

Council of Economic Advisers. He is quoted in the *Atlantic Monthly*, October 2002, page 77. He was known as an erudite and academically brilliant economist. He summarized when asked: When did the downturn start?

He said:

The economy was slipping into recession even before Bush took office, and the corporate scandals that are rocking America began much earlier.

In this article he is explaining the American economy, which had been so buoyant for almost 10 years. We spoke of it from both sides of the aisle, with great admiration and fantastic respect for who did what, who did not do what, and why did this American economy grow.

He is suggesting the beginnings of the downward trends, in response to a question:

The economy was slipping into recession even before Bush took office . . .

Not when he sent us a budget; not when he sent us a tax bill; not when he recommended we have tax cuts to perk this economy up; not when he recommended we spend more money to continue perking it up. Before those events occurred, the American economy was slipping into recession.

It is all right by this Senator that we come to the floor and state what we think. It is all right with me if we state them in political tones. It is all right with me if we state them with overtones that are patently political. It is someone's responsibility, when they think that is the case, to at least try to respond.

I will not be able, in the next 5 or 6 minutes, to respond to what probably was more than an hour last week by two or three on the other side, led by their leader, the majority leader, and the chairman of the Budget Committee, and what they had to say when they blamed the President of the United States for almost everything that is going wrong with the economy, in spite of many of them knowing that this is the fact, that this is the salient fact—that it all began long before that. We may be even fortunate that the economy, in its downward pressures, did not get worse. Perhaps it did not get worse because we did some things right under the leadership of the President and with Congress. Although it was difficult, hard work, we did follow most of his suggestions to try to get out from the slippage.

In less than a week we will enter the new fiscal year, the year of 2003. Let me repeat, in less than 1 week we will be entering the new Federal fiscal year, fiscal year 2003. As this new fiscal year approaches without us having enacted even one appropriations bill for next year, I have been struck by some of the statements being made on the floor—principally on that side of the aisle, and principally by leaders of the majority party.

Recently, the majority leader and the chairman of the Senate Budget Committee have taken to the floor to

criticize the President's handling of the economy. I would like to be as honest as I can about this, so let's try to be honest as to what this is all about. This is politics, in my humble opinion, at its worst. Unwilling or afraid to face up to their own responsibilities, unable to defend their own record for failing to enact a budget in the Senate for the first time in the history of the Budget Act, they are now trying to confuse the public and somehow blame the President or the House of Representatives—which happens to be Republican by a few votes—for their failure. So now the time has come to play the blame game and to run away from whatever you have done and pin it on somebody else. That is this time of year.

This is important, and I would like the record to be clear. Back in May, the majority leader blamed the lack of a budget on an evenly divided membership in the Senate. Earlier this month, the chairman of the Democratic National Committee, Mr. McAuliffe, appearing on a Sunday morning show—I think it was "Face The Nation"—said: Don't blame us: . . . we need 60 votes for a budget.

Finally, last week the chairman of the Senate Budget Committee, referring to an amendment that was voted in the Senate on June 20, clearly implying that it was a Senate budget, literally said here on the floor:

. . . we got 59 votes for that proposal on a bipartisan basis. We needed a supermajority, which is 60.

Let me be as clear as I possibly can. We have not voted on a budget resolution in the Senate this year. We have not voted on a budget this year in the Senate. This will be the first time in the Budget Act's nearly 27-year history that the Senate has not adopted a budget blueprint. Say what you want about what it is or what it is not, we have always seen fit to adopt one. As tough as it was, as many hard votes as it took in the hours allotted under law, we always got one. We got one out of the committee when we were practically tied, for all intents and purposes. But no budget resolution has been brought to the floor of the Senate to be debated and voted on this year.

The chairman of the Budget Committee knows this. The majority leader knows this. To even hint that we have considered a budget is an absolute insult to those of us who worked to make this process a functional part of fiscal decisionmaking here in the Senate.

