S.J. Res. 24, a joint resolution proposing a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

S.J. RES. 44

At the request of Mr. ROCKEFELLER, the names of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. LIEBERMAN), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. COLEMAN) and the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BAYH) were added as cosponsors of S.J. Res. 44, a joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule set forth as requirements contained in the August 17, 2007, letter to State Health Officials from the Director of the Center for Medicaid and State Operations in the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services and the State Health Official Letter 08-003, dated May 7, 2008, from such Center.

S. CON. RES. 80

At the request of Mr. HAGEL, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 80, a concurrent resolution urging the President to designate a National Airborne Day in recognition of persons who are serving or have served in the airborne forces of the Armed Services.

S. RES. 273

At the request of Ms. MIKULSKI, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. COLEMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 273, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that the United States Postal Service should issue a semipostal stamp to support medical research relating to Alzheimer's disease.

S. RES. 580

At the request of Mr. BAYH, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mrs. HUTCHISON) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 580, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate on preventing Iran from acquiring a nuclear weapons capability.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. HARKIN (for himself and Mr. LUGAR):

S. 3291. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to treat certain income and gains relating to fuels as qualifying income for publicly traded partnerships; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I am pleased to join with Senator LUGAR in introducing the Biofuels Pipeline Act of 2008. This bill provides that the movement of biofuels by pipeline will receive the same tax treatment as petroleum-based fuels.

Earlier this session, Congress adopted a Renewable Fuels Standard that will require us to consume 15.2 billion gallons by 2012, and 36 billion gallons by 2022. Biodiesel and ethanol already have the capacity to meet a substantial share of our energy needs. In future years, second-generation ethanol from switch grass and other cellulosic feedstocks will further increase our liquid fuel supply.

But it is not enough to establish renewable fuels standards and mandates in order to spur production. We also need to clear the way for development of the infrastructure for storing, transporting, and marketing vast new quantities of renewable fuels.

In this regard, we have a problem. The lion's share of our renewable fuels are produced in the Midwest and in the Plains states, and we currently do not have the most efficient infrastructure in place to transport these liquid fuels to population centers in the East and elsewhere.

Currently, biodiesel and ethanol are transported by barge, rail, or truck. But these forms of transportation are far more expensive than the pipeline alternative. Simply stated, there aren't enough barges, rail cars, and trucks to move renewable liquid fuels from where they are produced to where they will be consumed.

While the most efficient mode for transporting liquid fuels is by pipeline, there are multiple obstacles—both technical and man-made—that have to be overcome.

The industry is overcoming the technical challenges associated with transporting so-called ''neat'' renewable fuels by pipeline, and is actively studying the prospect of transporting gasoline/ethanol blends via pipeline.

Since the rate of return on the transportation of oil and gas is highly regulated and limited, oil and natural gas companies have been selling their pipelines to companies that operate as Publicly Traded Partnerships—PTPs—whose core business is the transportation, storage and marketing of oil and gas.

However, by law, Publicly Traded Partnerships must earn 90 percent of their income from ''qualifying income,'' which is defined under the tax code as income from the exploration, transportation, storage, or marketing of depletable natural resources, including oil, gas, and coal.

By their very nature, renewable liquid fuels are not a depletable natural resource. And that means that the income produced from the transportation, storage, and marketing of these fuels is not qualifying income.

Since the penalty for PTPs that earn more than 10 percent of their income from a non-qualifying source is loss of PTP status, they cannot, and will not, invest in pipelines designed to transport renewable liquid fuels.

We simply have to remove this obstacle. Publicly Traded Partnerships now own and operate 50 percent of America's liquids pipelines. Some would argue that there are also others who would be willing to step in and meet the need with regard to renewable liquid fuels.

However, vertically integrated energy companies that own pipelines may not view the opportunity associated with renewable fuel pipelines in the same manner as a PTP. In fact, since the mid-1980s, when the PTP structure was originally codified, several major oil companies have been divesting themselves of pipelines, which they have been selling to Publicly Traded Partnerships.

As a result, since the PTP pipeline industry's core business is the transportation, storage, and marketing of liquid fuels, these PTP's are the most likely industry to build the pipeline infrastructure that we will need to transport alternative liquid fuels from the Midwest to far-flung parts of the country.

