will nonetheless know who stands for their defense and who does not.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

DEFEND AMERICA ACT INCREASES NUCLEAR THREAT

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, while the stated intent of the so-called Defend America Act is to reduce the threat of nuclear missiles to the United States, in fact, the Defend America Act, so-called, will actually increase that threat. Its passage would actually make us less secure. It should be renamed the Make America Less Secure Act, rather than the Defend America Act.

Do we want defenses? Of course. The issue is not do we want to defend. The issue is, against what threats? What threats do we create in the process of deploying defense? At what price? What resources do we deny ourselves for other threats that may be more real?

This is not simply the Republican leadership of the Congress—Senator DOLE, Speaker GINGRICH and others—versus President Clinton. In support of President Clinton's position are the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and the Defense Department.

Now, this is the letter which General Shalikashvili wrote to Senator NUNN relative to this bill. He said in this regard:

> . . . efforts which suggest changes to or withdrawal from the ABM Treaty may jeopardize Russian ratification of START II and, as articulated in the Soviet Statement to the United States of 13 June 1991, could prompt Russia to withdraw from START I. I am concerned that failure of either START initiative will result in Russian retention of hundreds or even thousands more nuclear weapons, thereby increasing both the costs and risks we may face.

He continues:

> We can reduce the possibility of facing these increased cost and risks by planning [a national missile defense] system consistent with the ABM treaty. The current National Missile Defense Deployment Readiness Program, which is consistent with the ABM treaty, will help provide stability in our strategic relationship with Russia as well as reducing future risks from rogue countries.