wounded. One hospital in Texas has handled 250 amputations. There are 2,000 double amputees as a result of this war.

The war continues to move in the wrong direction and yet—instead of digging us out of the hole it created in Iraq—instead of stopping this downward spiral of destruction—instead of taking the fight to the terrorists who attacked us on September 11—this White House wants us to keep doing more of the same in Iraq.

In January, President Bush said he would escalate the conflict and send 21,500 new troops for a few months. Of course, we were misled on that. We now know the number is around 30,000, and they will be there indefinitely, and the President has said he might ask for more troops. There is no short-term surge, as the President has described. It is more of the same. The President is placing troops in the middle of an Iraqi sectarian civil war. More military solutions to a problem that General Petraeus, our top commander in Iraq, has said can only be solved politically. Our commander on the ground in Iraq has said that only 20 percent of it can be won militarily. That is not good enough for me. We need to find a new way forward.

If the President will not listen to the generals, if he will not listen to the American people, who have spoken for a new direction, then perhaps he will listen to us, Congress, when we send him a supplemental bill that acknowledges reality in Iraq. We must find a new way forward. The President can swagger all he wants, but we have 3,241 dead Americans.

The Iraq measure in this bill changes the mission of U.S. troops from policing a civil war to counterterror, training, and force protection. It rejects the notion that this war can be won militarily, and it sets a goal of redeploying our troops by March 2008. It includes a requirement for a political, diplomatic, and economic strategy to be implemented in conjunction with the redeployment.

The Iraq language is based on a simple premise: Iraq can be won only politically. In short, it offers a responsible strategy in Iraq that the American people asked for last November 7—a strategy that will enhance our country's ability to wage war on terror.

Contrary to what President Bush believes, the key to success in Iraq is not escalating the conflict by adding tens of thousands of additional troops to trod down the same dangerous road. It is to find a new way forward.

I urge my colleagues to support this supplemental. After 4 years of war, our troops deserve a strategy to help them complete the mission so they can come home.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I wish to thank our leader for his comments about the progress that has been made in the Senate on issues that affect the working middle-class families of this country and also for his responses on the issue of the war in Iraq, where there should be an opportunity, as we focus on the particular amendment, to get into that in greater detail. But I thank him for his very worthwhile comments this afternoon.

NORTHERN IRELAND PEACE PROCESS

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, the leaders of Northern Ireland took another giant step toward lasting peace earlier today when Sinn Fein and the Democratic Unionist Party reached a landmark agreement to share power in a joint administration to be established on May 8. The agreement gives hope to all who have worked so long and so hard to bring unionists and nationalists together in government on a permanent basis.

Prime Minister Ahern of Ireland and Prime Minister Blair of Britain have been strong allies for peace. John Hume and many others have been heroes along the way. But the indispensable persons in this historic agreement today are Gerry Adams, the leader of Sinn Fein, and Ian Paisley, the leader of the Democratic Unionist Party. In reaching this agreement, they have acted to strengthen democracy and create a future of peace and stability for the future of that troubled land.

Today, the people of Northern Ireland salute them both for reaching this new day, and the world congratulates them as well. We know it was not an easy step to take. Their past disagreements have been intense and deep. The challenges they have faced often seemed irreconcilable, and the scars of the past have often seemed impossible to heal. Compromises have been difficult and painful to achieve. But with this agreement, Sinn Fein and the DUP have finally taken the essential step of looking forward together—not backward—and have agreed at long last to work with one another for the future of Northern Ireland.

The eyes of the world will be on them on May 8. All who care about lasting peace and stability look forward to the permanent restoration of the Northern Ireland Government at that time. In a world where political resolution often is elusive, these leaders deserve enormous credit for giving us hope.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I listened with interest to the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts. I do, myself, feel a great sense of pleasure and comfort in what has transpired today with regard to Ireland, and I wanted to say so.

THE EMPLOYEE FREE CHOICE ACT

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, on March 1, the other body passed the horribly misnamed ''Employee Free Choice Act,'' H.R. 800, and we may soon be called upon to consider that bill or a similar Senate counterpart. The bill was steamrolled through the House of Representatives in less than a month from its introduction, with only a single day of subcommittee hearings, at which only one expert witness critical of the bill was permitted to testify. It was considered in the House with only limited amendments allowed to be offered. Obviously, it is incumbent on us to make certain the Senate takes the opportunity for fuller debate on a measure of such wide impact.

