So the tragedy, in answer to the question, of this Congress not acting is that if somehow Mr. GORE is not elected, we may finally get the 60 votes we need to break the filibuster but we will have a President who is not ready to do something about the corrosive and corrupting influence of money in politics. Of course, the Senator knows from my work on this, that I consider this to be one of the two or three greatest problems in our society. We just have to do something about the corrupting effect of money on our political and legislative system.

Mr. REID. I have a final question. It is not a complicated issue, is it? The fact is, one of the things the Senator wants to do is keep corporate money out of politics; that is, have a corporation not be able to write large corporate checks or small corporate checks; keep corporate money out of politics, as was the law early last century. Isn't that right?

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, that is absolutely right. Let me make it clear, the ban on soft money that Senator MCCAIN, I, and a majority of this body support, bans corporate contributions, union contributions, and unlimited individual contributions. It is fair and balanced.

The Senator from Nevada is absolutely right. People who might be listening to this discussion might say: Well, these kinds of contributions have always been allowed anyway. That is not true. These kinds of unlimited contributions by corporations, unions, and individuals really didn't exist for purposes of these television ads until 5, 6 years ago. This is a new corrupting influence on our system, the likes of which has not been seen since the turn of the last century. I refer to the turn from the 19th to the 20th century. In answer to the question of the Senator from Nevada, that is what led to the 1907 Tillman Act which prohibited contributions by corporations in connection with federal elections, and then, when the unions came into their prominence in the middle part of the century, the Taft-Hartley Act said unions also must be prohibited from giving contributions.

All we are trying to do is put the genie back in the bottle. Unlimited contributions have always been considered inappropriate in our system of government, and shame on this Congress that we can't see the worst corrupting influence in 100 years and that we didn't, before the turn of the century, shut it down, because it must be shut down.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. REID. Will the Senator yield for a unanimous consent request?

Mr. HATCH. I am happy to.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that following the remarks of the Senator from Utah, the Senator from Illinois be recognized for 15 minutes.

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

GRANTING AMNESTY TO ILLEGAL ALIENS

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I rise to make some points that need to be made at the end of the session.

Here we are, running right up against election time, and we are being held hostage because the President of the United States wants to grant amnesty to up to 4 million illegal aliens, people who haven't played by the rules, haven't paid the price, who literally want to jump over those who have played by the rules and who belong here—this blanket amnesty all for the purpose of politics.

In fact, I heard one of the leading Democrats say: Boy, Telemundo and all of the Hispanic newspapers are really playing this up.

Well, that might be true in the Hispanic media, but I think Hispanic people in this country want fairness above everything else. I think they know what is going on here. They know darn well they are being played, and they are being played in a vicious way.

I once again urge President Clinton not to veto the Commerce-Justice-State appropriations bill the Senate passed on Friday.

President Clinton has threatened a veto because we did not include his so-called Latino Fairness Act. But we have included something much better than his Latino Fairness Act: the Legal Immigration Family Equity Act, the LIFE Act.

This act reunites families and restores due process to those who have played by the rules. Our proposal does not pit one nationality against another, nor does it pit one race against another. Our legislation provides relief to immigrants from all countries, not just special countries. A veto of CJS would be a blow against immigrant fairness. But a veto would do far more than that.

A veto would cut off funding for some of our most important programs. The CJS appropriation allocates $4.8 billion for the Immigration and Naturalization Service and an additional $15.7 million for Border Patrol equipment upgrades. It provides $3.3 billion for the FBI and $221 million for training, equipment, and research and development programs to combat domestic terrorism. We are not playing around here. This is important stuff. I don't think it is right to be playing politics with the lives of immigrants at the end of the session just to obtain some cheap political advantage.

There is $4.3 billion allocated for the Federal prison system in CJS. That is money we need to run the prison system and to treat people with due process. Then we have $1.3 billion for the Drug Enforcement Administration. This is critical to our fight against illegal drugs in this country. There is $288 million for the Violence Against Women Act. That is legislation that I have strongly supported and that provides assistance to battered women and children through a variety of different programs.

Actions have consequences. If President Clinton vetoes this bill, he is putting the public safety and well-being at risk both at home and abroad, all in an effort to play wedge politics. The President's veto threats ring hollow because this appropriations bill provides many proposals to help immigrants. The President himself has stated he wants to ''keep families together and to make our immigration policies more equitable.''

This is exactly what our LIFE Act that we have in the appropriations bill does. Had the White House proposed this during President Clinton's first 7 years in office, he might have been able to develop a mandate to grant amnesty to millions of undocumented aliens, aliens who have broken our laws. But no such mandate exists.

