straight face that we have addressed the revolving door problem in a meaningful way.

Let me emphasize one thing about this amendment. It does not apply to former staff. The reason is simple. We let, under this, former staffers leave this building and become lobbyists tomorrow. They are limited in what offices they can contact, but they are allowed to lobby. So preventing them from engaging in lobbying activities only with respect to certain offices would not make sense. But for former Members, who are prohibited from contacting anyone in the Congress, this additional prohibition actually makes a lot of sense and will have a real impact.

The American people are looking for real results in this legislation. We cannot claim to be giving them that with respect to the revolving door without this amendment. So I urge my colleagues to vote for the Feingold-Obama amendment.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I listened with interest to my friend from Wisconsin. I have to repeat what I said on the floor before. I may be the only one—I am not sure—who has had experience with the revolving door, as one who went through it. I worked in the Nixon administration. The day after I walked out, I had a number of clients who wanted me to lobby them at my former department. I was at the Department of Transportation, and I was the chief lobbyist. We pretend that executive departments don't have lobbyists. We call them congressional relations specialists or congressional liaisons, but they are lobbyists. And I had been lobbying the Congress on behalf of the Department of Transportation.

In that role I got access to the Secretary's inner circle. And the day after I left, I was hired by people who had interests before the Department. There was no prohibition for that at that time. So I went to the Department of Transportation and to my old friends with whom I had been working very closely for that period of time. I discovered very quickly that the fact that I no longer was at the Secretary's ear, the fact that I no longer had any position of influence in the Department made me a whole lot less welcome in their offices than I had been the week before. They were happy to see me. They were polite. But they had other things to do. And they were happy to get me out of their offices and out of their hair as quickly as they could.

Did I have an advantage? Yes, I had the advantage of knowing the Department well enough to know where to go and not waste my time. Did I have any additional clout to get these people to do something that would not have been in the public interest by virtue of the fact that I had been there and worked with them and knew them? Not at all. These were legitimate public servants who were not about to do something improper just because a friend who had worked with them asked them to do it. Of course, I was not about to ask them to do anything improper because that would be a violation of my responsibility to my clients. But I learned quickly that this idea of the revolving door is vastly overrated and overstated by some of our friends in the media.

I suppose we will pass the Feingold amendment. I don't suppose it will make any difference. But the idea that a former Member sitting in a board room talking to other people who are engaged in lobbying activity and saying to them: Don't talk to Senator so-and-so, talk to Senator so-and-so because the second Senator so-and-so is the one who really understands this issue. Don't waste your time with the first one. I know him well enough to know that he really won't get your argument—to criminalize that kind of a statement made in a law firm or a lobbying firm, to me, is going much too far. But we will probably pass it. We will go forward. We will see if it survives the scrutiny that it will get in conference and in conversations with the House.

I, once again, say that we are doing a lot of things that are in response to the media and in response to special interest groups that call themselves public interest groups but raise money and pay salaries just as thoroughly as the special interest groups. And they have to have something to do to keep their members happy. They have to have something to do to keep those dues coming in, those contributions coming in. So they scare them that a U.S. Senator, who leaves and goes to a law firm, cannot be in the room when anybody in that law firm is talking about exercising their constitutional right to petition the Government for redress of their grievances because, if the Senator is in that room for a 2-year period, he is somehow corrupting the entire process. I think that is silly.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I would just say, in response to my friend from Utah, that I don't doubt for a minute that what he has said is true. But to generalize from his experience I don't think makes sense. Our former colleagues are making millions of dollars trading on their experience. I don't think these lobbying firms are throwing away their money for nothing. And I know the public doesn't believe that, which is a very good reason to adopt this amendment. It is not silly; it is the right thing to do.

I yield the floor.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant journal 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.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that morning business be closed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

LEGISLATIVE TRANSPARENCY AND ACCOUNTABILITY ACT OF 2007—Resumed

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the pending business.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1) to provide greater transparency in the legislative process.

Pending:

Reid amendment No. 3, in the nature of a substitute.

DeMint amendment No. 12 (to amendment No. 3), to clarify that earmarks added to a conference report that are not considered by the Senate or the House of Representatives are out of scope.

DeMint amendment No. 14 (to amendment No. 3), to protect individuals from having their money involuntarily collected and used for lobbying by a labor organization.

Vitter-Inhofe further modified amendment No. 9 (to amendment No. 3), to prohibit Members from having official contact with any spouse of a Member who is a registered lobbyist.

Leahy-Pryor amendment No. 2 (to amendment No. 3), to give investigators and prosecutors the tools they need to combat public corruption.

Gregg amendment No. 17 (to amendment No. 3), to establish a legislative line item veto.

Ensign amendment No. 24 (to amendment No. 3), to provide for better transparency and enhanced congressional oversight of spending by clarifying the treatment of matter not committed to the conferees by either House.

Ensign modified amendment No. 25 (to amendment No. 3), to ensure full funding for the Department of Defense within the regular appropriations process, to limit the reliance of the Department of Defense on supplemental appropriations bills, and to improve the integrity of the congressional budget process.

Cornyn amendment No. 26 (to amendment No. 3), to require full separate disclosure of any earmarks in any bill, joint resolution, report, conference report or statement of managers.

Cornyn amendment No. 27 (to amendment No. 3), to require 3 calendar days notice in the Senate before proceeding to any matter.

Bennett (for McCain) amendment No. 28 (to amendment No. 3), to provide congressional transparency.

Bennett (for McCain) amendment No. 29 (to amendment No. 3), to provide congressional transparency.

Lieberman amendment No. 30 (to amendment No. 3), to establish a Senate Office of Public Integrity.

Bennett-McConnell amendment No. 20 (to amendment No. 3), to strike a provision relating to paid efforts to stimulate grassroots lobbying.

Thune amendment No. 37 (to amendment No. 3), to require any recipient of a Federal award to disclose all lobbying and political advocacy.

Feinstein-Rockefeller amendment No. 42 (to amendment No. 3), to prohibit an earmark from being included in the classified portion of a report accompanying a measure

unless the measure includes a general program description, funding level, and the name of the sponsor of that earmark.

Feingold amendment No. 31 (to amendment No. 3), to prohibit former Members of Congress from engaging in lobbying activities in addition to lobbying contacts during their cooling off period.

Feingold amendment No. 33 (to amendment No. 3), to prohibit former Members who are lobbyists from using gym and parking privileges made available to Members and former Members.

Feingold amendment No. 34 (to amendment No. 3), to require Senate campaigns to file their FEC reports electronically.

Durbin amendment No. 36 (to amendment No. 3), to require that amendments and motions to recommit with instructions be copied and provided by the clerk to the desks of the Majority Leader and the Minority Leader before being debated.

Cornyn amendment No. 45 (to amendment No. 3), to require 72 hour public availability of legislative matters before consideration.

Cornyn amendment No. 46 (to amendment No. 2), to deter public corruption.

Bond (for Coburn) amendment No. 48 (to amendment No. 3), to require all recipients of Federal earmarks, grants, subgrants, and contracts to disclose amounts spent on lobbying and a description of all lobbying activities.

Bond (for Coburn) amendment No. 49 (to amendment No. 3), to require all congressional earmark requests to be submitted to the appropriate Senate committee on a standardized form.

Bond (for Coburn) amendment No. 50 (to amendment No. 3), to provide disclosure of lobbyist gifts and travel instead of banning them as proposed.

Bond (for Coburn) amendment No. 51 (to amendment No. 3), to prohibit Members from requesting earmarks that may financially benefit that Member or immediate family member of that Member.

Nelson (NE) amendment No. 47 (to amendment No. 3), to help encourage fiscal responsibility in the earmarking process.

Reid (for Lieberman) amendment No. 43 (to amendment No. 3), to require disclosure of earmark lobbying by lobbyists.

Reid (for Casey) amendment No. 56 (to amendment No. 3), to eliminate the K Street Project by prohibiting the wrongful influencing of a private entity's employment decisions or practices in exchange for political access or favors.

Sanders amendment No. 57 (to amendment No. 3), to require a report by the Commission to Strengthen Confidence in Congress regarding political contributions before and after the enactment of certain laws.

Bennett (for Coburn) amendment No. 59 (to amendment No. 3), to provide disclosure of lobbyist gifts and travel instead of banning them as proposed.

Bennett (for Coleman) amendment No. 39 (to amendment No. 3), to require that a publicly available website be established in Congress to allow the public access to records of reported congressional official travel.

Feingold amendment No. 63 (to amendment No. 3), to increase the cooling off period for senior staff to 2 years and to prohibit former Members of Congress from engaging in lobbying activities in addition to lobbying contacts during their cooling off period.

