

CONCLUSION OF MORNING
BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is now closed.

PASSENGER RAIL INVESTMENT
AND IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2007

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of S. 294, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 294) to reauthorize Amtrak, and for other purposes.

Pending:

Lautenberg (for Carper) amendment No. 3454 (to amendment No. 3452), of a perfecting nature.

Allard amendment No. 3455, to strike the provisions repealing Amtrak's self-sufficiency requirements.

Bond (for DeMint) amendment No. 3467, to require Amtrak to disclose the Federal subsidy of every ticket sold for transportation on Amtrak.

Bond (for DeMint) amendment No. 3468, to increase competition in the American rail system by allowing any qualified rail operator or transportation company to compete for passenger rail service.

Bond (for DeMint) amendment No. 3469, to clarify the level of detail to be included in the modern financial accounting and reporting system required under section 203.

Bond (for DeMint) amendment No. 3470, to require the Performance Improvement Plan to address reaching financial solvency by eliminating routes and services that do not make a profit.

Bond amendment no. 3464, to amend section 24101 of title 49, United States Code, to clarify Amtrak's mission.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi is recognized.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, regarding the Amtrak legislation, work was done on Friday and it is being worked on now by our staffs. We had additional amendments that were filed this afternoon and we are going through them.

In the meantime, we have cleared on both sides some nine amendments in a variety of areas. Our staffs have worked together, and we have reviewed these amendments. They look constructive to me. They are from both sides of the aisle—from Senators CRAPO, TESTER, ALLARD, BOND, DEMINT, SANDERS, COBURN, and HUTCHISON. So we will, in a few moments, offer these amendments en bloc for acceptance.

I see that Senator DOMENICI has left the floor. I appreciate his remarks on the energy legislation. As on so many issues, he has been one of our most thoughtful and committed leaders on a variety of subjects. I used to call him our "No. 1 utility player." Wherever you had a complicated substantive issue, if you needed someone to come and talk about it sensibly, whether it was budget issues, energy issues, appropriations, energy plants, nuclear issues, he has been such a great Member for many years. The Senate will truly miss him upon his retirement. Once again, I thought his remarks a few moments ago were extremely

thoughtful and pointed out some of what we need to be doing in the energy policy of this country, and the many problems with trying to get to conference.

The biggest problem in getting to conference is that the two bills are almost irreconcilable. In our bill, we had some very strong requirements with regard to fuel efficiency standards. We knocked out the energy taxes, we refused to put in a high percentage of renewables mandates, and we came out with a bill that had in it something worth having, but we still had some problems.

The House had nothing on CAFE standards, the fuel efficiency standards. They went the other direction on renewables, and they went the other direction on taxes.

We have a real mess on our hands. We need a national energy policy, but we need one that, hopefully, will create more energy for our country and not more dependence on foreign oil.

We will continue to see if we can find ways to work together across the aisle and across the Capitol to see what can be done. We need to do something, but I fear we have created such a hodgepodge, we may not be able to reach agreement on how to proceed.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 3475, 3483, 3488, 3485, 3484, 3477, 3476, 3473, 3472, EN BLOC

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I have a package of amendments that have been cleared on both sides. On behalf of Senator LAUTENBERG and myself and the leadership on both sides, I ask unanimous consent that the amendments be considered and agreed to en bloc, and the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table en bloc: Coburn amendment No. 3475, DeMint amendment No. 3483, Hutchison amendment No. 3488, Bond amendment No. 3485, DeMint amendment No. 3484, Crapo amendment No. 3477, Allard amendment No. 3476, Sanders amendment No. 3473, and Tester amendment No. 3472.

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

The amendments were agreed to, as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 3475

(Purpose: To require Amtrak to publish a comprehensive annual financial report that allocates revenues and costs among each of its routes)

On page 14, line 25, strike "and" at the end and all that follows through page 15, line 20, and insert the following:

(2) shall implement a modern financial accounting and reporting system; and

(3) shall, not later than 90 days after the end of each fiscal year through fiscal year 2012—

(A) submit to Congress a comprehensive report that allocates all of Amtrak's revenues and costs to each of its routes, each of its lines of business, and each major activity within each route and line of business activity, including—

- (i) train operations;
- (ii) equipment maintenance;
- (iii) food service;
- (iv) sleeping cars;
- (v) ticketing; and
- (vi) reservations;

(B) include the report described in subparagraph (A) in Amtrak's annual report; and

(C) post such report on Amtrak's website.

