

seeking authority, to operate beyond United States municipalities and commercial zones on the United States-Mexico border that do not display a valid Commercial Vehicle Safety Alliance inspection decal, by certified Federal inspectors, or by State inspectors whose operations are funded in part or in whole by Federal funds, in accordance with the requirements for a Level I Inspection under the criteria of the North American Standard Inspection (as defined in section 350.105 of title 49, Code of Federal Regulations), including examination of the driver, vehicle exterior and vehicle under-carriage, and

“(ii) a Commercial Vehicle Safety Alliance decal to be affixed to each such commercial vehicle upon completion of the inspection required by clause (i) or a re-inspection if the vehicle has met the criteria for the Level I inspection when no component parts were hidden from view and no evidence of a defect was present, and

“(iii) that any such decal, when affixed, expire at the end of a period of not more than 90 days, but

nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to preclude the Administration from requiring re-inspection of a vehicle bearing a valid inspection decal or from requiring that such a decal be removed when a certified Federal or State inspector determines that such a vehicle has a safety violation subsequent to the inspection for which the decal was granted;”.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, this amendment, I have sent to the desk is offered by Senator SHELBY and myself and it will strengthen the truck safety provisions in the bill as reported by the committee.

It will require the Department of Transportation to implement a rigorous inspection regime under which every Mexican truck seeking to travel beyond the commercial zone will be required to be inspected at least every 90 days.

This inspection system has shown some level of success within the State of California in bringing down the high level of safety noncompliance that has been found in Mexican trucks seeking to cross the border.

We believe that his would improve upon the provisions already in place in the bill as reported by the committee.

I know that Senators MCCAIN and GRAMM have an interest in these provisions. In deference to them, I will not seek adoption of the amendment at this time. I will leave it as the pending amendment to the bill.

If need be, we can temporarily lay the amendment aside and take up amendments on other matters as debate occurs on this bill.

Mr. SHELBY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama suggests the absence of a quorum. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

#### MORNING BUSINESS

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there now be a period of morning business with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. CONRAD. Reserving the right to object, I ask that after Senator DODD completes his remarks, that it be possible for me to address the Senate for a period not to exceed 30 minutes. I make the request to respond to an attack that was made on me by Mr. Lindsey, the President's chief economic adviser.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Washington so amend her request?

Mrs. MURRAY. I amend my request. The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Connecticut.

#### VIEQUES

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I rise to spend a couple minutes talking about an issue that has received some notoriety in recent months and some specific attention over the last few weeks. That is the issue of the island of Vieques in Puerto Rico and the incarceration of a number of people who went down to express their opposition to the continued use of Vieques as a bombing site.

First of all, I say to those who have demonstrated there and have been sentenced to 30 days—in one case, I think 60 days—I think all of these people involved certainly were aware that when you engage in civil disobedience, there will be a price to be paid for that civil disobedience. I will address the underlying issue of Vieques, but my hope is that the authorities will recognize that there is some sense of balance in all of this and that 30 days and 60 days may be a bit excessive, to put it mildly, in light of some of the sentences we see meted out on crimes that are far more serious in our society.

I take particular note of my friend Bobby Kennedy from the State of New York and his wife Mary who are wonderful parents. During this period of incarceration, a new son was born to them. Bobby Kennedy, obviously, could not be there for the birth of his son because of his incarceration in Puerto Rico. I know how difficult and painful this was for him and his family. I want them to know that they have my strong sympathies and expressions of support. My hope would have been that Bobby Kennedy might have been able to be with his family during that important moment, despite the fact that he would be the first one to tell us that he understood fully the implications to the action he would take to express what were not only his views but the views of thousands of others within Puerto Rico and beyond the island over

the issue of whether or not Vieques ought to be used as a continued site for targeting practice by the U.S. military.

I express my sympathies for Bobby Kennedy, Dennis Rivera, and others who are in prison at this moment for those actions.

