

Judge Milburn, a Reagan appointee, and senior Judge Weis, a Nixon appointee, upheld the search. Judge Daughtrey dissented on the ground that there was no probable cause to search for additional pornographic material at the defendant's home. She flatly ignored a law enforcement officer's un rebutted affidavit, who said that based on his experience and from experts in the field that it was likely that more examples of child pornography would be found.

These judges are typical of more than half of the Clinton appellate judges. These judges sit on high above the district court judges who make the hundreds and thousands of usually uncontroversial, run-of-the-mill rulings that come up in a trial. These appellate judges make rulings on issues of law that will extend from the case before them to bind the other judges in that circuit on every similar case. The White House has cited decisions by Reagan-Bush judges as being soft on crime, but these decisions are almost exclusively at the trial level and seem to be an aberration for the particular judge. By contrast, I have focused attention previously on the important appellate decisions, and I have focused on particular judges rather than particular aberrational cases. It is clear that President Clinton has put on the bench particular individual judges who are continually activist.

To be sure, there are 13 Clinton appellate judges who have yet to issue activist decisions. But many of them have been on the bench for only a few months, and have yet to issue any significant opinions. And, quite honestly, I have not yet researched all of the decisions of all of these judges, who knows what I will find when I have more time to read these other decisions.

MYTH NO. 4

The Clinton administration maintains that it has appointed only moderate, highly qualified judges because its nominees have received better ratings from the American Bar Association than those received by judges appointed by Republican Presidents. This is truly unconvincing, because the ABA itself is no longer just an impartial trade association; over time it has been transformed into an ideological advocacy group.

The ABA has taken positions on some of the most divisive issues of our day, such as abortion, and it has vigorously lobbied on Capitol Hill against many of the sensible legislation and reforms that we, in the 104th Congress, have pursued. It has lobbied against the flag desecration amendment, against mandatory minimum sentences, against changes in the exclusionary rule, and against habeas corpus reform. It has lobbied for proracial preference and quota legislation and against the 104th Congress' efforts to end them. I question whether an ideological organization such as the ABA can be trusted to play an impartial role

in any governmental process, such as judicial selection. It is my hope that the ABA can play an impartial role. Only the future and the ABA's willingness to depoliticize itself, will tell.

MYTH NO. 5

The Clinton administration believes that it is hypocritical for Republicans in the Senate to criticize the Clinton judiciary, because we only voted against confirming a handful of the nominees. To be sure, sometimes we cannot predict how a nominee will act. In those cases where we can, in good faith, predict how a nominee will act, we have opposed the nomination, as in the cases of Judges Barkett, Sarokin, and Daughtrey.

But my main response is to remind the President of first constitutional principles. The Senate's job is only to advise and consent to those individuals nominated by the President. When Presidents Reagan and Bush lived with a Democratic Senate, we, Republicans, argued that the Senate owed some discretion to the President.

We have remained consistent in that position even under a Democratic President. As Alexander Hamilton explained in the *Federalist* No. 66:

It will be the office of the president to nominate, and with the advice and consent of the senate to appoint. There will of course be no exertion of choice on the part of the senate. They may defeat one choice of the executive, and oblige him to make another; but they cannot themselves choose—they can only ratify or reject the choice of the president.

The words of our Founding Fathers clearly explain why this election is so important. As a practical and as a constitutional matter, the Senate gives every President some deference in confirming judicial candidates nominated by the President. It is the President's power to choose Federal judges, and his alone. A Republican President would not nominate the same judges that a Democrat would, and vice versa. Thus, the American people should keep in mind that when they elect a President, they elect his judges too—and not just for 4 years, but for life. There simply is no substitute for the power to nominate Federal judges.

Finally, I would like to say this: We are not going to treat the Clinton judges the way our judges were treated in the Reagan and Bush administrations. We have treated them fairly. Yes, I would not have appointed very many of those judges. Neither would any other Republican. Neither will Senator DOLE when he becomes President. But the fact of the matter is President Clinton was elected. He is our President. He has a right to choose these judges, and we have an obligation to support those judges unless we can show some very valid constitutional reason or other reason why we should not.