Bear in mind, too, that PTPs have crucial right of way that would make the construction of renewable fuel pipelines more likely.

To this end, we need to expand the definition of ''qualifying income'' to include any renewable liquid fuel. This bill does just that—to any fuel approved by the Environmental Protection Agency for transport in pipelines. Effectively, the modification adds one category of fuels that currently do not receive the favorable qualified income status: biofuels like ethanol and biodiesel.

This is entirely consistent with Congress's original intent in codifying Publicly Traded Partnerships. At that time, both the Treasury Department and Congress recognized that partnerships were the traditional manner in which oil and gas exploration, refining, marketing and transport were financed.

Clearly, transportation of liquid fuels was an integral part of what Congress intended to cover. However, back in the mid-1980s, few people thought that alternative fuels would become a significant source of liquid energy.

It's time to bring the law up to date. Our current dependence on imported oil—including oil from some of the most unstable parts of the world—is a clear and present danger to America's national security. At the same time, our dependence on the burning of fossil fuels—a primary source of carbon dioxide emissions, and a primary cause of global warming—presents a clear and present, danger to the Earth as we know it.

The price of a barrel of imported oil has shot up nearly five fold during the last eight years—from $27.39 a barrel in 2000 to about $130 a barrel today. During the same time, the cost of a gallon of gasoline has risen more than 250 percent, from $1.50 to $4.11. In the future, price increases will be driven by an explosion of demand from China, India, and other rapidly developing countries.

We need to seize control of our energy future. We need to rapidly shift to clean, renewable, home-grown sources of energy, including ethanol and other renewable fuels.

This legislation is one step, but an important step, in moving us to considerably expand our efficient use of renewable fuels, thereby expanding our alternatives to gasoline and diesel.

By Mr. KERRY (for himself, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Ms. CANTWELL, and Mr. DODD):

S. 3292. A bill to provide emergency energy assistance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, today I am introducing the Emergency Energy Assistance Act of 2008, which will provide emergency relief to families in Massachusetts and around the country who are suffering from record energy costs. I am joined by Senators KENNEDY, LIEBERMAN, CARDIN, MENENDEZ, WHITEHOUSE, CANTWELL and DODD in introducing this important and timely piece of legislation. This legislation will help some of the 85 percent of American families who are eligible for assistance from the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance, but have been unable to obtain it due to budget restrictions.

Consumers around the country are facing skyrocketing prices for transportation and heating fuels. Heating oil prices in the Northeast averaged $3.40 in the first quarter of 2008, compared to just $2.52 in 2007, putting severe strains on the approximately 960,000 Massachusetts families who simply cannot afford these skyrocketing prices. Today, 100,000 Massachusetts households are still behind on their energy bills from last winter and remain at risk of shut-offs of vital energy services.

These high costs are expected to continue through this year's heating season. Home heating oil prices in Massachusetts are already averaging $4.60/gallon. The typical family uses approximately 1,000 gallons of heating oil during the course of the winter—Massachusetts households could realistically be looking at heating bills approaching $5,000—an impossible sum for thousands of families around the state. When coupled with the escalating costs of transportation fuels, the burden is simply too much to bear.

The primary Federal energy assistance program for low-income households is the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program LIHEAP. As energy costs rise, the demand for LIHEAP funds grows. 5.8 million families received LIHEAP funds in 2008, the highest participation levels in 16 years. In Massachusetts, over 145,000 families receive LIHEAP funds. However, as energy costs rise and demand for LIHEAP grows, the program's budget has not kept pace and we just can't cover all the people that need help. In fact, only 15 percent of eligible households nationally are receiving funding. Even in those households that do receive LIHEAP funds, the money isn't going very far—the average LIHEAP grant only pays for 18 percent of the total cost of heating a home with heating oil.

I have been a long-time, strong supporter of legislation introduced by Senator SANDERS—the Warm in Winter, Cool in Summer Act that would fund the LIHEAP program for 2008 at the fully-authorized level of $5.1 billion, and I have incorporated that essential provision into the legislation I am introducing today.