AMENDMENT NO. 3483

(Purpose: To encourage private sector funding of passenger trains)

On page 58, lines 3 through 5, strike "its operation of trains funded by the private sector in order to minimize its need for Federal subsidies." and insert "the operation of trains funded by, or in partnership with, private sector operators through competitive contracting to minimize the need for Federal subsidies."

AMENDMENT NO. 3488

(Purpose: To express the sense of the Senate regarding the need to maintain Amtrak as a national passenger rail system)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING
THE NEED TO MAINTAIN AMTRAK AS
A NATIONAL PASSENGER RAIL SYSTEM.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate makes the following findings:

(1) In fiscal year 2007, 3,800,000 passengers traveled on Amtrak's long distance trains, an increase of 2.4 percent over fiscal year 2006.

(2) Amtrak long-distance routes generated \$376,000,000 in revenue in fiscal year 2007, an increase of 5 percent over fiscal year 2006.

(3) Amtrak operates 15 long-distance trains over 18,500 route miles that serve 39 States and the District of Columbia. These trains provide the only rail passenger service to 23 States.

(4) Amtrak's long-distance trains provide an essential transportation service for many communities and to a significant percentage of the general public.

(5) Many long-distance trains serve small communities with limited or no significant air or bus service, especially in remote or isolated areas in the United States.

(6) As a result of airline deregulation and decisions by national bus carriers to leave many communities, rail transportation may provide the only feasible common carrier transportation option for a growing number of areas.

(7) If long-distance trains were eliminated, 23 States and 243 communities would be left with no intercity passenger rail service and 16 other States would lose some rail service. These trains provide a strong economic benefit for the States and communities that they serve.

(8) Long-distance trains also provide transportation during periods of severe weather or emergencies that stall other modes of transportation.

(9) Amtrak provided the only reliable long-distance transportation following the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks that grounded air travel.

(10) The majority of passengers on long-distance trains do not travel between the endpoints, but rather between any combination of cities along the route.

(11) Passenger trains provide transportation options, mobility for underserved populations, congestion mitigation, and jobs in the areas they serve.

(12) Passenger rail has a positive impact on the environment compared to other modes of transportation by conserving energy, reducing greenhouse gas emissions, and cutting down on other airborne particulate and toxic emissions.

(13) Amtrak communities that are served use passenger rail and passenger rail stations as a significant source of economic development.

(14) This Act makes meaningful and important reforms to increase the efficiency, profitability and on-time performance of Amtrak's long-distance routes.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) long-distance passenger rail is a vital and necessary part of our national transportation system and economy; and

(2) Amtrak should maintain a national passenger rail system, including long-distance routes, that connects the continental United States from coast to coast and from border to border.

AMENDMENT NO. 3485

(Purpose: To provide a mission statement for Amtrak, and for other purposes)

On page 11, between lines 22 and 23, insert the following:

(e) AMTRAK'S MISSION.—

(1) Section 24101 is amended—

(A) by striking “purpose” in the section heading and inserting “mission”;

(B) by striking subsection (b) and inserting the following:

“(b) MISSION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The mission of Amtrak is to provide efficient and effective intercity passenger rail mobility consisting of high quality service that is trip-time competitive with other intercity travel options and that is consistent with the goals of subsection (d).

“(2) PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT.—All measurements of Amtrak performance, including decisions on whether, and to what extent, to provide operating subsidies, shall be based on Amtrak's ability to carry out the mission described in paragraph (1).”; and

(C) by redesignating paragraphs (9) through (11) in subsection (c) as paragraphs (10) through (12), respectively, and inserting after paragraph (8) the following:

“(9) provide redundant or complimentary intercity transportation service to ensure mobility in times of national disaster or other instances where other travel options are not adequately available.”.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The chapter analysis for chapter 241 is amended by striking the item relating to section 24101 and inserting the following:

“24101. Findings, mission, and goals”.

On page 18, line 7, strike “and”.

On page 18, strike lines 8 and 9 and insert the following:

(12) prior fiscal year and projected operating ratio, cash operating loss, and cash operating loss per passenger on a route, business line, and corporate basis;

(13) prior fiscal year and projected specific costs and savings estimates resulting from reform initiatives;

(14) prior fiscal year and projected labor productivity statistics on a route, business line, and corporate basis;

(15) prior fiscal year and projected equipment reliability statistics; and

(16) capital and operating expenditure for anticipated security needs.