Feingold amendment No. 64 (to amendment No. 3), to prohibit lobbyists and entities that retain or employ lobbyists from throwing lavish parties honoring Members at party conventions.

Feingold-Obama amendment No. 76 (to amendment No. 3), to clarify certain aspects of the lobbyist contribution reporting provision.

Obama-Feingold amendment No. 41 (to amendment No. 3), to require lobbyists to disclose the candidates, leadership PACs, or political parties for whom they collect or arrange contributions, and the aggregate amount of the contributions collected or arranged.

Nelson (NE)-Salazar amendment No. 71 (to amendment No. 3), to extend the laws and rules passed in this bill to the executive and judicial branches of government.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, first of all, I apologize to everybody for having Senators wait around. I can remember when I was in the House, and in the interest of coming to the Senate, I turned on the TV set. Jim Exon from Nebraska kept suggesting the absence of a quorum. I was so upset not knowing what the procedure was. But I came and served with Jim Exon—first of all, he was as big as the Presiding Officer, and he was a man who was very dedicated to the Senate. But after I got here, I understood more what was happening. So I apologize for all the quorum calls. A lot of people think nothing is going on, but Democrats and Republicans and staff have been working so hard from last night to today to get us to this point.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all amendments to the amendment No. 3 be withdrawn and that the following be the only amendments remaining in order to the bill or substitute amendment; that the votes in relation to the amendments begin at 8:10 this evening, with 2 minutes for debate equally divided between each vote; that upon disposition of the above-listed amendments, the substitute amendment No. 3 be agreed to as amended, the bill be read the third time, and the Senate vote, without any intervening action or debate, on final passage of the bill.

The amendments that I have referred to are as follows: Bennett amendment No. 20 on grassroots lobbying; Lieberman-Collins amendment No. 30; Vitter amendment No. 9 on spouses; Coburn amendment No. 51 on gifts and travel disclosure; Ensign-DeMint amendment on scope of conference; Feingold amendment No. 31 on former members lobbying; Feingold amendment No. 33 on gym and parking; Durbin amendment No. 77 on providing managers copies of amendments; Obama amendment No. 41 on bundling; Sanders amendment No. 57 on study; Coleman-Cardin amendment No. 39, as modified, on travel Web site; managers' amendment to be agreed to by both managers; further, that the Senate begin consideration of H.R. 2, the minimum wage bill on Monday, January 22, at 2 p.m. and that Senator COBURN be recognized to speak following final passage following the remarks of the two leaders.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. LEAHY. Reserving the right to object, would the leader add to that, after the first vote that subsequent votes be 10-minute votes?

Mr. REID. Yes, I will.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, my understanding is that when the Senate turns to minimum wage, the majority leader, or his designee, will offer a substitute amendment that will be fully amendable; is that correct?

Mr. REID. True.

Mr. GREGG. Further, I understand the majority leader is aware that I have agreed to withdraw my amendment on this bill, the lobby reform bill, and I will be here Monday to offer my language to the minimum wage bill.

Mr. REID. That is my understanding. The Senator absolutely has that right.

Mr. GREGG. Further reserving the right to object, I understand that the majority leader will be unable to reach consent for a time agreement to vote on my amendment; therefore, it is likely that a cloture motion will be filed on my language on Monday. I expect my language to be the first amendment to the bill.

Mr. REID. It may not be the first, but we have an agreement that it would be following my recognition, the offering of the substitute, and the minority leader, who would be recognized.

Mr. GREGG. I thank the two leaders for their assistance in this process. I believe this is a reasonable way to bring up the amendment that I have offered and to move this bill at the same time.

I understand that on Monday it would be the expectation that nobody will be complaining that I have it on the wrong vehicle.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, before the Republican leader says anything, I will be brief. We have been able, if this agreement is reached, to accomplish what the distinguished Republican leader and I intended to do this week. As a result of that and an agreement to go forward on the minimum wage, there will be no votes tomorrow or Monday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican leader is recognized.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, to reiterate what the majority leader indicated, as a result of this agreement, which did take a while—and I know some of our colleagues wondered if we were ever going to get there—we will complete the bill tonight, and we will have no votes tomorrow or Monday.

This was a successful example of good negotiation—although it took a while—for a favorable result.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, has the agreement been accepted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, in that we are not voting until 8:10, I will say a few words. Let me say this. This legislation has been extremely difficult to deal with. It is difficult because it directly affects our lives, Members of the Senate. In the short term, this is going

to be difficult because we are going to have to get used to the provisions in this piece of legislation. But in the long term, we will all be thankful these steps have been taken. This legislation will remove even the appearance of impropriety from the work done in this Chamber.

This is not a time for declaring victory. Legislation is the art of compromise, the art of consensus building. There has been a victor in all of this when this matter is completed and that is the American people. I am not a victor, I am not a loser. Senator MCCONNELL is not a victor or a loser. We have worked through this in the way that legislators should work through difficult pieces of legislation. I believe last November Americans, through their votes, asked us to make Government honest. We have done that. We are going to give them what I believe is a Government they deserve.

I am satisfied that this debate has been good for this body. Now we are going to move forward, recognizing the last 24 hours has not been easy legislatively. As Senator DURBIN said last night, it was a bump in the road. It was a real bump and people should have had their seatbelts on because it was a difficult bump. But I believe last night there were people looking for an excuse to not move this bill forward. Let me say, underlying and underscoring this, as I said last night—and I will say it again—Senator JUDD GREGG, the senior Senator from New Hampshire, is a person who has tremendously strong principles. He believes in this legislation. I believe just as strongly that it is wrong. But he believes it is right. I admire and respect him for doing that, just as his partner on the Budget Committee, Senator CONRAD, is a person of principle. They have worked on this issue and other issues together, as legislators should work together. I so much respect the way they work together. They disagree on a number of different issues, but they do it in a way that I think brings dignity to this body.

I, also, wish to say one thing about my friend, Senator RUSS FEINGOLD. He has been a pioneer on a number of different legislative issues. He fought tooth and nail with my friend, the Republican leader, on campaign finance reform. It was a debate that went on for a number of years in this body. Senator FEINGOLD is a person who has talked about ethics since he came to the Senate. There are a lot of people responsible for this legislation, but there is no one more responsible than the Senator from Wisconsin.

He has been a pioneer, and he has not let up from the time he came to the Senate to today in moving forward on what he believes is good for this body politic. With rare exception, I agree with him. He is my friend. He is a person for whom I have great admiration based on his, if nothing else—and there is plenty more—being a Rhodes Scholar, a Harvard graduate with honors, a man who was a dignified and successful lawyer before he came to the Senate. He has shown he is a good legislator. So I have great respect for him.

In the past, I called this legislation the toughest reform since Watergate. That is an understatement. This is the toughest reform bill in the history of this body as it relates to ethics and lawmaking. So everyone tonight, when they vote on this bill, should vote proudly. What is going to happen soon is historic: requiring new lobbying disclosure, banning all gifts, reforming earmarks, requiring Senators to pay charter rates on corporate jets. We will restore the confidence of our citizenry in the Government.

I so appreciate the work that has been done on this legislation. I appreciate the work of my friend, the Republican leader. We have had disagreements on this legislation, but we have an agreement in principle as to what this body is all about. I look forward to working together on more bipartisan legislation. This is bipartisan legislation sponsored by the Democratic leader and the Republican leader of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I say to my friend, the majority leader, I couldn't agree more. This is a classic example of bipartisanship in the Senate at its very best. We had good bipartisan support last year when we passed a similar bill 90 to 8. This year, I think we are going to finish the job.

I particularly wish to recognize, on this side of the aisle, the extraordinary work of Senator GREGG in achieving his goal on the next bill up to get an important vote that is important not only to him but to many Members on our side of the aisle.

I extend my congratulations to my good friend, BOB BENNETT, the ranking member on our side, who has been involved on this from beginning to end and has done an extraordinary job of managing a very complex and difficult bill; to Senator SUSAN COLLINS, who has been a leader on the Collins-Lieberman amendment on which we will be voting shortly; to Senator VITTER, Senator COBURN, Senator DEMINT, who have been extremely active on this bill, and each of them has an imprint on this final passage measure that we will be dealing with shortly.

Mr. President, I congratulate all Senators for an extraordinary accomplishment, under very difficult circumstances on a broad, bipartisan basis. The patience that was exhibited to allow us to get to this point, I remind everyone, is what produced an opportunity to have no votes tomorrow and no votes on Monday. I think this was worth the wait.

I congratulate the majority leader.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I failed to acknowledge the managers of this bill. I apologize to both of them. They have been masterful in working this bill the last 2 weeks. The two managers are going to be involved heavily in getting this through conference. I have so much respect for both of them. They are outstanding Senators.

