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.