If my time is up, I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WYDEN). The Senator from Nevada, the assistant majority leader.

THE ECONOMY

Mr. REID. Mr. President, my friend, the senior Senator from New Mexico, has a chart. He talks about when the downturn started. The fact is, it is here. To try to divert attention from the problems of this country by trying to talk about when this problem start-

ed really doesn't do the trick. Presidents are blamed or given credit for what happens during their 4 years of office. That is the way it is, and that is the way it should be. The fact is, during this administration the economy has gone downhill every month the President has been in office.

To talk about when a problem started, we had problems during the 8 years that Clinton was President, but he was able to respond to make sure the country went on an upward path after that. The fact is, President Bush, no matter what he received when he was President, has done nothing to alleviate the problem. He has made it worse.

I would say to my friend from New Mexico, if he read the rest of Stiglitz's article, I find Stiglitz blames much, if not all, of the problems of this economy directly on the President, President Bush's economic policies. We just had Stiglitz appear before the Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee and he spent all afternoon telling us what was wrong with the Bush economic policies. Joseph Stiglitz has won a Nobel Prize in economics. He is one of the most renowned economists in the world. He places the blame at the foot of the President of the United States, President Bush, for the economy we now have.

There may have been some corporate problems that started many years ago. But, remember, this White House wanted to bring corporate America to the White House—and they did. There is no better example of that than the fact that when the Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission was having his confirmation hearings, he said he wanted to bring a kinder more gentle SEC to America. That is what we have had at this White House. They simply have been kinder and gentler. They brought corporate America to the White House. The American people do not want that.

My friend also mentions in passing the United States of Representatives, which is controlled by the Republicans by just a few votes. Those of us who have served in the House of Representatives know the party that controls the House of Representatives controls the agenda over there. That is the way it works. It has always worked that way. One reason we have gotten nothing done in the Congress is because the Republican majority in the House of Representatives decided a long time ago they were not going to have anything happen this year. That is why we have every conference report stuck in a dark hole in the House of Representatives. They won't let us do anything on bankruptcy. They won't let us do anything on terrorism insurance. They won't let us do anything on election reform. They won't let us do anything on the Patients' Bill of Rights. They won't let us do anything on our generic drug bill, and on and on.

Whether it is 1 or 100 vote, it doesn't matter in the House of Representatives. It works like the parliamentary

system. The party in power controls the agenda, and the House leadership has stated publicly that they are going to have nothing happen. They don't want their members to take tough votes, just like on the bankruptcy bill.

For the former chairman of the Budget Committee to come here and blame the problems on the budget—we don't have a budget because they won't let us have a budget—the fact is, the Appropriations Committee, under the leadership of Senator BYRD and Senator STEVENS, made sure that all appropriations bills were under the budget numbers, even though we didn't have budget numbers. The budget numbers are good numbers. They will not let us do the budget bills because of the same reason—the same reason. The House of Representatives has not moved appropriations bills.

You see, the Senate passed out of committee every appropriations bill. It has been done long since. But the House refuses to move on the bills. Therefore, we cannot do them. We are going to have a cloture vote on the Interior bill, which the Presiding Officer has worked on, not for hours, not days, but weeks, trying to come up with a compromise to meet the needs of the American public in the western part of the United States on firefighting but has been unable to work anything else. But that Interior appropriations bill is extremely important. It is not as if there is no money going to firefighting. There is 800 million extra dollars in this Interior bill to fight fires.

But they only want them to be fought—in the minds of the Republicans—the way they want to fight them. Do you know how they want to fight them? Take all environmental standards and go out and start chopping and burning anything in the forest that a lot of lumber companies want.

I say to my friend—he is my friend—the distinguished Senator from New Mexico that this won't sell. To come and say the problem started before President Bush became President is to blame it on somebody else. The President of the United States is stuck with an economic standard in this—his—administration, and for 2 years this economy has been going downhill, downhill, downhill. You can't blame it on September 11. The Afghanistan war caused about 25 percent of the problem. But all economists indicate that the other problem is right at the foot of this administration—whether it is tax policy or their other economic policies—which is responsible for 75 percent of our downturn.