There has been a long history here of divergence of interest with respect to the people of Puerto Rico and the Navy's interest in maintaining the capability for important live training exercises on the island of Vieques. Over the years, efforts have been made to reconcile these different interests. During the Clinton administration, in fact, an agreement was reached with the then-Governor of Puerto Rico, Pedro Rossello, that called for the holding of a referendum in November of the year 2001 to allow the residents of Puerto Rico to choose whether to end the military's use of Vieques by 2003 or to indefinitely permit military exercises to continue after that date.

That seemed at the moment to reduce the tensions over this matter and to provide a way for the people of Puerto Rico to express their views. On the idea of a referendum, I was thinking to myself, living in Connecticut, along Long Island Sound where there are small islands off the coast of Connecticut, that if one of our islands were being used as a target by the military, how long we would allow it to persist if the people of my State felt strongly about it. I see the Presiding Officer from the State of Florida with a huge coastline. In many cases, of course, people have tolerated and supported it in their jurisdictions or States.

This is a matter which has provoked tremendous interest on the island of Puerto Rico, a part of the United States, of course.

Since the inauguration of Sila Maria Calderon, the new Governor of Puerto Rico, in January of this year, the efforts by President Clinton and Pedro Rossello, it has become clear that the resolution calling for the referendum in November of 2001 has been sort of put aside, that the plan did not resolve these tensions, despite the good efforts of those involved in crafting that particular solution.

On June 14, in response to continued tensions, President Bush, in consultation with the U.S. Navy, announced that all military exercises in Vieques would cease by May 1, 2003.

That provoked serious voices of dissent within this Chamber. In fact, there were those who were very disappointed by President Bush's decision. I happen to think he made the right decision. I know it was not an easy one to make, but he did listen to the various sides of this story and decided that, given all the information and facts, this was the right decision to make. Naval training on the island was to proceed between then and May of 2003.

In addition, in accordance with the earlier agreement, the Navy returned

more than a third of its Vieques holdings to the island on May 1, 2001.

Notwithstanding the Bush announcement, a number of issues have led to increasingly vocal opposition to the continued use of Vieques by the Navy in the interim period. Puerto Rican critics of the Navy cite the loss of economic development opportunities on the island because access to most of the island's land is restricted. They also mention the failure of the Navy to live up to pledges to compensate for these lost economic opportunities.

Damage to the environment and ecology have also been mentioned. Most worrisome, concerns have been raised about the impact the Atlantic Fleet Weapons Training Facility has had on the health and safety of the people on the island of Vieques. Were we to put ourselves in the shoes of the mothers and fathers of the children on the island of Vieques, we might better understand to some degree why there is increasing impatience and concern about having to wait 3 years before a potential danger to their loved ones will cease.

The relationship between the Navy and the people of Vieques has been a rocky one, to put it mildly, over the years. More recently the situation has grown from bad to worse. Visits by prominent Members of Congress and other well-known public figures, including the wife of Jesse Jackson and Robert Kennedy Jr., have served to educate Americans writ large about the Vieques issue.

Overly harsh treatment of these protesters by the court has only served to make, in my view, the matter even worse. It seems to me that the time has passed for the relationship between the Navy and the people of Vieques to ever be mended in a satisfactory manner that would allow both to coexist on this little island.

The matter is going to get even more heated, in my view, as the July 29 referendum called for by the Governor of Puerto Rico draws near. It seems fairly obvious what the results of the referendum will be. And while I appreciate President Bush's decision to end the use of Vieques by the year 2003, at this juncture I believe that is not going to be satisfactory. Those are the realities, Mr. President. Many wish it would be otherwise, but I don't think it is going to be so.

As a practical matter, continued civil disobedience is going to make the Navy's use of its facilities impossible. We need to accept it and move on, in my view.

Certainly, we need to find a way for our military to conduct training exercises. That is extremely important, and I don't, in any way, minimize the significance of that particular issue. The question is whether or not there are alternatives to this particular venue which is provoking so much dissent

and so many problems for both the Navy and the people of the island of Puerto Rico. A Department of Defense panel has already recommended that the Navy work toward ceasing all training activities on Vieques within 5 years. In light of recent events, that timeframe will clearly have to be accelerated. I find it hard to believe that some interim locations can't be found where much of the necessary training that the Navy needs to conduct could take place. Search for alternative sights needs to be given a much higher priority than was anticipated.