I repeat, I am so sorry I didn't acknowledge them. I should have done that in the beginning because they have done more than anybody else in moving this bill forward. They worked as partners moving this bill forward. It has been a difficult partnership because of the different thoughts on different sides of the aisle as to what is good and bad. They have been able to be dignified in what they have done. I appreciate it.

AMENDMENT NO. 20

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending question is the Bennett amendment No. 20.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state his inquiry.

Mr. BENNETT. How is the time allocated between now and the scheduled votes?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No time is allocated. The Senator may speak.

Mr. BENNETT. Do I understand, Mr. President, that the votes are not locked in for 8:10 p.m.?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the voting begins at 8:10 p.m.

Mr. BENNETT. So the time between now and 8:10 p.m. is not allocated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I wish to be fair to whoever opposes my amendment to allow time for them to do that, but I would like to speak briefly in favor of my amendment.

My amendment is called the grassroots lobbying amendment. I have discussed it and its virtues at some length previously during the period of debate, but I remind everyone what this is all about.

This has to do with the regulations and reporting requirements placed on organizations that stimulate people to contact their Members of Congress. These organizations can be, and many times are, outside of Washington, DC. They can, and many times do, carry on their work without ever contacting a Member of Congress directly or participating in any of the activities we normally think of as lobbying. And yet, if an organization or an individual were to stimulate neighbors, Members of a fraternal organization, their bowling club—whatever it is—to try to get them active in the process of petitioning the Government, they run the risk of not registering properly because under the underlying bill, they are defined as lobbyists, and if they fail to fill out their forms properly, if they fail to register properly, they are subject to a $200,000 fine.

The ACLU has said—in my opinion accurately—that this would have a

chilling effect on all of these kinds of activities. People on the right side, the National Right to Life, have said this would have a chilling effect on everything we do.

I know there has been talk about astroturf lobbyists and astroturf campaigns. I am certainly competent to know when an astroturf phony campaign has been mounted. The letters and the postcards come into the office, and it is very transparent they are not genuine and real. I do not need to be protected from my constituents by the language in the underlying bill.

My amendment is very simple. It simply strikes the grassroots provision.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I intend to support amendment No. 20 offered by my colleague from Utah, Senator BENNETT. This amendment would strike section 220, the grassroots reporting provision, from the bill.

Yesterday, during my statement on the need for comprehensive lobbying and ethics reform, I discussed the importance of an informed citizenry and how it is essential to a thriving democracy. A democratic government operates best in the disinfecting light of the public eye. With this bill, we have an opportunity to balance the right of the public to know with its right to petition government; the ability of lobbyists' to advocate their clients' causes with the need for truthful public discourse; and the ability of Members to legislate with the imperative that our government must be free from corrupting influences, both real and perceived. We must act now to ensure that the erosion we see today in the public's confidence in Congress does not become a collapse of confidence.

We have an obligation to address this crisis of confidence, but we also have an obligation to ensure that we do so in a thoughtful, reasoned, and constitutional manner. It is imperative that we be mindful of the rights of American citizens to freely contact their public officials and take part in the political process. After careful consideration, and much input from groups representing all parts of the political spectrum, it has become evident to me that section 220 of the underlying bill could seriously impact legitimate communications between public interest organizations and their members. That is why I will support the efforts of my colleague from Utah to strike section 220 from the bill.

It is my understanding that, under this provision, small organizations—many with no representation in Washington—would have to register as grassroots lobbying firms. These groups would then have to comply with onerous quarterly reporting requirements or face fines and criminal penalties. I do not think it was the intention of the proponents of this provision to restrict the ability of groups to communicate with their membership, but I have concluded that this could very well be the outcome.

The approach taken in the underlying bill is one of greater disclosure of and transparency into the interactions of lobbyists with our public officials. More transparency and disclosure of professional lobbyists' activities can only lead to better government. Unfortunately, section 220 simply goes too far, and I fear that the unintended consequences would negatively impact the legitimate, constitutionally protected activities of small citizen groups and their members.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I oppose the amendment offered by Senator BENNETT which would strike the grassroots lobbying provision in S. 1.

Several years ago, I, along with several colleagues, undertook the task of strengthening reporting requirements for lobbyists. This culminated in the passage of the Lobbying Disclosure Act which broke new ground by allowing sunlight into the activities of lobbyists in Washington. It finally required meaningful disclosure of the billions of dollars spent on lobbying Members of Congress.

While great progress was made, there was a major loophole left open which needs to be closed. Under current law, lobbyists are permitted to exclude the cost of their efforts to stimulate grassroots lobbying when they report under the LDA. We recognized this problem in 1996 but were not successful in efforts to address it. However, I continue to believe that lobbyists who engage in this so-called ''Astroturf'' lobbying should also be required to disclose their spending.

The Wall Street Journal examined this issue when we last reviewed this and reported that an estimated $790 million was spent on this type of grassroots lobbying in a 2-year period alone. Accounting for the growth in the lobbying industry that we have seen over the last decade, this number is surely over a billion by now.

What sort of activities does money spent on ''Astroturf'' lobbying efforts pay for? It is spent on phone banks, telephone patch-throughs to Members, and even professional campaign organizers who are paid to go to key congressional districts to organize letter-writing campaigns. These are coordinated efforts costing tens of thousands of dollars which on their face are part of professional lobbying efforts.

I was pleased to work with Senator LIEBERMAN last year to craft a provision during the Homeland Security and Government Affairs Committee's consideration of the lobbying bill that would close this loophole by requiring disclosure of ''paid efforts to stimulate grassroots lobbying.'' It requires disclosure by paid lobbyists and lobbying firms who stimulate the grassroots to take action. We even went so far as to define pure grassroots lobbying and exclude it from this provision.

The Lieberman-Levin provision that was included in S. 1 simply requires disclosure. This provision does not in any way ''restrain'' or ''regulate'' paid efforts to stimulate grassroots lobbying. All that it does is require paid lobbyists to disclose how much they are spending on their grassroots lobbying efforts. This disclosure would be no more burdensome than the disclosure already required by the Lobbying Disclosure Act for direct lobbying: Amounts spent for efforts to stimulate grassroots lobbying, like amounts spent on direct lobbying, would be disclosed only in the form of good-faith estimates, which would be rounded to the nearest $20,000.

In addition, the provision, like the Lobbying Disclosure Act, recognizes that certain organizations are already required to track lobbying expenses, and grassroots lobbying expenses, for IRS purposes. The provision allows these organizations to use their IRS numbers for disclosure purposes, ensuring that they do not have to account twice by different rules.

This section was carefully crafted to exclude certain activities that are not part of this Astroturf lobbying industry. Efforts by an organization to communicate with its own members, employees, officers, or shareholders are expressly excluded. Organizations that exist solely to lobby Congress but do not employ paid lobbyists do not have to report. Finally, any grassroots lobbying efforts targeted at less than 500 people do not have to be reported.

I would also like to clarify just who is required to disclose as a lobbyist under this provision, as there seems to be confusion over this point. Paragraph (b) of section 220 clearly states that individuals who are not registered lobbyists now would not have to register as a lobbyist under this provision so long as their expenditures are only directed at grassroots lobbying. This provision is intended to shed light on the dollars being spent by lobbyists. It in no way affects individuals who want to call or write their Member of Congress.

For the past decade, we have allowed lobbyists to exclude the cost of their organized grassroots lobbying campaigns, even while they are reporting their other lobbying expenses. It is time to put an end to this arbitrary exclusion because the public has a right to know who is paying how much to whom in an effort to influence our decisions.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the Bennett amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of 8:10 p.m. having arrived, the question is on agreeing to the Bennett amendment No. 20.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, before I propound a unanimous consent request, I would very much like to

thank both leaders. I know this has been a difficult day. I think it has worked out, and I think that is to the good. I hope everyone else who has waited hour after hour understands that the leadership was in negotiations and there is a product of those negotiations.

I, also, thank the ranking member with whom it has been a great pleasure for me to work. Members should know that we are new. Members should know that our staffs are new to the committee and that this is their first bill on the floor. I believe they have done an excellent job, both on the Democratic side and on the Republican side. It is a kind of baptism of fire, if you will. I say thank you.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I thank the chairman of the committee for her kind words. I echo her laudatory comments about the staffs on both sides. This is a baptism of fire for all of us, for my staff and her staff as well, and they have had enough background that they know how to swim.

We are very grateful for the cooperation we have received and the support that has come from the staff. I look forward to a productive Congress, working with Senator FEINSTEIN on the Rules Committee on all of the other matters that will come before us.

