

Pennsylvania as well as my colleague from Illinois, and my home State colleague, Senator LIEBERMAN, and Senator McCAIN, who have joined as sponsors. I think we have made a good case for it, the bright line to get rid of the tripwires. That is a word you will hear me use quite frequently during the course of this discussion. We need clear, bright lines. We are not trying to complicate or make life difficult for people, but we are trying to make sure we have some very clear understandings as to what is permissible or not permissible in the conduct of our official business. So I thank my colleagues for their support.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that before we move to the amendment at hand, Senator FEINGOLD have his amendment in order following the Santorum-McCain amendment, and we will put it in the queue at that point. If it turns out not to be, we will work with the Senator at a later time.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, and I will not object, let me say I appreciate the work of the Senators on this. Clearly what Senator DODD did is an improvement. I, however, believe we need to do more. I don't see this as a question of tripwires. What I see this as is a question of whether certain often well-to-do individuals who work for companies, who are not themselves registered lobbyists, be able to take Members of Congress out to lunch without the Member paying his own way for dinner, and I want to offer an amendment on that. But I want to acknowledge that Senator DODD has achieved a significant step in the right direction.

I will offer my approach to this a bit later.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, if I could modify my request, since I understand we had not gotten an agreement formally locked in. But after we dispose of the Dodd-Santorum amendment and the Wyden-Grassley amendment, the next amendment to be in order is the Santorum-McCain amendment, to be followed by the Feingold amendment.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 2942, AS MODIFIED

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the Dodd amendment No. 2942, as modified.

The amendment (No. 2942), as modified, was agreed to.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

RECESS

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess until 2:15 p.m. today so that the parties can have their respective conference meetings.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 1:12 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and

reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. SUNUNU).

LEGISLATIVE TRANSPARENCY
AND ACCOUNTABILITY ACT OF
2006—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I believe the Senate did clear the Dodd-Santorum amendment, so the pending issue is the Wyden-Grassley-Inhofe amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment has not been submitted so it is not currently the pending question.

Mr. WYDEN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi has the floor.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I believe, then, we would be ready to go with this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon is recognized.

AMENDMENT NO. 2944

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I propose the Wyden-Grassley-Inhofe amendment, No. 2944, which is at the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. WYDEN], for himself and Mr. GRASSLEY, proposes an amendment numbered 2944.

Mr. WYDEN. I ask unanimous consent the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To establish as a standing order of the Senate a requirement that a Senator publicly disclose a notice of intent to object to proceeding to any measure or matter)

At the end of title I, add the following:

SEC. __. REQUIREMENT OF NOTICE OF INTENT TO PROCEED.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The majority and minority leaders of the Senate or their designees shall recognize a notice of intent of a Senator who is a member of their caucus to object to proceeding to a measure or matter only if the Senator—

(1) submits the notice of intent in writing to the appropriate leader or their designee; and

(2) within 3 session days after the submission under paragraph (1), submits for inclusion in the Congressional Record and in the applicable calendar section described in subsection (b) the following notice:

“I, Senator __, intend to object to proceeding to __, dated __.”.

(b) CALENDAR.—The Secretary of the Senate shall establish for both the Senate Calendar of Business and the Senate Executive Calendar a separate section entitled “Notices of Intent to Object to Proceeding”. Each section shall include the name of each Senator filing a notice under subsection (a)(2), the measure or matter covered by the calendar that the Senator objects to, and the date the objection was filed.

(c) REMOVAL.—A Senator may have an item with respect to the Senator removed from a calendar to which it was added under subsection (b) by submitting for inclusion in

the Congressional Record the following notice:

“I, Senator __, do not object to proceeding to __, dated __.”.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, if you walked down the Main Streets of this country and asked people what a hold was in the U.S. Senate, I think it is fair to say nobody would have any idea what it is you were talking about. In fact, they might hear the word “hold,” and they would think it was part of the wrestling championships that are going on across this country right now. But the reason I am on the floor of the Senate today with my distinguished colleague, Senator GRASSLEY, and Senator INHOFE, is that the hold in the Senate, which is the ability to object to a bill or nomination coming before the Senate, is an extraordinary power that a United States Senator has, and a power that can be exercised in secret.

At the end of a congressional session, legislation involving vast sums of money or the very freedoms on which our country relies can die just because of a secret hold in the Senate. At any point in the legislative process, an objection can delay or derail an issue to the point where it can't be effectively considered.

What is particularly unjust about all of this is that it prevents a Senator from being held accountable. I think Members would be incredulous to learn this afternoon that the Intelligence reauthorization bill, a piece of legislation which is vital to our national security, has now been held up for months as a result of a secret hold.

I am going to talk a little bit about the consequences of holding up an Intelligence authorization bill in a moment. But I want to first be clear on what the Wyden-Grassley-Inhofe amendment would do. It would force the Senate to do its business in public, and it would bring the secret holds out of the shadows of the Senate and into the sunshine. Our bipartisan amendment would make a permanent change to the procedures of the Senate to require openness and accountability. We want to emphasize that we are not going to bar Senators from exercising their power to put a hold on a bill or nomination. All we are saying is, a Senator who wants that right should also have a responsibility to the people he or she represents and to the country at large.

Now, to the hold on the Intelligence bill that has been in place for more than 3 months, I think every Member of the Senate would agree that authorizing the intelligence programs of this country is a critical priority for America. Striking the balance between fighting terrorism ferociously and protecting our civil liberties is one of the most important functions of this Senate. The bill that is now being held up as a result of a secret hold, the Intelligence reauthorization bill, has been