

ENSIGN and Senator REID spent \$20 million in the State of Nevada. I am not making a misstatement. The State of Nevada has about a million and a half people. We spent \$20 million. That is really too much money. That doesn't take into consideration the independent expenditures involved.

So with JOHN McCAIN on the floor of the Senate now, I throw bouquets to JOHN McCAIN for the leadership he has shown. He has not backed down, and I appreciate that.

I also see present my friend, the Senator from Wisconsin, RUSS FEINGOLD. He has been a leader. I have admired the work he has done with Senator McCAIN. I have said it privately, but I say it publicly how much I appreciate the work he has done. He has truly been a leader of this country with his partner Senator McCAIN. I am glad my friend, the Democratic leader, talked about campaign finance.

We want to work together. The Senate is divided 50/50. There is no reason in the world we can't pass legislation. When we pass legislation, there is credit to go around. There is credit to go to Republicans and credit to go to the Democrats. There is credit to go to the President. We can all walk out of here recognizing we have done something for the common good. I hope we can do that.

The last 2 years have not been constructive or good. I hope we can reflect in the future on the good work we have done for our States and our country.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ALLEN). The Senator from Arizona is recognized.

CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

Mr. McCAIN. I thank my colleagues, the Democrat leader and Senator HARRY REID, for their comments and their willingness to work together on all issues, including campaign finance reform. I am grateful for their continued cooperation and constructive comments.

I send a bill to the desk on behalf of myself, Senator FEINGOLD, Senator COCHRAN, and others.

(The remarks of Mr. McCAIN, Mr. FEINGOLD, and Mr. COCHRAN pertaining to the introduction of S. 27 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa, Mr. GRASSLEY, is recognized.

FAREWELL TO A TRUE PUBLIC SERVANT

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I address the Senate because of a very trusted and longtime staffer of mine, Kris Kolesnik, who is leaving my staff to work in the private sector and to continue some very good work. He served the taxpayers effectively for 18 years and has moved to the private sector, where I think he will not only do

the work of the association with which he works, but he is also going to be working to save the taxpayers money, which is something he did very well for me during that 18-year period of time.

Kris started in January of 1982. He began as a budget analyst working for me on the Budget Committee. That year, I proposed what would become the first of several yearly across-the-board budget freezes of the Federal budget. Kris worked on those proposals for me.

Among my Republican colleagues, the freeze proved popular because it would make a big impact on slowing down the Federal deficits which, at that time, were about \$100 billion as far as the eye could see.

The only problem was, Republicans wanted to exempt defense spending from that freeze. All other programs were appropriate to freeze, they said, and at that time the defense budget under President Reagan was increasing by double digits even after inflation was calculated. My reaction was that even if one program—even the defense program—were exempt, that would defeat the purpose of an across-the-board freeze which had the purpose of fairness and shared sacrifice.

Today, after 4 years of paying down the national debt, we might forget that maybe a freeze was not something that did much in particular. But if you looked at that particular time, we were in the middle of what was going to be 28 years of unbalanced Federal budgets before we finally got our house in order. An across-the-board freeze might not have seemed like much, but it was really revolutionary for that particular time. So that year I didn't receive much support among my Republican colleagues on this freeze. They all said the defense budget could not be frozen and that even one penny would cause our defense plan to fall apart.

At the end of the year, I asked Kris Kolesnik to spend the winter determining whether a case could be made for freezing the defense budget while not harming national security. If it could not, then I needed to know because I would have to abandon my attempts to freeze across the board. When I returned to the Senate in January of 1983, I asked Kris what progress had been made during that 3-week interim. He said he had discussions with advocates on both sides of the issue and he determined that those in favor of a defense freeze were more persuasive.

Those against a freeze seemed to rely on an argument of "just trust us." As a first step in unraveling the truth of the defense budget, Kris suggested that I call up then-Secretary of Defense Cap Weinberger and ask to speak to a relatively obscure Pentagon budget analyst by the name of Franklin Chuck Spinney. The rumor was that Chuck Spinney had an explosive new report that showed the defense budget was bloated with new programs which far exceeded the already huge projected

costs. Fitting all those programs and their costs within even President Reagan's growing defense budget would eventually mean skyrocketing costs, plummeting defense capability, or perhaps both. Only a freeze in defense spending, coupled with management reforms, could save the defense plan from imploding.