AMENDMENT NO. 98

Mr. ENSIGN. Mr. President, in a moment, the Senate will adopt the Ensign-McCain-DeMint amendment related to scope of conference. I want to thank Senator MCCAIN and Senator DEMINT for working with me on this amendment.

I also want to explain why this amendment is such an important improvement over the underlying bill. Under the Constitution, the legislative branch controls the purse strings. That is a significant authority given to Congress. Congress must use that authority wisely. As I explained earlier today on the floor, too often conferees insert earmarks in conference reports that were not funded in either bill passed by the House or the Senate.

In a democracy such as ours, Congress should do its business in the full light of day. The entire Senate should consider, debate, and amend legislation in full view of the American public. We should scrutinize how Federal dollars are spent. Each project Congress funds should be debated and considered by Congress. We must do a better job of oversight. We must ensure that the taxpayers' dollars are being spent wisely. But when we insert projects in a conference report, without debate and without oversight, we fail to live up to our responsibilities as Senators.

What the Ensign-McCain-DeMint amendment would do is fix what has become a broken process. My amendment makes clear that a point of order can be raised against any funding, no matter how specific, for any program, project, or account that was not originally funded in either bill sent to conference. This is a simple but critical change. It will improve how Congress operates, and it will make the Government more accountable to the American people.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, the underlying substitute does include two provisions that are intended to address the out-of-control earmarking and porkbarrel spending of the past years. And, the adoption of the DeMint and Durbin amendments earlier this week have improved upon the underlying bill to ensure that all earmarks are disclosed—including those to Federal entities, as well as all that are included in statements of managers and conference reports. A number of us supported a similar proposal last year, and I am pleased that the effort was finally successful.

I am now pleased that additional improvements will be adopted with respect to section 1 of the underlying bill concerning out of scope matters in conference reports. The amendment sponsored by Senators ENSIGN, DEMINT, and myself, which I understand is agreeable on both sides, would ensure that points of order can be raised against specific items in conference reports. It would add a definition of any matter so that members are empowered to remove out of scope earmarks and policy riders from conference reports without taking down the entire conference report. And, importantly, it would ensure that funding associated with any provision stricken from a conference report is reduced from the total amount appropriated—a critical requirement missing from the underlying measure.

For example, if a conference report provides $10 million for bridge improvements, but then adds a directive that $5 million of that funding should be directed to a specific bridge in a specific place—a directive that was not included in either the House or Senate bill, our amendment would ensure the $5 million that accompanies that out of scope earmark is also removed from the total allocation of the bill. So that the total appropriated would be $5 million, not $10 million. This is about fiscal restraint, Mr. President. It makes little sense to raise a point of order that is sustained against an out of scope earmark, but to appropriate the funding regardless.

While I support the improvements proposed and accepted so far, earmark reform still needs to go much further. We need to curtail earmarks, not just disclose them. The process is clearly broken when each year Congress continues to earmark billions and billions of taxpayer dollars, sometimes with virtually no information about the specifics of those earmarks. The scandal that came to light during the last Congress that involved earmarking by a former House member—now in prison—is a pox not just on him, but on each of us and the process that we have allowed to occur on our watch. The American public, Mr. President, deserves better. That is what this amendment is about.

The growth in earmarked funding in appropriations bills during the past 12 years has been staggering. According to data gathered by CRS, there were 4,126 earmarks in 1994. In 2005, there were 15,877—an increase of nearly 400 percent. There was a little good news in 2006, solely due to the fact that the Labor-HHS appropriations bill was approved almost entirely free of earmarks—an amazing feat given that there were over 3,000 earmarks the prior year for just that bill. Despite this first reduction in 12 years, it doesn't change the fact that the largest number of earmarks in history have still occurred in the last three years—2004, 2005, and 2006.

Now, let's consider the level of funding associated with those earmarks. The amount of earmarked funding increased from $23.2 billion in 1994 to $64 billion in fiscal year 2006. Remarkably, it rose by 34 percent from 2005 to 2006, even though the number of earmarks decreased. Earmarked dollars have doubled just since 2000, and more than tripled in the last 10 years. This is wrong and disgraceful and we urgently need to curtail this seemingly out of control pork barreling practice that has become the norm around here.

I filed an amendment designed to curtail earmarking. I was pleased to be joined by Senators FEINGOLD and GRAHAM in introducing amendment No. 29. Unfortunately, it is clear that we will not be given an opportunity to vote on that amendment and I find myself in the same position as I was in last March during debate on lobbying reform when I was not allowed a vote on my amendment. But one day soon, I am confident we will fundamentally change business as usual with respect to pork barrel spending. The American public has a powerful voice, and I would have thought more of us would have heard that voice last November. But I do want to state my recognition that at least some improvements have been made to require full disclosure of all earmarks and to prevent out of scope matters in conference. And, I believe the Ensign, McCain, DeMint amendment makes further improvements.

AMENDMENT NO. 41

Mr. OBAMA. Mr. President, I have come to the floor to discuss the amendment I introduced with Senator FEINGOLD to require that lobbyists disclose the contributions that they bundle for campaigns. I am grateful to the leadership for accepting the amendment and believe it strengthens an already very strong bill.

Neither I nor any of my colleagues enjoy the amount of money that running for office requires us to raise and spend. And I realize that having influential people help a campaign by asking their friends for contributions makes that task a little easier. And so I appreciate how difficult it can be for us to legislate our own behavior in this area.

But lobbyists who bundle contributions have a personal stake in the outcome of specific legislation before Congress. And because of that nexus, lobbyists should have to report who they are raising money for and the amounts that they are raising—including the contributions that they collect for campaigns from their networks of friends and colleagues.

The legislation before us today is meant to shine a bright light on how lobbyists influence the legislative process. Influence is not just about free meals or gifts or travel but about the millions upon millions of dollars raised to get us elected every few years. We should not keep the biggest role lobbyists play in that process hidden.

We all know that with strict campaign contribution limits, an important sign of a lobbyist's influence is not only how much money he gives but also how much he raises from friends and associates. During the last Presidential campaign, both candidates made great use of bundling.

For instance, the Bush Rangers each raised over $200,000; the Bush Pioneers each raised over $100,000. The Kerry campaign also relied on ''vice chairs'' who raised at least $100,000.

According to a USA Today story in 2003: ''Motives for becoming a bundler include the possibility of increased influence on government policy and consideration for appointment to ambassadorships and other government posts.''

And so if we believe that lobbyists should have to disclose campaign contributions, then they should certainly have to disclose the bundling they engage in so that the public knows the relationship between members, their views on policy, and the industries that support them.

Right now, this relationship is largely hidden from public view. So to correct this gap in the underlying bill, my amendment would require quarterly reporting of all contributions that a lobbyist collected or arranged that total more than $200 in a calendar year. This includes not only campaign contributions, but also contributions to Presidential libraries, inaugural committees, and lawmakers' charities.

The amendment has the support of all the major reform advocacy organizations, as well as congressional scholar Norm Ornstein and Thomas Susman, the chair of the Ethics Committee for the American League of Lobbyists.

According to Norm Ornstein: ''What is needed is disclosure here—who is doing the bundling, for whom, and how much. These are simple but critical steps for openness in the lobbying and money relationship. The public deserves to know—and this amendment gives them that opportunity.''

And in Professor Susman's words: ''Full disclosure of these activities, including the 'bundling' of campaign contributions for a candidate, will not burden or inhibit lobbyists. Lobbyists are proud of the role that we play in helping to finance federal campaigns, and we will be just as effective if the public knows about that role as well. Senator OBAMA's amendment is a reasonable way to keep these activities out in the open.''

Under the amendment that Senator FEINGOLD and I are offering, contributions are considered to be collected by a lobbyist if they are received by the lobbyist and forwarded to the campaign. Contributions are considered to be arranged by a lobbyist if there is an arrangement or understanding between the lobbyist and a campaign that the lobbyist will receive some kind of credit or recognition for having raised the money.

In discussing this proposal that I am offering, a Washington Post editorial this week said: ''No single change would add more to public understanding of how money really operates in Washington.''

This is an important addition to the bill we are considering, and I thank my colleagues for accepting it.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 9, 98, 51, 31, 33, 77, 41, 57, AND 39, AS MODIFIED, EN BLOC

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following amendments be considered en bloc and agreed to en bloc, with the motions to reconsider laid on the table, and that the action thereupon appear separately in the RECORD. The amendments are: Vitter amendment No. 9; Ensign-Demint amendment No. 98; Coburn amendment No. 51; Feingold amendment No. 31; Feingold amendment No. 33; Durbin amendment No. 77; Obama amendment No. 41; Sanders amendment No. 57; and Coleman-Cardin amendment No. 39, as modified.

