

John F. Kennedy, Jr. had large shoes to fill as the son of a great President and a beautiful, elegant and strong mother. While John F. Kennedy, Jr. was born into the privilege and the fame of his family, he handled it better than anyone I know. His dignity, his sense of style, his connection to ordinary people was unsurpassed.

Finally, I admire the strength and courage of my friend and colleague, Senator TED KENNEDY. Senator KENNEDY is the patriarch of this great family. He has served the Nation and the people of Massachusetts with distinction in the U.S. Senate for almost four decades and the people of Massachusetts have repeatedly shown their gratitude for his service. Senator KENNEDY has given much to this country and yet he has never forgotten the legacy of his distinguished family. To Senator KENNEDY, to the entire Kennedy family, and to the Bessette family, I extend my condolences.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, our State of New York has lost three of its finest citizens. I want to add my voice to the condolences to John Kennedy's sister Caroline, to his entire family, and to his wife's family, as well, for their double loss. Anyone who knew these three people knew they were the finest of New Yorkers and the finest of Americans. They were decent people; they were concerned people; they were people who cared about average folks.

As was noted, John, in particular, would never go by somebody and make them feel they were less significant than he was, despite his enormous wealth, attractiveness, good looks, his grace, and everything else about him. He and his wife were a man and woman of grace. I am told that her sister was as well, although I did not know her.

So we in New York particularly mourn our loss. John had become a real New Yorker, and the Bessette girls always were. There is nothing we can do but pray that they have met their final reward, and that the wounds that are so deep in their families, with God's help, heal quickly.

DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000—Continued

AMENDMENT NO. 1217

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. BIDEN. What is the business of the Senate now?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The regular order is the Gregg amendment No. 1217.

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, I understand I have a few minutes to speak, and I will take only a few minutes right now and reserve the remainder of the time when I have completed.

I want to be very brief at this point. Mr. President, I want to separate out two aspects of the Gregg amendment:

One I wish to compliment him on, and one I am going to remain silent on. The one part I want to compliment him on is that I think the reauthorization of the violent crime trust fund for another 5 years is the single-most significant thing we could do to continue the war on crime.

In 1994, when we introduced the Biden crime bill, which eventually became the crime bill of 1994 which had the 100,000 cops in it, the Violence Against Women Act, and many other things, toward the end of that debate, with the significant help of the senior Senator from Texas, Mr. GRAMM, who didn't like many aspects of my bill, and the senior Senator from West Virginia, Mr. BYRD, who did like the bill, we all agreed on what was viewed as sort of a revolutionary idea—that crime control was the single-most undisputable responsibility of the Federal Government domestically. We can argue about whether there should be welfare. We can argue about whether we should be involved in education. But no one can argue about the requirement of the Government of the United States to make the streets safe. That is the starting point for all ordered society.

So we had an idea, and the three of us joined together to set up a violent crime trust fund. The way we did that was not to raise taxes for America because everybody kept saying: BIDEN, your bill, over the next 5 years, is going to cost over \$30 billion. They were right. Putting 100,000 cops on the street costs a lot. Building thousands of new prison cells costs a lot. Spending money on prevention costs a lot. The total of the Biden crime bill was about \$30 billion over 5 years in 1994 when I introduced it.

They said: How are we going to pay for it? None of us likes telling the citizens the truth. We all like lying to you, telling you we are going to find a magic way to do this that is not going to cost you any money. The American public wants safer streets, and they have gotten them, I might add. Crime has gone down significantly every year since the crime bill was introduced. I am not claiming it is only because of that, but it is in large part because of that.

So the way we reached this accord was Senator GRAMM, who wanted to see the size of the Federal Government cut even more urgently than—I will speak for myself—even more urgently than I did—we codified, as part of this deal, the agreement that we would let 250,000 Federal employees go. We would shrink the size of the Federal Government. And we did.

The second part of the agreement I wanted was that the paycheck we used to pay the person working in the Justice Department or in the Defense Department or at IRS, who was not going to be rehired, we take John Jones' paycheck and put it into a trust fund to do nothing but deal with violent crime in America. Not an innovative notion—

that concept of a trust fund—but it is fairly radical in terms of applying a Social Security-type trust fund—only this does have a lockbox—a trust fund of dedicated revenues to deal with nothing but crime.