The chairman of the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee has scheduled a hearing tomorrow, where we will undoubtedly hear how ''unfair'' the current unionization system is and how it must be amended to allow for greater unionization. I am sure we will have a full and robust debate in this body. But as we kick off this debate over whether to deny private ballots to workers who wish to unionize, it is my hope we will be able to at least hold fast and true to the facts. There should be a full debate on these facts.

There is ample evidence to indicate that we should be wary of amending the National Labor Relations Act, the NLRA, in a way that would upset the balance in national labor policy between labor and management and employer and employee. We must not rely on slogans, anecdotal stories, and questionable secretly commissioned and selective statistics about alleged unfair labor practices.

The NLRA and its attendant volumes of reported decisions and case precedent by the National Labor Relations Board is an extremely complicated, interwoven area of law. Amending it in the way the sponsors of H.R. 800 envision could rip a gaping hole in the precise weave of this complex fabric and have a dramatic impact with many unintended consequences.

It must also be considered that amending the NLRA will not only affect the welfare of unions, but it will also have a negative overall impact on workers, employers—especially small employers—and on the economy and America's ability to be competitive in a global economy.

So let us begin the discussion of the bill. The Employee Free Choice Act is designed to increase union membership, which currently stands at 7.4 percent of the private sector workforce. The bill would accomplish that through an artificial, union-controlled ''card check'' certification procedure in place of the traditional NLRB-supervised private ballot election or, as

some have called it, a secret ballot election.

In fact, the bill would radically upset the balance in labor and management and employer-employee relations by amending the National Labor Relations Act in three ways:

First, the bill would mandate union representation without a private ballot election among employees. The so-called Employee Free Choice Act mandates that the NLRB certify a union as the exclusive collective bargaining representative of employees when the union has demonstrated that a majority of the employees, 50 percent plus 1, have signed union authorization cards—or, in other words, the ''card check'' system without a private ballot election among employees.

Not only would this deny employees the right of private, NLRB-protected ballot elections on the question of initial union representation, but through operation of the NLRB's current ''certification bar'' doctrine, it would prevent employees from challenging the union's majority status through a decertification election for the certification year.

Secondly, the bill would guarantee union contracts where the Government would impose the wages, the terms, and conditions of employment for 2 years if the parties fail to agree after 90 days of bargaining and 30 days of mediation. That is because the so-called Employee Free Choice Act requires compulsory, binding arbitration of initial union contracts.

Specifically, under the so-called Employee Free Choice Act, an employer must begin bargaining within 10 days of the union's demand. Thereafter, if the union and the employer cannot reach an agreement within 90 days, the contract terms must be submitted to the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service for a 30-day period of mediation. If the FMCS is unable to mediate an agreement between the parties, then it must refer the initial contract to an FMCS arbitration panel with the authority to issue a decision that is binding on the employer and union for a 2-year period.

Added to current law, the effect would be to deny employees the opportunity to approve, or ratify, the terms of the contract. They would be prevented by the NLRB's ''contract bar'' from initiating a private ballot decertification election challenging the union's continuing majority status for the 2-year term of the contract.

Finally, the bill would impose new antiemployer penalties. These include prioritizing NLRB investigations of unfair labor practice charges alleged to have been committed by an employer during an organizing campaign and possibly pursuing injunctive remedial action in Federal Court.

The proposal also provides for liquidated damages in the amount of two times any back pay found due and owing and subjects an employer to a civil penalty not to exceed $20,000 per violation of the NLRA. As this chart shows, the proponents of the so-called Employee Free Choice Act are asking the American worker to accept the denial of access to complete information about the union, the denial of a private ballot vote, the inability to decertify a union for at least 28 months after it is initially certified, the denial of the right to strike for a better deal after binding arbitration, potentially the denial of an employee's opportunity to vote on a contract, and the denial of knowing if a union is organizing at their place of work.

Let us look at that again. The effect of the Employee Free Choice Act dissolves workers' rights to access to complete information about the union, to vote in secret, to decertify the union for at least 28 months, to strike for a better deal—takes that away from them—to vote on a contract—takes that away from them—and to know if union organizing is taking place. It takes their rights away as workers.