I believe this has been cleared on both sides of the aisle.

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

The amendments (Nos. 9, 51, 31, 33, 41, and 57) were agreed to.

The amendment (No. 39), as modified, was agreed to, as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. CONGRESSIONAL TRAVEL PUBLIC WEBSITE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than January 1, 2008, the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives shall each establish a publicly available website without fee or without access charge, that contains information on all officially related congressional travel that is subject to disclosure under the gift rules of the Senate and the House of Representatives, respectively, that includes—

(1) a search engine;

(2) uniform categorization by Member, dates of travel, and any other common categories associated with congressional travel; and

(3) all forms filed in the Senate and the House of Representatives relating to officially-related travel referred to in paragraph (2), including the ''Disclosure of Member or Officer's Reimbursed Travel Expenses'' form in the Senate.

(b) EXTENSION AUTHORITY.—If the Secretary of the Senate or the Clerk of the House of Representatives is unable to meet the deadline established under subsection (a), the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate or the Committee on Rules of the House of Representatives may grant an extension of such date for the Secretary of the Senate or the Clerk of the House of Representatives, respectively.

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out this section.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 98 AND 77 TO AMENDMENT NO. 3, EN BLOC

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report amendments Nos. 98 and 77.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. ENSIGN], for himself, Mr. MCCAIN, and Mr. DEMINT, proposes an amendment numbered 98 to amendment No. 3.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN] proposes an amendment numbered 77 to amendment No. 3.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendments are agreed to en bloc.

The amendments (Nos. 98 and 77) were agreed to, as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 98

(Purpose: To provide for better transparency and enhanced Congressional oversight of spending by clarifying the treatment of matter not committed to the conferees by either House)

Strike page 3, line 9 through page 4, line 12 and insert the following:

''(a) IN GENERAL.—A point of order may be made by any Senator against any item contained in a conference report that includes or consists of any matter not committed to the conferees by either House.

(1) For the purpose of this section ''matter not committed to the conferees by either House'' shall include any item which consists of a specific provision containing a specific level of funding for any specific account, specific program, specific project, or specific activity, when no such specific funding was provided for such specific account, specific program, specific project, or specific activity in the measure originally committed to the conferees by either House.

(2) For the purpose of Rule XXVIII of the Standing Rules of the Senate ''matter not committed'' shall include any item which consists of a specific provision containing a specific level of funding for any specific account, specific program, specific project, or specific activity, when no such specific funding was provided for such specific account, specific program, specific project, or specific activity in the measure originally committed to the conferees by either House.

The point of order may be made and disposed of separately for each item in violation of this section.

(b) DISPOSITION.—If the point of order raised against an item in a conference report under subsection (a) is sustained, then—

(1) the matter in such conference report shall be stricken;

(2) when all other points of order under this section have been disposed of—

(A) the Senate shall proceed to consider the question of whether the Senate should recede from its amendment to the House bill, or its disagreement to the amendment of the House, and concur with a further amendment, which further amendment shall consist of only that portion of the conference report that has not been stricken (any modification of total amounts appropriated necessary to reflect the deletion of the matter struck from the conference report shall be made).

AMENDMENT NO. 77

(Purpose: To require that amendments and instructions accompanying a motion to recommit be copied and provided by the Senator offering them to the desks of the Majority Leader and the Minority Leader before being debated)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. . AMENDMENTS AND MOTIONS TO RECOMMIT.

Paragraph 1 of Rule XV of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended to read as follows:

''1. (a) An amendment and any instruction accompanying a motion to recommit shall be reduced to writing and read and identical copies shall be provided by the Senator offering the amendment or instruction to the desks of the Majority Leader and the Minority Leader before being debated.

''(b) A motion shall be reduced to writing, if desired by the Presiding Officer or by any Senator, and shall be read before being debated.''.

AMENDMENT NO. 20

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, utilizing a moment in opposition to the amendment of my friend from Utah, Mr. BENNETT, if the section on grassroots lobbying in the bill were as Senator BENNETT described it and as other groups on the outside have described it, I would oppose it.

This provision was in the overall lobbying bill that passed the Senate 90 to 8 last year. It is a natural extension of what the entire bill is doing, which is asking for disclosure from professional lobbying.

Billions of dollars are spent on so-called grassroots lobbying. It is totally legal, but let's get it out into the sunshine. The individual groups writing to Members to lobby us do not have to disclose anything. This only requires disclosure if a group retains a professional lobbyist and only if they pay that lobbyist more than $25,000 a quarter.

This is not amateur citizen lobbying. This is to find out who is getting how much money to influence us. It is not, in any sense, a limitation on the revered first amendment right to petition Congress for a redress of grievances. It is an attempt for disclosure consistent with the entire bill. So I ask my colleagues respectfully to leave this critical provision in this progressive reform bill.

I thank the Chair, and I yield the floor.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I rise to speak in favor of the amendment offered by Senator BENNETT. This is a very rare instance where I disagree with my colleague and good friend from Connecticut. I simply don't want to discourage any effort to increase citizen participation in Government. Too many citizens are convinced that their voices don't count. They become apathetic about their Government. They become convinced they cannot influence our positions. I think activity that encourages citizens to contact us, to participate in the process, should be encouraged, not discouraged, and I believe the language in the bill could well discourage citizen contact with Members of Congress. So I urge my colleagues to support the amendment offered by the Senator from Utah.

Thank you, Mr. President.

AMENDMENT NO. 99

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I send a manager's package to the desk. It combines a number of technical corrections requested by the Parliamentarian, the Secretary of the Senate, and the Indian Affairs Committee. It is concurred in by both sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from California [Mrs. FEINSTEIN], for herself and Mr. BENNETT, proposes an amendment numbered 99.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 99

(Purpose: to make technical amendments)

On page 4, strike lines 16 through 19.

On page 13, lines 1 and 2, strike ''the Select Committee on Ethics and''.

On page 15, strike beginning with line 22 through page 16, line 21, and insert the following:

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 207(j)(1) of title 18, United States Code, is amended, by—

(1) striking ''The restrictions'' and inserting the following:

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The restrictions''; and

(2) adding at the end the following:

''(B) INDIAN TRIBES.—The restrictions contained in this section shall not apply to acts done pursuant to section 104 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 450i).''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 104(j) of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 450i(j)) is amended by striking ''and former officers and employees of the United States employed by Indian tribes may act as agents or attorneys for or'' and inserting ''or former officers and employees of the United States who are carrying out official duties as employees or as elected or appointed officials of an Indian tribe may communicate with and''.

On page 24, strike lines 11 through 20 and insert the following:

(A) by striking the first sentence and inserting the following: ''Not later than 20 days after the end of the quarterly period beginning on the 1st day of January, April, July, and October of each year, or on the first business day after the 20th day if that day is not a business day, in which a registrant is registered with the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives, a registrant shall file a report or reports, as applicable, on its lobbying activities during such quarterly period.''; and

On page 27, strike line 12 through ''day,'' on line 15 and insert ''Not later than 20 days after the end of the end of the quarterly period beginning on the 1st day of January, April, July, and October of each year, or on the first business day after the 20th day if that day is not a business day,''.

On page 46, lines 12 and 13, strike ''over sight and enforcement'' and insert ''administration''.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 99) was agreed to.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 20

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the Bennett amendment. The yeas and nays have been ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant journal clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from South Dakota (Mr JOHNSON) is necessarily absent.

Mr. LOTT. The following Senator was necessarily absent: the Senator from Kansas (Mr. BROWNBACK).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 55, nays 43, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 17 Leg.]

YEAS—55

Alexander	Dole	McConnell
Allard	Domenici	Murkowski
Baucus	Dorgan	Nelson (NE)
Bayh	Ensign	Roberts
Bennett	Enzi	Salazar
Bond	Graham	Sessions
Bunning	Grassley	Shelby
Burr	Gregg	Smith
Chambliss	Hagel	Snowe
Coburn	Hatch	Specter
Cochran	Hutchison	Stevens
Coleman	Inhofe	Sununu
Collins	Isakson	Thomas
Conrad	Kyl	Thune
Corker	Landrieu	Vitter
Cornyn	Lott	Voinovich
Craig	Lugar	Warner
Crapo	Martinez	
DeMint	McCain	

NAYS—43

Akaka	Harkin	Nelson (FL)
Biden	Inouye	Obama
Bingaman	Kennedy	Pryor
Boxer	Kerry	Reed
Brown	Klobuchar	Reid
Byrd	Kohl	Rockefeller
Cantwell	Lautenberg	Sanders
Cardin	Leahy	Schumer
Carper	Levin	Stabenow
Casey	Lieberman	Tester
Clinton	Lincoln	Webb
Dodd	McCaskill	Whitehouse
Durbin	Menendez	Wyden
Feingold	Mikulski	
Feinstein	Murray	

NOT VOTING—2

Brownback	Johnson

The amendment (No. 20) was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending amendment is the Lieberman-Collins amendment.

