

who only handle a small number of civil cases. The limited assistance provided by these senior judges is likely to decline further in the near future. These judges are not able to retire due to the constraints put forth by the loss of the temporary judgeship seat, should one of the current judges decide to leave. Furthermore, receiving assistance from visiting judges is made difficult by the high cost of travel to Hawaii. For these, and many other reasons, the Judicial Council of the Ninth Circuit supports the Judicial Conference's recommendation to convert this temporary judgeship to a permanent position.

I share the concern of many in Hawaii's legal community that the lack of a fourth permanent position will delay the timely issuance of justice in matters pending before the U.S. District Court, District of Hawaii. This is a disservice to all. The economic impact of extending trials and prolonging time spent in jail will burden Hawaii's taxpayers. Moreover, the lack of timely judicial review will have negative social impacts by prolonging the disruption in individuals' families and lives. The bill we introduce today would ensure 4 Federal judgeships remain active in Hawaii to address the needs of the District Court of Hawaii and the people of Hawaii.

By Mr. REID (for Mr. OBAMA (for himself and Mr. HARKIN)):

S. 1324. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to reduce greenhouse gas emissions from transportation fuel sold in the United States; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

Mr. OBAMA. Mr. President, we heard from a panel of top climate change experts from around the world earlier this year that global warming is a certainty and that most of the temperature increase is very likely due to rising greenhouse gas concentrations. Reducing America's dependence on oil should be one of our top priorities, but any policy that affects our production and consumption of fuel must also address the pressing problem of global warming. Because the oil used in the U.S. transportation sector accounts for about one-third of our nation's emissions of greenhouse gases, we must adopt a policy that curtails these emissions in an effective manner.

Today, along with Senator HARKIN, I am introducing the National Low-Carbon Fuel Standard Act of 2007, which calls for a reduction in the lifecycle greenhouse gas emissions of the transportation fuels sold in the U.S. of 5 percent in 2015 and 10 percent in 2020. These reductions can play an important role in stemming the dangerous transformation of our climate.

According to one estimate, the National Low-Carbon Fuel Standard, NLCFS, would reduce annual greenhouse gas emissions by about 180 million metric tons in 2020. This is the equivalent of taking over 30 million cars off the road. If enacted in conjunc-

tion with the bill I introduced earlier this year to raise fuel efficiency standards, the NLCFS would reduce greenhouse gas emissions by about 530 million metric tons in 2020, the equivalent of taking over 50 million cars off the road.

The effect on our oil imports would also be dramatic. By making greater use of home-grown, renewable fuels, the NLCFS could reduce the annual consumption of gasoline derived from foreign oil imports by about 30 billion gallons in 2020.

The NLCFS will greatly expand the market for domestic renewable fuels such as corn-based ethanol, cellulosic ethanol, and biodiesel. By one estimate, the NLCFS will create a market for over 40 billion gallons of biofuels by 2020. To provide near-term demand certainty for renewable fuel producers, the bill expands the Renewable Fuel Standard established in the Energy Policy Act of 2005 to require 15 billion gallons of renewable fuel by 2012.

The bill also contains a minimum requirement for fuels with lifecycle greenhouse gas emissions that are 50 and 75 percent lower than gasoline. This requirement signals to investors that there will be a market for advanced fuels with ultra-low carbon emissions, but still allows significant leeway for fuel blenders to choose the optimal mix of fuels to meet their overall greenhouse gas emissions targets.

Because the NLCFS will encourage a rapid expansion of our domestic renewable fuels production capacity, the bill contains provisions that protect sensitive areas like national wildlife refuges, national parks, old-growth forests, national grasslands, and national forests. The bill calls for an assessment of the impacts of the expansion compared to the business-as-usual scenario of continued reliance on petroleum-based transportation fuels, and the development of standards by 2012 to protect air, land, and water quality. This approach strikes a balance between the need to rapidly expand our domestic renewable fuel production capacity and the need to ensure sustainability and environmental protection. I urge my colleagues to support the National Low-Carbon Fuel Standard Act.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 189—TO AUTHORIZE TESTIMONY AND LEGAL REPRESENTATION IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA V. ELLEN E. BARFIELD, EVE-LEONA TETAZ, JEFFREY A. LEYS, AND JEROME A. ZAWADA

Mr. REID (for himself and Mr. McCONNELL) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 189