AMENDMENT NO. 3484

(Purpose: To include private rail passenger operators on the Next Generation Corridor Equipment Pool Committee)

On page 97, line 13, insert “host freight railroad companies, passenger railroad equipment manufacturers, and other passenger railroad operators as appropriate,” after “Administration.”.

AMENDMENT NO. 3477

(Purpose: To give additional consideration to States with limited Amtrak service when considering new intercity passenger rail routes)

On page 24, line 6, insert “intercity passenger rail service or by” after “served by”.

On page 25, strike lines 10 through 16 and insert the following:

(e) PIONEER ROUTE.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, Amtrak shall conduct a 1-time evaluation of passenger rail service between Seattle and Chicago (commonly known as the “Pioneer Route”), which was operated by Amtrak until 1997, using methodologies adopted under subsection (c), to determine whether to reinstate passenger rail service along the Pioneer Route or along segments of such route.

AMENDMENT NO. 3476

(Purpose: To require Amtrak to develop a plan to operate within budgetary limits, including a longterm plan)

On page 56, strike lines 12 through 17 and insert the following:

(1) PLAN REQUIRED.—Section 24101(d) is amended—

(A) by striking “plan to operate within the funding levels authorized by section 24104 of this chapter, including the budgetary goals for fiscal years 1998 through 2002.” and inserting “plan, consistent with section 204 of the Passenger Rail Investment and Improvement Act of 2007, including the budgetary goals for fiscal years 2007 through 2012.”; and

(B) by striking the last sentence and inserting “Amtrak and its Board of Directors shall adopt a long term plan that minimizes the need for Federal operating subsidies.”.

AMENDMENT NO. 3473

(Purpose: To clarify that the Secretary of Transportation should favor projects that involve the purchase of environmentally sensitive, fuel-efficient, and cost-effective passenger rail equipment in selecting projects to receive capital investment grants to support intercity passenger rail service)

On page 66, line 10, insert “, including projects that involve the purchase of environmentally sensitive, fuel-efficient, and cost-effective passenger rail equipment” before the period.

AMENDMENT NO. 3472

(Purpose: To require Amtrak to conduct a 1-time evaluation of passenger rail service between Chicago and Seattle through Southern Montana)

On page 25, between lines 16 and 17, insert the following:

(f) NORTH COAST HIAWATHA ROUTE.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, Amtrak shall conduct a 1-time evaluation of passenger rail service between Chicago and Seattle, through Southern Montana (commonly known as the “North Coast Hiawatha Route”), which was operated by Amtrak until 1979, using methodologies adopted under subsection (c), to determine whether to reinstate passenger rail service along the North Coast Hiawatha Route or along segments of such route, provided that such service will not negatively impact existing Amtrak routes.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 3455 AND 3464 WITHDRAWN

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following pending amendments be withdrawn: amendments Nos. 3455 and 3464.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The amendments are withdrawn.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD. 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. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to speak as in morning business for up to 30 minutes.

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

(The remarks of Mr. BYRD pertaining to the submission of S. Res. 358 are printed in Today's RECORD under “Submission of Concurrent and Senate Resolutions.”)

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida is recognized.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. President, parliamentary inquiry: I wish to speak as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That will take unanimous consent.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator may proceed.

FLORIDA AND THE DNC

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. President, I have come to the Senate floor today to inform colleagues of both parties that there is a monumental legal issue that has arisen between the Democratic National Committee and the voters of the State of Florida, specifically the 4¼ million registered Democrats. The Democratic National Committee, the DNC, has exacted punishment upon Florida Democrats because the State legislature of Florida moved its Presidential primary from March to January 29. Both parties said they would bring about retribution on any one State, other than four privileged States—the Nevada caucus, the Iowa caucus, the New Hampshire primary, and the South Carolina primary—if any other State moved ahead of February 5, earlier than February 5.

The Florida Legislature, in its wisdom last spring—last May, May of this year—decided to make the move to January 29. This is a legislature that is two-thirds Republican. That legislation, setting the date of January 29, was signed into law by Governor Crist, who himself is a Republican.

In the course of deliberation of the legislation, the Democratic leader in the State senate offered an amendment to move the primary later, from January 29, 2008, to February 5, thus to comply with the request and rules of the DNC. That amendment was voted down.

