

have made some progress, and I look forward to seeing if we can make more progress. The export administration bill, as the leader said, is a bill that has wide bipartisan support, and we should move forward on this, even though we have some people concerned about it. That is what the process is all about. They should come down and talk about their concerns, vote on it, and move it on. If there were ever a high-tech issue this congressional session, it is this bill. So the high-tech industry can remain competitive and keep that business we so value in the United States, we have to pass this bill or very quickly the business will be going offshore.

I thank the leader very much, and I look forward to continued progress on legislation to help the country.

#### RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

#### MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be a period for the transaction of morning business until 5 p.m. Under the previous order, the time until 1 p.m. shall be under the control of the Senator from Illinois, Mr. DURBIN, or his designee. Under the previous order, time will be under the control of the Senator from Wyoming, Mr. THOMAS, or his designee, from 1 o'clock to 2 o'clock.

The Senator from Nevada.

#### TRIBUTE TO SENATOR ROBERT C. BYRD

Mr. REID. Mr. President, we are all very proud of Senator BYRD. I have had the good fortune over my career—in the business part of it as an attorney and as a government official—to work with people who, for lack of a better description, are very smart. I have to say I have not seen anyone who has more intellectual capacity than ROBERT BYRD.

How many people do you know who can recite poetry for 8 hours without ever reciting the same poem twice? He can do that.

How many people do you know have actually studied and read the Encyclopedia Britannica? Senator BYRD has.

How many people do you know have used a congressional break to study the dictionary and read every word in the dictionary? Senator BYRD has done that.

Those of us who serve with him in the Senate, and especially those who serve with him on the Appropriations Committee, are every day amazed at his brilliance. His congressional service

has been brilliant. I look forward to his reelection this year and his continued service in the Senate. It has been a remarkable pleasure for me to serve with Senator BYRD.

#### CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

Mr. REID. Mr. President, when I was a little boy, I lived in the town of Searchlight, NV. One of my brothers, who is 10 years older than I, worked for Standard Stations. He was assigned to a place called Ashfork, AZ, which to me could have been as far away as New York City because I had never traveled anywhere.

When I was a young boy of 11 years, he allowed me to spend a week with him in Ashfork, AZ. My brother had a girlfriend. The thing I remember most about my journey to Ashfork, AZ. The girlfriend had a brother about my age, or a year or so older. We would play games. I never won a single game, not because I should not have, but because he kept changing the rules in the middle of the game. It does not matter what the game was; as I started to win, he would change the rules. So I returned from Ashfork never having won anything, even though I should have won everything.

The reason I mention that today is that is kind of what campaign finance is all about in America. The rules keep changing, not for the better, but for the worse. They are complicated. They are impossible to understand.

I was recently criticized because I did not disclose the names of people who gave to my leadership fund. Why didn't I? The reason I did not is that I did not legally have to. The most important reason, however, is that people who gave to my fund said: Do you have to disclose my name? And I said no, which was true. That is the law; I did not have to.

Over the last several weeks, there have been a number of people writing about the fact I have not disclosed who gave me the money and how much it was. I made a decision that even though it was unnecessary legally for me to do that, I would disclose those names. I could not do that, however, until I went back to the people whom I told I would not make a disclosure and got their permission to do so. I am happy to report I was able to do that. Everyone understood, and they said: Go ahead, I would rather you did not do it, but you have told me why you have to do it; go ahead and do that.

That goes right to the heart of what is wrong with the campaign finance system in America today. There is no end to what is politically correct, but yet if a person follows the legal rules, it still may not be politically correct. It is a Catch-22. No matter what one does in the system, it is wrong; people of goodwill trying to do the right thing are criticized.

We have to do something. Everything I have done with my Searchlight fund, as it is called, is totally legal. I have not done anything wrong. It has been checked with lawyers and accountants. In fact, when people came to me and said, do you have to disclose my name? I checked to make sure I was giving them the right information when I said no.

I thought it was important to follow the law, and I have done that. It was important for me to keep my word. Where I grew up, there was not a church and there was not a courthouse; everything was done based on people's word. If you shook hands with someone or you told them you were going to do something, that was the way it had to be, and that is the way I felt about disclosing these names.

It was very hard for me and somewhat embarrassing to go back to these people, and say: May I have your permission to disclose your name, even if you did not want it done? Even though they consented, it was not an easy thing to do.

I have disclosed these names and the money. The problem is the system is simply broken. There are traps set up all along the way for people who are trying to comply with the law. If we comply with the law, sometimes we lose the confidence of the public, who come to believe we are all in the grip of wealthy special interests whose cash carves out ordinary Americans from the system.

Under our current system, money is the largest single factor, some say, in winning a Federal political election, and a lot of times that is true. The dilemma we face is: Too little money, and you may very well lose your political position; too much money, and the public thinks you are in someone's pocket, for lack of a better description.

I finished an election last year. The State of Nevada at the time of that election had a population of fewer than 2 million people. My opponent and I spent the same amount in State party money and funds from our campaigns. We each spent over \$10 million for a total of \$20 million in a State of less than 2 million people. That does not count all the money spent in that election because there were independent expenditures also. We do not know the amount because there is no legal reason they be disclosed, but I estimate another \$3 million at least.

In the State of Nevada, a State of fewer than 2 million people, we had spent \$23 million. If that is not an example of why we need campaign finance reform, there is not an example. We need to do something now.

I have talked about the State of Nevada, but there are other States in which more money is spent. It is not unusual or uncommon to hear about races costing more money than the \$20 million spent in the State of Nevada.