mr. speaker, i thank the gentleman. reclaiming my time, the business that the gentleman from texas has set forth for next week is the energy business. given the schedule the gentleman has just announced, would the gentleman expect the bill to be on the floor both wednesday and thursday?

mr. speaker, if the gentleman will yield

my expectation is you are not going to have a fully open rule but that you would have some modified open rule. am i correct on that? i yield to the gentleman from texas.

mr. speaker, i thank the gentleman for yielding. obviously, i can not anticipate what the committee on rules may do on this bill.

i appreciate the gentleman yielding. i do recall that in the last congress when we approached the energy bill there was i think at least 20, if not more, amendments allowed on the bill. i would anticipate that the same approach, because the bill is very similar to the bill we passed in the last congress, would be taken.

mr. speaker, reclaiming my time, some of us do not believe that is quite as obvious as the gentleman does. i yield back to the gentleman.

i appreciate the gentleman yielding. i do recall that in the last congress when we approached the energy bill there was i think at least 20, if not more, amendments allowed on the bill. i would anticipate that the same approach, because the bill is very similar to the bill we passed in the last congress, would be taken.

mr. speaker, reclaiming my time, i appreciate the leader’s observation. i know that, on our side, we had a discussion on that bill this morning. all of us believe the energy bill is a very, very important piece of legislation.

fashion a bill in a bipartisan way that we can see passed and signed by the president.

mr. speaker, the last item i would ask the majority leader about is, as the gentleman knows, the ethics process in the house is essentially at a standstill. the gentleman has made that observation, obviously; and we have made that observation as well. efforts to move the ethics process forward have failed so far, both in committee and on the floor, when virtually all of the members on the gentleman’s side of the aisle, now twice, have voted to table motions that would have provided for the appointment of a bipartisan task force to make recommendations to restore public confidence in the ethics process. as the gentleman knows, the gentleman from maryland (mr. cardin) xz4000640, he was sitting to my left here, although he is now to my right; maybe he is running for office and wants to position himself; but the gentleman from maryland (mr. cardin) xz4000640 and mr. livingston performed an outstanding service for this house in coming together and adopting and presenting, proposing a bipartisan ethics process
we had that in place, as the gentleman knows, and it was changed, we believe, in a partisan fashion. we oppose that change, as the gentleman knows, as does the former chairman of the committee on standards of official conduct, the gentleman from colorado (mr. hefley) xz4001740. he and the gentleman from west virginia (mr. mollohan) xz4002810 have a bill, and that bipartisan resolution has now 207 cosponsors, and that would simply return the ethics rules to where they were, adopted bipartisanly, proposed bipartisanly by the livingston-cardin committee, and it would return to a place where we believe the committee on standards of official conduct would not be at impasse. we are also concerned about, as the gentleman knows, the chairman's proposition that we have a partisan division now of the ethics staff, which heretofore has been a bipartisan, i might even say nonpartisan, staff. i would respectfully inquire, given that background, which the gentleman knows, of course, if and when we might see house joint resolution 131 on the floor. as i say, it has 207 cosponsors. it reflects the bipartisan agreement of the livingston-cardin committee and the bipartisan vote of this house some years ago in adopting the livingston-cardin option. in the alternative, of course, when we might find an opportunity to support a bipartisan commission that could again look at this and try to get us off the dime. i know i have mentioned a number of points, mr. leader, but i know that the gentleman believes it is important personally and institutionally. i have worked with the gentleman institutionally. we want to see this institution not mired in ethical questions of our side or of the gentleman's side. i think that either direction might get us there. mr. speaker, i ask the leader respectfully if he thinks that we might proceed in either direction, or perhaps both, and i yield to my friend.

== Speaker2_0679022_(Rep, voted yes).txt ==

mr. speaker, i appreciate the gentleman yielding. this is a very, very important issue that upholds the integrity of the house, that has to do with the image of the house in making sure that the house can enforce its own rules in a bipartisan way. i would just remind the gentleman, with all the work that the gentleman from maryland (mr. cardin) xz4000640 and mr. livingston did, which is excellent work, unfortunately, we can not anticipate unintended consequences; and once we start implementing that wonderful work, we find out that there are some flaws that need to be corrected. the speaker of the house looked at the last few years and decided that the rules allowed the use of the committee on standards of official conduct for partisan purposes, and its ability to act in a bipartisan way was seriously hindered. most importantly, there were some due-process issues to protect members of their due-process rights. i will give my colleagues one example. the committee, on its own, decided to change the way they operated from the past. in the past, when the committee wanted to warn a member about certain actions that were not in violation of the rules, they used to send a private letter to that member. this committee and the last committee had decided on their own that, without consulting with the affected member, to send a public letter and release the underlying documents to support their position, without the opportunity for a member to face the committee and discuss those letters of warning, the speaker felt very strongly that that undermines the rights of every member, both democrat and republican, to due process. the speaker, in his office, looked at the standing rules of the 108th congress in this regard and felt that some minor changes needed to be made; one, to protect the committee from being politicized; and, two, to protect members' rights of due process. that suggestion by the speaker, as the gentleman knows, was brought to this house and debated extensively on this house floor, and those amendments to the rules were passed by the entire house, with some nay votes, i understand. i think it is unfortunate that we have found ourselves in this position, particularly when the speaker was trying to protect the rights of the members and certainly, more importantly, protect the integrity of the institution that we have reached this point. i am advised through the speaker that the chairman of the committee on standards of official conduct is working with his ranking member, and i would hope that they would come to some sort of
agreement in how we get past this impasse. otherwise, the rights of members will not be protected, and i find that extremely unfortunate.

mr. speaker, reclaiming my time, i thank the leader for his thoughtful response. we have a difference of view.

... 

i certainly will, but let me make one additional point.

will the gentleman yield?

i will be glad to yield my friend.

mr. speaker, i appreciate the gentleman’s concerns.

and i will be glad to yield my friend.

will the gentleman yield?

mr. speaker, reclaiming my time, i thank again the gentleman for his thoughtful remarks. we see it differently,

... 

i certainly will yield to the leader, but before i do, do you see my point, mr. leader?

i yield to my friend.

if the gentleman will yield, the gentleman has made my point. under the old rules, both sides could protect themselves.

no, sir. reclaiming my time, mr. leader.

if the gentleman is not going to let me respond and interrupt me, then this colloquy can end.
i want to apologize to the gentleman.

thank you. i appreciate that.

i will yield back to him.

as i was saying before i was interrupted, and i appreciate the gentleman yielding,