Thus, a duly called election, pursuant to State law, is, in fact, going to be conducted by the machinery of the government of the State of Florida and paid for by the government of the State of Florida—estimated to the tune of some \$18 million of taxpayer money—in order to have this Presidential primary. Because Florida law set the date of January 29, municipalities have now moved all of their elections to concur with January 29. Indeed, also on the ballot is expected to

be a major constitutional amendment for the voters to decide upon having to do with a different subject matter, a matter of great import to the people of Florida, and that is the amount of their real estate taxes. In other words, it is expected to be a big turnout on January 29. That is Florida law.

But the DNC took great umbrage at the State of Florida and said: Under the rules we are going to penalize you by taking away one-half of your delegates. Concurrently, the Republican National Committee likewise took away one-half of the delegates at the quadrennial nominating conventions to be held later this year. Then the DNC decided it was going to exact additional punishment and took the punitive measure of taking away all of Florida's delegates.

But that is not all. The DNC then further decided that it would penalize Florida further by prohibiting the Presidential candidates from coming into the State and campaigning. Campaigning was defined under the rules of the DNC as talking with voters, having any kind of communication, hiring staff, opening an office, having any kind of advertising, whether in print or electronically, or holding press conferences; in other words, to muzzle the Presidential candidates so they could not go into the State of Florida—with one huge exception: that they could go into the State of Florida to raise money. They couldn't campaign, couldn't talk to ordinary voters, but they could come in to raise money.

The net effect is the only way a Florida Democrat could have interaction with a Presidential candidate one on one is to have to pay for that participation.

This was further enhanced by the four States that I mentioned that want to go first—the Iowa caucus, the Nevada caucus, the New Hampshire primary, and the South Carolina primary—those four States exacting a pledge in writing from the Presidential candidates who said they would not have any campaigning in a State that moved its primary earlier than February 5—except those four States.

This is a little sensitive for us in Florida, naturally, as I have just come from the State Democratic Convention where not any of the major Presidential candidates have appeared. But, of course, they come and go from time to time into Florida to raise money. Of course, what a contrast that is, since the only penalty by the Republican National Committee was to take away half of Florida's Republican delegates. They did not stop their candidates from coming in. Indeed, 1 week ago—a significant contrast with the State Republican Convention—all of the Presidential candidates were there, and indeed they ended up, the State Republican Convention, with a televised debate of all the Republican Presidential candidates.

This should concern not only Floridians, and it should concern not only

Democrats, it ought to concern all voters because it is the principle of one person, one vote. That is a principle that has long been established in law and established by the Supreme Court of the United States. In order to enforce that principle, I, along with others, including the chairman of our Florida Democratic delegation, Congressman ALCEE HASTINGS, have filed a federal lawsuit in Federal District Court against the political party bosses in Washington. Our lawsuit is about the right of every American to have access to the ballot box and to have their ballot counted and to have their ballot counted as intended.

In this lawsuit we are fighting for every person who takes time to stand in line in the rain or in the cold, at the local church or the precinct house, to vote and to come outside from that precinct house feeling as if they did their part in this grand American process.

Those of us who filed this lawsuit believe there is no reason that can excuse the denial of this fundamental right to vote. Certainly, as we see by this fracas that has erupted by members of the DNC saying: Go on and have your Presidential primary vote, Florida, on January 29, but just make it a beauty contest because it is not going to count—it certainly points to the fact that this Presidential primary system is broken, and it desperately needs to be reformed. But the answer is not to deny people the right to vote and to have that vote count.

For 2008, there is an easy, short-term fix. This Senator suggested this fix last summer to Howard Dean in writing, in person, and over the telephone; that is, if you had the States that want to go early to move up a little early, then everyone has the same order, and the law of Florida is complied with since there is nothing we can do about it. It is the law. The election in the Presidential primary process is going to be January 29 in Florida.

No one would pay any attention to that easy, short-term fix, but that is in effect what is happening right now because, as of yesterday, Iowa Democrats joined Iowa Republicans and moved the Presidential caucus up to January 3. It is expected that the New Hampshire secretary of State—who has sole authority to set the date of New Hampshire's primary election—will move the date of the primary in New Hampshire to something within a week of Iowa's January 3 caucus. What was suggested as a compromise last summer, without all of this punishment that has been levied, in effect is starting to happen.

For the long term we can fashion a solution that takes into account the larger States as well as the small States. Let all of them have a fair say in a system rotating regional primaries, similar to the ones Senator LEVIN and I have introduced in the Senate. But in the process of exacting this punishment on Florida, it is equally troubling that the average citizen in

Florida can no longer see their candidates for President because, as I explained, the party bosses have barred them from campaigning in Florida—except for the private fundraisers.

