

RECORD which has gotten a lot of notoriety since I issued it and put it in the RECORD some days ago. It is a statement by Joseph Stiglitz, chairman of President Clinton's Council of Economic Advisors. I don't think we can quote it enough, as those on the other side think they are going to convince the American people, who are already rather doubtful, that they are going to convince them that President George Bush is responsible for this slow economy.

This is a man, Dr. Joseph Stiglitz, who speaks for the Democrats, if he speaks for either party. He worked for President Clinton. He answered the question: When did the downturn start? I quote:

[T]he economy was slipping into recession even before Bush took office, and the corporate scandals that are rocking America began much earlier [than that.]

We ought to be able to carry one of these around for the next 4 or 5 weeks, just as our friend Senator BYRD carries the Constitution. Every time we hear a Democrat, wearing his partisan clothes, get up and say President Bush did this, we will refer him to one of the best economists that ever served America, served the previous President on his Council of Economic Advisors, and later on was a member of the Federal Reserve with the distinguished President we have there now, and he wrote this as a part of a dissertation with reference to the American economy.

Along comes the Washington Post a few weeks later, Saturday, October 5. Let me just read the yellow print and you can all be looking at the rest of it:

But President Bush's main economic policy—the large tax cut of last year—was not responsible for any of the current damage. Indeed, given the twin shocks of 9/11 and the post-Enron stock market decline, the short-term stimulus created by the tax cuts has turned out to be fortuitously well timed.

You might recall, on a number of occasions, Senators who were putting forth the President's tax policy—I think the occupant of the Chair might have even supported that tax policy—would get up and say: It just might be the right time. We might be doing something right for a change, where we are getting a tax cut to come in just at the time that the American economy starts to stutter, starts to stammer around. And for once we might be on time, I said, in proposing it and getting the reconciliation instruction through here.

I said, in addition, spending additional resources rather than tightening the budget would be in order also. Sure enough, the tax cuts were supplemented by an increase in expenditures. And, guess what. The Federal Reserve Chairman lowered the interest rates, and we had the threefold attack which normally works in terms of the American economy.

We seldom do it right and punctual enough, but we did. So the American economy is stuttering for some other reason. It may very well be that we had

such an extensive balloon-type economy when the stock market was driving almost everything to outlandish prices coming on to the market that maybe when those start to fall, it takes a little bit longer for things to catch on and push that back up the ladder because so much is falling down on us. Some say \$11 trillion is the amount—trillion—of diminution in value. I put "value" in quotes as I say it because I am not sure what that value meant. I am not sure that was value like you had dollar bills, but I am not sure what it was. People are having difficulty saying how much of that was nothing more than the hot air of the stock market. I don't know the answer to that, I haven't studied that.

I would like very much to say to the editors of the Washington Post, I have some additional comments on the editorial that they have written. Obviously, I have taken parts of it and put it in my statement, obviously giving the Washington Post credit wherever I thought it was right, that that language was consistent with what I am talking about.

The lead editorial on Saturday, titled "Negative Al Gore," seriously questions the Senate leader's attack on President Bush. Let me highlight once more a couple of items:

But President Bush's main economic policy—the large tax cut of last year—was not responsible for any of the current damage.

That is not the Senate Republican Policy Committee saying that. That is the Washington Post.

Another quote:

Given the twin shocks—

I have read that to you. It ends with: . . . fortuitously well timed.

That is again not mine, not the Republican Senatorial Committee. That is the Washington Post's summary of how their editors see things in terms of the stock market and other things related to the American economy.

Another quote:

But to blame the weak American economy on Mr. Bush is nonsense.

That is the editorial of the Washington Post I am showing you here. Anyone who doesn't want to listen can read this and see what the Washington Post says. Let me proceed. I think the writers of the editorial have it just about right. The economic blame and the blame game that Leader DASCHLE and former Vice President Gore have launched is, for certain, wrong. There is little truth to it, and there is little economic veracity attendant. It is not accepted as being realistic by those in the highest echelons of economic terms and assessments in America.

From the long-term economic history, we know a speculative boom, once started, cannot end without some disruption. I believe the American public understands this, and understands that to blame the current weak economy on President George Bush is nonsense.