Kris predicted Pentagon officials would not let me talk to Chuck Spinney.

So, I picked up the phone right away and called Cap Weinberger. It was a Thursday evening. He told me there was no problem, that I could have Spinney come over to my office the following Monday at 2 p.m. I left that night for Iowa, expecting a full briefing by Spinney in 4 days.

Beginning Friday, however, Kris began to get phone calls from the Pentagon saying that Spinney would not be available to brief me, that they would send someone named Dr. Chu instead. It turned out that Dr. David Chu was Spinney's boss, and a political appointee.

My reaction was, it's okay to send Dr. Chu, but I want Spinney there as well. It didn't happen. I had an inkling that I had to go see Chuck Spinney in his office if I wanted to talk to him. I told Kris to go warm up my orange Chevette, that we were going to the Pentagon to find out why Cap Weinberger had reneged on his promise to me.

It's not every day that a United States Senator shows up at the Pentagon unannounced and in a disturbed mood. Cap Weinberger was at the White House, and Dr. Chu was called to persuade me that Spinney's briefing was just a bunch of chicken scratches on pieces of paper. My suspicions were really heightened. We left the Pentagon unsatisfied but resolved. My last words to Dr. Chu were, one way or another, I will get that briefing.

When I got back to my office, I got a phone call from Cap Weinberger. It is hard to remember 18 years later just exactly what that conversation was, but it was something to the effect that if we Republicans could not trust the civil servants that we ought to listen to the political appointees of the Reagan administration; that it might be good in some instances—but it didn't satisfy me—that Chuck Spinney was a civil servant; that he was somebody to whom I should listen.

Six weeks later, Mr. Spinney appeared before a joint hearing of the Senate Budget and Armed Services Committees in the ornate Russell Caucus Room, with a dozen TV cameras, a room full of reporters, and standing room only for the public. Instead of a briefing in the privacy of my office, Spinney briefed the entire country maybe for the good of the country. That was on a Friday afternoon. On Monday, he was on the cover of TIME magazine. Kris and his underground allies had orchestrated the whole thing.

That episode marked the beginning of the end for the Reagan defense budget buildup. In just two short years, in large part due to Kris' leadership as a staffer, the defense budget was frozen, and remained so until 2 years ago—a span of 14 years.

We had a vote. It was 50-49 on the floor of the Senate when we adopted that as part of the budget of 1985.

During those 2 years, Kris helped uncover the infamous over-priced spare parts, such as a \$500 hammer and a \$7,600 coffee maker purchased by the military. He did so by working with whistleblowers throughout the defense community, such as Ernie Fitzgerald, Tom Amlie, Colin Parfitt, and many others. Their work exposed tens of billions of dollars of waste and mismanagement of the taxpayers' defense dollars.

Through the inspector general community, Kris discovered that the Justice Department rarely prosecuted defense contractors. By 1986, eight out of the top ten defense contractors were under criminal indictment or criminal investigation for contract fraud. In that year, he was named in Esquire magazine as one of the top eight staffers in Washington to watch.

In the late 1980's and early 1990's Kris investigated the POW/MIA issue. His work, which uncovered many unanswered questions about missing soldiers from the Vietnam War, went toward establishing a Senate Select Committee on POW/MIA Affairs. I was a member of that Committee, and Kris staffed it for me. The Committee was able to find answers for many of the families who, up until then, had none. And millions of pages of POW/MIA records were declassified for the public to see.

In 1995, after Republicans took control of the Congress, House and Senate Republican leaders asked Kris and a small group of staffers to share their oversight skills with the new majority staff. Having performed oversight over the Defense and Justice Departments for a dozen years, Kris with his colleagues, now began to apply their oversight experience to the rest of the federal government. The result has been increased and systematic oversight by Congress across the board.

During that time, Kris focused on overseeing the FBI. Such systematic oversight of the FBI, on a committee that has always been reluctant to investigate the bureau, has not been successfully done in recent times in the Senate. Because of Kris' staff work, much has been done to help restore the public's confidence in federal law enforcement.