This deceptively named bill has little to do with employee free choice. In fact, it would take away an employee's right to choose union representation through private ballot elections—some say ''secret ballot'' elections—something the unions have always fought for but now are going to throw away in their desire to unionize at all costs. Indeed, it has everything to do with guaranteeing union organizing to increase union membership, at a time when unions represent a steadily declining percentage of America's private sector workforce.

As you can see clearly from this chart, since the modern-day union movement in 1935, when you evaluate their percentage of the overall workforce, unions have had good years, up in here, and they have had many bad years.

As that chart clearly demonstrates, under the current system of NLRB overseeing private ballot elections in recent years, unions have lost membership.

Currently, I must underscore, union membership stands at 7.4 percent of the private sector workforce. Proponents of the Employee Free Choice Act seek to turn back time when it comes to the percentage of the American workforce that is unionized and that they want to be unionized.

I have no inherent problem with a fairly considered, fairly elected union. However, this bill attempts to increase union strength through an artificial, union-controlled ''card check'' certification procedure which tosses away the traditional NLRB-supervised private ballot election.

Where is the problem we are trying to fix? This bill would replace the time-honored, NLRB-protected private ballot election, the traditional system under which workers decide whether to be represented or not represented by a union. Instead, the system would be supplanted with the mandated ''card check'' procedure, where union organizers can pressure employees to sign union authorization cards which are then presented to the NLRB for certification of the union as the exclusive collective bargaining representative of all of the employees.

It is important for us to consider that the U.S. Supreme Court has repeatedly denounced union authorization cards as being ''inherently unreliable'' because of the types of peer pressures, some subtle and some not so subtle or benign, to sign the cards. In its 1969 Gissel Packing decision, the Court acknowledged that the use of authorization cards to determine majority support is unreliable and that private ballot elections are the ''most satisfactory—indeed the preferred method of ascertaining whether a union has majority support.''

Unions, likewise, prefer a NLRB-protected and supervised private ballot election, at least when they are faced with a decertification petition from their members to determine whether the union has majority support. That was demonstrated once again last month by union opposition to a proposed amendment to apply the ''card check'' provisions of the so-called Employee Free Choice Act to decertification elections. That amendment was defeated in the House committee's markup.

As one court stated with regard to ''card check'' authorization:

> It would be difficult to imagine a more unreliable method of ascertaining the real wishes of employees than a ''card check'' unless it were an employer's request for an open show of hands. The one is no more reliable than the other.

That is in the NLRB v. Logan Packing Company of the Fourth Circuit.

It is hard to believe we are seriously considering a bill to deny workers a private ballot vote so soon after the national elections. It is also inconsistent with our Nation's history of promoting private ballot elections for the disenfranchised members of society through the suffragette and civil rights movements, especially when we are fighting for the opportunity of individuals around the world to have the democratic right to a private ballot election that is free of intimidation and coercion.

I am reminded of a statement made on January 31 of this year by my longtime friend and colleague from Massachusetts on the need for fair elections:

> For too long, we've ignored the festering problem of deceptive practices intended to intimidate and deceive voters in our national elections. . . .''

Although I am not able to say this very often, I can say that I am in absolute agreement with my friend on that point. In every election, whether it is for President, local dog catcher, or union organization, we as representatives of the people whom we serve have an obligation to ensure our constituents' votes will be cast without fear of intimidation.

I assert—and I think many also would back this up—that a private ballot election overseen by the NLRB, a

Government agency, has a better chance to be more free and fair than one in which it is left to the union organizers to solicit cards in secret until they receive a majority of 50 plus 1. What happens to the other 49 percent? Are they just disenfranchised? The answer is yes.

Under the ''card check'' system, there is no inducement to allow employees to make an informed decision, learn all the facts, and hear arguments for and against unionization.

It is difficult for me to believe we would be considering a bill which would mandate that the Government impose wages, terms, and conditions of employment where the parties, new to collective bargaining, have not reached agreement after 90 days. This would destroy free collective bargaining and the entire labor law concept of ''impasse'' when the parties are unable to agree. Under the so-called Employee Free Choice Act, for first contracts, ''impasse'' would be defined as 90 days of bargaining before the Government steps in. Even basic labor law textbooks term compulsory binding arbitration as the ''antithesis of collective bargaining.''