Whereas, in the cases of District of Columbia v. Ellen E. Barfield (Cr. No. 07-3133), Eve-

Leona Tetaz (Cr. No. 07-3144), Jeffrey A. Leys (Cr. No. 07-5009), and Jerome A. Zawada (Cr. No. 07-5088), pending in the Superior Court for the District of Columbia, testimony has been requested from Katie Landi, an employee in the office of Senator John McCain;

Whereas, pursuant to sections 703(a) and 704(a)(2) of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978, 2 U.S.C. 288b(a) and 288c(a)(2), the Senate may direct its counsel to represent employees of the Senate with respect to any subpoena, order, or request for testimony relating to their official responsibilities;

Whereas, by the privileges of the Senate of the United States and Rule XI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, no evidence under the control or in the possession of the Senate may, by the judicial or administrative process, be taken from such control or possession but by permission of the Senate;

Whereas, when it appears that evidence under the control or in the possession of the Senate may promote the administration of justice, the Senate will take such action as will promote the ends of justice consistent with the privileges of the Senate: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That Katie Landi and any other employees of Senator McCain's office from whom testimony may be required are authorized to testify in the cases of District of Columbia v. Ellen E. Barfield, Eve-Leona Tetaz, Jeffrey A. Leys, and Jerome A. Zawada, except concerning matters for which a privilege should be asserted.

SEC. 2. The Senate Legal Counsel is authorized to represent Katie Landi and other employees of Senator McCain's staff in the actions referenced in section one of this resolution.

SENATE RESOLUTION 190—EXPRESSING THE CONDOLENCES OF THE NATION TO THE COMMUNITY OF GREENSBURG, KANSAS

Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Mr. BROWNBACK) submitted the following resolution, which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 190

Whereas, on Friday, May 4, 2007, a tornado struck the community of Greensburg, Kansas;

Whereas this tornado was classified as an EF-5, the strongest possible type, by the National Weather Service, with winds estimated at 205 miles per hour;

Whereas the tornado is the first EF-5 on the Enhanced Fujita scale, and the first F-5 on the previous scale since 1999;

Whereas approximately 95 percent of Greensburg is destroyed;

Whereas 1,500 residents have been displaced from their homes; and

Whereas, in response to the declaration by the President of a major disaster, the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency has made Federal disaster assistance available for the State of Kansas to assist in local recovery efforts: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate expresses the condolences of the Nation to the community of Greensburg, Kansas, and its gratitude to local, State, and National law enforcement and emergency responders conducting search and rescue operations.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 33—RECOGNIZING THE BENEFITS AND IMPORTANCE OF SCHOOL-BASED MUSIC EDUCATION

Mr. ALEXANDER (for himself, Mr. DODD, and Mr. KENNEDY) submitted the

following concurrent resolution, which was referred to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions:

S. CON. RES. 33

Whereas school music programs enhance intellectual development and enrich the academic environment for students of all ages;

Whereas students who participate in school music programs are less likely to be involved with drugs, gangs, or alcohol, and have better attendance in school;

Whereas the skills gained through sequential music instruction, including discipline and the ability to analyze, solve problems, communicate, and work cooperatively, are vital for success in the 21st century workplace;

Whereas the majority of students attending public schools in inner city neighborhoods have virtually no access to music education, which places them at a disadvantage compared to their peers in other communities;

Whereas the arts are a core academic subject, and music is an essential element of the arts; and

Whereas every student in the United States should have an opportunity to reap the benefits of music education: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the sense of Congress that music education grounded in rigorous instruction is an important component of a well-rounded academic curriculum and should be available to every student in every school in the United States.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 1045. Mr. REID (for Mr. OBAMA) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. REID to the bill S. 1082, to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to reauthorize and amend the prescription drug user fee provisions, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table;