In addition, the Emergency Energy Assistance Act of 2008 includes critical emergency funding for the Weatherization Assistance Program at the U.S. Department of Energy. This program enables service providers to install energy efficiency measures in the homes of qualifying homeowners free of charge, and it provides real, short-term opportunities for homeowners to bring down their energy bills. My legislation would fund the program at $750 million, the fully-authorized level for 2008.

Finally, this legislation would provide a temporary increase in the Earned Income Tax Credit EITC for 2008 to help families pay their increasing energy bills. The EITC is a refundable tax credit for low-income working families. These households are bearing the burden of escalating energy costs, yet many of these beneficiaries did not receive the full rebates provided through the Economic Stimulus Act of 2008.

This legislation would increase the maximum EITC credit amount by $300 for 2008. By increasing the credit amount, more families will be eligible for the credit than under current law. Beneficiaries will receive the increased EITC when they file their 2008 tax returns. This $300 will help working families with rising heating and transportation costs.

In the face of skyrocketing energy prices, we must take serious and immediate measures to assist low-income working families. We cannot stand idly by as American families are forced to make impossible decisions about whether to heat their homes or put food on their tables. This is a crisis of tremendous proportions, and it is incumbent upon us to take steps now to ensure that millions of households are not literally left out in the cold this winter.

By Mr. BINGAMAN (for himself, Mrs. HUTCHISON, Mr. DOMENICI, and Mr. CORNYN):

S. 3293. A bill to provide financial aid to local law enforcement officials along the Nation's borders, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, today I am introducing an important measure that will provide local, State, and Tribal law enforcement agencies along our Nation's borders with critical assistance in addressing border-related criminal activity. I am pleased that Senators HUTCHISON and DOMENICI are joining me in introducing this bipartisan legislation.

By virtue of their proximity to an international border, law enforcement agencies operating along the border face a variety of unique challenges. Criminal enterprises are able take advantage of weaknesses in security to traffic drugs and other illicit contraband into the country, as well as smuggle weapons and stolen vehicles out of the country. This creates a nexus of criminal activity that requires substantial resources to address.

While Congress has dramatically increased funding to hire additional Border Patrol agents and to build tactical infrastructure—such as surveillance cameras and barriers—we haven't done enough in terms of helping local law enforcement. The reality is that although we are making some progress in securing the borders, local law enforcement agencies still have to pick up much of the burden in tackling the criminal activity throughout the region.

Many of these police departments are ill-suited to cover these costs without financial assistance. Many are responsible for large, rural areas of land and lack the personnel and equipment to adequately patrol these areas. If we are going to be successful in bringing real security to the border region, we need to have Federal, State, and local law enforcement agencies doing their respective parts to fight criminal activity. But to do this, we also need to ensure that local law enforcement have the resources necessary to play a constructive role, and to recognize the substantial costs they are incurring.

The Border Law Enforcement Relief Act of 2008 would do just that.

Specifically, the legislation would: establish a new competitive grant program within the Department of Justice to assist local law enforcement operating within 100 miles of the U.S. borders with Mexico and Canada; authorize the Attorney General to designate areas outside of the 100-mile limit as ''High Impact Areas'' to permit additional police departments impacted by border-related criminal activity, such as drug smuggling, to access grant funding; and authorize $100 million each year for the next 5 years to implement this program.

Let me also be clear about what this legislation would not do. It does not confer local law enforcement with authority to enforce Federal immigration law. The purpose of this bill is to help

these agencies cover some of the costs they incur in addressing border-related criminal activity, not to shift another burden to them.

The U.S.-Mexico border region is a vibrant area, economically and culturally. International trade with our southern neighbor continues to increase and communities on both sides of the border maintain strong ties. Unfortunately, over the last year and a half we have seen a dramatic increase in the level of violence in Mexico as the government steps up efforts to tackle drug cartels—over 4,000 people have been killed. This violence has had a negative impact on both sides of the border, and Congress recently provided $400 million in assistance for Mexican law enforcement to address this problem. But we also need to be aware of the fact that local law enforcement within the United States also need additional resources to prevent this violence from spreading and to fight these drug gangs in a comprehensive manner.

