

So we have accomplished a great deal in the budget: Social Security, education, defense, tax relief, health care, and now a banking bill—all things that are good for America—but yet without letting the Federal Government grow out of control.

It is legitimate to have different views, and we ought to have an exchange of views. There are different views everywhere. One of the basic differences here has to do, frankly, with the size and involvement of the Federal Government; it has to do with spending. The liberals, of course, want to have more taxes, more spending, put the Federal Government into more things, override the States because they think that is a better way to do it. It is a legitimate point of view. I do not agree with it.

We ought to try to limit those things that can best and must be done by the Federal Government. Do we raise money to do it? Of course. But after that we ought to let that be done closer to the people.

Those are the real issues. Sometimes they do not show up. We get to talking about details, but the basic philosophy is there and it is legitimate and we need to work at it.

I hope we can move forward. I think we have completed a good amount of work this year. We have some more to do. We have probably less than 2 weeks to do it. So I hope we move forward.

I now yield whatever time he might consume to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. I thank the Senator from Wyoming.

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Paul Barger, a fellow in my office, be granted floor privileges for the remainder of today's session.

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

The distinguished Senator from Oklahoma is recognized.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I appreciate very much the Senator from Wyoming taking the time to show some of the differences and some of the accomplishments of this session of the Senate. While I was watching him do that, it occurred to me that something else constantly needs to be brought up before the American people because a lot of times people look at Democrats and Republicans and do not realize that we do stand for different things.

In the case of the Republican Party, I have had the honor, since I have been in the Senate, of serving on the Senate Armed Services Committee. I originally discovered when I was in the House of Representatives—and it was a

shocker—why there is such a difference in the approach to national security between the Democrats and Republicans.

To put it very bluntly, the Republicans have always believed that the primary responsibility of Government was to give America a more secure country and to promote our national security. Yet time and time again, it is quite obvious that there is a difference between Democrats and Republicans.

To document this or to quantify it, there is a group called the Center for Security Policy. I think this is kind of interesting because people need to know what we are doing here. All too often people will read the mail of their Senators and assume that is everything that is going on here, when, in fact, there are some things that may not be accurately expressed in that mail. For example, if a constituent is concerned with how his particular Member is voting on tax issues, the National Tax Limitation Committee and National Taxpayers Union rank us so they can tell who is for more taxes and who is for less taxes. If a constituent is concerned about what is happening in terms of family values, they have a number of organizations that will tell how Members voted on issues such as abortion. If they are concerned about how much regulation is disturbing people who are trying to run small businesses, the NFIB, National Federation of Independent Business, actually does a rating.

As far as national security is concerned, the Center for Security Policy is an organization that takes all these votes we cast having to do with a strong national defense, having to do with test ban treaties, a national missile defense system, defense spending, and they rank us to see who the good guys and the bad guys are in their eyes; that is, who is promoting a stronger national defense and is more concerned about national security or who legitimately believes there is a threat.

The average Democrat is ranked, in accordance with the Center for Security Policy, at 12 percent; the average Republican is 94 percent. That tells us something. It tells us there is a basic difference in the policy of the Democrat versus the Republican Party.

This is significant because we just completed debate on the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty and we heard a lot of dialog on both sides. To the last one on the Republican side who voted in opposition to this treaty, it was a recognition that there is a real threat out there. By unilaterally disarming, which is essentially what we would have done under the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, we would have allowed those nations to go ahead and test their nuclear arsenal, even though there is no way of verifying whether or not they were testing, of course.

Good old America, we do what we say we are going to do. If we say we will

not do it, then we don't do it. I remember several times Secretaries of Defense would actually testify: We know we are not going to do it, but there is no way of knowing whether the other side is doing it. I had no doubt in my mind that both China and Russia would continue to test their nuclear weapons, even if they had ultimately ratified. By the way, they kept using the argument that we are going to have to ratify this because if we don't do it, Russia won't do it. I remember that same argument in the START II treaty. Russia still hasn't done it. We need to look at these things. Unfortunately, it does become a partisan issue.

In talking about our national defense, I come from the background of chairing the Readiness Subcommittee of the Senate Armed Services Committee. There is a huge issue taking place right now. I will make a couple of references to it because I have introduced a Senate concurrent resolution, with several Members who are cosponsoring it, which calls upon the President and the Secretary of Defense to reopen the Vieques training bombing range off the island of Puerto Rico.

This is what the range looks like. This is the island of Puerto Rico. It is about 22 miles from here to there. This part represents a live bombing range. It only constitutes 2.7 percent of the entire island.

This bombing range has been hot range active for 58 years. During the time period it has been active, there has only been one death on the ground as a result of the use of the range. That was last April 19. As a result, everyone in Puerto Rico who is running for office, whether it is for delegate or for the Governor of Puerto Rico, is using as his or her platform: We are going to do the most we can to shut down this range.

This is the range over here. It has been used for 58 years. There is live ordnance all over the range. There are protesters there right now, illegally trespassing, who are picking up and throwing around these live pieces of ordnance.

I have written twice to Janet Reno and told her she should go down there and enforce the trespassing laws, if for no other reason than just to keep someone from getting killed. She has refused to do that. Unfortunately, it has been politicized.

We had a committee meeting where we had the Governor of Puerto Rico and others testify. They take the position that if you want to keep this training range active so we can properly train our American soldiers, which include Puerto Rican soldiers, somehow you don't like Puerto Ricans. I think it is very important to realize that that little training range offers three components of training that cannot be duplicated anywhere else in the Western Hemisphere.