I don't fault those who tried to come up with a time line that would be satisfactory, but the realities are such that I don't think that is any longer possible. The steps I have outlined can begin the process for moving forward on this very difficult and contentious matter that undoubtedly has important implications for the people of Puerto Rico and for our national defense.

Mr. President, again, I salute my friends who have gone down to express not only their views but the views of the overwhelming majority of the people on Vieques. My plea at this particular hour, after having these members serve two weeks in incarceration, is that the courts might find it possible for them to have expressed their obligations by incarcerating these people in light of their civil disobedience, but I think moving on is the best course of action.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota is recognized.

#### RESPONDING TO LAWRENCE LINDSEY

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I thank the Presiding Officer. Yesterday, Mr. Lawrence Lindsey, the President's chief economic adviser, attacked me in a speech before the Federal Reserve Bank in Philadelphia. In that speech, he repeatedly misrepresented my views, my clear positions, and my record.

Mr. Lindsey, the President's chief economic adviser, for some reason feels compelled to take my positions and twist them into something that is unrecognizable. These are not my positions, not my statements. This is not my voting record. I call on Mr. Lindsey to recant these false statements. This does not improve the level of debate about serious issues and what is to be done about our economy and the management of the fiscal affairs of our country.

Yesterday, Mr. Lindsey, in this speech in Philadelphia before the Federal Reserve, said at one point early in the speech, for example:

The new chairman of the Senate Budget Committee has alleged the recent tax cuts are driving the country right into the fiscal ditch.

He got that part of it right. I applaud him for that. He then went on to say:

These views reflect one side of the political debate—one that ultimately favors allocating more of our Nation's resources to government.

Mr. Lindsey, you know better. That was not the proposal of this Senator. The proposal of this Senator in the budget debate this year was to continue to reduce the role of the Federal Government. That was my clear position. That is the clear record, and no attempt by him to distort it can change the facts.

Here are the facts. The spending proposal I put before my colleagues would have continued to reduce the share of our national income going to the Federal Government from 18 percent of gross domestic product to 16.4 percent of gross domestic product, which is the lowest level since 1951. Mr. Lindsey, facts are stubborn things. Mr. Lindsey then went on to say:

The criticisms of the tax cut and comments on the budget made by Senator Conrad hearken back to views widely held in the 1920s and 1930s.

He went on to describe those views supposedly widely held. He concluded that their solution was to raise taxes. The top income-tax rate was raised from 24 percent to 63 percent. The result, of course, was economic disaster. Mr. Lindsey ascribes those views to me.

Mr. Lindsey, that is false. You know it is false, and that it is a total misrepresentation of the record of this Senator.

Let's turn to what I proposed to our colleagues. These are the charts that were used on the floor of the Senate during the budget debate highlighting the Democratic alternative.

No. 1, we protected the Social Security and Medicare trust funds in every year. Does Mr. Lindsey disagree with that? Let's hear an honest debate about that issue.

No. 2, we paid down the maximum amount of publicly held debt.

Next, we provided for an immediate fiscal stimulus of \$60 billion. That was a tax cut, not a tax increase, Mr. Lindsey. That was a tax cut. I was one of the first to propose a significant tax cut—in fact, a tax cut to help stimulate the economy that was far bigger than what the administration proposed.

Let's look at what the administration proposed in terms of a fiscal stimulus for the current year, at a time when we are suffering an economic slowdown. All one has to do is turn to the proposal. This is from the President. Their proposal: No tax cut in 2001. None. Zero. That was their proposal. They had no fiscal stimulus. They had no tax cut at a time of economic slowdown. It was largely Democrats who insisted on providing a bigger tax cut this year to provide a fiscal stimulus to help this struggling economy.