

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN. Madam President, I certainly share the sentiment offered by the Senator from Arizona about the excitement of the Internet, the fascinating, remarkable growth of the telecommunications industry and all that it means for the future of our country and the world. Things are moving so quickly, and changing so rapidly, it is just breathtaking and very hard to keep up with. From a public policy standpoint, regarding the kind of legislation that will be brought to the floor of the Senate at some point—for example, such as the Internet Tax Freedom Act—it is very important that we understand exactly what we are doing and what the consequences of what we are doing might be now and in the future.

I would say the increased commerce over the Internet, that is increasing at a very dramatic pace, illustrates that there is nothing at the moment, nothing anywhere that I am aware of at the moment, that impedes the transaction of commerce on the Internet.

The very growth of that commerce suggests there are no impediments. One way to do commerce in this country is to set up a web page and advertise and sell books, automobiles, travel services, or whatever it is you want to advertise over the Internet. That is one way to do business.

Another way to do business is to rent a storefront someplace to get some inventory moved in, hire some people, open the door and put "Open for Business" and invite customers to come in and look at your merchandise and sell merchandise that way.

Still another way is to have your merchandise in a warehouse somewhere and send a catalog through the mail and do business through mail-order catalogs.

If the Congress decides to change the state and local Tax Codes related to all of those different ways of doing business, it is very important that we not create a circumstance where one way of doing business has preference over another way. I certainly hope that whatever we do to those involved in Internet transactions, we will say, "To whatever extent you are advantaged by this new legislation, the Main Street businesses will be similarly advantaged."

The Internet Tax Freedom Act is very controversial in my judgment. The concerns Governors and many others have about what impact it might or might not have on the State and local revenue bases are serious. The Internet Tax Freedom Act is a very significant piece of legislation and it is very controversial.

Another issue that the Senator from Arizona mentioned is the slamming issue. For those who are not familiar with slamming, it refers to the unauthorized practice of a company changing a consumer's telephone exchange

service or telephone toll service. In other words, a company says if you are using one long distance service, we are going to change that and your new long distance carrier is XYZ, and all of a sudden you begin getting bills from XYZ when, in fact, you never authorized changing your long-distance carrier. That is called slamming, and it is a growing, continual problem in this country.

The FCC had about 20,000 complaints of slamming in the last year. We understand the "king of slammers" identified by Chairman Kennard of the FCC is a man named Daniel Fletcher. GAO investigators allege that Fletcher switched at least a half million customers' long-distance service without their knowledge or consent.

I noticed a story in the paper this past weekend in North Dakota that one of the victims of slamming was the attorney general of North Dakota, Heidi Heitkamp. "Heitkamp Victim of Phone Billing Scam" reads one headline.

This company that was slamming would have been well-advised to stay away from the attorney general of that State.

I am confident that the North Dakota attorney general is on the case. She is aggressive and tough and will get to the bottom of who is involved in this slamming.

To all the slammers out there I will say, "Senator McCain, I and others will bring a piece of legislation to the floor that will attempt to shut the door on slamming. But, slammers might want to stay away from attorneys general and law enforcement officers, because it is against the law. We hope, prior to the legislation being passed, we can count on State authorities and the FCC to take appropriate action to levy fines and other penalties against those who are involved in this kind of activity.

There are a number of other issues we will discuss when we talk about slamming. I expect the U.S. Senate will pass this legislation by a wide, wide majority. It is a good piece of legislation. I compliment Senator McCain for bringing it to the floor. Only because the majority leader and minority leader have not talked and reached agreement on the question of procedure we are not able to proceed at this point. But I expect in the coming hours, when Senator LOTT and Senator DASCHLE will find a mechanism by which we are able to consider this legislation.

I just received a note from someone else, from another Senator in the Chamber that says, "I've been slammed twice." I don't know if that Senator wishes to be identified. In any event, it is not something that only relates to attorneys general. I have not been slammed once, and I am not looking forward to the first slam. Hopefully, before that happens, this kind of legislation can pass. Those who have been victims will be victims no more, and those who have been involved in slamming will begin to pay a significant price for criminal behavior.

Madam President, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT REQUEST—
S. 1150

Mr. LUGAR. Madam President, on behalf of the majority leader, after consultation with the minority leader, I ask unanimous consent that the Chair lay before the Senate the conference report accompanying S. 1150, the agriculture research bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. GRAMM. Madam President, reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. GRAMM. Madam President, as the distinguished chairman of the Agriculture Committee knows, we agreed previously not to have a recorded vote today. It is my intention, when the conference report is before the Senate, to have at least one motion to recommend with instructions. So rather than have that debate today when no one is here to listen to it, when we know it will have to be debated on another day if we are going to have a recorded vote, I suggest that we simply begin the debate on this issue today and that we bring it up tomorrow, or some date in the future when we can have a recorded vote following a debate on the motion.

