

amendment has been delivered to the office of the Committee and circulated via e-mail to each of the offices by at least 5:00 PM the day prior to the scheduled start of the meeting.

2. It shall be in order, without prior notice, for a Member to offer a motion to strike a single section of any bill, resolution, or amendment under consideration.

3. The time limit imposed on the filing of amendments shall apply to no more than three bills identified by the Chairman and included on the Committee's legislative agenda.

4. This section of the rule may be waived by agreement of the Chairman and the Ranking Minority Member.

VI. PROXY VOTING

When a recorded vote is taken in the Committee on any bill, resolution, amendment, or any other question, a quorum being present, Members who are unable to attend the meeting may submit their votes by proxy, in writing or by telephone, or through personal instructions. A proxy must be specific with respect to the matters it addresses.

VII. SUBCOMMITTEES

1. Any Member of the Committee may sit with any Subcommittee during its hearings or any other meeting, but shall not have the authority to vote on any matter before the Subcommittee unless a Member of such Subcommittee.

2. Subcommittees shall be considered de novo whenever there is a change in the Subcommittee chairmanship and seniority on the particular Subcommittee shall not necessarily apply.

3. Except for matters retained at the full Committee, matters shall be referred to the appropriate Subcommittee or Subcommittees by the Chairman, except as agreed by a majority vote of the Committee or by the agreement of the Chairman and the Ranking Minority Member.

4. Provided all Members of the Subcommittee consent, a bill or other matter may be polled out of the Subcommittee. In order to be polled out of a Subcommittee, a majority of the Members of the Subcommittee who vote must vote in favor of reporting the bill or matter to the Committee.

VIII. ATTENDANCE RULES

1. Official attendance at all Committee business meetings of the Committee shall be kept by the Committee Clerk. Official attendance at all Subcommittee business meetings shall be kept by the Subcommittee Clerk.

2. Official attendance at all hearings shall be kept, provided that Senators are notified by the Committee Chairman and Ranking Minority Member, in the case of Committee hearings, and by the Subcommittee Chairman and Ranking Minority Member, in the case of Subcommittee hearings, 48 hours in advance of the hearing that attendance will be taken; otherwise, no attendance will be taken. Attendance at all hearings is encouraged.

HONORING OUR ARMED FORCES

Mr. HAGEL. Mr. President, I rise to express my sympathy over the loss of U.S. Army 1LT Jacob Fritz of Nebraska. Lieutenant Fritz died from wounds sustained in an ambush in Karbala, Iraq, on January 20. He was 25 years old.

Lieutenant Fritz was raised on his family's farm near Verdon, NE. From a young age, Lieutenant Fritz knew he

wanted to be a leader. After graduating from Dawson-Verdon High School in 2000, he followed through on this goal. I had the honor of nominating Lieutenant Fritz to the U.S. Military Academy at West Point and he graduated from the Academy in 2005. His brother, Daniel Fritz, 22, followed in his footsteps and is currently in his third year at West Point.

Lieutenant Fritz was leading a unit of more than 30 soldiers in Iraq since October. Lieutenant Fritz described his mission as a liaison between Iraqi police and the U.S. Army. He said the work was challenging but rewarding. Thousands of brave Americans like Lieutenant Fritz are currently serving in Iraq. We are proud of Lieutenant Fritz's service to our country.

In addition to his brother, Lieutenant Fritz is survived by his parents Lyle and Noala and his younger brother Ethan.

I ask my colleagues to join me and all Americans in honoring 1LT Jacob Fritz.

ETHICS REFORM

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I rise today to speak on the lobbying and ethics reform bill that the Senate has passed.

In the early 1990s, I along with several colleagues, including Senator William Cohen, embarked on a journey to enact meaningful lobbying and ethics reform. While we had been assured by colleagues that this was a monumental and perhaps impossible undertaking, we nonetheless forged ahead. Decade after decade, Congress had tried to close loopholes that had existed for almost 50 years, which kept lobbying activities in the dark.

In 1995, we finally succeeded in passing the Lobbying Disclosure Act. Our bill, for the first time, opened up the world of lobbying, and the billions spent in it, to the light of day. That act required paid professional lobbyists to register and disclose whom they represent, how much they are paid, and the issues on which they are lobbying.

As much as we knew that the Lobbying Disclosure Act was a real step forward, we knew that like all procedural reforms, it too would eventually need updating. Inevitably, lawyers and lobbyists would find loopholes and create new methods to dance around the law's intent.

We have seen this dance prominently over the past few years. From super-lobbyist Jack Abramoff's attempts to peddle influence, to Congressman Duke Cunningham's abuse of the appropriations process, it is obvious that the time to close these loopholes has come.

The bill that the Senate just passed brings much needed reforms, many of which I sought in the original Lobbying Disclosure Act over a decade ago. It goes after not only the real problems that have arisen over the past few years, but as the perception of corruption that is sometimes the effect of too

little disclosure and rules which are too weak.

One of the most important reforms in S. 1 is a strict curb on gifts by lobbyists to Members of Congress. These are perks that have no place in Government. The new rules in this bill will eliminate these gifts.

I am also pleased at the final outcome of the strong earmark reform provisions in this bill. Too many earmarks are added in the dead of night or buried in conference reports so dense that the average American has no idea where their tax dollars are going. The language can also be ambiguous to the point where we don't even know who is the intended beneficiary. This bill will require full and open disclosure of earmarks, which I hope will help to ensure the quality of the projects which are funded.

Strong travel restrictions are also an essential component of this bill. The new rules will ensure that Members traveling on corporate jets would have to reimburse at the charter rate, not as is now the case merely at the level of a first class commercial ticket.

While I applaud passage of these strong reforms, I believe we needed to go even further. One of the most important provisions in this bill is one that I worked on with Senator LIEBERMAN, which would have finally closed the major loophole that exists under current law that allows lobbyists to conceal millions of dollars worth of expenditures spent in stimulating "grass-roots" lobbying efforts, or what has been described as "astroturf" lobbying.

Ten years ago, when we enacted the Lobbying Disclosure Act, it required paid lobbyists to disclose the amounts that they spend to try to influence Congress and the executive branch. However, under the LDA, lobbyists are not required to disclose how much they spend in efforts to persuade others to help them make their case. In the mid-1990s, the Wall Street Journal estimated that major lobbying firms spent almost half a billion dollars every year for this purpose. The amounts have undoubtedly grown substantially since then. Yet these amounts still go undisclosed on the lobbying disclosure forms filed by those firms. The disclosure provision in S. 1 was intended to close this loophole and require paid lobbyists to disclose all of their expenditures, instead of just some of them.

This provision would have had no impact at all on citizens who contact their Government, regardless whether they decide to make those contacts on their own initiative or at the suggestion of others. It would have had no impact on religious organizations, unions, universities or other employers who suggest that their own members or employees contact the Government. It was aimed at paid lobbyists who spend large sums of money to persuade others to contact the Government in support of a lobbying campaign that they are conducting on behalf of a client. These paid lobbyists would have been required to disclose how much they are