The good news about that and the reason I felt so strongly about that at the time I wrote the bill was it is the one place no one can compete. If it is in general funds—and to people who don't share my view about the single-most important responsibility of Government is to maintain order—it is in competition. If it is general revenues, the COPS Program or the prevention programs or building prisons is in competition with money for education, money for the space program, money for the Defense Department, and money for every other function of the Government. By having this trust fund, though, it is not in competition with anything. It is there. It is set aside. It is similar to a savings account to fight crime.

I respectfully suggest that it worked. Now, under the Biden crime bill, which is due to expire this year, the trust fund will end. This special, dedicated pot of money that nobody can compete for, which is not paid for by raising taxes, is paid for by not lowering taxes because it is legitimate to say: BIDEN, if you eliminate the trust funds, you can take John Jones' paycheck, the guy who left the Treasury Department in 1997, and you can give it back to the taxpayers as a tax cut.

That is true. But I choose safe streets over tax cuts. The tax cut would be minuscule, I might add.

So when I heard that my friend from New Hampshire was taking language essentially the same as the Hatch-Biden bill that passed out of here in juvenile justice, the same as the language I have been reintroducing everywhere I can and in every bill I can in the last 4 years, I thought not only is he an enlightened fellow but there has been a bit of an epiphany, that, my Lord, the powerful chairman of the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee has seen the Lord, has seen the light, and I was overjoyed.

So I said to my staff: I am going to go up there and compliment him. Literally, I said this this morning. They said: Don't be so quick. I said: Why? They said: There is a little kicker here. The kicker is once this amendment that you, BIDEN, have fought so hard for over the last 12 years, even before the crime bill was passed—once it is adopted, there will be a little amendment attached to it that has to do with the way this place functions procedurally, affecting how we can move substantively.

I will not speak to that. I will only say and plead with my friend from New Hampshire, if and when the second issue is resolved, however it is resolved, that he not walk away from the substantive beauty of his amendment as it relates to the trust fund. I don't want to get into a fight with him about

legislating on appropriations and second amendments and the rest. I want to say to him publicly that I truly appreciate the practical impact of reestablishing the violent crime trust fund, if we can do it.

I hope in this procedural fight that is above my pay grade right now, which is about to take place, that a casualty of this fight will not end up being us committing for another 5 years to do what we did in the last 5 years—bringing crime in America down. The way to do that is to guarantee that the law enforcement agencies of the United States for 5 years do not have to compete with anybody, and we don't have to raise anybody's taxes. We are taking those old paychecks, and we are going to continue to make a deposit, similar to a trust fund in a family, for cops, for prisons, and for prevention.

Mr. GREGG. If the Senator will yield, I appreciate the kind words of the Senator, and I am duly thankful for those words. As a result, I can tell the Senator I am committed to trying to get this authorization, in some manner, in this bill when it returns to Congress—should this bill ever make it to conference, which is very much an issue at this time.

Mr. BIDEN. I truly appreciate that because I, quite frankly, think—and this is presumptuous of me to say because you know as much about these issues as I do, clearly—this is the single-most significant thing we can do to continue the successful fight against crime. I authored it, so you might say there is pride of authorship here. But I didn't do this alone. The distinguished Senator from Texas and the distinguished Senator from West Virginia were really the ones who made it happen. I hope, in a bipartisan way, we can continue the funding mechanism. I thank him for his comments. If I have any time, I reserve it.

I yield the floor.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time continue to run on this amendment equally divided, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, how much time is left on the amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Approximately 5 minutes.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, at the end of that 5 minutes, I understand there will be 20 minutes, 10 minutes for the Senator from South Carolina and 10 minutes for myself.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ASHCROFT). Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Dan Alpert, who is a fellow in my office, be granted privileges of the floor during the consideration of S. 1217.

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

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to speak for up to 10 minutes as in morning business.

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

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I have come to the floor to speak about what I see as a funding shortfall for the 2000 census.