The Senator from California.

AMENDMENT NO. 30

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, there have been a variety of proposals for what has been called an Office of Public Integrity. The Senate voted 67 to 30 against one such proposal last year. Last time, Senators JOHNSON and VOINOVICH, the chairs of the Ethics Committee, stood in opposition. This time, the new chairs of the Ethics Committee, Senators BOXER and CORNYN, stand in opposition.

I recognize the strong interest in this issue, especially by Senators

LIEBERMAN, COLLINS, OBAMA, FEINGOLD, MCCAIN, and others. I have spoken with Senator OBAMA about it. I have assured him that we would hold a hearing in the Rules Committee and that we would take a look at this proposal and what might or might not be done.

I will vote against this amendment, and I will see that the Rules Committee and the Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee hold these hearings. They will focus on these proposals and ways of strengthening ethics enforcement in the Senate.

Let me say this now. I do believe we need to take great care in how we do this. Yes, we need to reassure the public that those who run afoul of the Senate rules will be held accountable. But we must make sure this does not simply become a new tool used by political opponents who would seek to manipulate the political process by filing false claims. You can be sure that the minute a claim becomes public, without any verification as to its veracity, and is released to the public, that claim will be a 30-second spot in someone's campaign. That is not what we are about.

We have to also ensure that we do not create an office—with a special prosecutor bound and determined to justify his or her existence by creating an atmosphere of ongoing investigation—that will cost taxpayers millions of dollars. The Constitution provides:

Each House of Congress may determine the Rules of its Proceedings, punish its Members for disorderly Behavior, and, with the Concurrence of two thirds, expel a Member.

Our Founders knew the importance of this and placed it in article I.

The challenge we face right now is how to do it right and ensure that the tough ethics rules we are putting in place will be vigorously overseen and enforced.

I urge a ''no'' vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I rise in support of the amendment to create an Office of Public Integrity.

This underlying bill is a very good one. It will help to restore public confidence in the integrity of our decisions. But we leave the job undone if we do not create an Office of Public Integrity. I thank the leaders on both sides of the aisle for allowing the Senate to have a vote on this important issue.

The problem is that the current system is inherently conflicted. We are our own advisers, we are our own investigators, we are our own prosecutors, we are our own judges, and we are our own jurors. This amendment would take only the investigative part of the process and invest it in an independent, impartial Office of Public Integrity that would help restore the public's confidence in the integrity of our ethics system.

I yield the remainder of the time to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, there is not much to add to my colleague from Maine. I thank her for her statement.

Basically, we have a very strong reform of the rules by which we govern our ethics and that of those who lobby before us. What is missing is an equal reform of the process which would do that.

Nothing in this amendment alters the superior role of the Senate Ethics Committee pursuant to the Constitution to make final decisions on claims before it. This amendment simply sets up an independent investigative office. Incidentally, it is merely responding to what my friend from California, Senator FEINSTEIN, said. There is actually more protection against abuse of this process with frivolous complaints than there is in the current system.

I have a feeling this will not pass tonight, but our committee is going to take it up and hopefully report out a bill independently later this session.

I thank the Chair, and I yield the floor.

Mr. REID. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) is necessarily absent.

Mr. LOTT. The following Senator was necessarily absent: the Senator from Kansas (Mr. BROWNBACK).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 27, nays 71, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 18 Leg.]

YEAS—27

Bayh	Grassley	McCaskill
Biden	Kerry	Menendez
Bingaman	Klobuchar	Nelson (FL)
Cantwell	Kohl	Obama
Carper	Landrieu	Reed
Casey	Lautenberg	Snowe
Collins	Levin	Stabenow
Feingold	Lieberman	Whitehouse
Graham	McCain	Wyden

NAYS—71

Akaka	DeMint	Lugar
Alexander	Dodd	Martinez
Allard	Dole	McConnell
Baucus	Domenici	Mikulski
Bennett	Dorgan	Murkowski
Bond	Durbin	Murray
Boxer	Ensign	Nelson (NE)
Brown	Enzi	Pryor
Bunning	Feinstein	Reid
Burr	Gregg	Roberts
Byrd	Hagel	Rockefeller
Cardin	Harkin	Salazar
Chambliss	Hatch	Sanders
Clinton	Hutchison	Schumer
Coburn	Inhofe	Sessions
Cochran	Inouye	Shelby
Coleman	Isakson	Smith
Conrad	Kennedy	Specter
Corker	Kyl	Stevens
Cornyn	Leahy	Sununu
Craig	Lincoln	Tester
Crapo	Lott	Thomas
Thune	Vitter	Warner
	Voinovich	Webb

NOT VOTING—2

Brownback Johnson

The amendment (No. 30) was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The substitute amendment, as amended, is agreed to.

The amendment (No. 3), as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I have been privileged to serve as a legislator—first in the Maryland House of Delegates, then in the U.S. House of Representatives, and now in the Senate. I appreciate the trust that the people of Maryland placed in me. And I appreciate how important it is that we adhere to the strictest ethical standards. The American people need to believe their Government is on the up and up.

I served on the House Committee on Standards of Official Conduct from 1991 to 1997. I served as the ranking member of the adjudicative subcommittee that investigated and ultimately recommended sanctions against former House Speaker Newt Gingrich. In 1997, the House leadership appointed me to serve as the cochairman of the House Ethics Reform Task Force, with my colleague Bob Livingston from Louisiana. Our bipartisan task force came up with a comprehensive set of reforms to overhaul the ethics process. We created a bipartisan package to change House and committee rules. This was the last bipartisan effort in the House to fix ethics procedures. Unfortunately, the ethics process in the House broke down after that.

Here in the Senate, there has been more bipartisan cooperation when it comes to ethics reform. Last year, the Senate voted 90 to 8 to approve a reform bill. And we are getting off to a good start this year, with both the Democratic leader and the Republican leader co-sponsoring both S. 1 and the substitute amendment. Members on both sides of the aisle have been given ample opportunity to offer amendments and have them considered.

As amended, S. 1 represents a significant change in the way elected officials, senior staff, and lobbyists would do business—change the American people are demanding.

When it comes to how we treat ourselves, this legislation revokes the pensions of Members convicted of bribing public officials and witnesses, perjury, and other crimes. S. 1 bans gifts and meals from lobbyists. It slows down the revolving door by extending lobbying bans for former Members and staff. It eliminates floor privileges for former Members who become lobbyists. And it stops partisan attempts, such as the K Street Project to influence private-sector hiring. The bill makes ethics training mandatory for Members and staff.

When it comes to making how Congress works more transparent, this legislation shines a spotlight on earmarks, targeted tax breaks, and tariff reduction bills, to make it clear who is

offering them, and on whose behalf. S. 1 ensures that the minority will get to participate in conference committees, and that conference reports can't be changed after they're signed by a majority of the conferees. The bill requires that conference reports have to be posted on the Internet 48 hours prior to consideration so that Members of Congress, staff, and the public can find out what's in them.

When it comes to how lobbyists are to act, this legislation puts an end to the lavish parties they throw in our honor at the national conventions. S. 1 quadruples the penalty for failure to comply with the requirements of the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995. It requires lobbyists to file quarterly reports instead of semi-annually. And it directs the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives to maintain on the Internet a publicly available database of lobbying disclosure information.

I am pleased to report that the bill contains an amendment that Senator COLEMAN from Minnesota and I offered to require the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives to establish a website freely available to the public that will contain easy-to-understand information on all officially related congressional travel subject to disclosure under the gift rules.

During the debate on S. 1, we have heard over and over again former Supreme Court Justice Louis Brandeis' famous dictum, ''Sunlight is said to be the best of disinfectants,'' because it is so true. That is the direction we are moving in by passing this bill. That is what the American people want us to do, and that is what we need to do to regain their trust.

Mrs. CLINTON. Mr. President, as allegations of ethical abuses swirl around their government, the American people have understandably lost confidence in the ability of their elected representatives to lead with integrity. Their confidence has dwindled as the undue influence of lobbyists and special interests has permeated their government. They have lost faith not only in their elected leaders, but also in the institutions that stand as the very pillars of our representative democracy. With their trust waning, Americans spoke at the ballot box last November, admonishing their elected leaders and declaring that they would no longer tolerate the exploitation of their government by those who wield excessive influence.