Among the celebrated cases Kris investigated or helped investigate were: the FBI crime lab scandal; the FBI's poor investigation of the TWA Flight 800 crash; the incidents at Waco and Ruby Ridge; Chinese espionage cases, including the FBI's botched case against Wen Ho Lee; and the campaign finance scandals of the 1996 election.

Kris's legacies will be the tens of billions of dollars he helped to save the taxpayers through his work, as well as his work on behalf of whistleblowers. After all, without the whistleblowers, there would be no savings. He depended on them, from the staff level, for information. And so he fiercely defended their right, through legislation he helped draft on my behalf, to share information with Congress. He assisted in the drafting and/or passing of major whistleblower statutes including: the False Claims Act Amendments of 1986; the Whistleblower Protection Act; and, the yearly-passed anti-gag appropriations rider for federal employees.

Appropriately, Kris is leaving Capitol Hill to become the executive director of the National Whistleblower Center, an organization that supports and protects whistleblowers throughout government. There, he can continue his work on behalf of the taxpayers, and fighting for those who dare to speak the truth and risk their jobs.

The taxpayers will indeed be missing a trusted ally with Kris's departure. But the impact of his accomplishments will be with us a long time. He'll still work to save the taxpayers money, but he won't be on the public payroll. That's the principled crusader he is!

One additional thought that just came to my mind as I was going through what I prepared today about Kris: Going back to the budget freeze of 1980 and the fact that the spending on defense needed to be ramped up, it was ramped up to fast. There was a lot of money wasted.

We are going to spend money on defense because we have to. But we ought to learn from the lessons of the 1980's, and hopefully our new President, President Bush, will move fairly slowly in that area so that the money will be invested wisely and spent wisely and so we don't have a situation such as we had in 1982 where one assistant Defense Department secretary said we put the money bags on the steps of the Pentagon and said come and get it. We want to keep our hands on those money bags that we set before the Pentagon as we spend money on defense.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine is recognized.

(The remarks of Ms. COLLINS on the introduction of S. 27 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

NEW DIRECTIONS

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, it is a good day to begin a new session. It is a

good day to begin, of course, the new year with many challenges before Members. I think all Members have enjoyed the last several days with many folks visiting from home, particularly from Wyoming, because of the new Vice President. We had a great turnout. We were very pleased and are all very proud of our new Vice President.

We have a great deal to do, as is always the case. I think particularly this year we are faced with seeking to accomplish many things. We talked about many of them last year but did not in every case succeed in getting them finished, so we are back at it again. Hopefully, we will see some new directions; we will see some new directions from the White House certainly. I was pleased with the President's talk on Inauguration Day and his defining the goals that he has set forth. Certainly during the next couple of weeks we will see a great deal more defining of that. Our first obligation, obviously, is to finish the nominations so this administration can be in place.

We will see some new directions, and hopefully they will be the kinds of things upon which we can agree. I believe we will see more emphasis in the private sector, trying to encourage and cause things to happen that need to be done for the country in terms of individuals doing them, in terms of local governments doing them, as well as the contribution of the Federal Government.

I think we will be inclined to move toward reduction in taxes. I certainly hope so. We have the highest tax rates now being paid of anytime since World War II. This is a time, of course, when there are lots of things we need to do. One of them is paying off the debt; another is certainly to be able to fund and finance those things that we want to strengthen, such as education, such as health care.

On the other hand, the fact that we have a very healthy economy which has produced a surplus doesn't mean we necessarily need to grow the role of the Federal Government. On the contrary, I think each time we do something in the Federal Government, we ought to analyze the extent to which we are able to do that at the State or local level, or that it is more efficient to do it here simply because we have more money.

That does not mean we need to increase the role of government. We will allow States and local governments to have more of a role in the decision-making process. We have talked about it already in education, certainly strength in education. We will look for more flexibility so local schools can use the dollars as they need them. There is a great deal of difference, often, in the needs between Wheatland, WY, and Philadelphia. We should have the flexibility to use those dollars locally as is appropriate.

We will certainly be seeking to balance resource development. I live in a State that is 50 percent owned by the