

they refuse to let this institution work its will. From bankruptcy reform to H-1B legislation to juvenile justice reform to religious liberty protection legislation, there are several legislative items where the blessings of good faith cooperation have not been bestowed. Consider, for example, the fact that a handful of members on the other side of the aisle have kept us from simply proceeding to a formal conference on the bankruptcy bill. Having poisoned the water themselves, they have no ground for complaining that the water is now poisoned.

The more substantive complaints lodged by some of our colleagues have taken various forms. Some complain that there is a vacancy crisis in the federal courts; that the Senate has not confirmed enough of President Clinton's judicial nominees; and that the confirmation record of the Republican Senate compares unfavorably to the Democrats' record when they controlled this body.

The claim that there is a vacancy crisis in the federal courts is simply wrong. Using the Clinton Administration's own standard, the federal judiciary currently is at virtual full employment. Presently there are 60 vacancies in the 852-member federal judiciary, yielding a vacancy rate of just seven percent. Of these 60 vacancies, the President has failed to make a nomination for 27 of them.

Think about that. Some of my colleagues are complaining about a so-called vacancy crisis when almost half of the current vacancies don't even have a nominee. It is too late to really send additional nominations up here because we are in the final few months of the Congress and there is no way to get through them with the work we have to do in processing judges.

In 1994, at the end of the Democrat-controlled 103d Congress, there were 63 judicial vacancies. That is when the Democrats controlled the Senate and President Clinton was President. There were 63 judicial vacancies, yielding a vacancy rate of 7.4 percent. At that time, on October 12, 1994, the Clinton administration argued in a Department of Justice press release that "[t]his is equivalent to 'full employment' in the 837-member Federal judiciary." If the Federal judiciary was fully employed in 1994, when there were 63 vacancies and a 7.4 percent vacancy rate, then it certainly is fully employed now when there are only 60 vacancies and a 7 percent vacancy rate, even though we have a significantly larger judiciary.

Democrats further complain that the Republican Senate has not confirmed enough of President Clinton's judicial nominees. So far this year, the Judiciary Committee has held seven hearings for 30 judicial nominees. In addition, the Committee is holding a hearing today for four additional nominees. This year the Senate has confirmed 35

nominees, including eight nominees for the U.S. Courts of Appeals.

With eight court of appeals nominees already confirmed this year, it is clear that the Senate and the Judiciary Committee have acted fairly with regard to appeals court nominees. In presidential election years, the confirmation of appellate court nominees historically has slowed. In 1988, the Democrat-controlled Senate confirmed only seven of President Reagan's appellate court nominees; in 1992, the Democrat-controlled Senate confirmed eleven of President Bush's appellate court nominees. This year, the Senate already has confirmed eight circuit court nominees—evidence that we are right on track with regard to circuit court nominees.

While some may complain that the Republican Senate has not confirmed enough of President Clinton's judicial nominees, conservatives criticize us for confirming too many. An editorial in today's Washington Times argues that the Republican Senate has confirmed far too many federal judges since gaining control of the Senate in 1995. This view is typical of many reactionary conservatives who, like their counterparts on the extreme left, serve in some respects as a check on our political system. I plan to respond to this particular editorial in a more formal manner, but let me just say this—the notion that our Leader is not doing what he believes is best for our country's future is absurd.

The fact that the criticism comes from both sides leads me to believe that we probably are carrying out our advice and consent duties as most Americans would have us.

There are some on the political right who complain that we are not confirming conservative judges. They forget that we are in the midst of a liberal Presidency and that the President's power of nomination is more powerful than the Senate's power of advice and consent. I urge them to get on the ball and help elect a Republican President who will nominate judges that share our conservative judicial philosophy.

Finally, Democrats contend that things were much better when they controlled the Senate. Much better for them perhaps—it certainly was not better for many of the nominees of Presidents Reagan and Bush. At the end of the Bush administration, for example, the vacancy rate stood at nearly 12 percent. By contrast, as the Clinton administration draws to a close, the vacancy rate stands at just seven percent. The disparity between the vacancy rate at the end of the Bush Administration, as compared to the vacancy rate now, illustrates that the Republican Senate has, in fact, acted in good faith when it comes to President Clinton's nominees.

The Senate has carried out its advice and consent duties appropriately, in a

manner that has been fair to all—to the President's nominees, to the federal judiciary, and to the American people. I stand ready to help Senators LOTT and DASCHLE undertake and complete work on the appropriations bills that are before us and on other legislation, much of which enjoys broad, bipartisan support and should be acted on this year.

I am getting sick and tired of my colleagues on the other side just stopping everything—even bills that they agree with—to try and make the Senate look bad for their own political gain, so that they can take control of the Senate after the next election. If I were in their shoes, I would want to take control of the Senate honorably, rather than dishonorably.

I repeat, I stand ready to help Senators LOTT and DASCHLE undertake and complete work on the appropriations bills before the Senate and on other legislation which enjoys broad bipartisan support and should be acted on this year.

It is my hope that the important legislative work of the Senate will not be impeded by political gamesmanship over judicial confirmations. I particularly resent people indicating that the Senate is not doing its duty on judicial confirmations, or that there is some ulterior purpose behind what goes on, or that this President isn't being treated fairly, because he has been treated fairly. I am getting sick and tired of it and will not put up with it anymore.

I yield the floor.

Mr. REID. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRAPO). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

EXTENSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that morning business be extended to the hour of 4 p.m. with the time equally divided between the majority and minority.

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

BETTING ON COLLEGE GAMES

Mr. REID. Mr. President, my good friend from the State of Kansas, Senator BROWNBACK, has come to the floor a number of times in recent weeks to talk about some legislation that he favors. He favors a ban on legal betting on college games in Nevada.

This legislation has received the following comments from respected publications from around the country. George F. Will: