

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

Mr. DURBIN. I thank the Chair.

There are many millions of children around the world who deserve our concern and our compassion. I hope those who are expressing this feeling about Elian Gonzalez will not stop at that, will decide that we can do more to help many others in small ways and large ways combined. I hope next week the leadership of the Senate does not bring this matter before us. I will oppose it. I will support the resolution from the Senator from Connecticut. I think it is sensible. It answers the basic question with the most basic family value. Where should Elian Gonzalez be? He should be with his father, his last surviving parent. The trauma that he has been through I think, I hope he can endure. I hope he will be a strong little boy. I hope he will grow up and reflect on his experience in the United States, remembering that there were people who loved him in this country as well, and there certainly are.

Let me close by saying that I hope Cuban Americans will consider this for a moment. I don't believe the action they have taken relative to Elian Gonzalez has increased the popularity of their cause at all. Many people are confused and bewildered that they would fight a foreign policy battle on the back of a 6-year-old boy.

I think we should learn a lesson from history. There was a time when Eastern Europe was under Soviet domination.

There was a time when we considered them to be victims of a Communist regime. We decided in the latter part of the last century that the best way to change that government and that mindset in Eastern Europe was to open the doors wide, let them see the rest of the world, let them trade with the United States and Europe, and let them understand what democracy was all about, let them see what freedom meant in their daily lives, and, you know, it worked.

We saw the Berlin Wall come down. We saw countries such as Poland, under Soviet domination for 40 years, emerge into a democracy and an economy that is an inspiration to all. Can't we learn the same lesson when it comes to Cuba? If we open the doors and allow Cubans to come to the United States to visit, to work, to trade, to engage in cultural and educational exchanges, is there anyone who can doubt that will lead to a new Cuba? Is there anyone who doubts that kind of exchange, instead of this isolationism, will force the political change we have been waiting for for over four decades?

I don't think that change will come about by granting citizenship to Elian Gonzalez. That one little boy will become just a tragic footnote in history. He has endured enough in his short life. I hope this Senate doesn't add to the burden he now has to carry—the memory of seeing his mother drown at sea. I hope the leadership of the Senate will

think twice before they allow us to become party to what has become a sad chapter in the history of this country. I yield the floor.

APPOINTMENTS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair, on behalf of the majority leader, pursuant to Public Law 106-120, appoints the following individuals to serve as members of the National Commission for the Review of the National Reconnaissance Office: The Senator from Colorado (Mr. ALLARD), Martin Faga, of Virginia and William Schneider, Jr., of New York.

APPOINTMENTS BY THE DEMOCRATIC LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair, on behalf of the Democratic Leader, pursuant to Public Law 106-120, appoints the following individuals to serve as members of the National Commission for the Review of the National Reconnaissance Office: The Senator from Nebraska (Mr. KERREY), and Lieutenant General Patrick Marshall Hughes, United States Army, Retired, of Virginia.

APPOINTMENT BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, pursuant to the order of the Senate of January 24, 1901, appoints the Senator from New York (Mr. MOYNIHAN) to read Washington's Farewell Address on February 22, 2000.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator GRAMS of Minnesota be allowed to speak in morning business when the Senator from Nevada has completed his statement.

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

THE HIGH COST OF CAMPAIGNS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, about a year ago, I was still celebrating my victory from the election of 1998. It was a tough election. The reason I mention that today is because in the small State of Nevada, with less than 2 million people, the two candidates running for the Senate spent over \$20 million. We had less than 500,000 people who voted in that election but we spent over \$20 million. We spent approximately \$4 million in our campaign accounts, and then each party spent about \$6 million. So it was a total of \$20 million, plus an undisclosed amount of money that was spent by people who represented the National Rifle Association, the truckers' association, and other groups. These independent ex-

penditures on both sides were something that added to the cost of that election in Nevada.

The reason I mention this is when I first came to the Senate, I had an election I thought cost too much money. It cost about \$3 million. In this election I spent over \$10 million—that is, counting the money spent mostly on my behalf and on behalf of the others in that election cycle.

Something has to be done to stop the amount of money being spent on these elections. We know that on the Presidential level, Senator MCCAIN, who is running for the Republican nomination for the Presidency, is spending a lot of his time talking about the need for campaign finance reform. I admire and appreciate the work of Senator MCCAIN in this regard. On the Democratic side, both Senators Bradley and Vice President GORE are talking about the need for campaign finance reform. Those who support campaign finance reform got a real boost, a real shot in the arm, in the last few days when the U.S. Supreme Court, in a case that came out of Missouri, rendered a 6-3 opinion. In effect, that opinion said in the case of *Shrink v. Missouri Government* that the Court had a right to set maximums as to how much somebody could spend. The Court held that the Missouri law imposing a little over a \$1,000 limit on contributions to State candidates did comply with the Constitution, despite a challenge claimed that the limit was so low it affected the ability of interested people to give to the candidate of his choice.

The reason this case was so important is that everybody has been waiting for almost 25 years to determine what the Court would do about *Buckley v. Valeo*, were the Court held that political contributions are speech protected by the first amendment. Though certain limits could be enforced, the Government could not put too many restrictions on when and what a person could spend on political candidates. Some hoped and wished the *Shrink* case, cited by the Supreme Court, would throw out all the limitations and, in effect, there would be a free-for-all as to how much money could be raised, and there would be no restrictions as to from where the money would come. The *Shrink* case, while it didn't cite all the problems with campaign finance money, decided there could be limits established in campaign finance spending. That is an important step.

I think what we need is to have elections that are shorter in time. We have to have limitations on how much people can spend on elections. We can't do anything in light of the present law with having individuals spend unlimited amounts of money until we pass a constitutional amendment, which has been pushed by Senator FRITZ HOLLINGS for many years. In spite of our being unable to stop people from spending personal moneys of unlimited amounts, the Court clearly said limits