These are radical changes in collective bargaining which have little to do with employee free choice. In fact, these amendments would disenfranchise workers by denying them private ballot elections and a vote on whether to accept wages, terms, and conditions the Government arbitration panel would impose on them.

Who would benefit from the passage of the so-called Employee Free Choice Act? I can tell you. Only unions. They would be virtually guaranteed organizing success, increased union membership, and more union dues.

As you can see from this chart, over the past 6 years, unions traditionally win approximately 50 to 60 percent of NLRB-supervised private ballot elections. In contrast, it is reported that ''card check'' elections yield unions success approximately 80 to 85 percent of the time. Who would benefit? I can tell you. Only unions.

Look at that chart again. ''Union Win Rates in Elections.'' The NLRB-supervised election, in 2000, the unions won 51 percent; in 2001, the unions won 54 percent; in 2002, they won 56 percent; in 2003, they won 57 percent; in 2004, they won 57 percent; in 2005, they won 61 percent; and in 2006, they won 61 percent.

Where ''card check'' elections have been held—because the employers have agreed to them, I guess, because they are certainly not law yet; that is why they are bringing this up—80–85 percent have become unionized even though 49 percent of the people in those companies have had nothing to say about it. It is not right. It is not the way to go.

Unions would be guaranteed first contracts for a period of 2 years under this bill.

Looking at the big picture, what would the so-called Employee Free Choice Act mean for our economy? Let me read from a recent article written by Jack and Suzy Welch in the March 12 issue of BusinessWeek magazine. Jack Welch is one of the alltime important business leaders in this country. Here is what they had to say:

> We know it must sound strange to oppose legislation that promises something as motherhood-y as ''free choice.'' But the title of this bill is pure propaganda. It won't encourage liberty or self-determination in the workplace; more likely it will introduce intimidation and coercion by labor organizers, who, after a long slide into near-oblivion, finally see a glorious new route to millions of dues-paying members. Their campaign could trigger a surge in unionization across U.S. industry—and in time, a reversion to the bloated economy that brought America to its knees in the late 1970s and early '80s and that today cripples much of European business. If you want to be reminded of what that looks like, drive through Pennsylvania's Lehigh Valley, as we did last weekend, and take a look at all the shuttered factories. Steel—like coal, autos, and so many other industries in the global economy—paid the inevitable price of unionization run amok.
>
> . . . The advance of the Employee Free Choice Act continues unabated. And so pretty soon, if enough business leaders and legislators don't stand up, it may well be: Hello again, unions. So long, American competitiveness. The change will not happen instantly. Companies will fight unions as if their lives depend on it, because they do. But given the logistics of the Employee Free Choice Act, any management campaign is hobbled. If you can't be at the kitchen table with the organizers and their hard stares, you probably can't win.

He sums it up:

> In those areas where employers have agreed to a ''card check,'' they have invariably become unionized and many employees unionized against their will with the obligation of paying dues.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the full article be printed in the RECORD.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I assert that this is the start of another historic Senate debate on national labor policy. It is unfortunate that I have to be involved in this because I was raised in the union movement. I am one of the few people who have served in Congress who actually earned a union card, who actually became a skilled building tradesman, who worked in the building construction trade unions for 10 years. I believe unions are important, but I believe they should have to earn their membership and not have it given to them.

In conclusion, as we enter this debate, let us not be fooled by the misinformation from the other side.

Take a look at this chart. They claim employers coerce employees to vote no. The truth is that in less than 2 percent of cases is it found that an employer has inappropriately interfered in a union organizing election.

They claim unions can't win elections under the current system. The truth is that unions won 62 percent of NLRB elections in 2005, the last year for which a complete set of statistics exists.

They claim American workers want to form unions using a ''card check'' system. The truth is that, according to a recent poll, 79 percent of Americans disagree with the elimination of private ballots when voting in union organizing elections.

The President has issued a Statement of Administration Policy that he would veto the so-called Employee Free Choice Act if it reached his desk. That should not make us complacent in the Senate. Even if a veto were necessary, Senate passage of a bill like that which was passed by the House would put us on record in future Congresses as being against private ballot elections for workers in union representation decisions, in support of Government-imposed wages, benefits, and other terms and conditions of employment through union contracts where workers themselves will be denied a ratification vote. Is that where we want to be a year or two from now? I, for one, do not believe we as a nation should head in that direction, and I urge my colleagues to resist any attempt to force unionization on the American workforce.