I ask that we simply begin the debate today and that we agree on some future date to readdress this question. On that basis, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard. The Senator from Indiana.

AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH, EXTENSION, AND EDUCATION REFORM ACT OF 1998—CONFERENCE REPORT

MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. LUGAR. Madam President, I now move to proceed to the conference report accompanying S. 1150.

Mr. GRAMM. Madam President, I ask that the bill be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to read the conference report.

Mr. GRAMM. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is not in order to suggest the absence of a quorum. The clerk will continue to read.

The assistant legislative clerk continued with the reading of the conference report.

Mr. LUGAR. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the conference report be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. GRAMM. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is not in order to suggest the absence of a quorum. Is there objection?

Mr. GRAMM. Madam President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard. The clerk will continue reading.

The assistant legislative clerk continued with the reading of the conference report.

Mr. HARKIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the conference report be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. GRAMM. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard. The clerk will continue reading.

The legislative clerk continued with the reading of the conference report.

Mr. GRAMM. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the conference report be dispensed with.

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

(The text of the conference reports is printed on pages H2171-H2205 of the April 22, 1998 edition of the RECORD.)

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. LUGAR. Madam President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Texas, and I ask unanimous consent now on behalf of the majority leader, after consultation with the minority, that at 11 a.m. on Tuesday, tomorrow, the Senate proceed to the consideration of the conference report to accompany S. 1150, the agricultural research bill. I further ask unanimous consent that the time until 12:10 p.m. be divided as follows: Senator LUGAR, 30 minutes; Senator GRAMM of Texas, 10 minutes; Senator ROBERTS, 10 minutes; Senator HARKIN, 10 minutes; Senator COCHRAN, 5 minutes. I further ask unanimous consent that, at 2:15 p.m. on Tuesday, Senator GRAMM be recognized in order to move to recommit the conference report. I further ask unanimous consent that no amendments be in order to the motion and debate on the motion be limited to 1 hour equally divided in the usual form. I ask unanimous consent that following the debate, the Senate proceed to a vote on or in relation to the motion.

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

Mr. LUGAR. I thank the Chair.

Madam President, I would point out that, in consultation with Senator GRAMM and others, we have agreed that general debate at 11 tomorrow is appropriate. Senators will be present. They

will be able to hear the debate. And our respective conference lunches will hear more debate on this issue, and hopefully, following our hour debate, at 2:15 the issue will be clearer for all of us and perhaps we will be able to proceed tomorrow to final action on this report.

I thank the Chair. I thank all Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa is recognized.

Mr. HARKIN. Madam President, I just want to concur in the unanimous consent agreement and commend my chairman, Senator LUGAR, for his leadership on this bill. This is an extremely important bill. We should have gotten it through a long time ago. There are farmers out in my area of the country, all up and down the Midwest—I am sure in the Senator's home State also—who have contracts up this summer on crop insurance, and if we don't hurry up and get this through, we are going to be in big trouble; we will not have the money for the crop insurance program to allow these farmers to renew their contracts for next year. So it is imperative that we do get it through.

If this bill were to be recommitted—and I will have more to say about this tomorrow, but I wanted to talk about this a little here—I think that would be the end of the bill. We tried for a long time in conference to get to this point. It is a delicate balance of many interests, but it is a good balance. It is one that balances all of the interests in all sections of the country. It advances the cause of agricultural research; it does the job of providing the necessary funds to keep the crop insurance program going; and it also fills in the gap on the food stamps for legal immigrants, elderly, disabled, and children, and also refugees and asylees who are in this country.

Madam President, as I said, the conference report of the Agricultural Research Extension and Education Reform Act of 1998 represents a strong statement by the Senate on the importance of research to the future of American agriculture and fulfills important promises to restore food stamp benefits to legal immigrants, refugees, and asylees, and to fully fund the crop insurance program.

Again, I am pleased that both sides of the aisle in both the House and the Senate have come together to invest in the future of agriculture in rural communities as well as nutrition programs for needy individuals who were unfairly cut off from food stamp benefits in the welfare reform bill that we passed in 1996.

I again commend Chairman LUGAR for his diligent and tireless efforts to, first of all, get the changes made in the research program that we so vitally need in this country in our ag research program, and his efforts to get the bill through, and through conference, and to the point where we are now. Chairman LUGAR has done a great job in guiding and directing and leading us in

a bipartisan fashion to get the bill through.