We have all been affected. People in Nevada—in fact, people in every State in the Union—have been affected by the downturn in the economy. Many Nevadans, and people who live in all 50 States, have seen their retirement savings disappear in the wake of corporate crime, accounting abuses, and stock market declines.

The Las Vegas Review-Journal, the largest newspaper in Nevada, which has

a circulation of a quarter million—to say it is conservative is a gross understatement; it is really conservative. It really focuses on government a lot. However, as conservative as that newspaper is, they wrote an editorial one day last week—in fact, the day after Senator DASCHLE gave a speech on the floor with the charts that he had—under the headline “Daschle is right.” I thought they made a misprint when I picked up that newspaper. But they had not. They believe TOM DASCHLE is right.

This newspaper with a conservative bias, and which seldom has kind words for Democrats or the majority leader, said in this editorial that America needs a new economic direction and President Bush's policies have failed.

The Las Vegas Review-Journal said:

The economy is showing an anemic 1 percent rate of growth, the majority leader charged. Under the Bush administration the Nation has lost 2 million jobs and \$4.5 trillion in stock market value—much of it melting out of individual Americans' retirement acts. Foreclosures are up, and the government is once again spending Social Security surpluses to pay for other programs . . . it would be a mistake to dismiss the statistics he cites. They are real, as are the economic doldrums they describe.

They go on to say:

President Bush has indeed failed to do all that he could and should have done to put America back on the path to vibrant economic growth, opportunity and prosperity.

That is about as direct as you can get.

It doesn't stop there. Robert Novak—I have great respect for Robert Novak. I consider him a friend. But I have to tell you that he has rarely said anything nice about me, and rarely has anything nice to say about Democrats. He is a very conservative political pundit, and he is a good one. I have appeared on his show on a number of occasions. He is hard, but he is fair. You always know where he is coming from. But rarely does he join with us in criticizing Republicans and what they are doing. But he did yesterday. I think it was yesterday. I read about it in the paper. It may have been Saturday. He said something very similar to what the Las Vegas Review-Journal said. But his column is printed all over America, and in the Washington Post, of course.

In this piece, under the headline “Avoidance Agenda”—and in other newspapers the same column had a different headline: “Winning Without a Vision”—in this piece, Novak takes Republicans to task for offering no domestic alternative to the “kitchen table” issues which Democrats are discussing and working on: Prescription drugs and other health benefits, corporate accountability, pension protection, Social Security.

According to Novak:

Midsummer Democratic exuberance has vanished, and Republican anxiety has faded—thanks to Iraq's eclipsing economic issues six weeks before midterm elections. Yet, beneath the surface, thoughtful Repub-

licans ask: What will it mean for the party to sneak by on November 5 without a vision and, indeed, without an agenda?

George W. Bush is committed to being a war President, unwilling to use the bully pulpit to press domestic programs, especially without support from Congress.

He continues:

The crowding out of corporate corruption by war against Iraq unquestionably has brightened Republican prospects for winning both houses of Congress, saving President Bush from electoral disasters frequently visited on new presidents at midterm. However, apart from the war on terrorism, the Republican Party flinches from standing for much of anything in the 2002 election.

The problem is that Republicans—including Bush himself—do not pursue a domestic alternative.

This is a matter of concern for the future and perhaps even for this election among a variety of wise old heads in the GOP. One early GWB-for-president backer voiced displeasure with Bush's handling of an economy in which corporate profits are low, investor confidence has been shattered and consumer confidence is in jeopardy. “He does not seem worried enough about the economy, does not express himself forcefully enough.” The president does not share his father's boredom with domestic affairs, but there is no doubt he sees his destiny as winning the war against terrorism and not as reformer of the tax system.

There are officials inside the administration who signal their concern by suggesting it is necessary to come up with new domestic initiatives.