To paraphrase the movie ''The Godfather,'' I believe union bosses have made the American workforce a deal they can refuse. We must oppose any attempt to pass any iteration of the Employee Free Choice Act, and we must do it on behalf of the American worker.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

EXHIBIT 1

[From Business Week, Mar. 12, 2007]

THE UNEMPLOYMENT ACT

(By Jack and Suzy Welch)

Are you at all concerned about American competitiveness in the future?

—Srikanth Raghunathan, Irwin, Pa.

Yes. But not for the standard ''the sky is falling'' reasons, like the twin deficits, low-cost Chinese manufacturing, or intellectual property piracy. We believe those challenges will largely be ameliorated by market, political, and legal forces. No, we're as worried as can be that American competitiveness is about to be whacked by something no one seems to be talking about: the Employee Free Choice Act, which is currently weaving an insidious path through Congress toward becoming law. If it does, the long-thriving American economy will finally meet its match.

You didn't read wrong. We know it must sound strange to oppose legislation that promises something as motherhood-y as ''free choice.'' But the title of this bill is pure propaganda. It won't encourage liberty or self-determination in the workplace; more likely it will introduce intimidation and coercion by labor organizers; who, after a long slide into near-oblivion, finally see a glorious new route to millions of dues-paying members. Their campaign could trigger a surge in unionization across U.S. industry—and in time, a reversion to the bloated economy that brought America to its knees in the late 1970s and early '80s and that today cripples much of European business. If you want to be reminded of what that looks like,

drive through Pennsylvania's Lehigh Valley, as we did last weekend, and take a look at all the shuttered factories. Steel—like coal, autos, and so many other industries in the global economy—paid the inevitable price of unionization run amok.

Make no mistake, We don't unilaterally oppose unions. Indeed, if a company is habitually unfair or unreasonable, it deserves what it gets from organized labor. But the problem with unions is that they make a sport out of killing productivity even when companies are providing good wages, benefits, and working conditions. It is not uncommon in a union shop to shut down production rather than allow a nonunion worker to flip a switch. Only a union or millwright electrician can do that job! Come on. Companies today can't afford such petty bureaucracy or the other excesses unions so often lead to, such as two people for every job and a litigious approach to even the smallest matters. Yes, managers and employees will sometimes disagree. But in the global economy, they have to work through those differences not as adversaries but as partners.

The Employee Free Choice Act undermines that. Here's how. Currently, when labor organizers want to launch a unionization effort, they ask each worker to sign a card as a show of support. If 30% or more employees do so, a federally supervised election can be called and conducted with one of the most revered mechanisms in democracy, the secret ballot. Thus, employees can vote their conscience, without fear of retribution from either union leaders or management.

By contrast; under the Employee Free Choice Act, organizers could start a union if 50% of employees, plus one more worker, sign cards. That's right—no more secret ballot. Instead, employees would likely get a phone call with a pointed solicitation, or worse, a home visit from a small team of organizers. You can just imagine the scenario. The organizers sit around the kitchen table and make their case, likely with a lot of passion. Then they slide a card in front of the employee with a pen. Who would say no? Who could?

Now, union supporters will tell you that they won't intimidate employees for votes, and regardless, management intimidates all the time by threatening to fire employees who vote union. But the system as it exists has safeguards, including heavy fines against companies that misbehave and automatic new elections.

Still, the advance of the Employee Free Choice Act continues unabated. And so pretty soon, if enough business leaders and legislators don't stand up, it may well be: Hello again, unions. So long, American competitiveness. The change won't happen instantly. Companies will fight unions as if their lives depend on it, because they do. But given the logistics of the Employee Free Choice Act; any management campaign is hobbled. If you can't be at the kitchen table with the organizers and their hard stares, you probably can't win.

It's too bad. In fact, its terrible. And ironic. First, because the ability to unionize already exists in America, thanks to the secret ballot. And second, because the Employee Free Choice Act ultimately only provides a free choice nobody would ever want: how to spend a government issued unemployment check.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Colorado.