The American people need to know that the INS, the FBI, and the Border Patrol are being brought to the brink of a shutdown because President Clinton wants Congress to grant amnesty for up to 4 million illegal aliens, people who haven't played by the rules.

When we fought the H–1B legislation on the floor, many on the other side pointed out the difficulties of legal immigrant families. They pointed out that children needed to be reunited with their parents, that spouses needed to be reunited with their husbands and wives. I said I would try to do something about that.

We realized there was a problem with the late amnesty class of 1982 who qualified for residency under the 1986 Act. We said we would try to do something about that, and the LIFE Act does. The American people are a fair people. The LIFE Act will take care of 1 million people who either don't have due process or who need to be reunited with their families. It takes care of them first rather than granting amnesty to up to 4 million illegal people who haven't played by the rules, which is what the President wants to do. Fairness dictates that we not grant amnesty to millions of illegal aliens when there are 3.5 million people who have played by the rules waiting to come to the United States. The President should remember this inequitable proposal and reconsider what he wants to do here.

Let me say a couple of other things. I have even let the White House know that to determine if there are further inequities we will hold hearings right after we come back at the first of the year, and we will find out what needs to be done to restructure INS, if necessary, to make sure they treat people with more respect. We will consider these people who President Clinton would like to help. But most of them are here illegally and without further information, we think they should not be jumped above or in front of these people who aren't here legally or who have been waiting in line to be reunited with their families.

We brought both sides together in this LIFE Act and brought a variety of

different people into this. But there are some people who don't want any immigration to our country. They may live in States that are overrun with illegal immigrants; at least some of them do. Others don't seem to care about any rules, and I suspect the President is in that category. But we have brought these people together in the LIFE Act to resolve the problems that were mentioned during the H–1B debate. By gosh, I think it is time for the President to sign this bill and get about doing the Nation's business. He should quit playing wedge politics with these issues that are highly inflammable and about which he can blame people in illegitimate and wrongful ways.

I have worked very hard, along with a number of others, to bring this about in a way that is equitable, fair, and takes care of those who first need to be taken care of, with promises to hold hearings to see if there are any others who need the help and fairness that we can grant. That is the best we can do this year. That is the best we can do at the end of this session. It is the best we can do in bringing people together.

I think we have done a good job getting it done, and I hope the President will go along with our proposal so we can continue funding the INS, the Border Patrol, the FBI, training and equipment research and development programs to combat domestic terrorism, the Federal prison system, and the Drug Enforcement Administration. We must enact the CJS Appropriations into law because it funds things that are absolutely critical to this country. Moreover, it makes it possible for 1 million people to get permanent residency, people who have been waiting in line, have paid the price, and played by the rules.

This is a front-page issue in the Hispanic media, but most Americans don't know what the President is trying to do because the mainstream media is not reporting this issue. The American people need to know what is going on here. I think it is a crass approach to play wedge politics at the end of this session, holding us hostage so we can't get home and campaign and do what we need to do. Right now, I would much rather be home in Utah than here in Washington. But as long as we have to be here, I am going to make these points to try to help all immigrants, including Hispanics to receive fair treatment by the INS and by our immigration policies.

I am a cochairman of the Republican Senatorial Hispanic Task Force. I started it a number of years ago to make sure Hispanics are treated fairly and that Hispanic issues are given the attention they deserve. We have done an awful lot in this area, and I think the LIFE Act is a very good piece of legislation that will take us far down the road. Additionally, we have made a promise to hold hearings next year to see if there are any other inequities that need to be remedied. We will be glad to do that.

We have 535 Members of Congress and a wide variety of viewpoints. I think we have brought them together in a way that will work and solve some of these problems.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I wonder if the Senator from Utah would stay on the floor for a moment. It is my understanding that, as chairman of the Senate Committee, the Senator from Utah has jurisdiction over immigration issues. I am trying to recall. In the last 2 years, the only major immigration bill that I can recall was the H–1B visa bill that we considered. Is my memory accurate on that?

Mr. HATCH. I don't think it is. We have held a number of hearings. The Subcommittee on Immigration holds hearings, which is chaired by Senator ABRAHAM and the ranking member, Senator KENNEDY. We have been trying to do an agricultural bill, H–1B, H–1A. There are a whole raft of things we have been trying to do. We have also worked consistently on the committee with the INS, the administration, and the Justice Department to resolve problems. I work on them all the time.

Mr. DURBIN. Was there a bill brought to the floor from the Subcommittee on Immigration that dealt with the larger issues that the Senator is now addressing other than H–1B during the last 2 years?

Mr. HATCH. The visa waiver bill was brought to the floor. As I understands, we have had 8 years of this administration and they haven't brought anything to the floor either, nor have they asked us to do anything here.