First, I compliment Chairman GREGG and Senator HOLLINGS for their work on this bill. I fully appreciate the very tight budget constraints under which they have been working. However, I want to make sure all Senators also know that, even though we will soon pass this appropriations bill, our work is not yet finished.

Census day, which is April 1 of the year 2000, is less than 9 months away. Still today, at this late date, this bill lacks sufficient funding to adequately conduct the 2000 census.

The Founding Fathers recognized the importance of a fair and accurate count of the population. Article I, section 2 of the Constitution provides that Congress is to conduct a decennial census "in such Manner as they shall by Law direct." In fact, the census is one of the few actions that is mandated by the Constitution.

Let me take a few minutes to discuss the importance of a full and accurate census for all Americans.

Data from the 2000 census will be used to apportion House seats among the States for the 108th through the 112th Congresses. The States also use census data to draw legislative districts for congressional seats as well as for State and local representatives. In addition, Federal, State, and local governments use census information to guide annual distribution of the \$180 billion of Federal funds for critical services such as child care, Social Security, Medicare, education, and job training.

By now, we have all heard details of the serious shortcomings of the 1990 census. In fact, at the time of the 1990 census, many of us spent many days and hours trying to ensure that a fair census was taken. Mr. President, 8.4 million people were missed in that census, and 4.4 million were counted twice.

In my State of New Mexico, we suffered the highest undercount of any

single State. There were nearly 50,000 New Mexicans left out of the census in 1990 and 20,000 of them were children. The worst undercounts were among our Native American and Hispanic communities. A recent General Accounting Office estimate found that the 1990 census shortchanged my State of New Mexico at least \$86 million in much-needed Federal grants.

The Census Bureau has made substantial efforts to avoid a repetition of the undercounts that have hurt my State in the past decade. I applaud the Bureau's efforts to reach out to every resident in New Mexico, particularly the extra efforts they have made to count everyone in the Hispanic and the Native American communities. In Spanish, the motto is: "Hagarse Contar!"—"make yourself count." For Native American communities, I cannot give you the Navajo or Taos version of that, but clearly the slogan is "generations are counting on this; don't leave it blank."

So I think everyone agrees that a full and fair census must be our goal. Congress must appropriate all of the funds necessary to produce that full and fair census. The census is not a place where we should be cutting corners. It is time to put partisan politics aside to give the professionals in the Census Bureau the resources they need to get the job done.

Indeed, the appropriations bill on the floor today does provide nearly \$2.8 billion for the 2000 census. This is the full amount in the President's original budget. I thank the chairman for providing the Census Bureau's full initial request.

However, as all Senators know, the Supreme Court ruled that under current statutes only a traditional head count may be used for apportionment of House seats among the States. In response to the ruling, the Census Bureau requested an additional \$1.7 billion to provide the best census possible using only the traditional method.

The additional funds were requested to cover the Bureau's additional workload, advertising, staffing, and data processing required to perform this actual head count which the Supreme Court has interpreted the Constitution to require.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a detailed list of the additional costs for a head count be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

(See Exhibit No. 1.)

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, at this point this appropriations bill does not provide any of the additional funding that the Census Bureau has requested in response to the Supreme Court's January ruling. In fairness to the chairman and the ranking member, and the members of the committee, the Census Bureau's revised request did not arrive until very late in the process. Consequently, the subcommittee may

not have had sufficient time to review the supplemental request and conduct the normal oversight hearings. I understand the subcommittee intends to consider the Census Bureau's supplemental funding request in the near future. I thank the chairman for moving forward promptly and for working on this issue in a spirit of bipartisanship.

What worries me is that even with the additional funds required for a head count, in all likelihood we will still fall well short of counting everyone and, as in the 1990 census, the undercount will hurt certain population groups the most. However, I have not come to the floor today to debate which enumeration method the Census Bureau should use. Except for apportionment, the Bureau will alleviate the undercount problem by using modern scientific methods. This is the only way to assure that States such as New Mexico will not be shortchanged again.

The Supreme Court ruled the 2000 census must include a full head count. I believe Congress has an obligation to provide all the funds required.