ENERGY

Mr. SALAZAR. Mr. President, I come to the Senate floor to speak about the issue of energy and the importance of this Senate and this Congress and this country moving forward with an authentic picture with respect to energy independence for our country. When I get up in the morning and think about the major issues that are facing our country, there are three issues which always come to mind.

The first is what is happening in Iraq and around the world and how we restore America's greatness and how we put Humpty Dumpty together again with respect to making sure America's greatness which we have enjoyed for the last two centuries is something we enjoy in the 21st century and beyond.

Second are the difficult and important domestic issues which we are attempting to confront today—the issue of health care and how we move forward to create a system of health insurance and health care availability for all the people of America, an issue which continues to confront us.

Third, the issue of energy and how we look forward. The issue of energy is something many of us in this Chamber and in the House of Representatives and the White House today will continue to work on, which is so important to all of us.

With respect to Iraq, we will be facing that issue here in the weeks and months ahead. I believe strongly there is unity in the United States of America in terms of our support for our troops. I believe there is a long-term desire for us to make sure what we do is establish stability in the Middle East.

I believe all of us want to make sure we are doing everything we can do to support our troops. Nonetheless, the debate will occur here on this floor this week and beyond. It is an important debate. It is a debate that involves perhaps the most important issue of our time. That is the issue of war and peace and the debate that is certainly appropriate to be held on the floor of the Senate.

With respect to health care, I am pleased with the efforts the Senate Finance Committee and the HELP Committee are undertaking, with the leadership of Senator BAUCUS and Senator KENNEDY and others, as we try to address the issue of health care. This year for sure we will move forward with a program that hopefully will expand the coverage of health insurance to the children of America. We think about 9 million children in this country today who have no health insurance. The expansion of the SCHIP program is something that is very important for all of these children across our many States who today do not have health insurance.

But the other issue, the energy issue, is one which is winding its way through our various committees in the Senate today. In the Agriculture Committee, under the leadership of Senator TOM HARKIN, we currently are looking at title 9 of the farm bill. We will have a robust law that will move us forward with a new agenda with respect to agriculture and energy.

In the Senate Energy Committee, under the leadership of Senators BINGAMAN and DOMENICI, we are working on several bills that will help us move forward toward energy independence.

In the Senate Finance Committee, under the leadership of Senator BAUCUS and Senator GRASSLEY, we have numerous initiatives on the table that will create incentives for us to have the kind of biofuels, solar energy, and the other kinds of energy that will create the new environment for us to be successful in a program on energy independence.

For me, when I think about energy, I see the dawning of a new age for my State of Colorado and also for America. It is a dawning of an age for America which we ought to embrace with vigor. It is the dawning of the age of a clean energy future for the United States of America. One year ago in my State I hosted the first Colorado Renewable Energy Summit. At the summit, there were more than 500 of us brought together to talk about our national energy policy and the energy opportunities we face in my State.

We put renewable energy in the headlines for Colorado, and we have kept energy at the top of Colorado's agenda for the past year. This last Saturday, 2 days ago, on March 24, 2007, we again summoned the people of Colorado and we had over 1,000 people who attended a summit at the Colorado Convention Center. We were joined in that summit by my colleague Senator WAYNE ALLARD, by Colorado Governor Ritter, the mayor, six Members of the U.S. House of Representatives, the president of the Colorado Senate, the speaker of the Colorado House of Representatives and, as I said, more than 1,000 people in my State who were interested in renewable energy and energy efficiency, not only for our State but for the entire country.

Because of the work we have taken on in the last year in Colorado, today we have a Colorado Renewable Energy collaboration. That laboratory is an incredible association with the National Renewable Energy Lab, the Colorado School of Mines, Colorado State University, and the University of Colorado at Boulder.

Even though the ink is not yet dry on the formation of the collaboration, these four great research institutions have already launched a world-class research program. It is called the Colorado Center for Bioresearch and Biofuels.

Colorado's private sector is moving forward, too, on a variety of different fronts. First, with respect to wind, Colorado has added over 60 megawatts of wind generation in the last 4 years. But consider what is on the agenda for 2007. In 2007, my State of Colorado will add another 775 megawatts. That is more than tripling the State's production of wind generation. That is an equivalent of the generation we get from approximately two full-fledged powerplants.