I strongly believe this legislation will provide this essential assistance and I hope my colleagues will support this effort.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 3293

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Border Law Enforcement Relief Act of 2008''.

SEC. 2. BORDER RELIEF GRANT PROGRAM.

(a) GRANTS AUTHORIZED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Attorney General is authorized to award grants to an eligible law enforcement agency to provide assistance to such agency to address border-related criminal activity that occurs in the jurisdiction of such agency.

(2) COMPETITIVE BASIS.—The Attorney General shall award grants under this subsection on a competitive basis.

(b) USE OF FUNDS.—Grants awarded pursuant to subsection (a) may only be used to provide additional resources for an eligible law enforcement agency, including resources to—

(1) obtain equipment;

(2) hire additional personnel;

(3) upgrade and maintain law enforcement technology;

(4) cover the operational costs, including overtime and transportation costs; and

(5) assist that agency in responding to border-related criminal activity.

(c) APPLICATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Each eligible law enforcement agency seeking a grant under this section shall submit an application to the Attorney General at such time, in such manner, and accompanied by such information as the Attorney General may reasonably require.

(2) CONTENTS.—Each application submitted under paragraph (1) shall—

(A) describe the activities for which assistance under this section is sought; and

(B) provide such additional assurances as the Attorney General determines to be essential to ensure compliance with the requirements under this section.

(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) ELIGIBLE LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCY.—The term ''eligible law enforcement agency'' means a tribal, State, or local law enforcement agency located or performing duties in—

(A) a county that is not more than 100 miles from a United States border with—

(i) Canada; or

(ii) Mexico; or

(B) a county that is more than 100 miles from each of the borders described in subparagraph (A), if such county has been certified by the Attorney General as a High Impact Area.

(2) HIGH IMPACT AREA.—The term ''High Impact Area'' means any county designated by the Attorney General as a High Impact Area, taking into consideration—

(A) whether an eligible law enforcement agency in that county has the resources to protect the lives, property, safety, or welfare of the residents of that county;

(B) whether the county has been designated as a ''High Intensity Drug Trafficking Area'' by the National Drug Control Program under section 707 of the Office of National Drug Control Policy Reauthorization Act of 1998 (21 U.S.C. 1706);

(C) the relationship between any lack of security along the United States border and the rise, if any, of criminal activity in that county; and

(D) any other unique challenges that eligible law enforcement agencies face due to a lack of security along the United States border.

(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized to be appropriated $100,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 2009 through 2013 to carry out the provisions of this section.

(2) ALLOCATION OF AUTHORIZED FUNDS.—Of the amounts appropriated pursuant to paragraph (1), 33 percent shall be set aside for areas designated as High Impact Areas under subsection (d)(2).

(f) SUPPLEMENT NOT SUPPLANT.—Amounts appropriated for grants under this section shall be used to supplement and not supplant other tribal, State, and local public funds obligated for the purposes provided under this title.

SEC. 3. ENFORCEMENT OF FEDERAL IMMIGRATION LAW.

Nothing in this Act shall be construed to authorize tribal, State, or local law enforcement agencies or their officers to exercise Federal immigration law enforcement authority.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Border Law Enforcement Relief Act of 2008.

This legislation will address one of the most serious threats facing our communities—drug trafficking. The magnitude of narcotics trafficking along the U.S.-Mexico border is staggering.

According to the U.S. State Department, in 2007 alone, Mexico, with close cooperation from U.S. and regional law enforcement, confiscated 48.5 metric tons of cocaine, 2,171 metric tons of marijuana, and 25.7 tons of precursor chemicals for methamphetamines.

On the American side of the border, in fiscal year 2007, on a typical day, U.S. Customs and Border Protection confiscated 2,250 pounds of narcotics in 69 seizures at ports of entry and 5,138 pounds of narcotics in 29 seizures between ports of entry and conducted 70 criminal arrests.

While new funding for the Merida Initiative in the Supplemental Appropriations bill will help the Mexican government attack the problem, the funding is currently unbalanced, as it does not address the U.S. side of the border and the battle that our hometown law enforcement officials are waging against the exact same threat.