I appreciate the very tight budget situation in which we find ourselves. Time is getting short. Again, I thank the chairman and the ranking member for their continued bipartisan work on this appropriations bill, and I hope that they can move quickly to provide the supplemental funds required for the 2000 census.

EXHIBIT No. 1

ADDITIONAL COSTS FOR A NON-SAMPLING CENSUS

On January 25, 1999, the Supreme Court ruled that the Census Act bars the use of statistical sampling for purposes of apportionment. Additional funds are therefore needed to cover the increased workload of a non-sampling census, principally follow-up visits to an additional 16 million households (50 percent more than under the sampling design).

The President's Budget requests \$2.8 billion in FY 2000 to conduct a sampling-based decennial census. The budget amendment will request \$1,723 million. Major elements of the \$1,723 million are discussed below:

\$954M for non-response follow-up.—To get responses from all households that do not answer the mail survey, Census will hire more enumerators and will expand non-response follow-up to ten weeks, four weeks more than expected in the previous census design. Training will be increased by half a day to sustain quality with a larger workforce, and each of the 520 Local Census Offices will be provided additional staff. For purposes of quality control, Census will randomly re-interview addresses to verify the data gathered during non-response follow-up.

\$268M for data collection infrastructure.—The larger workforce also requires that Local Census Office have additional space, phone lines, information technology support, supplies, recruiting materials and advertisements, and related items.

\$229M for coverage improvement efforts.—The Census Bureau will conduct coverage interviews where forms appear to have deficiencies (e.g., forms lacking complete information on all household members reported) as well as a program to recheck approximately 7.6 million vacant housing units initially classified as vacant or nonexistent and new construction.

\$219M for a variety of data collection operations, including:

\$96M in rural areas without street addresses (where surveys are delivered to households by Census rather than the Postal Service) for quality checks before the census date and related activities. Census has learned through its address listing program that this workload will be five million household units larger than originally estimated.

\$56M for activities including special enumeration methods in remote areas and field verification for the "Be Counted" program (which distributes census forms in post offices and other public places) to reduce duplicate and erroneous responses.

\$42M for enumerating soup kitchens, shelters, and similar facilities. This work will require advance visits as well as two enumerators per facility at census time.

\$25M to redeliver questionnaires where the Postal Service designated forms as undeliverable (e.g., areas where zip code boundaries have changed recently). The Census Bureau anticipates a workload of five million addresses.

\$14M to keep all the data processing centers open longer.—The four data processing centers will remain open through September 30, 2000, and process a higher volume of data.

\$89M for advertising and promotion efforts.—Additional advertising and promotion, including more materials for schools, non-profits, and State and local governments, are intended to increase the speed and rate of response and public cooperation.

Offsets from reduced sample size.—Because the sampling portion of the census will now be based on larger geographic units, the sample size for the Accuracy and Coverage Evaluation (A.C.E.) program (i.e., sampling) can be reduced without compromising accuracy. Reducing the sampling size for A.C.E. will save \$214M relative to the request in the President's Budget.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss my concerns about appropriations for the census—an issue that is critical for the State of California and for the Nation.

The Commerce, Justice, and State Appropriations bill for FY 2000 allocates \$2.8 billion for census operations. It does not include the additional \$1.7 billion that the Administration requested to pay for its revised census plan. This funding shortfall will certainly result in an undercount in the 2000 Census.

In the 1990 Census, California lost \$2.2 billion because not everyone was counted, and that's not fair. Although the Administration's request was submitted late in the appropriations process, it is crucial that we equip the Census Bureau with the funds necessary to make the Census 2000 as accurate as possible. How can the Census Bureau do its best to carry out an accurate census in 2000, if they do not have the appropriate resources? We can be sure that the Census 2000 will fail if the Census Bureau does not have the extra \$1.7 billion it needs for this operation.

The census has real impact on the lives of people across the Nation. Information gathered from the census count determines how nearly \$200 billion of federal funds are allocated. In addition, census information is used by states and local governments to plan schools and highways, and by businesses in making their economic plans.