This is unacceptable. Paying for political participation is unacceptable, and in a bygone era—one that we do not want to return to—that was called a poll tax.

Just recently we saw a measure of Florida voters overwhelmingly agree, regardless of their party affiliation, that they do not think this is right. A just-released Quinnipiac Poll says by a margin of 62 to 16 Florida voters—that is, Republicans, Independents, and Democrats—believe it is wrong to strip us of the delegates to the nominating convention. That same poll also shows the delegate ban may be hurting our own Presidential candidates.

In this latest Quinnipiac Poll, it has been basically neck and neck between Presidential candidate Giuliani and Presidential candidate Clinton. As Clinton was in the lead, now Giuliani has suddenly gone into the lead. Very significantly, in that same Quinnipiac Poll of independent voters, 22 percent of those independent voters said they are less likely to consider voting for the Democrat for President in the general election because of the DNC's shenanigans.

Mr. Chairman, Howard Dean, I hope you are listening to our plea. If you are not going to listen on the merits of the case, that polling data is certainly why, Mr. Chairman Dean, you should lift the ban because you are giving an additional opportunity, an advantage to the Republicans in the general election in the State of Florida.

I have today formulated a motion for summary judgment to be offered in the next couple of days in the Federal District Court where the lawsuit has been filed. Today is the last day upon which the defendant, Chairman Howard Dean, and the defendants, the members of the Democratic National Committee, have to answer the lawsuit. Upon the basis of their answer, it is my intention and the intention of the other plaintiffs to this lawsuit of filing a motion for summary judgment that sets out the legal and constitutional arguments of why the judge should, in fact, stop this travesty of taking away votes from more than 4.25 million registered Democratic voters in the State of Florida.

It does not have to be this way. If, in fact, the DNC recognizes that all these other States are moving forward to earlier dates, then the sequence is preserved for those who wanted to be first. Whether that is justified, their sequence is preserved, and we can go on about getting our eye focused on the November 2008 election, instead of going through all of this rhubarb that is now engulfing the election apparatus.

It is my hope that now the other States are jumping to an earlier date, the DNC will see the wisdom of putting

this all behind us, of joining together as the family we are, stop the family squabbles, unite, and then start focusing later on the 2008 November election.

Madam President, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. McCASKILL.) The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. CANTWELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

MORNING BUSINESS

Ms. CANTWELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent there now be a period for the transaction of morning business with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

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

U.S. SENATE TRAVEL REGULATIONS

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Madam President, I wish to inform all Senators that the Committee on Rules and Administration has updated the U.S. Senate Travel Regulations. The Ethics Committee recently issued guidance to the Rules Committee that making more than one reservation for official travel with a participating airline would not constitute a gift under Senate rule XXXV, the Gift Rule. Consistent with the Ethics Committee's guidance, the transportation expenses section of the U.S. Senate Travel Regulations has been updated to address the issue of making more than one reservation on scheduled flights.

The following statement has been added to I.B of the transportation expenses section, found on page IV-64 of the U.S. Senate Handbook:

3. A Member shall be permitted to make more than one reservation on scheduled flights with participating airlines when such action assists the Member in conducting his/her official business.

This change is effective immediately.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the updated U.S. Senate Travel Regulations be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AUTHORITY OF THE COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION TO ISSUE SENATE TRAVEL REGULATIONS

The travel regulations herein have been promulgated by the Committee on Rules and Administration pursuant to the authority vested in it by paragraph 1(n)(1)8 of Rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate and by section 68 of Title 2 of the United States Code, the pertinent portions of which provisions are as follows:

STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE Rule XXV

Paragraph 1(n)(1)8

(n)(1) Committee on Rules and Administration, to which committee shall be referred

... matters relating to the following subjects: . . .

8. Payment of money out of the contingent fund of the Senate or creating a charge upon the same . . .

UNITED STATES CODE Title 2 section 68

Sec. 68. Payments from contingent fund of Senate

No payment shall be made from the contingent fund of the Senate unless sanctioned by the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate . . .

UNITED STATES SENATE TRAVEL REGULATIONS

Revised by the Committee on Rules and Administration.

United States Senate, effective October 1, 1991 as amended January 1, 1999, as further amended December 7, 2006, as further amended October 26, 2007.

General regulations

I. Travel Authorization

A. Only those individuals having an official connection with the function involved may obligate the funds of said function.

B. Funds disbursed by the Secretary of Senate may be obligated by:

1. Members of standing, select, special, joint, policy or conference committees.
2. Staff of such committees.
3. Employees properly detailed to such committees from other agencies.