Having said that, I know we are engaged today, and for the next few days,

in a serious discussion. Some would like to put the economy back front and center, and some think that would not be right. I believe we should proceed with dispatch to give the President the authority, if necessary, to see to it Saddam Hussein does not use weapons of mass destruction, and to use force, if he has to do that. I will speak in more detail and in more depth on that subject later on.

I think we are capable of discussing two major issues at the same time and getting them both right. We surely can discuss this issue the writers in the Washington Post editorial bring to our attention. I, for one, am not fearful of standing up and discussing that issue with anybody, any color of politics, any party that wants to talk about President Bush and the relevancy of his actions to the current status of the American economy.

I believe almost everything that was done—the lowering of the interest rates, extra expenditures that were put on rather than keeping the strings tightened around the budget and, obviously, a tax cut that came in just as the recession started to occur—I think we can discuss those and we can ask anyone around, what would you have done? They would come up with three of them, or two out of the three. When a President gets that done and he is starting his first term, and he has one body that is not of his party, it seems he deserves some very significant accolades. It is not every President who would have gotten that done.

I believe we all looked for the right way to do it and the right things to do—what we did in urging a tax cut, urging the Fed to lower interest rates, and making the strings a little bit looser instead of tighter so we can spend more money. Some other reason is causing the slowdown, but it is not President Bush and his policies. It is not what the Senate voted in when we were in the majority and carrying it out under the majority of the Democrats, who have the body by one vote. We must remember one of our Members became an Independent and now votes with the other side.

Whoever would like to discuss the American economy, I am willing. I have a lot of other Senators who are willing. We will be here whenever you care to speak about it, and we might be here even when you don't care about speaking about it. We may speak to it ourselves.

21ST CENTURY DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZATION ACT

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, I rise today to call attention to Section 2202 of the 21st Century Department of Justice Appropriations Authorization Act which directs the President—in consultation with the Attorney General, the Secretary of Health and Human Services and the Secretary of Education—to review all Federal drug and

substance abuse treatment, prevention, education and research programs and make recommendations about how to "streamline, consolidate, coordinate, simplify, and more effectively conduct and deliver" these services.

Mr. HATCH. I understand that this provision is intended to allow the administration to assess current treatment, prevention, education and research programs. The conference report directs the President to conduct the study. The President's logical choice to conduct this study would be Drug Czar John Walters, the President's point person on the drug issue, wouldn't you agree?

Mr. BIDEN. Yes, I would.

Mr. President, I want to make it clear that Section 2202 of the 21st Century Department of Justice Appropriations Authorization Act was not included because the Senate wants to cut substance abuse treatment, prevention, education and research programs. After all, when the Senate unanimously passed S. 304, the Drug Abuse Education, Prevention and Treatment Act, which Senators HATCH, LEAHY and I introduced, it went on record supporting an increase in funding for demand reduction programs, including providing treatment for some of the 3.9 million people in this country who need it but are not receiving it. I know that the President does not want to shrink these programs either. Recall that when he announced Mr. Walters' nomination to be drug czar, he said that "the most effective way to reduce the supply of drugs in America is to reduce the demand for drugs in America" and he pledged that his administration "will focus unprecedented attention on the demand side of the problem." As I see it, the study is meant to assess current programs in order to identify where there may be duplication of effort and where we need to increase effort.

The belief that demand reduction programs are a valuable part of our national drug policy needs to guide this report. That does not mean that the authors should be afraid of recommending ways to deliver services more efficiently or to suggest that there is duplication of effort that needs to be streamlined. What it means is that the report should not be interpreted as a directive from Congress to decrease the level of effort dedicated to demand reduction.

Increasing access to treatment is critical. Drug addiction is a chronic relapsing disease. And as with other chronic relapsing diseases, such as diabetes, hypertension and asthma, there is no cure, although a number of treatments can effectively control the disease. According to the Journal of the American Medical Association, the rate of adherence to treatment programs and relapse rates are similar for drug addiction and other chronic diseases. That means that treatment for addiction works just as well as treatment for other chronic relapsing dis-

eases. I hope these facts will be reflected in the drug czar's report, particularly in terms of relapse. We should not be skimping on the amount of time a patient spends in treatment because someone thinks that would be more efficient. In truth, it would be less efficient. Studies have shown that the longer a patient spends in treatment the more likely that patient is to stay off drugs. But even with the best treatment protocol, patients relapse. That does not mean that treatment does not work, however.