We should not fail to recognize that the narco-terrorists in Mexico have grown increasingly violent, killing 300 policemen last year and the head of the Mexican federal police force in May.

However, the violence is not confined to Mexico. In 2007, a councilman from Acuña was killed on U.S. soil in Del Rio, TX, and seven border patrol agents were killed on the frontlines. Two agents have been killed so far this year. The total number of assaults against officers has increased from 335 in 2001 to 987 in 2007. We must take a balanced approach to this growing problem, which is why I am introducing the Border Law Enforcement Relief Act today.

This bill would create a grant program to help certain local law enforcement agencies obtain equipment, upgrade technology, hire additional personnel and cover transportation costs associated with criminal activity along the border. Both northern and southern border law enforcement agencies would be eligible, as well as counties that the Attorney General designates as ''High Impact Areas'' for drug trafficking.

While we have taken steps to provide our Federal officials with necessary resources, we have not done enough to sufficiently arm our local law enforcement officials with the equipment and resources they need to address an increasingly sophisticated and lethal enemy.

Our local law enforcement across the country serve as a front-line defense, and Congress must ensure they have the necessary resources to stay ahead of the cartels and protect our communities from narcotics trafficking and associated violence.

I ask my colleagues to signal their support for our local law enforcement in their fight against narco-terrorism by supporting this legislation.

By Mr. LEAHY (for himself and Mr. SPECTER):

S. 3295. A bill to amend title 35, United States Code, and the Trademark Act of 1946 to provide that the Secretary of Commerce, in consultation with the Director of the United States Patent and Trademark Office, shall appoint administrative patent judges and administrative trademark judges, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be placed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 3295

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. APPOINTMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE PATENT JUDGES AND ADMINISTRATIVE TRADEMARK JUDGES.

(a) ADMINISTRATIVE PATENT JUDGES.—Section 6 of title 35, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in the second sentence, by striking ''Deputy Commissioner'' and inserting ''Deputy Director''; and

(B) in the last sentence, by striking ''Director'' and inserting ''Secretary of Commerce, in consultation with the Director''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(c) AUTHORITY OF THE SECRETARY.—The Secretary of Commerce may, in his or her discretion, deem the appointment of an administrative patent judge who, before the date of the enactment of this subsection, held office pursuant to an appointment by the Director to take effect on the date on which the Director initially appointed the administrative patent judge.

''(d) DEFENSE TO CHALLENGE OF APPOINTMENT.—It shall be a defense to a challenge to the appointment of an administrative patent judge on the basis of the judge's having been originally appointed by the Director that the administrative patent judge so appointed was acting as a de facto officer.''.

(b) ADMINISTRATIVE TRADEMARK JUDGES.—Section 17 of the Act entitled ''An Act to provide for the registration and protection of trademarks used in commerce, to carry out the provisions of certain international conventions, and for other purposes'', approved July 5, 1946 (commonly referred to as the ''Trademark Act of 1946''; 15 U.S.C. 1067), is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) by inserting ''Deputy Director of the United States Patent and Trademark Office'', after ''Director,''; and

(B) by striking ''appointed by the Director'' and inserting ''appointed by the Secretary of Commerce, in consultation with the Director''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(c) AUTHORITY OF THE SECRETARY.—The Secretary of Commerce may, in his or her discretion, deem the appointment of an administrative trademark judge who, before the date of the enactment of this subsection, held office pursuant to an appointment by the Director to take effect on the date on which the Director initially appointed the administrative trademark judge.

''(d) DEFENSE TO CHALLENGE OF APPOINTMENT.—It shall be a defense to a challenge to the appointment of an administrative trademark judge on the basis of the judge's having been originally appointed by the Director that the administrative trademark judge so appointed was acting as a de facto officer.''.

By Mr. LEAHY (for himself and Mr. SPECTER):

S. 3296. A bill to extend the authority of the United States Supreme Court Police to protect court officials off the Supreme Court Grounds and change the title of the Administrative Assistant to the Chief Justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, today I introduce legislation cosponsored by Senator SPECTER that would extend for 5 years the authority of the United States Supreme Court Police to protect Supreme Court Justices when they leave the Supreme Court grounds. In January of this year, after months of compromise, the Court Security Improvement Act was signed into law to authorize additional resources to protect Federal judges, personnel, and courthouses. The bill that we are introducing today would extend the authority of the U.S. Supreme Court Police to protect the Supreme Court Justices on and off Court grounds. It would also change the title of the Chief Justice's senior advisor from ''Administrative Assistant'' to ''Counselor.'' The administrative assistant position was created by statute in 1972.