4. Employees of Members of such committees whose salaries are disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate and employees appointed under authority of section 111 of Public Law 95-94, approved August 5, 1977, when designated as "ex officio employees" by the Chairman of such committee. Approval of the reimbursement voucher will be considered sufficient designation.

5. Senators, including staff and nominating board members. (Also individuals properly detailed to a Senator's office under authority of Section 503(b)(3) of P.L. 96-465, approved October 17, 1980.)

6. All other administrative offices, including Officers and staff.

C. An employee who transfers from one office to another on the same day he/she concludes official travel shall be considered an employee of the former office until the conclusion of that official travel.

D. All travel shall be either authorized or approved by the chairman of the committee, Senator, or Officer of the Senate to whom such authority has been properly delegated. The administrative approval of the voucher will constitute the approvals required. It is expected that ordinarily the authority will be issued prior to the expenses being incurred and will specify the travel to be performed as such possible unless circumstances in a particular case prevent such action.

E. Official Travel Authorizations: The General Services Administration, on behalf of the Committee on Rules and Administration, has contracted with several air carriers to provide discount air fares for Members, Officers, and employees of the Senate only when traveling on official business. This status is identifiable to the contracting air carriers by one of the following ways:

1. The use of a government issued travel charge card.

2. The use of an "Official Travel Authorization" form which must be submitted to the air carrier prior to purchasing a ticket. These forms must be personally approved by the Senator, chairman, or Officer of the Senate under whose authority the travel for official business is taking place. Payment must be made in advance by cash, credit card, check, or money order. The Official Travel Authorization forms are available in the Senate Disbursing Office.

II. Funds for Traveling Expenses

A. Individuals traveling on official business for the Senate will provide themselves with sufficient funds for all current expenses, and are expected to exercise the same care in incurring expenses that a prudent person would exercise if traveling on personal business.

1. Travel Advances

(a) Advances to Committees (P.L. 81-118)

(1) Chairmen of joint committees operating from the contingent fund of the Senate, and chairmen of standing, special, select, policy, or conference committees of the Senate, may requisition an advance of the funds authorized for their respective committees.

(a) When any duty is imposed upon a committee involving expenses that are ordered to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate, upon vouchers to be approved by the chairman of the committee charged with such duty, the receipt of such chairman for any sum advanced to him[her] or his[her] order out of said contingent fund by the Secretary of the Senate for committee expenses not involving personal services shall be taken and passed by the accounting officers of the Government as a full and sufficient voucher; but it shall be the duty of such chairman, as soon as practicable, to furnish to the Secretary of the Senate vouchers in detail for the expenses so incurred.

(2) Upon presentation of the properly signed statutory advance voucher, the Disbursing Office will make the original advance to the chairman or his/her representative. This advance may be in the form of a check, or in cash, receipted for on the voucher by the person receiving the advance. Under no circumstances are advances to be used for the payment of salaries or obligations, other than petty cash transactions of the committee.

(3) In no case shall a cash advance be paid more than seven (7) calendar days prior to the commencement of official travel. In no case shall an advance in the form of a check be paid more than fourteen (14) calendar days prior to the commencement of official travel. Requests for advances in the form of a check should be received by the Senate Disbursing Office no less than five (5) calendar days prior to the commencement of official travel. The amount of the advance then becomes the responsibility of the individual receiving the advance, in that he/she must return the amount advanced before or shortly after the expiration of the authority under which these funds were obtained.

(Regulations Governing Cash Advances for Official Senate Travel adopted by the Committee on Rules and Administration, effective July 23, 1987, pursuant to S. Res. 258, October 1, 1987, as applicable to Senate committees)

(4) Travel advances shall be made prior to the commencement of official travel in the form of cash, direct deposit, or check. Travel advance requests shall be signed by the Committee Chairman and a staff person designated with signature authority.

(5) Cash: Advances for travel in the form of cash shall be picked up only in the Senate Disbursing Office and will be issued only to the person traveling (photo ID required), with exceptions being made for Members and elected Officers of the Senate. The traveler (or the individual receiving the advance in the case of a travel advance for a Member or elected Officer of the Senate) shall sign the travel advance form to acknowledge receipt of the cash.

(6) In those cases when a travel advance has been paid, every effort should be made by the office in question to submit to the Senate Disbursing Office a corresponding travel voucher within twenty-one (21) days of the conclusion of such official travel.