We have had great cooperation. I am thankful to him for the great cooperation he has given me as the ranking member, and to his staff for the many kindnesses that his staff has afforded our staff. I also commend our colleagues in the House for assisting and aiding us getting this bill through. I am especially pleased that the agriculture, nutrition and immigrant communities are united in support of this conference report.

Reinforcing the strong support for this bill, on April 24, 71 Senators sent a letter to the leadership asking that we bring up this bill and pass it. Madam President, 71 Senators signed a letter to the majority leader of the Senate asking we bring up this bill and pass it. So I hope we can move quickly on this vital piece of legislation.

Let me just mention the three components of the bill. First, the issue of food stamps. This bill will spend about \$816 million over the next 5 years to restore food stamp eligibility for nearly 250,000 individuals. Again, with this action we have reaffirmed our compassion and our priority for taking care of the most vulnerable in our society. The bill takes a major step towards fulfilling a promise that was made by our President and many of us here in the Congress on both sides of the aisle to correct inequities made in the 1996 Welfare Reform Act.

What we have done in this bill, Madam President, mirrors the changes made in last year's balanced budget agreement. That bill eliminated eligibility for several classes of legal immigrants for food stamps. Refugees, asylees, elderly and disabled legal immigrants and their children, among refugees and certain native Americans who were unfairly denied food stamp benefits will once again be eligible for this important food assistance under this bill before us.

I might also add, parenthetically, that it is not just compassion, but it is dollar wise. We know in the past when these people are cut off from the needed food stamps, the elderly and the disabled, their kids are cut off, and when they lack nutrition, where do they end up? They are at the emergency room door of our hospitals, and we pay for that. Better we put some money into adequate food and nutrition to keep them healthy in the first place rather than pay for the needed medical services they would require later on.

Under research and rural development, the research provisions of this bill will ensure that our farmers and ranchers have the world's best science and technology at their disposal to produce food and fiber, to protect the environment, and to create rural economic opportunities. In this regard, we are devoting \$600 million in new funds over the next 5 years to advance the science and technology underlying our agricultural system. This new initiative will invest in priority research

topics like food safety, biotechnology and environmental quality. There are new incentives for the development of new crops and new uses for existing crops. Finally, modest reforms in the land grant system will help it to remain a leader in research, education and outreach in the coming century.

We have also extended the Fund for Rural America through the year 2002, and we have reaffirmed our commitment to the pressing development needs of our rural communities. This fund was a key component of the 1996 farm bill, created to provide funds to help farmers in rural communities to transition to the new farm policy environment. Although I wish we could have found more funds for this purpose, I am pleased that over the next 5 years, an additional \$100 million was added to the Fund for Rural America.

Finally, the third component of the bill is crop insurance. Since the last Crop Insurance Reform Act in 1994, participation in crop insurance has more than doubled in our country. Without agreement to this conference report, millions of farmers face the possibility of canceled insurance policies in just the next few months. That would leave them without risk protection for the 1999 crop season.

The action we have taken in this bill will secure funding for the Crop Insurance Program for the next 5 years. It will set the stage also for a vigorous debate about how to further restructure and reform the program in the coming years. I look forward to working with Chairman LUGAR in moving that discussion and that debate forward. The more tools and options we can give our farmers to manage the risks of production, the more resilient our rural communities will be in the face of market and weather fluctuations.

So this conference report accomplishes a great deal in a single package. We have let the world know that we care about the vulnerable in our society, those who are refugees and asylees who are escaping persecution—many times religious persecution in other countries. A lot of times when they come here, they don't have a million dollars in their pockets. Usually those aren't the kind of people who are persecuted. But those who are persecuted for religious beliefs or otherwise, a lot of times who flee their countries, who come here, they don't have a lot of money. They need an education. And, yes, we provide them food assistance. I think that is a part of what we ought to be about in this country. What this bill does is it restores it. We say to those people, if you are escaping intolerable situations in other parts of the world, our doors will be open to refugees and asylees, and we are going to assure that you have adequate nutrition to get you to the point where you can apply for citizenship.

Second, we have let the world know we are serious about equipping American agriculture for future food produc-

tion challenges. We have taken the steps to assure the taxpayers that research dollars are expended in the most efficient manner. Finally, we ensure that our farmers will have good risk management tools available to them.

We have done all of this in a very strong, bipartisan manner. We can all take pride in the fact that today we have made a significant investment in a better future, not only for our farmers and ranchers, but also in a better future for an increasingly crowded and hungry world. So, Madam President, I urge my colleagues to agree to this conference report without delay.