The 1990 Census undercounted the U.S. population by more than eight million Americans (mostly children, the poor, and communities of color), and more than four million Americans were counted twice. In California alone, the 1990 Census missed more than 834,000 people. A disproportionate number of those undercounted in California were minorities: Nearly half the net undercount—47 percent—were Hispanic-American. Twenty-two percent were African-American and eight percent were Asian Pacific-American. Such differences in census coverage introduce inequities in political representation and in the distribution of funds. Communities from these undercounted ethnic minority populations have been disadvantaged by not receiving the resources they need for various government programs.

A recent study by the General Accounting Office estimates that the economic consequences of the undercount in California caused my state to lose over \$2.2 billion in federal funds, more than any other state and more than the additional appropriations requested by the Administration. As a result, the state did not get its fair share of funds for Medicaid, Child Care and Development, Rehabilitation Services, Adoption Assistance, and Foster Care, to mention only a few of the federal grant programs affected. Each person missed in the census cost California \$2,660 in Federal funds over the decade.

Some of the top 10 undercounted cities in the 1990 census, two of which are from my state, include:

Los Angeles (138,808); San Diego (32,483); Chicago (68,315); Houston (66,748); Dallas (37,070); Detroit (28,206); and Philadelphia (23,365).

Unless the Census Bureau is allowed to carry out its plan to produce a more accurate count than that which was produced in 1990, California and other states will again lose billions of dollars in federal assistance and will again have to subsidize federal programs with state and local tax dollars.

Since the flawed 1990 population count, the Census Bureau has worked with experts from across the country to design a more accurate census for 2000. The National Academy of Sciences, in three separate reports, concluded that the key to improving accuracy in the census is the use of sound statistical methods. Earlier this year, the Supreme Court ruled that the Census Bureau could not use statistical sampling for apportionment purposes.

Because the Census Bureau cannot use sampling, it has revised its census plan and requested additional appropriations to carry out a full enumeration census, using mail-back census forms and employing an army of bureau workers to personally and repeatedly visit those who do not respond. The Census Bureau's operational plan for carrying out the 2000 Census will be the largest peacetime effort in our nation's history, and will employ more than 860,000 temporary workers.

Mr. President, Congress must make every effort to support the Census Bureau's plan to count all Americans in 2000. The census should not be about politics. This is an issue of fairness, that impacts Americans nationwide. I urge my colleagues to support the additional \$1.7 billion appropriation that the Census Bureau needs to carry out an accurate census in 2000. We must do everything we can to ensure that everyone is included in the count, and that our communities are provided with the resources we need.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative assistant proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

RULE XVI

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, in order to explain what is not happening now, I will use some leader time to advise Senators what our hopes are and why we are having a quorum at this time.

First of all, we are respecting the request of the Democratic leader to not go forward to the conclusion of the statements and any action or votes on the pending resolution so they can have a conference to discuss how to proceed.

What is involved here is my continuing effort to have the Senate correct a mistake that was made a few years ago with regard to rule XVI. Rule XVI prohibited legislation on an appropriations bill. A precedent was set, and I confess I helped set that precedent. I mistakenly voted to overrule the ruling of the Chair, and so did others, because we were so committed to the issue. It has certainly been a problem for the Senate ever since.

Both sides of the aisle use appropriations bills for every legislative amendment or bill that they might be sponsoring or something they may be harboring to get a vote on. It has really gotten to be a problem in moving appropriations bills forward. The right thing to do for the institution, the right thing to do in terms of legislative sanity, and the right thing to do for the people of this country is to have that precedent established again which would say that Senators cannot offer legislation on appropriations bills without a point of order being in order. Keep in mind, if you get 51 votes, that could be overturned, but I think it will add additional pressure on Senators not to abuse that process.

The matter pending is the Commerce, State and Justice appropriations bill, a very important bill. It provides the funds, obviously, for the Departments of Commerce, State, and Justice. A major portion of law enforcement money is in this appropriations bill. We need to move it forward.

The Senate does not always move with dispatch, but sometimes we do. On an appropriations bill, obviously, involving billions of dollars, Senators want to have a chance to review it carefully and amendments will be in order. Amendments would be in order after the vote that we are about to have or could have reestablishing rule XVI. Senators could offer amendments that relate to the bill, that take money out or put money in, or strike out sections. All of that would still be in order.