As a general rule, we follow that rule and we do it even though we may not agree with these particular selections. But that does not negate the fact that

in retrospect as you look over the record these judges are more liberal. They are deciding cases in a more liberal fashion. They are deciding cases in an activist fashion. They are deciding cases that are soft on crime. And I have to say this is one of the big issues of our time. Are we going to continue to put up with this? Are we going to start realizing that these are important issues? And that is not to say that there are not Republican judges who make mistakes too. But these are more mistakes. These involve philosophy of judging that literally should not be a philosophy of judging. Judges are not elected to these positions. Judges are appointed for life and confirmed for life. They should be interpreting the laws made by those elected to make them, and they should not be making laws as legislators from the bench. Unfortunately, that is what we are getting today.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from North Dakota is recognized for 8 minutes.

ILLEGAL IMMIGRATION

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from Wyoming, if he has a moment, would have an opportunity to hear what I have to say. The business of the Senate as I understand from the majority leader's announcement is to come back to the bill on illegal immigration which is to be managed by the Senator from Wyoming, Senator SIMPSON.

Let me just in a couple of minutes of morning business say that I will likely vote for the illegal immigration bill. There are a couple of issues in it that I think will be the subject of some controversy. But I think the piece of legislation that has been constructed is worthy, and it is a reasonably good piece of legislation. It addresses a subject that needs addressing, and that should be addressed. I have no problem with this bill at all.

I believe we find ourselves in the following circumstances. Consent was given when the piece of legislation was introduced. Following the introduction of the Dorgan amendment, consent was given to the Simpson amendments. I think they were offered, and those amendments are pending. There is an underlying amendment that I offered that has been second-degreed by Senator KEMPTHORNE from Idaho. That is apparently where we find ourselves.

I wanted to explain again briefly what compelled me to offer an amendment on this piece of legislation. And, if we can reach an understanding with the majority leader, I have no intention to keep the amendment on this legislation. But here are the circumstances.

The majority leader has the right to bring a reconsideration vote on the constitutional amendment to balance the budget at any time without debate

and without amendment. He understands that. We understand that. He has indicated to me now that he does not intend to do that in the coming days. It will probably be in a couple of weeks. But he had previously announced that he would, at some point in April, perhaps mid-April, the end of April, force a reconsideration vote on the constitutional amendment to balance the budget.

The result was because we were going to have no opportunity to debate or to offer an amendment, and because some of us feel very strongly we will vote for a constitutional amendment provided it takes the Social Security trust funds and sets them outside of the other Government revenues and protects those trust funds. If it does that, we would vote for an amendment. We had done that before. There are a number of us on this side who have done that before. We offered it as an amendment. We voted for it. But we will have no opportunity to do a similar thing at this time, and my point was we would like the Senate to express itself on that issue.

The only way I could conceive of doing that was to offer a sense-of-the-Senate resolution. The sense-of-the-Senate resolution was to say that when a constitutional amendment to balance the budget is brought back to the floor of the Senate, it ought to include a provision that removes the Social Security trust funds from the other operating revenues of the Federal Government. We, incidentally, did that previously in an amendment that I believe got 40 votes. If it does, I would vote for it and I think there are probably a half dozen or dozen other Members who would similarly vote for it and we would have 70 or 75 votes for a constitutional amendment to balance the budget.

Because of circumstances and because of the parliamentary situation, I offered that as a sense-of-the-Senate resolution. It was then second-degreed. The Senator from Wyoming became fairly upset about that, and I understand why. He is managing a bill dealing with immigration. He said, "What does this have to do with immigration?"

Plenty of people have offered amendments that are not germane in the Senate. We do not have a germaneness rule. They have offered them because they felt the circumstances required them to offer them.

The Senator from Massachusetts indicated that he intends to offer an amendment on the minimum wage, increasing the minimum wage on this piece of legislation. My expectation would be, if there were an agreement reached by which the Senate would be able to agree to a vote on the minimum wage at some point, that amendment would go away as well. I do not intend to press my amendment if I can reach an agreement with the majority leader to give us an opportunity to offer, either a constitutional amendment to

balance the budget that protects the Social Security trust funds, or some other device that allows us to register on that issue before we are forced to vote on reconsideration.