We have extended the U.S. Supreme Court Police's authority to protect Justices before, the last time in 2004. This authority expires at the end of this year. I urge Senators to pass this legislation quickly so we can provide Supreme Court Justices the protection that they need as they serve our country.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 3296

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT POLICE AND COUNSELOR TO THE CHIEF JUSTICE.

(a) EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY OF THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT POLICE TO PROTECT COURT OFFICIALS OFF THE SUPREME COURT GROUNDS.—Section 6121(b)(2) of title 40, United States Code, is amended by striking ''2008'' and inserting ''2013''.

(b) COUNSELOR TO THE CHIEF JUSTICE.—

(1) OFFICE OF FEDERAL JUDICIAL ADMINISTRATION.—Section 133(b)(2) of title 28, United States Code, is amended by striking ''administrative assistant'' and inserting ''Counselor''.

(2) JUDICIAL OFFICIAL.—Section 376(a) of title 28, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1)(E), by striking ''an administrative assistant'' and inserting ''a Counselor''; and

(B) in paragraph (2)(E), by striking ''an administrative assistant'' and inserting ''a Counselor''.

(3) ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT TO THE CHIEF JUSTICE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Section 677 of title 28, United States Code, is amended—

(i) in the section heading, by striking ''**Administrative Assistant**'' and inserting ''**Counselor**'';

(ii) in subsection (a)—

(I) in the first sentence, by striking ''an Administrative Assistant'' and inserting ''a Counselor''; and

(II) in the second and third sentences, by striking ''Administrative Assistant'' each place that term appears and inserting ''Counselor''; and

(iii) in subsections (b) and (c), by striking ''Administrative Assistant'' each place that term appears and inserting ''Counselor''.

(B) TABLE OF SECTIONS.—The table of sections for chapter 45 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by striking the item relating to section 677 and inserting the following:

''677. Counselor to the Chief Justice.''.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 616—REDUCING MATERNAL MORTALITY BOTH AT HOME AND ABROAD

Mrs. LINCOLN (for herself and Ms. SNOWE) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions:

S. RES. 616

Whereas more than 536,000 women die during pregnancy and childbirth every year which is one every minute;

Whereas in 15 percent of all pregnancies, the complications are life-threatening;

Whereas girls under 15 are 5 times more likely to die in childbirth than women in their 20s;

Whereas nearly all these deaths are preventable;

Whereas survival rates greatly depend upon the distance and time a woman must travel to get skilled emergency medical care;

Whereas care by skilled birth attendants, nurses, midwives, or doctors during pregnancy and childbirth, including emergency services, and care for mothers and newborns is essential;

Whereas the poorer the household, the greater the risk of maternal death, and 99 percent of maternal deaths occur in developing countries;

Whereas newborns whose mothers die of any cause are 3 to 10 times more likely to die within 2 years than those whose mothers survive;

Whereas more than 1,000,000 children are left motherless and vulnerable every year;

Whereas young girls are often pulled from school and required to fill their lost mother's roles;

Whereas a mother's death lowers family income and productivity which affects the entire community;

Whereas in countries with similar levels of economic development, maternal mortality is highest where women's status is lowest;

Whereas the United States ranks 41st among 171 countries in the latest UN list ranking maternal mortality;

Whereas the overall United States maternal mortality ratio is now 11 deaths per 100,000 live births, one of the highest rates among industrialized nations;

Whereas United States maternal deaths have remained roughly stable since 1982 and have not declined significantly since then;

Whereas the Centers for Disease Control estimates that the true level of United States maternal deaths may be 1.3 to 3 times higher than the reported rate; and

Whereas ethnic and racial disparities in maternal mortality rates persist and in the United States maternal mortality among black women is almost four times the rate among non-Hispanic white women: Now, therefore, be it