

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I understand all time has expired on both sides at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota has a little over 3 minutes of time left.

Mr. INHOFE. I think he yielded the floor. I ask unanimous consent I be allowed to speak as in morning business.

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

GOVERNMENT REGULATION

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I will make this very brief, because several questions have come up concerning Social Security. I think it is a very critical thing. I happen to have been privileged to be presiding yesterday when the distinguished Senator from Wyoming, the senior Senator, Senator SIMPSON, who is the chairman of the Social Security Subcommittee and, I think we all agree, is the authority in this body on Social Security—he is here and will be responding to these questions in a much more informed and eloquent way than I would be able to respond to them. But I do have to respond to a few things that have been said by both my good friend, the Senator from North Dakota, and the Senator from Kentucky.

First of all, it was implied—I am sure it was not intentional—that I was only concerned about Republican grandchildren. Obviously, we are all concerned about our own. I opened my remarks yesterday on the floor making a reference to Senator Simon, who had talked about Nicholas Simon, his grandchild. I said I know he is just as emotionally involved with his children and grandchildren as I am, and Democrats are as much as Republicans. I hope that is understood.

But, when the distinguished Senator from North Dakota used the example of government control, with the rats eating the bread laced with arsenic, certainly if I had been there at the time I would have strongly supported an effort to stop these types of abuses and these types of unsanitary practices from taking place.

But there is a fine line here. You come to a point where, if you see that point, you have too much government control. I think that is one of the basic philosophical differences, and it is an honest difference, between Democrats and Republicans. I suggest to you, if you talk to Tim Carter of Skiatook, OK, who was called a couple of days before Christmas a few years ago and put out of business by the EPA, what he had done wrong was he moved his business from one area of Skiatook, OK, a very small city, to another area, and did not inform the EPA of this move.

I said, "They do not know that you moved?" He said, "Well, yes, I informed the district office, but they apparently did not inform the national office." For that reason they put him

out of business and they took his number away from him.

Then, when I finally got that corrected, he called me again and he said, "Now I have another problem. I have an inventory of 50,000 bottles." He had some kind of operation, horse spray or something, that they manufactured. Apparently there is a market for it. He said, "The EPA says I cannot use those bottles now, because during that brief time I was out of business they gave my number to somebody else." This is the type of thing.

Or Jim Dunn, who owned a third generation family lumber company in Tulsa, OK, who called me up and said, "The EPA put me out of business." This was a couple years ago. I was in the other body at the time. I said, "What did you do wrong?" He said he did not do anything wrong. He said, "I have been selling used crankcase oil to the same contractor for a couple years and they traced some of that to the Double Eagle Superfund Site and they say I am in violation. They are going to impose \$25,000 a day fines on me." This is a company that had its net increase the year before of something like \$50,000. He was out of business. The heavy hand of overregulation.

We corrected that situation. But if he had not called me, he probably would be out of business today. That contractor he sold his oil to 10 years ago was licensed by the Federal Government, by the State of Oklahoma, by Tulsa County. He did nothing illegal. Yet Government was regulating him out of business. This is what I am talking about. Have we gone beyond that point, to where we are the most overregulated society or country, to the point where we are not globally competitive? I say, yes, we are overregulated.

MISSILE DEFENSE

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from North Dakota talked about star wars. He and I have had this discussion. There is, I guess, nothing to be gained other than to update it and put it in the context of today's debate, but it always offends me when we talk about star wars. Star wars is a phrase that was coined to make it look like this is something fictitious, something imaginary, when in fact there is a very real threat that is facing the United States of America, that of missile attack.

We know the Russians have their SS-25. They have the SS-18, which is a MIRV'd missile with a number of warheads capability, some 10 warheads. We know the Chinese have a missile that can reach us. We know the North Koreans are in the final stages of developing the Taepo Dong missile that originally was going to reach the United States by 2002. Now we feel, our intelligence community feels, it will be the year 1999.

We were on schedule from 1983 to protect ourselves against a missile attack, so that we would have protection, or a

defense system in place, by the year 1999. We are not talking about star wars. We are not talking about even space-based launchers. We are talking about technology that is alive today. We have bought and paid for and have almost \$50 billion invested in 22 Aegis ships that are floating now, paid for. They have launching capability. They can knock down missiles coming in. But they cannot knock down missiles coming in, ICBM's, that would come in from above the atmosphere. So we are trying merely to take that \$50 billion that has already been spent, spend \$4 billion more so they can reach above the atmosphere and knock down a missile that might be coming from North Korea.

We would have some 30 minutes' time between the time a missile is launched and our technology tells us when that was launched. I am an aviator. I flew an airplane around the world a couple of years ago. I used the global positioning system, that is satellites, for navigation all the way around. We can know what is happening around the world today. The technology is there.

So, if a missile is launched in North Korea, we know it is coming, we have 30 minutes to do something about it, but you cannot hit it because it is above the upper tier. All we need to do is spend about 10 percent more of the money that we have spent to be able to give the capability to knock it down. That is not star wars. I do not know where they come up with this \$70 billion or \$60 billion. The CBO came out and said it would cost about \$31 billion to \$60 billion more, over the next 14 years, if we installed and made a reality all of the proposed missile defense systems. We are not suggesting that. No one is.

The other day on this floor I said it is like going into a used car lot and saying I want to buy all the cars. You do not need to do that. You get the one that works, the one that fits your needs, and that takes care of it. That is the way we are in our missile defense system. I hate to use that as an example. I hate to be redundant by coming back over and over again, talking about it, but it has to be talked about.

When the distinguished Senator from North Dakota said we are talking about a budget next week about spending \$11 billion more than the Pentagon wants—yes, I will be supporting that. Those of us who are conservatives over here, we want cuts in programs. We have to defend America. I was so proud of the chiefs of the four services testifying before the Senate Armed Services Committee, who came in and—this is the first time, I think, in the history of this country this has happened—they defied their own President and said we have to have \$20 billion more in order to defend America. This is what they said.

They are not the top. There is the Secretary of Defense, appointed by the President; not the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, John