Bush and the Republican Party actually risk a lot tying themselves to the limited goal of maintaining a House majority. By accepting the caution urged on him by Capitol Hill, the president abdicates a vital responsibility of the president as a party leader. Any new initiatives await passage of an Iraq resolution or perhaps even congressional adjournment, leaving a Republican voice that is muted on everything but Iraq.

I started saying a couple of weeks ago, as others have said, that this country is a big country; we can have a big political agenda. We can focus on Iraq, as we should, but we can focus on other things. The administration is focusing only on Iraq. Let us talk about the other issues. Let us talk about the stumbling, faltering economy, which we must address.

If you were planning on retiring, Mr. President, this year, you would have to wait, on average, 7 years before you could retire. You would have to work an extra 7 years because you have lost that much—mostly in the stock market. People who were going to retire can't retire. If you started out with \$100 in savings, you now have about \$65 in savings. That is it. You multiply that, and you will see what it does to somebody who is building for retirement.

The Las Vegas Review-Journal has not changed its political philosophy; they have had the same political philosophy for decades. Also, I would say that Robert Novak hasn't changed; he has had the same political philosophy for 30 or 40 years.

The Republicans' proposed solution to economic woes plaguing Nevada and

the entire country are far different from those favored not only by Senate Democrats. I also not only speak for Senate Democrats but I speak for mainstream Nevadans and Americans.

I have no doubt that Republicans will continue to criticize and even mislead readers about our policies, and that is too bad. To come here today and to say the problems of this country are the result of something that started a long time ago is ridiculous. I have no doubt we must continue to address the problems that face this country, and we must continue to address them focusing on more than Iraq. This country has more ability to do that.

I am very disappointed that my friend, the distinguished Senator from New Mexico, would come here and cite Joseph Stiglitz as supporting the policy of this country going back to the last administration when, in fact, if you read anything that Stiglitz writes, he talks about the economy being bad as a result of what happened with this administration's economic policy.

TRIBUTE TO GREG MADDUX

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to an outstanding Nevadan, Greg Maddux.

Greg Maddux is a baseball player. That is a tremendous understatement. He is one of best pitchers in professional baseball today and considered among the best to ever play the game.

Yesterday Greg won this 15th game of the season for the 15th year in a row, tying a record set by Cy Young.

For those who do not follow baseball or are not aware of the significance of this accomplishment, let me explain that Cy Young was one of baseball's first superstars. He pitched about a hundred years ago, starting in 1890 and finishing his career in 1911. Cy Young set many records that last to this day and will likely never be broken. He became the standard by which all pitchers who followed, even now about a century after him, are judged. In fact, the honor bestowed each year on the best pitcher in each league is known as the Cy Young award.

Greg Maddux became the first player to ever win four consecutive Cy Young awards with his dominant performances in the early to mid 1990s. His latest achievement testifies to his continued excellence, his endurance and consistency and his continued hard work.

Greg was born on April 14, 1966, the youngest of three children born to parents Dave and Linda Maddux. Dave was in the Air Force so the family including Greg's brother Mike and sister Terri moved around a lot but eventually settled in Las Vegas.

At Valley High in Las Vegas, Greg Maddux earned All-State honors in baseball his junior and senior years. He was selected by the Chicago Cubs in the second round of the free agent draft while he was still in high school, and following his graduation in 1984, he joined their minor league system. He

made quick progress in the minors, earning a call up to the big leagues in 1986 at age 20, becoming the youngest Cub in the majors since 1967. He won his first start on September 7 of that year with a complete game victory against the Cincinnati Reds, who were his favorite team as a youth. And later that month he won his second game when he beat his brother Mike, himself a successful professional player who pitched for 15 years in the major leagues. In fact, Mike pitched for 10 major league teams over 15 years. But for his brother, Greg, he would be Las Vegas's most famous major league pitcher.