Research is another area where returns on investment are not always linear or predictable. But I believe that we need to be doing more research on new forms of treatment, particularly when it comes to developing new anti-addiction medications. In the last Congress, I worked with Senators LEVIN and HATCH and former Senator Moynihan to pass a law to allow qualified doctors to prescribe certain anti-addiction medications from their offices rather than requiring patients to pick them up at special clinics. The bill helps to move drug treatment using anti-addiction medications into the medical mainstream. And buprenorphine, the first medication that could be prescribed under the system created by the bill, is expected to be approved any day now. We need to develop additional medications for this new system to treat cocaine and methamphetamine addiction as well as to curb the cravings associated with addiction.

The last item that I would suggest that the drug czar keep in mind when drafting his report is the importance of prevention, particularly school-based prevention programs. After several years of a stable level of drug use in the United States, this year drug use is up 11 percent among 12 to 17-year-olds and 18 percent among 18 to 25-year-olds. It is vital that we increase our current efforts at preventing drug use among teens and young adults. After all, we know that if we can get a child through age 21 without abusing drugs, they are unlikely ever to do so.

My goal is not to dictate what the drug czar writes in his report. Rather, I want to make clear that when Congress directs that the drug czar write a report on how to "streamline, consolidate, coordinate, simplify, and more effectively conduct and deliver" Federal drug and substance abuse treatment, prevention, education and research programs, it does not mean that we are trying to minimize the importance of these programs. We are merely looking for guidance on how they could be delivered more effectively and more efficiently.

SENATOR JESSE HELMS

Mr. SHELBY. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to North Carolina Senator JESSE HELMS, a dedicated public servant who has served with distinction for five terms in the United States

Senate. During this time, Senator HELMS has had a tremendous influence on the issues which have faced our country and his reasoned and determined beliefs on foreign policy have helped to shape the direction of America's relationships around the globe. In doing so, Senator HELMS has always put the interests of the United States above all else, and his efforts were often rewarded with hard-fought concessions. Indeed, when others would hope to expedite and rush through legislation, it was often Senator HELMS who called for deliberation and patience. Senator HELMS truly understands the Senate's function as a deliberative body and takes to heart the great responsibility the Constitution has given the Senate in its role as a check to the powers of the Executive branch. I have had the pleasure to work with Senator HELMS for the past 16 years and it is with great appreciation and respect that I commend him for all of his meaningful work as he retires at the end of the 107th Congress.

Senator HELMS was born in Monroe, NC in 1921. A product of the public schools of Monroe county, he took to heart the lessons he learned early in life. A firm believer in family, respect for one's elders, morality, patriotism and religious faith, Senator HELMS has let these convictions be his guide throughout his life. After serving his country in the Navy during World War II, Senator HELMS came back to his home State as a city editor of the Raleigh Times. It was not long before he received his first exposure to Senatorial duties working as an Administrative Assistant to U.S. Senator Willis Smith and later for Senator Alton Lennon. Politics seemed to agree with Senator HELMS, for in 1952, he directed the radio-television division of the presidential campaign of Democratic Senator Richard B. Russell of Georgia. For the next 7 years, Senator HELMS served as the Executive Director of the North Carolina Bankers Association and editor of the Tarheel Banker, which grew under his guidance into the largest banking publication in the United States. Following this remarkable success, Senator HELMS in 1960 became the Vice-President, Vice-Chairman of the Board and assistant Chief Executive Officer of Capitol Broadcasting Company. It was from this post that Senator HELMS became a familiar voice in politics, filing daily editorials for WRAL-TV and the Tobacco Radio Network. Over the next 12 years, Senator HELMS became known as an articulate conservative across the nation, where his editorials were printed regularly in more than 200 newspapers throughout the United States and broadcast by more than 70 stations in North Carolina. Senator HELMS capitalized on his familiarity and popularity with the voters of North Carolina in 1972, when he was elected to the U.S. Senate on his first attempt at state-wide elective office. His election marked the beginning of a long and distinguished career in the Senate, where