Mr. DURBIN. Senator HARRY REID of Nevada, Senator KENNEDY, and I have each introduced bills relative to the three elements the administration is urging and they have been pending for months now.

Frankly, I understand the good faith of the Senator from Utah, but when we literally have hundreds of thousands of people across America whose fate is hanging in the balance here on a decision to be made by the Senate and we have not seen on the Senate floor—other than the H–1B visa bill—frankly, some bills of smaller consequence, I think perhaps the Senator from Utah can understand the anxiety and concern of these families.

I deal with these families all the time, and I am sure the Senator does, too. Two out of three of my constituent cases coming into the Chicago office deal with immigration. I hear these heartbreaking stories about families that are torn apart because of some of the laws we have passed, the failure of this Congress to respond to this. And I, frankly, have urged the President to take the position he has taken—don't go home and leave these poor families out there, frankly, languishing because we failed to address three basic things. We failed to say we are going to give those refugees who have come to this country and have faced the same kind of political persecution as refugees from Nicaragua and Cuba—we believe they should receive equal and fair treatment. I don't think that is a radical idea. Secondly, 245(i) says if you are going to get a chance to finally get your green card and become a naturalized citizen, go through the process, we think it is an unreasonable hardship to force you to go back to your country of origin and apply for a visa, which is an economic hardship and, in many cases, a danger that families should not go through.

I can't imagine why that is a radical idea. The idea of updating the registry in this country that we have used to affect immigrants has been updated regularly since 1929. We are not bringing a radical notion to the Senate. In fact, we are following the tradition of Democratic and Republican administrations, and we have not had a bill come to the floor.

We have hundreds of thousands of people whose lives hang in the balance. Frankly, I can understand the position of the President, and I agree with him. I am sorry we have not had hearings on this issue nor brought it to the floor; but to say that it is something we might look at next year is cold comfort to these people who, frankly, face the fear of being extradited or somehow removed from this country in a situation that could be a great hardship to their families.

I say to the Senator from Utah, there is another side to the story. I deal with it every day in my Chicago office and all across Illinois.

Mr. HATCH. If the Senator will allow me to respond, yes, there is another side of the story. I work on it all the time. A high percentage of people who come to my office have immigration problems. I work very hard to try to resolve them. But for 7½ years the administration has not raised this. We have had hearings on restructuring INS and straightening out some of the problems. But for 7½ years, the INS has fought against the 1982 people who we resolved in this bill called the LIFE Act that is in this bill.

The Clinton administration INS has fought the 1982 class' efforts to get due process every year since I have been here. It is one of the things that I wanted resolved, we have resolved it with the LIFE Act.

With regard to 245(i), I would like to do more, to be honest with you. But that is a minor problem compared to bringing in before them people who basically are illegal and who haven't played by the rules.

Mr. DURBIN. May I ask the Senator——

Mr. HATCH. If you would let me finish my thought.

Mr. DURBIN. I want to ask you a question specifically on that point.

Mr. HATCH. Here is the problem. This was never faced by the administration until the spring of last year.

Mr. DURBIN. I have to say to the Senator that I sent a letter along with

Senator KENNEDY and Senator REID asking, I think almost a year ago, for this matter to be considered.

Mr. HATCH. You may have done that. The administration has fought us on these issues, and frankly——

Mr. DURBIN. The administration supports our position.

Mr. HATCH. They do now and they didn't then. They support it now for crass political purposes.

Let me say one other thing. The Senator has been on the Judiciary Committee. He knows these are hot-button issues, and hot-button issues are very difficult issues to handle. He knows I want to solve these problems. But he also knows that there is a wide disparity of belief in both bodies, and it is almost impossible to bring everybody together and solve every problem, just like that. We have done our best.

Mr. DURBIN. We have not had a vote on this floor on this, have we?

Mr. HATCH. We have on the LIFE Act. It is part of the bill.

Mr. DURBIN. In terms of what we have proposed—the three bills we have proposed—I don't believe we have had a vote on the floor on them.

Mr. HATCH. I don't think we have.

Mr. DURBIN. There are a number of people who have criticized Congress because we can't act in a bipartisan fashion. Frankly, we don't get a chance to act, if we can't bring a bill to the floor—and if we can't have amendments and if we can't have debates and votes.

Mr. HATCH. One reason why it is difficult to do so is because of the wide disparity of different beliefs, and if one House or the other won't let it come to the floor.

Mr. DURBIN. If the only matters that we can consider are matter of consensus, what in the world has this Chamber turned into? Why are we afraid of debate and amendments?

Mr. HATCH. That is not my point. In this climate, any single Senator can stop anything. In the House of Representatives, any block of Members can stop anything. These are hot-button issues, and I think it is pretty amazing what we have been able to get done.

