

(Mr. CARPER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3200, a bill to develop capacity and infrastructure for mentoring programs.

S. 3223

At the request of Mr. KERRY, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. PRYOR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3223, a bill to establish a small business energy emergency disaster loan program.

S. 3242

At the request of Mrs. LINCOLN, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. COLEMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3242, a bill to suspend temporarily the duty on digital-to-analog converter boxes, and for other purposes.

S. 3255

At the request of Mr. LEVIN, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. COLEMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3255, a bill to amend the Commodity Exchange Act to provide for the oversight of large trades of over-the-counter energy and agricultural contracts to prevent price manipulation and excessive speculation, and for other purposes.

S. 3268

At the request of Mr. REID, the names of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) were added as cosponsors of S. 3268, a bill to amend the Commodity Exchange Act, to prevent excessive price speculation with respect to energy commodities, and for other purposes.

S. 3272

At the request of Mr. SPECTER, the names of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. COLEMAN), the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS), the Senator from Texas (Mrs. HUTCHISON), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY) and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. SMITH) were added as cosponsors of S. 3272, a bill to make emergency supplemental appropriations for the National Institutes of Health for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008, and for other purposes.

S.J. RES. 24

At the request of Mr. GRAHAM, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) was added as a cosponsor of 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