You can imagine how proud the Maddux family must have been to see these 2 brothers competing against each other as they had years earlier when they played whiffle ball games in the backyard, and the satisfaction Gregg took in overcoming his big brother.

Greg started playing catch with his dad when he was just 2 years old and made enough progress that several years later he skipped tee ball and started playing pee-wee ball against boys much older and bigger than him.

Although he was the smallest and youngest kid on the team, Greg became the starting pitcher and the best player on the team, and his father—who coached the team—already saw signs that Greg was destined to be a star.

The Maddux family had a passion for sports, and the children learned the key to success was effort.

"I think our household was like every other American household," says Greg's mother, Linda. "It was routine. They had school, homework, baseball practice, and chores around the house."

One of the values that David and Linda Maddux tried to instill in Greg and his two siblings was a "good work ethic."

"Each one had his jobs around the house," she says, "and they did them without question."

That hard work clearly has paid off throughout Greg Maddux's career, helping make him the winningest pitcher of the 1990s.

He is not physically imposing—he stands less than 6 feet tall and weighs perhaps 175 pounds. He doesn't overpower but baffles batters with his pinpoint control and mastery. A maxim normally applied to real estate could also describe the keys to Greg Maddux's successful pitching: location, location, location.

He works efficiently, using economy of pitches. In yesterday's record-setting victory 61 of his 76 pitches were strikes. And last year he averaged only 1 walk per 9 innings.

As different as it is to draw a walk from him Greg is also stingy in giving up runs.

He concluded the 1990s with a 2.54 ERA over the decade, the third lowest ERA for any decade since 1910, behind only Hoyt Wilhelm (2.16) and Sandy

Koufax (2.36) in the 1960s. In 1995, he became the first pitcher to log back to back seasons with an ERA under 1.80.

His main pitches include a fastball in the mid-80s, a curve ball, slider and changeup. But whatever he throws, he regards his favorite pitch as strike three.

Teammate John Smoltz, also a Cy Young winning pitcher says of Greg, "Every pitch has a purpose. Sometimes he knows what he's going to throw two pitches ahead. I swear, he makes it look like guys are swinging foam bats against him."

And an opposing team's scout remarks, "Maddux is so good, we all should be wearing tuxedos when he pitches."

Greg Maddux has been described as a scientist who dissects opposing teams, an artist who paints the corners of home plate and a magician who can perform wonders with a baseball and make a talented batter disappear.

Sports Illustrated hailed him as the "best pitcher you'll ever see."

When he takes the mound, he presents a clinic, masterfully working the plate and using his arsenal of pitches. With guile, cunning and a poker face, he outsmarts opponents and keeps them guessing. It has been said that he can throw any pitch anywhere he wants on any count. As a result, batters are seldom able to hit the ball solidly and are often off balance, resulting in a harmless grounder or fly ball.

Not only is Greg Maddux an outstanding pitcher, but an all around baseball player, as he can field, hit and run the bases very well. He holds numerous records for putouts, assists and double plays, and is considered one of the best-fielding pitchers of all time. He has won 12 consecutive Gold Glove Awards for his fielding and is likely on his way to yet another.

As I said he works hard on his batting, normally not something pitchers are known for. In 1999, he hit 2 home runs and averaged .264.

Clearly, Greg Maddux is willing to give his all to help his team win though he manages to keep his cool regardless of the circumstances.

His calm demeanor and humility mask a fierce determination and competitive spirit that have earned him the nickname "Mad Dog."

Greg has been one of the major reasons the Atlanta Braves have been able to win their division an unprecedented 12 years in a row and again this year have the best record in the league.

He wears number 31, but since joining the Braves as a free agent in 1993, he has been the number 1 pitcher on a team that includes 2 other Cy Young winners, Smoltz and Glavine.

Yet Greg is a modest man who downplays his achievement.

"I never really thought about it," Maddux said of the record he set yesterday. "It feels good to be healthy enough to get it." He praises his teammates for much of his success and cites winning the World Series with the