Senator DASCHLE and I have basically agreed—in fact, we have exchanged pleasantries on this rule XVI issue several times over the past few years—that this is a precedent we need to go back and correct. We had a colloquy a month or so ago in which we said, yes, this needs to be done, and we need to work together to get it done.

There is concern that the way this was done, the minority had not been given notice. But earlier this summer, the minority was aware we were going to try to reverse this precedent, and 2 or 3 days were spent trying to block us from getting an opportunity.

I don't necessarily feel we have to do it this way or do it on this bill or do it right now, but my question is, if not now, when? If not in this way, in what way?

Mr. HOLLINGS. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. LOTT. I will be glad to yield, when I complete the point. I am willing to work with both sides to try to find a way we can get this done. If there are suggestions by the Senator from South Carolina or the leader, I certainly am very interested in that.

I am not interested in any kind of a surprise action, but I am interested in trying to get some results on this which would help Senators on both sides of the aisle get the appropriations bills done. That is my only intent.

I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. HOLLINGS. If the distinguished leader will yield, the truth is, on the contrary, we were given notice. We were told this particular violent crime trust authorization was just a place setter, a gatekeeper, so to speak, in the first degree, and we were going to voice vote it.

We were given notice that it was going to be voice voted and not use this particular maneuver to have a time agreement and, thereby, not be able to debate the rule change. So we were given notice in the other direction. We were totally misled. We were totally misled. I resent it.

Let me go back—there is no use in getting all excited. I am going back to Mississippi with the Governor, Ross Barnett. He was the first fellow to take the door off the capitol on Wednesday afternoon, and he lined them all up. Any and every citizen could come in and express his grief. And one day the trustee who cleaned up the capitol stood in line, and he said: I have to go to a funeral; my aunt just died.

And Governor Barnett said: When is that?

He said: Saturday.

I am hastening it along.

He said: All right. You can go Saturday; be back here on Monday.

And the trustee, Phillips, said: Yes, that is the truth. I will be back.

And so 2 months had passed. Phillips hadn't come back, and the press all agreed, let's just jump on Ross and get him this time. And so they said: Governor, wait a minute; where is the trustee and everything else? And old Ross just laid back and said: If you can't trust the trustee, who can you trust?

If I can't trust the chairman and the chairman can't trust the ranking member, then who can I trust? We were given notice wrongly.

Mr. LOTT. If I could reclaim my time, I don't know exactly what was said between the two Members, but I know there is no desire on either side to mislead. I want to make it clear that I have suggested to the chairmen of our subcommittees that we need to find a time and have a way to address this rule XVI issue. It is in the interest of the Senate. It is in the interest of both parties. But I am told that you have to get a time agreement to set up this process.

If we don't do it here, then, unless we get cooperation on both sides, we may never get an opportunity to reinstate rule XVI. I will bet the Senator from South Carolina would like to see us do that. I will bet he would like to have the appropriations bills be appropriations bills. If we are going to do all of our legislating on appropriations bills, let's just get rid of the legislative committees. Let's just all get on appropriations. I would like to be on the Senator's committee. He is on Commerce, and I would enjoy serving there. I would like to be on the Commerce, State, Justice appropriations bill. That would work nicely.

I don't think we need to do that, though. We don't want to do it.

I want to make it clear, my instructions to our chairmen have been: Find a way, find a time for us to get this rule XVI reconsidered and corrected. A mistake was made.

I say to the Senator from South Dakota, who is here now, the distinguished Democratic leader, I am using leader time. I was trying to explain why we haven't been having votes, what is going on. I was reviewing the bidding of why we need to make this change, and I had not attributed any quotes or impugned anybody's integrity in their absence. I was trying to get this process going forward.

That is what is involved. I have been trying to find a way to get this done. I believe the Democratic leader wants to join me in getting this done. We have talked about it privately and publicly. If this is not the time, this is not the way to do it, then I am open to other times or other ways to do it. But this needs to be done so we can get our