For this reason, I was gratified to see the House of Representatives move so quickly on ethics and lobby reform when the 110th Congress convened, and I was pleased when Majority Leader REID placed ethics and lobby reform at the top of the Senate agenda. Both the Legislative Transparency and Accountability Act of 2007 and the Lobbying Transparency and Accountability Act of 2007 enact long overdue ethics and lobbying reforms that will hold our elected officials to the highest possible standards.

If we are going to restore the American public's trust in their government, any reform we enact must squarely confront the undue influence that special interests and lobbyists exert on the legislative process. It must strengthen the rules that govern lobbying and close the revolving door between the ''K Street'' lobby firms and the Capitol. It must shine a light on what has until now been a legislative process corrupted by backroom promises and deals struck in the dead of night. It must promulgate new rules that curb wasteful spending by creating greater transparency in the earmark process.

Earning back the confidence and trust of the American people will require greater transparency and stronger laws. The American public deserves to be certain that their elected officials are not being swayed by lavish gifts offered as quid pro quo for promoting special agendas. To that end, gifts from registered lobbyists have no place in our legislative process. For that reason, I support the sweeping ban on lobbyist-paid gifts in the Senate bill. This ban includes not just meals but also gifts of travel and lodging, areas that have been the subject of notorious abuse.

Our commitment to a new era of openness must go hand in hand with a similar commitment on the part of lobbyists. We must demand more disclosure from lobbyists about their practices and increase the penalties for their failure to disclose their activities. To be clear, our Constitution protects the right of Americans to petition their government. However, what it does not do is protect their ability to hire lobbyists to buy influence by showering elected officials with expensive gifts and vacations.

Reining in wasteful spending must also be a part of any ethical reform we enact. Specifically, we must bring reform and accountability to the process of earmarking. Although the term ''earmark'' has taken on a negative connotation, the designation of funds for individual projects or programs is not in and of itself devious. The practice of earmarking permits essential public projects that would otherwise go unfunded and ignored to receive critical funds that can sustain their important community work. However, the process by which earmarks are currently distributed is susceptible to corruption and abuse, and that must be corrected by injecting both accountability and transparency into the process.

In order to promote accountability, the Senate bill requires that the legislator sponsoring the earmark identify him or herself and provide a description explaining the ''government purpose'' served by the sponsored project. Additionally, I believe we can improve accountability by mandating publication of the earmark for a minimum period of time prior to any vote on the underlying measure, ensuring that both other elected officials and the general public have the opportunity to scrutinize the sponsored outlay. Taking these common sense steps would ensure that legislators are made to answer for the spending they sponsor.

The American people demand a more open and honest government, one that strives to put their concerns ahead of those of special interest, one that endeavors to hold its elected officials accountable to the electorate, and one that inspires the confidence of its people. In order to achieve these goals, we must remove any semblance of impropriety. The reforms contained in both the Legislative Transparency and Accountability Act of 2007 and the Lobbying Transparency and Accountability Act of 2007 enact much-needed and long-awaited reforms that move us toward those goals.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I rise today as a proud cosponsor to this Senate ethics reform legislation. The American people sent a clear message in the last election. No more scandals. No more bribes. No more dirty politics. They wanted real ethics reform. The American people want to know that Congress is working in their interest—not for special interests. The American people deserve a government which is honest and open. They want a government which will fight for their values not for corporate values. Democrats have made it our top priority to clean up Washington and clean up politics.

What does this bill do? This bill bans all gifts and travel from lobbyists. It closes the revolving door by extending the lobbying ban for former Members of Congress from one to two years. It improves lobbying disclosure requirements and brings transparency to the Senate. Finally, it requires that all Senators and their staff attend ethics training.

The American people wanted to clean up Washington. They wanted real ethics reform. They wanted to know that lawmakers are fighting for the people they represent—not the special interest lobbyists. This bill holds lawmakers and lobbyists accountable by creating real penalties for those who break the law—by punishing them with jail time not just fines. This bill sets the tone for this Congress—dirty politics will not be tolerated.

The American people demanded change in the last election. They wanted a government they could trust. They wanted a government that would protect everyday, hardworking Americans. This bill is a step in the right direction. We are listening to what American people are telling us. We here in the U.S. Senate are taking their concerns seriously. We are making changes in Washington.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. MCCASKILL). The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Madam President, for the information of all Senators, we will have a vote Tuesday morning—well, at least by noon Tuesday. No votes Friday or Monday, but we will vote Tuesday at noon or thereabouts.

Madam President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) is necessarily absent.

Mr. LOTT. The following Senator was necessarily absent: the Senator from Kansas (Mr. BROWNBACK).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 96, nays 2, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 19 Leg.]

YEAS—96

Akaka	Dorgan	Menendez
Alexander	Durbin	Mikulski
Allard	Ensign	Murkowski
Baucus	Enzi	Murray
Bayh	Feingold	Nelson (FL)
Bennett	Feinstein	Nelson (NE)
Biden	Graham	Obama
Bingaman	Grassley	Pryor
Bond	Gregg	Reed
Boxer	Hagel	Reid
Brown	Harkin	Roberts
Bunning	Hutchison	Rockefeller
Burr	Inhofe	Salazar
Byrd	Inouye	Sanders
Cantwell	Isakson	Schumer
Cardin	Kennedy	Sessions
Carper	Kerry	Shelby
Casey	Klobuchar	Smith
Chambliss	Kohl	Snowe
Clinton	Kyl	Specter
Cochran	Landrieu	Stabenow
Coleman	Lautenberg	Stevens
Collins	Leahy	Sununu
Conrad	Levin	Tester
Corker	Lieberman	Thomas
Cornyn	Lincoln	Thune
Craig	Lott	Vitter
Crapo	Lugar	Voinovich
DeMint	Martinez	Warner
Dodd	McCain	Webb
Dole	McCaskill	Whitehouse
Domenici	McConnell	Wyden

NAYS—2

Coburn	Hatch

NOT VOTING—2

Brownback	Johnson

The bill (S. 1), as amended, was passed, as follows:

(The bill will be printed in a future edition of the RECORD.)

Mr. BENNETT. I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. DURBIN. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. COBURN. Madam President, I had asked for this time to spend a few minutes talking about what has happened in the last few weeks. One of the things that is going on in our country is that we have a little bit of a crisis of confidence in our legislative bodies. Some of it is well deserved.

We have had a bill on the floor under the guise of ethics reform. The bill is a statute. It is not a rule. It is going to become law. But I think the American people should be on guard. I was one of two people who voted against this bill and for some very good reasons.

What the American people would like to see is transparency. They would like to see clarity. They would like to see sunshine. Some of the amendments to this bill made it much better; there is no question about that. But some of the things that happened along the way did not allow the American people to really know what is going on in terms of what needs to change. A lot of the amendments tonight were accepted only on the basis that they would preclude debate. Now it is Thursday night. The Senate is not in session tomorrow. And the question people have to ask is, why didn't we debate those amendments? Why didn't we want to debate those amendments? The reason we didn't want to debate those amendments is because they are going to be discarded as soon as we get to conference.

Let me talk about one of them because I believe it is important. We have had hundreds of stories over the last 2 years of Members of Congress who have used the earmark process to enhance the well-being of either members of their office staff's families, personal family members, and even in the House a couple of occasions where they helped themselves. I am thinking particularly about a $1.2 million road that was built for properties owned by the Member of Congress. That fact is, that should have been debated. The American people need to know what the problems are, and there needs to be sunshine. There needs to be transparency about what we do.

The question the American people ought to ask is: What is going to happen when this bill goes to conference and what is going to come out? And is all the rhetoric we heard on the floor truly going to be reflected in an ethics bill that will change behavior?

A lot of effort has been concentrated on lobbyists. Lobbyists aren't the problem. Members of Congress are the problem. And transparency solves that problem. So we are not going to have transparency anymore. We are going to say you can't take a meal from somebody, but you certainly can deliver on a couple-million-dollar earmark. And we are going to create a situation where we say we are going to expose it, but you shouldn't count on that happening until the final bill comes.

My faith and my hope is that we put everything we have done away and don't do any of the things that have been accepted by the Senate tonight because of fear of political consequences, but that we do what the American people want, and that is to be transparent in both our actions and our deeds. The way to clean up ethical problems in Congress is for the Members to be transparent about what they do. So if this bill were to come back and we pass it just as it is, we are going to go through all these hoops that will have been created, and we are going to make sure people don't come to the Senate to serve. We are going to have a ''gotcha'' system. That is what we just passed. Good, honorable people of integrity are going to make an innocent mistake, and they are going to be gotten. I am not talking about the things that were intentionally done that we have seen over the past 4 to 6 years from both parties. I am talking about good, honest people making an innocent mistake, and it is going to ruin them. Consequently, people are not going to come here. Only those who are shielded and armored, who are careerists and have enough money that no matter what happens, they can defend themselves with the trial lawyers they are going to need to defend themselves after we pass all these rules that are going to come.