Madam President, I will have more to say tomorrow about the pending amendment by the Senator from Texas, who as I understand, would exempt from the coverage of the Food Stamp Program, refugees and asylees who come to this country after, I think it is August of 1996, if I am not mistaken. I think that would just be the wrong step to take, first of all, for a compassionate and caring society, and for those of us who care about asylees and refugees. I think that covers both political parties, and certainly covers all of the religious institutions in America. I know I received letters from—I know Cardinal O'Connor in New York, from many members of the Jewish faith, other Christian faiths who have written to us asking us to please make this fix in food stamps to cover these very vulnerable people who are in our society.

And, second, I would just say again, if the amendment contemplated by the Senator from Texas were to be successful, that is referring this back to conference committee, that would be the end of this bill. Make no mistake about it. The amendment that I have seen written and proposed—he has not offered it yet, but as proposed by the Senator from Texas—would kill this bill. It would kill the research provisions of this bill and it could kill the crop insurance provisions of this bill along with the food stamp provisions.

Why do I say that? For two reasons. First, because we worked long and hard to get to this point in a bipartisan fashion. There were long, serious discussions both in the Senate and in the House and in conference, and we reached our agreements and we have strong bipartisan support for this. If this were to go back to the conference committee—one, either the conference committee would not or could not make these changes, and thus the bill would die in conference; or if the conference committee voted to make these changes and it went back to the House, there is no way that it would succeed in the House. Maybe it wouldn't even succeed in the Senate. I don't know.

But, Madam President, I have been on the Agriculture Committee now, both in the House and the Senate, for 23 years. I have been through a lot of farm bills and a lot of farm bill amendments and modifications. And we have for a long time had a good working re-

lationship with our urban friends in keeping a good, strong coalition together to both answer the needs of those of us who represent rural America and to answer the needs of those who represent urban America.

I believe it has been a good working relationship. When we look at it, hunger in America is almost nonexistent. Yes, we have some gaps out there. Yes, we have some nutritional gaps out there, but compared to any other country, we are light-years ahead.

We provide the needed nutrition from the School Breakfast Program to the School Lunch Program to afternoon programs to the Food Stamp Program to Women, Infants and Children nutrition program, and then we provide support for our food banks and our soup kitchens and feeding facilities around the country along with the private sector.

We have taken care to address the nutritional needs of those who live in our urban areas, and we have taken care of the needs of those who live in our rural areas. As I said, part of this bill is funds for rural America that helps continue to invest in rural economic development so our people who live in small towns and communities will have the kind of jobs and support they need. Our farmers will have the risk management tools and crop insurance they will need to provide the food and fiber for America.

It has been a good coalition, a healthy coalition. The amendment contemplated by the Senator from Texas will tear that coalition apart. That is why I say, if it were to succeed—I don't think it will, I hope it won't, I don't think it will—if it were, that would be the end of this bill.

I am hopeful, and I know the Senator from Texas is sincere in what he is trying to do—I happen to disagree with him, deeply disagree—that we ought to carve out asylees and refugees from the food stamp provisions of this bill.

Be that as it may, I still suggest that this amendment really is a basic amendment that will kill this bill. We can't afford to have that happen. I hope all my colleagues will support the chairman and support others on both sides of the aisle who signed the letter to bring up the bill and to pass it as it is. If we do that, I think we can have a swift conclusion of this bill tomorrow, get it down to the President for his signature, our farmers can go ahead and get their crop insurance contracts renewed, we can begin the process of changing our research system, and we can meet the nutritional needs of the most vulnerable in our society. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GRAMS). The Senator from Mississippi is recognized.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I am pleased that the order has been entered for the consideration of the conference report on the agriculture research bill. As Senators may remember, when we passed the 1996 farm bill, the research

programs were only authorized to the year 1997. This allowed the committees of jurisdiction to undertake a reevaluation of the way in which Federal dollars are allocated to research facilities that are operated by the Department of Agriculture and that are used for grants for research and extension service activities at colleges and universities throughout the country.

As a result of that review, this legislation was produced. It improves the way those funds are allocated. It targets those funds to the highest priority subjects for agriculture research in our country. It is this Senator's hope that the Senate will approve the conference report and we can proceed to consider other related legislation.

I point out the fact that we are in the appropriations process now for the next fiscal year. The passage of this conference report will facilitate the handling of the appropriations bill for the Department of Agriculture and other departments of the Government. If we are sent back to rewrite the bill in conference on a motion to recommit, it will slow down the process. It will make it more difficult to achieve the kind of coherent funding procedure that we would otherwise be able to enjoy.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT REQUEST—
S. 1873

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, at this point in the order of business, the majority leader had indicated that it would be appropriate to call up Calendar Order No. 345, S. 1873, the missile defense bill.

