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, to 30 days—in one case, I think 60 days—I think all of these people in- volved 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 hits.

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.

I take particular note of this 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 would we allow it to persist if the people of my State felt strongly about it. I see the President's Office 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 devolved 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 consulta- tion with the U.S. Navy, announced that all military exercises in Vieques would cease by May 1, 2003.

That provoked serious voices of dis- sent within this Chamber. In fact, there were those who were very dis- appointed 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 exercises to proceed between then and May of 2003.

In addition, in accordance with the earlier agreement, the Navy returned the bill as reported by the committee.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that after Senator Dodd completed his remarks, the authority 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. 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 noto- riety in recent months and some spec- ific attention over the last few weeks. That is the issue of the island of Vieques in Puerto Rico and the incarcer- ation 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 sen- tenced to 30 days—in one case, I think 60 days—I think all of these people in- volved 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 under- lying 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 wonder- ful 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 impor- tant 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
more than a third of its Vieques hold-
ings to the island on May 1, 2001.

Notwithstanding the Bush announce-
ment, a number of issues have led to
increasingly vocal opposition to the con-
tinued use of Vieques by the Navy in the
interim period. Puerto Rican critics of the Navy cite the loss of eco-
nomic 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 ecol-
gy 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 place of the local
parents and fathers of the children on the
island of Vieques, we might better un-
tend to some degree why there is in-
creasing impatience and concern about
having to wait 3 years before a poten-
tial 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, in-
cluding 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 pro-
testers 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 satisfactorily solved in a satisfac-
tory 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 28 refer-
endum called for by the Governor of
Puerto Rico draws near. It seems fairly
obvious what the results of the refer-
endum will be. And while I appreci-
ate 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 reas-
ties, 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 ex-
ercises. That is extremely important, and
I don’t, in any way, minimize the sig-
nificance of that particular issue. The
question is whether or not there are al-
ternatives 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 reportedly 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 ac-
celerated. 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
two weeks in incarceration, is the
right choice for those who commit
these offenses. I think moving on is the best course of
action.

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 par-
ticular hour, after having these mem-
bbers serve two weeks in incarceration,
is that the courts might find it possible
for them to have expressed their obliga-
tions 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 Sen-
ator 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 advisor, for some reason feels
compelled to take my positions and
twist them into something that is un-
recognizable. These are not my posi-
tions, 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 man-
agement of the fiscal affairs of our
country.

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

The new chairman of the Senate Budget
Committee has acknowledged that the recent tax cuts are
driving the country right into the fiscal

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 I do not particularly favor. Alloc-
cating more of our Nation’s resources to gov-
ernment.

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 con-
tinue to reduce the role of the Federal
Government. That was my clear posi-
tion. That is the clear record, and no
attempt by him to distort it can change the facts.

Here are the facts. The spending pro-
posal I put before my colleagues would have continued to reduce the share of
our national income going to the Fed-
eral 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 com-
ments 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
as agitatedly 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 re-
sult, 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 mis-
representation 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 Secu-
ritv and Medicare 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 stimu-
late the economy that was far bigger
than what the administration pro-
posed.

Let’s look at what the administra-
tion proposed in terms of a fiscal stim-
ulus for the current year, at a time when there are suffering an economic
slowdown. All one has to do is turn to
the proposal. This is from the Presi-
None. Zero. That was their proposal.
They had no fiscal stimulus. They had no fiscal stimulus.

It was largely Democrats who in-
sisted on providing a bigger tax cut
this year to provide a fiscal stimulus to help this struggling economy.