language means, the 10th Circuit's decision in *United States* v. *Hathaway*, 318 F.3d 1001, 1008–09, 10th Cir. 2003. A conforming change has also been made to section Ill of title 18, so that sections 111 and 115 will match each other and, again, so that people can easily figure out what this offense actually proscribes.

Section 503 of the bill guarantees that senior district judges may elect to participate in court rulemaking, appointment of magistrates and court officers, and other administrative matters, so long as such judges carry at least half of the caseload of an active district judge. I believe that this provision is a bad idea, though its negative consequences have been greatly mitigated in this final substitute as a result of the intervention of Senator SESSIONS. Many senior judges are often not present at the courthouse and are disengaged from the work of the court and the life of the court. Moreover, Congress has no business telling the courts how to manage these types of internal organizational matters. Those jurists who share my objection to this provision should be grateful to Senator SESSIONS, who insisted that the provision be limited to district judges as opposed to circuit judges, that a senior judge be required to elect to exercise these functions, and that a senior judge carry at least half of a full caseload in order to be entitled to assume these powers.

Finally, section 511 adds nomenclature to section 2255 of title 28, a change recommended to me by Kent Scheidegger of the Criminal Justice Legal Foundation. This change has no substantive effect but should make this code section easier for litigants to cite.

Mr. DODD. I ask unanimous consent that a Leahy substitute amendment at the desk be agreed to; the bill, as amended, be read a third time and passed; the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate, and any statements related to the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

The amendment (No. 3868) was agreed to.

(The amendment is printed in today's RECORD under ''Text of Amendments.'')

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill read a third time.

The bill (H.R. 660), as amended, was read the third time and passed.

U.S. CAPITOL POLICE AND LIBRARY OF CONGRESS POLICE MERGER IMPLEMENTATION ACT OF 2007

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H.R. 3690, just received from the House and at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 3690) to provide for the transfer of the Library of Congress police to the United States Capitol Police, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

RIGHTS AND PROTECTIONS

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, I appreciate the work by my colleague, Senator FEINSTEIN, who chairs the Committee on Rules and Administration, and by other Senators over many years to accomplish this merger of the U.S. Capitol Police and the Library of Congress Police.

The U.S. Capitol Police and Library of Congress Police Merger and Implementation Act of 2007 provides that employees of the Library of Congress Police shall be transferred to the United States Capitol Police. I would like to ask my colleague Senator FEINSTEIN about provisions under which the Chief of the U.S. Capitol Police will make certain final determinations regarding the incoming Library of Congress Police employees that shall not be appealable or reviewable in any manner. It is my understanding that these provisions would generally prevent individuals from appealing or seeking review of the determinations of the Chief of the U.S. Capitol Police, but would not limit the right of any individual to seek any appropriate relief under the Congressional Accountability Act if these determinations by the Chief allegedly violated that act.

The Congressional Accountability Act was enacted in 1995 to provide to congressional employees the same rights and protections that are available to other employees in our Nation, including protection against discrimination on the basis of race, sex, national origin, religion, or age. My understanding is that the merger legislation would in no way limit the right of any employee covered under the Congressional Accountability Act to initiate an action regarding any alleged violation of rights protected under that Act. I have also been told that this interpretation of the legislation is shared by the Chief of the U.S. Capitol Police, and that Library of Congress employees transferring to the U.S. Capitol Police will be informed and educated about their rights and protections under the Congressional Accountability Act.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. The understanding of my colleague from Connecticut, Senator LIEBERMAN, is correct. The finality provisions in this legislation were intended to give the Chief of the U.S. Capitol Police authority to transfer employees and assign duties as necessary to meet the mission of the U.S. Capitol Police in maintaining the security of the Capitol complex. However, the provisions in this legislation in no way limit the protections and rights of an employee to seek relief under the Congressional Accountability Act.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. I thank the Senator for her assistance and courtesy.

Mr. DODD. I ask unanimous consent that the amendment at the desk be considered and agreed to; the bill, as amended, be read a third time, passed, and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table; that any statements relating to the bill be printed in the RECORD without further intervening action or debate.

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

The amendment (No. 3869) was agreed to.

(The amendment is printed in today's RECORD under ''Text of Amendments.'')

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H.R. 3690)was read the third time and passed.

NATIONAL TEEN DATING VIOLENCE AWARENESS AND PREVENTION WEEK

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 541, S. Res. 388.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 388) designating the week of February 4 through February 8, 2008, as ''National Teen Dating Violence Awareness and Prevention Week.''

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table, and that any statements relating to the resolution be printed in the RECORD.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 388) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S. RES. 388

Whereas 1 in 3 female teenagers in a dating relationship has feared for her physical safety;

Whereas 1 in 2 teenagers in a serious relationship has compromised personal beliefs to please a partner;

Whereas 1 in 5 teenagers in a serious relationship reports having been hit, slapped, or pushed by a partner;

Whereas 27 percent of teenagers have been in dating relationships in which their partners called them names or put them down;

Whereas 29 percent of girls who have been in a relationship said that they have been pressured to have sex or to engage in sexual activities that they did not want;

Whereas technologies such as cell phones and the Internet have made dating abuse both more pervasive and more hidden;

Whereas 30 percent of teenagers who have been in a dating relationship say that they have been text-messaged between 10 and 30 times per hour by a partner seeking to find out where they are, what they are doing, or who they are with;

Whereas 72 percent of teenagers who reported they'd been checked up on by a boyfriend or girlfriend 10 times per hour by email or text messaging did not tell their parents;