Mr. DURBIN. Let me reclaim my time.

Mr. HATCH. Can I make one last comment with the indulgence of my friend?

Mr. DURBIN. I am happy to yield.

Mr. HATCH. President Clinton properly signed the 1996 immigration bill. But now weeks before election day he seeks to turn the 1996 act on its head.

I, too, want to help constituents. But putting several million people who violated the immigration laws ahead of the line of the 3.5 million people who are legitimately waiting and have waited for years to come here legally, it seems to me, is wrong.

Mr. DURBIN. I was happy to yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. HATCH. Especially under these circumstances.

Mr. DURBIN. But I certainly want to add a few things.

Mr. HATCH. I yield the floor.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, this image is being created under this immigration act that we are talking about people who managed to sneak into the United States illegally and who have lived their lives in violation of the law and are now trying to sneak into citizenship. There are people like that, I am sure, but they are an extremely small minority.

The vast majority of people we are concerned about are people such as Sarah. Sarah is a 19-year-old girl in southern California. She was born in Mexico and adopted at the age of 4. English is her primary language. She lives at home with her family. She is adored by her parents and her five older siblings. She is also an illegal immigrant. Why is she an illegal immigrant? It turns out that Sarah's parents made a crucial mistake at the time of adoption. They didn't apply for citizenship. The family wrongly assumed that she automatically became a citizen when they completed the formal adoption procedures in the California courtroom. No one told them they had to file separately for citizenship. It was only last year when they decided to take a trip to Mexico and asked for a passport that they realized Sarah is here illegally.

Is this someone who managed to sneak across the border and is living in violation of the law?

There are thousands of Sarahs who are, frankly, looking for relief in Congress and who can make a contribution to the United States.

But the fact that we have not brought a serious immigration bill—but for one H–1B visa bill—before Congress is the reason this President has put his foot down and said: Congress, don't go home until you address this problem.

There are people such as Sarah across America who deserve fair treatment. Frankly, they have been ignored.

I count the Senator from Utah as my friend. But I have to say that the Senate Judiciary Committee has not taken up this issue. They have ignored it. He identified the reason: It is controversial.

When you talk about immigrants, there are a lot of people who say I know how to exploit that issue. Let me tell you something. I know that is the case in my home State of Illinois. But I happen to be the son of an immigrant. I am very proud of the fact that I serve in this Senate as the son of immigrants. And many of us in this country look to our parents and grandparents as immigrants with great pride.

We should look at immigration fairly and honestly and in a legal way. You can't do it if you run away from a debate on immigration law the way we have in the Senate for the last two years.

President Clinton, hold your ground. For those across America who are waiting for us to do the fair and right and equitable thing for immigrants, hold your ground. Insist that this Senate, before it goes home, and this Congress, before it leaves to go back to campaign, are fair to those across America who are looking to be treated equitably and justly under our immigration system.

I am responding, of course, to what the Senator from Utah raised as an issue. It wasn't the reason I came to the floor, but I feel passionately about it.

Senator KENNEDY, Senator REID, and myself are the three major sponsors of the measure on which President Clinton is insisting. They can add, I am sure, during the course of this debate their strong feelings as well.

CHOOSING A PRESIDENT

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, in just a few days the American people get to make one of the most important decisions that we are ever called on to make, and that is to choose a leader for our country. It appears from all of the polls that the American people just can't decide. The polls go up and down every single week. You see one candidate ahead one week and another candidate ahead the next. Frankly, the verdict of public opinion will be rendered on November 7, and we will decide the leader for the next 4 years.

Many of us believe this is a decision of importance way beyond 4 years. We think the next President is going to chart a course for many years to come.

We have to make a very basic decision.

Frankly, if you believe that the Presidency is an easy responsibility, and if you believe that America will run forward in a positive way on automatic pilot, then I think, frankly, you might be inclined to vote for Governor Bush because he has spoken in very general terms about what he thinks about America. He has made specific proposals, which are fairly radical departures from what we have been, and he says everything is going to be fine; in fact, it will be better.

Many of us, though, can remember something that perhaps Governor Bush never experienced. He was not a Governor in Texas during the period of time when we dealt with the worst deficits in the history of the United States in Washington. Under Presidents Reagan and Bush, we dealt with deficits that were crippling to this American economy. I saw it in my home State of Illinois with high unemployment and high inflation. People weren't building homes and weren't starting businesses. It was a very bad time. We were in a recession. We paid a bitter price for it—families and businesses across America. Thank goodness, in 1993, we turned a corner and started moving forward. Some of the things that have happened since are absolutely historic.

If you take a look, since March 1991—which goes back to the Bush Presidency for a few months—we have had