SA 1046. Ms. STABENOW (for herself, Mr. KOHL, Mr. HATCH, and Mr. COBURN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1082, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1047. Mr. ROBERTS (for himself, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. BURR, and Mr. COBURN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1082, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1048. Ms. SNOWE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1082, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1049. Mr. ENZI (for himself and Mr. KENNEDY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1082, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1050. Mr. ENZI (for himself and Mr. KENNEDY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1082, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1051. Mr. STEVENS (for himself and Ms. MURKOWSKI) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1082, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1052. Mr. CORKER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1082, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1053. Mr. ENZI (for himself, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. DODD, and Mrs. CLINTON) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1082, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1054. Mr. FEINGOLD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1082, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1055. Mr. LEVIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1082, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1056. Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. ISAKSON) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1082, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1057. Mr. GREGG submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1082, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1058. Mr. DEMINT (for himself, Mr. COBURN, and Mr. MARTINEZ) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1082, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1059. Mr. SESSIONS (for himself, Mrs. LINCOLN, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. PRYOR, Mr. LOTT, and Mr. SHELBY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1082, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1060. Mr. HATCH (for himself and Mr. KENNEDY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1082, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 1045. Mr. REID (for Mr. OBAMA) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. Reid to the bill S. 1082, to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to reauthorize and amend the prescription drug user fee provisions, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ IMPROVING GENETIC TEST SAFETY AND QUALITY.

Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall enter into a contract with the Institute of Medicine to conduct a study to assess the overall safety and quality of genetic tests and prepare a report that includes recommendations to improve Federal oversight and regulation of genetic tests. Such study shall take into consideration relevant reports by the Secretary's Advisory Committee on Genetic Testing and other groups and shall be completed not later than 1 year after the date on which the Secretary entered into such contract.

SA 1046. Ms. STABENOW (for herself, Mr. KOHL, Mr. HATCH, and Mr. COBURN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1082, to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to reauthorize and amend the prescription drug user fee provisions, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ CITIZENS PETITIONS AND PETITIONS FOR STAY OF AGENCY ACTION.

Section 505 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 355), as amended by this Act, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(s) CITIZEN PETITIONS AND PETITIONS FOR STAY OF AGENCY ACTION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—

“(A) NO DELAY OF CONSIDERATION OR APPROVAL.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—With respect to a pending application submitted under subsection (b)(2) or (j), if a petition is submitted to the Secretary that seeks to have the Secretary take, or refrain from taking, any form of action relating to the approval of the application, including a delay in the effective date of the application, clauses (ii) and (iii) shall apply.

“(ii) NO DELAY OF CONSIDERATION OR APPROVAL.—Except as provided in clause (iii), the receipt and consideration of a petition described in clause (i) shall not delay consideration or approval of an application submitted under subsection (b)(2) or (j).

“(iii) NO DELAY OF APPROVAL WITHOUT DETERMINATION.—The Secretary shall not delay approval of an application submitted under subsection (b)(2) or (j) while a petition described in clause (i) is reviewed and considered unless the Secretary determines, not later than 25 business days after the submission of the petition, that a delay is necessary to protect the public health.

“(B) DETERMINATION OF DELAY.—With respect to a determination by the Secretary under subparagraph (A)(iii) that a delay is necessary to protect the public health the following shall apply:

“(i) Not later than 5 days after making such determination, the Secretary shall publish on the Internet website of the Food and Drug Administration a detailed statement providing the reasons underlying the determination. The detailed statement shall include a summary of the petition and comments and supplements, the specific substantive issues that the petition raises which need to be considered prior to approving a pending application submitted under subsection (b)(2) or (j), and any clarifications and additional data that is needed by the Secretary to promptly review the petition.

“(ii) Not later than 10 days after making such determination, the Secretary shall provide notice to the sponsor of the pending application submitted under subsection (b)(2) or (j) and provide an opportunity for a meeting with appropriate staff as determined by the Commissioner to discuss the determination.

“(2) TIMING OF FINAL AGENCY ACTION ON PETITIONS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding a determination made by the Secretary under paragraph (1)(A)(iii), the Secretary shall take final agency action with respect to a petition not later than 180 days of submission of that petition unless the Secretary determines, prior to the date that is 180 days after the date of submission of the petition, that a delay is necessary to protect the public health.

“(B) DETERMINATION OF DELAY.—With respect to a determination by the Secretary under subparagraph (A) that a delay is necessary to protect the public health the following shall apply:

“(i) Not later than 5 days after making the determination under subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall publish on the Internet website of the Food and Drug Administration a detailed statement providing the reasons underlying the determination. The detailed statement should include the state of the review of the petition, the specific outstanding issues that still need to be resolved, a proposed timeframe to resolve the issues, and any additional information that has been requested by the Secretary of the petitioner or needed by the Secretary in order to resolve the petition and not further delay an application filed under subsection (b)(2) or (j).

“(ii) Not later than 10 days after making the determination under subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall provide notice to the sponsor of the pending application submitted