I know this sounds a bit negative now that we have passed supposedly an ethics reform bill. But my warning to the American people and to this body is, we should measure that when we see the final product. And we should measure the final product against Senator DEMINT's amendment for true transparency on earmarks, my amendment on true lack of ethical bias in terms of monetary gain for staff members' families or Members' families in terms of earmarks. My faith will be renewed if, in fact, we come out with a great ethics bill. I wait and remain to be convinced that that will be the case.

The final point I want to make is process. Why did we not want to debate in front of the American people the idea that it is unethical for somebody to gain monetarily, directly or indirectly, staff member or staff member's family, Member's family or Member, from an earmark? Why did we not want to debate that? That is a question the press ought to be asking. That is a question we all ought to be asking, as the conference comes back.

The way we solve the problems with ethics in the Senate is through complete and total transparency about what we do. And if we are not ashamed of what we are doing, we should not be ashamed of putting up what we are doing and how we are doing it.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. 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

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that there be a period for morning business with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

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

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE RULES OF PROCEDURE

Mr. BAUCUS. Madam President, pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 2, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I submit for publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the rules of the Committee on Finance for the 110th Congress, adopted by the committee on January 17, 2007. I ask unanimous consent that the rules be printed.

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

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

I. RULES OF PROCEDURE

(Adopted January 17, 2007)

Rule 1. *Regular Meeting Days*.—The regular meeting day of the committee shall be the second and fourth Tuesday of each month, except that if there be no business before the committee the regular meeting shall be omitted.

Rule 2. *Committee Meetings*.—(a) Except as provided by paragraph 3 of Rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate (relating to special meetings called by a majority of the committee) and subsection (b) of this rule, committee meetings, for the conduct of business, for the purpose of holding hearings, or for any other purpose, shall be called by the chairman after consultation with the ranking minority member. Members will be notified of committee meetings at least 48 hours in advance, unless the chairman determines that an emergency situation requires a meeting on shorter notice. The notification will include a written agenda together with materials prepared by the staff relating to that agenda. After the agenda for a committee meeting is published and distributed, no nongermane items may be brought up during that meeting unless at least two-thirds of the members present agree to consider those items.

(b) In the absence of the chairman, meetings of the committee may be called by the ranking majority member of the committee who is present, provided authority to call meetings has been delegated to such member by the chairman.

Rule 3. *Presiding Officer*.—(a) The chairman shall preside at all meetings and hearings of the committee except that in his absence the ranking majority member who is present at the meeting shall preside.

(b) Notwithstanding the rule prescribed by subsection (a) any member of the committee may preside over the conduct of a hearing.

Rule 4. *Quorums*.—(a) Except as provided in subsection (b) one-third of the membership of the committee, including not less than one member of the majority party and one member of the minority party, shall constitute a quorum for the conduct of business.

(b) Notwithstanding the rule prescribed by subsection (a), one member shall constitute a quorum for the purpose of conducting a hearing.

Rule 5. *Reporting of Measures or Recommendations*.—No measure or recommendation shall be reported from the committee unless a majority of the committee is actually present and a majority of those present concur.

Rule 6. *Proxy Voting; Polling*.—(a) Except as provided by paragraph 7(a)(3) of Rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate (relating to limitation on use of proxy voting to report a measure or matter), members who are unable to be present may have their vote recorded by proxy.

(b) At the discretion of the committee, members who are unable to be present and whose vote has not been cast by proxy may be polled for the purpose of recording their vote on any rollcall taken by the committee.

Rule 7. *Order of Motions*.—When several motions are before the committee dealing with related or overlapping matters, the chairman may specify the order in which the motions shall be voted upon.

Rule 8. *Bringing a Matter to a Vote*.—If the chairman determines that a motion or amendment has been adequately debated, he may call for a vote on such motion or amendment, and the vote shall then be taken, unless the committee votes to continue debate on such motion or amendment, as the case may be. The vote on a motion to continue debate on any motion or amendment shall be taken without debate.

Rule 9. *Public Announcement of Committee Votes*.—Pursuant to paragraph 7(b) of Rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate (relating to public announcement of votes), the results of rollcall votes taken by the committee on any measure (or amendment thereto) or matter shall be announced publicly not later than the day on which such measure or matter is ordered reported from the committee.

Rule 10. *Subpoenas*.—Witnesses and memoranda, documents, and records may be subpoenaed by the chairman of the committee with the agreement of the ranking minority member or by a majority vote of the committee. Subpoenas for attendance of witnesses and the production of memoranda, documents, and records shall be issued by the chairman, or by any other member of the committee designated by him.

Rule 11. *Nominations*.—In considering a nomination, the Committee may conduct an investigation or review of the nominee's experience, qualifications, and suitability, to serve in the position to which he or she has been nominated. To aid in such investigation or review, each nominee may be required to submit a sworn detailed statement including biographical, financial, policy, and other information which the Committee may request. The Committee may specify which items in such statement are to be received on a confidential basis. Witnesses called to testify on the nomination may be required to testify under oath.

Rule 12. *Open Committee Hearings*.—To the extent required by paragraph 5 of Rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate (relating to limitations on open hearings), each hearing conducted by the committee shall be open to the public.

Rule 13. *Announcement of Hearings*.—The committee shall undertake consistent with the provisions of paragraph 4(a) of Rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate (relating to public notice of committee hearings) to issue public announcements of hearings it intends to hold at least one week prior to the commencement of such hearings.

Rule 14. *Witnesses at Hearings*.—(a) Each witness who is scheduled to testify at any hearing must submit his written testimony to the staff director not later than noon of the business day immediately before the last business day preceding the day on which he is scheduled to appear. Such written testimony shall be accompanied by a brief summary of the principal points covered in the written testimony. Having submitted his written testimony, the witness shall be allowed not more than ten minutes for oral presentation of his statement.

(b) Witnesses may not read their entire written testimony, but must confine their oral presentation to a summarization of their arguments.

(c) Witnesses shall observe proper standards of dignity, decorum and propriety while presenting their views to the committee. Any witness who violates this rule shall be dismissed, and his testimony (both oral and written) shall not appear in the record of the hearing.

(d) In scheduling witnesses for hearings, the staff shall attempt to schedule witnesses so as to attain a balance of views early in the hearings. Every member of the committee may designate witnesses who will appear before the committee to testify. To the extent that a witness designated by a member cannot be scheduled to testify during the time set aside for the hearing, a special time will be set aside for the witness to testify if the member designating that witness is available at that time to chair the hearing.

Rule 15. *Audiences*.—Persons admitted into the audience for open hearings of the committee shall conduct themselves with the dignity, decorum, courtesy and propriety traditionally observed by the Senate. Demonstrations of approval or disapproval of any statement or act by any member or witness are not allowed. Persons creating confusion or distractions or otherwise disrupting the orderly proceeding of the hearing shall be expelled from the hearing.

Rule 16. *Broadcasting of Hearings*.—

(a) Broadcasting of open hearings by television or radio coverage shall be allowed upon approval by the chairman of a request filed with the staff director not later than noon of the day before the day on which such coverage is desired.

(b) If such approval is granted, broadcasting coverage of the hearing shall be conducted unobtrusively and in accordance with the standards of dignity, propriety, courtesy and decorum traditionally observed by the Senate.

(c) Equipment necessary for coverage by television and radio media shall not be installed in, or removed from, the hearing room while the committee is in session.

(d) Additional lighting may be installed in the hearing room by the media in order to raise the ambient lighting level to the lowest level necessary to provide adequate television coverage of the hearing at the then current state of the art of television coverage.

(e) The additional lighting authorized by subsection (d) of this rule shall not be directed into the eyes of any members of the committee or of any witness, and at the request of any such member or witness, offending lighting shall be extinguished.

(f) No witness shall be required to be photographed at any hearing or to give testimony while the broadcasting (or coverage) of that hearing is being conducted. At the request of any such witness who does not wish to be subjected to radio or television coverage, all equipment used for coverage shall be turned off.

Rule 17. *Subcommittees*.—(a) The chairman, subject to the approval of the committee, shall appoint legislative subcommittees. The ranking minority member shall recommend to the chairman appointment of minority members to the subcommittees. All legislation shall be kept on the full committee calendar unless a majority of the members present and voting agree to refer specific legislation to an appropriate subcommittee.

(b) The chairman may limit the period during which House-passed legislation referred