I want to make just another point on the Social Security issue because I think it is so important. We are not talking about just politics, as some would suggest. Some say there is no money in the Social Security trust fund. That is going to be a big surprise to some kid who tries to ask his father what he has in his savings account, and his father says you have Government savings bonds, but there is really no money there. That is what is in the Social Security trust fund, savings bonds, Government securities. Of course there is money there.

The problem is continuing to do as we have done for recent years, and that is, instead of save the surplus that we every year now accumulate in the Social Security system, \$71 billion this year, if we instead use it as an offset against other Government revenues we guarantee there will be no money available in the Social Security trust funds when the baby boomers retire. It is about a \$700 billion issue in 10 years, and we ought to address it. It is not unimportant. It is not politics. It might be a nuisance for some for us to require that it be addressed at some point or another, but those of us who want it addressed are not going to go away.

I guess I would say at this point that the two issues that have been raised—the one I have raised by the sense-of-the-Senate resolution I think can be resolved if the majority leader, who was, from our last conversation yesterday, going to be visiting with the Parliamentarian to see if we could find a way to provide a method for a vote on the approach I have suggested and we have previously offered on the constitutional amendment to balance the budget. If that happens, I do not intend to be continuing to press the sense-of-the-Senate resolution that I had previously offered.

I wanted to speak in morning business only to describe what the circumstances are on this piece of legislation. I am not here to make life more difficult for the Senator from Wyoming. I have great respect for him. I think the legislation he has brought to the floor has a great deal to commend it.

Even if we do not resolve this issue on the Social Security trust funds, I would not intend to ask for more than 10, 15, 20 minutes debate. I am not interested in holding up the bill. Under any conditions, I am not interested in holding up this bill.

I would agree to the shortest possible debate time, if we are not able to resolve the issue in another way. But my hope would be in the next hour or so we might be able to resolve that issue in another way. We would still, then, be asking, it seems to me, based on the discussions of Senator KENNEDY, for some kind of commitment to allow the

Senate to proceed to deal with the issue of the minimum wage.

I yield the floor.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

IMMIGRATION CONTROL AND FINANCIAL RESPONSIBILITY ACT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now resume consideration of S. 1664, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1664) to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to increase control over immigration to the United States by increasing border patrol and investigative personnel and detention facilities, improving the system used by employers to verify citizenship or work-authorized alien status, increasing penalties for alien smuggling and document fraud, and reforming asylum, exclusion, and deportation law and procedures; to reduce the use of welfare by aliens; and for other purposes.

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill.

Pending:

Dorgan amendment No. 3667, to express the sense of the Senate that a balanced budget constitutional amendment should protect the Social Security system by excluding the receipts and outlays of the Social Security trust funds from the budget.

Simpson amendment No. 3669, to prohibit foreign students on F-1 visas from obtaining free public elementary or secondary education.

Simpson amendment No. 3670, to establish a pilot program to collect information relating to nonimmigrant foreign students.

Simpson amendment No. 3671, to create new ground of exclusion and of deportation for falsely claiming U.S. citizenship.

Simpson amendment No. 3672 (to amendment No. 3667), in the nature of a substitute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, just a prefatory remark, with regard to my friend from North Dakota.

I enjoy working with the Senator from North Dakota. We are near neighbors in that part of the world. I can understand the depth of his very honest conviction about Social Security and the balanced budget. It is not an opinion I share, because I feel that the Social Security System is going to go broke, whether you have it on budget, off budget, hanging from space or coming out of the Earth. It is going to go broke in the year 2029. It is going to start its huge swan song in 2012, and the reason we know that is because the trustees of the system are telling us that. So I understand completely.

He is sincere in what he is doing. He is a believer in that cause and he is persistent, dogged, and I know that very well. So, in that situation we will just see how it all plays out.

AMENDMENT NO. 3669

Mr. SIMPSON. So the status of the floor is that the bill is now reported.