On behalf of the majority leader, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now turn to the consideration of Calendar No. 345, S. 1873, the missile defense bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

AMERICAN MISSILE PROTECTION
ACT OF 1998—MOTION TO PROCEED

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I move to proceed to Calendar Order No. 345, S. 1873, and I send a cloture motion to the desk on behalf of the majority leader.

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 provision 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. 345, S. 1873, the missile defense system legislation:

Trent Lott, Thad Cochran, Strom Thurmond, Jon Kyl, Conrad Burns, Dirk Kempthorne, Pat Roberts, Larry Craig, Ted Stevens, Rick Santorum, Judd

Gregg, Tim Hutchinson, Jim Inhofe, Connie Mack, R. F. Bennett, and Jeff Sessions.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I have been authorized to announce to the Senate on behalf of the majority leader that this cloture vote will occur on Wednesday at a time to be determined by the majority leader, after notification of the Democratic leader.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum under rule XXII be waived.

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

Mr. COCHRAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi is recognized.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, this legislation was introduced by me and the distinguished Senator from Hawaii, Mr. INOUE, last month. It is legislation that would change the policy of our country with respect to the deployment of a national missile defense system that would protect our Nation against limited ballistic missile attack. Since its introduction, 48 other Senators have joined us as cosponsors of the legislation, and the Senate Armed Services Committee has reviewed the legislation and reported it for the consideration of the Senate. The committee report is available as Calendar Order No. 345, and I invite the attention of Senators to the report.

The legislation was produced because of the findings of the Subcommittee on International Security, Proliferation, and Federal Services, which I chair, which conducted hearings over the past year looking into the threat caused by the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and the means for delivering those weapons of mass destruction, particularly missile systems.

We had numerous expert witnesses who talked about the basics of how missile systems are developed, how the Atlas system was developed in our own country. General Bernard Schriever, who was the manager of the Atlas intercontinental ballistic missile program, told of the challenges faced by those who worked to build this first long-range missile system for the United States almost 50 years ago. He told of how, with the passage of time and the development of new technologies and communications systems and the easy access to scientific and technical information, those hurdles that were so difficult to overcome back then are now not difficult at all; that nation states who are intent on developing the capacity to deliver weapons of mass destruction over long distances now can achieve those results not with a 10-year program, but almost overnight if they have the determination, are willing to commit the dollars necessary to acquire the component parts, and have access to outside assistance in the form of either components or technical expertise.

You can see evidence of that and why that is really a new concern for us as a

country without a national missile defense system, without the capacity to defend ourselves against an accidental launch of an intercontinental ballistic missile, or an unauthorized launch from another country possessing these systems, or from a rogue nation which puts all of these ingredients together without our being able to detect it and threatens the security of this country.

So this is an effort to change our national policy from the current 3+3 program of the administration, which is to develop within 3 years, starting in 1997, a national ballistic missile defense capability, and then, if a threat is perceived to exist thereafter, to deploy such a system within 3 years from the date that the threat is perceived to exist. That is the 3+3 program of this administration. We are seriously concerned that this is inadequate to meet the threat that currently exists.

First of all, the 3+3 program assumes that there is no threat at this time to the security of the United States or to the citizens of the United States. The legislation we have introduced says that there is a threat, we are vulnerable. There could be—although it might be unlikely—an accidental or unauthorized missile attack from Russia or from China, both of whom, as we know, have intercontinental ballistic missile capabilities right now.

There is also an emerging threat that exists right now, because of events that have occurred over the last several years that we have not been able to detect or discover through our intelligence gathering agencies. I am going to cite some examples. And I invite the attention of Senators to the bill itself, which recites a series of facts that were uncovered during the course of the hearings our committee conducted last year.

The case of Iran is a good example. When that country was provided missile components from Russia, we realized that they were capable of acquiring new expertise not discernible by the Central Intelligence Agency. As a matter of fact, during testimony that was provided to the Senate, the Director of Central Intelligence indicated that it was anticipated that Iran would not be able to develop a medium-range missile system for some 8 years or 9 years into the future.

Now, 1 year after that testimony was delivered to the Senate in 1997, the Director of Central Intelligence suggested that because of outside assistance obtained by Iran from other countries, it appears that they would be able to deploy a medium-range ballistic missile much sooner than had been earlier predicted. Even though the Director of Central Intelligence did not say exactly when that capability could be fielded, a State Department witness told the Senate that, within a year or a year and a half, that missile system could be deployed by Iran.

So what had been viewed as a threat which could occur 8 or 9 years in the