

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment (No. 1709) was agreed to, as follows:

(Purpose: To designate the Grand Teton Discovery and Visitor Center as the “Craig Thomas Discovery and Visitor Center”)

Strike section 4 and insert the following:

**SEC. 4. CRAIG THOMAS DISCOVERY AND VISITOR CENTER.**

(a) **FINDINGS.**—Congress finds that—

(1) Craig Thomas was raised on a ranch just outside of Cody, Wyoming, near Yellowstone National Park and Grand Teton National Park, where he—

(A) began a lifelong association with those parks; and

(B) developed a deep and abiding dedication to the values of the public land of the United States;

(2) during his 18-year tenure in Congress, including service in both the Senate and the House of Representatives, Craig Thomas forged a distinguished legislative record on issues as diverse as public land management, agriculture, fiscal responsibility, and rural health care;

(3) as Chairman and Ranking Member of the National Parks Subcommittee of the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate and a frequent visitor to many units of the National Park System, including Yellowstone National Park and Grand Teton National Park, Craig Thomas was a strong proponent for ensuring that people of all ages and abilities had a wide range of opportunities to learn more about the natural and cultural heritage of the United States;

(4) Craig Thomas authored legislation to provide critical funding and management reforms to protect units of the National Park System into the 21st century, ensuring quality visits to units of the National Park System and the protection of natural and cultural resources;

(5) Craig Thomas strongly supported public-private partnerships and collaboration between the National Park Service and other organizations that foster new opportunities for providing visitor services while encouraging greater citizen involvement in the stewardship of units of the National Park System;

(6) Craig Thomas was instrumental in obtaining the Federal share for a public-private partnership with the Grand Teton National Park Foundation and the Grand Teton Natural History Association to construct a new discovery and visitor center at Grand Teton National Park;

(7) on June 4, 2007, Craig Thomas passed away after battling cancer for 7 months;

(8) Craig Thomas is survived by his wife, Susan, and children, Patrick, Greg, Peter, and Lexie; and

(9) in memory of the distinguished career of service of Craig Thomas to the people of the United States, the dedication of Craig Thomas to units of the National Park System, generally, and to Grand Teton National Park, specifically, and the critical role of Craig Thomas in the new discovery and visitor center at Grand Teton National Park, the Grand Teton Discovery and Visitor Center should be designated as the “Craig Thomas Discovery and Visitor Center”.

**(b) THE CRAIG THOMAS DISCOVERY AND VISITOR CENTER.—**

(1) **DESIGNATION.**—The Grand Teton Discovery and Visitor Center located in Moose, Wyoming, and scheduled for completion in August 2007 shall be known and designated as the “Craig Thomas Discovery and Visitor Center”.

(2) **REFERENCE.**—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the Grand

Teton Discovery and Visitor Center referred to in paragraph (1) shall be deemed to be a reference to the “Craig Thomas Discovery and Visitor Center”.

**SEC. 5. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**

There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary such sums as are necessary to carry out this Act.

The bill (S. 277), as amended, was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 277

*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 “Grand Teton National Park Extension Act of 2007”.

**SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.**

In this Act:

(1) **PARK.**—The term “Park” means the Grand Teton National Park.

(2) **SECRETARY.**—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Interior.

(3) **SUBDIVISION.**—The term “Subdivision” means the GT Park Subdivision, with an area of approximately 49.67 acres, as generally depicted on—

(A) the plat recorded in the Office of the Teton County Clerk and Recorder on December 16, 1997, numbered 918, entitled “Final Plat GT Park Subdivision”, and dated June 18, 1997; and

(B) the map entitled “2006 Proposed Grand Teton Boundary Adjustment”, numbered 136/80,198, and dated March 21, 2006, which shall be on file and available for inspection in appropriate offices of the National Park Service.

**SEC. 3. ACQUISITION OF LAND.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary may accept from any willing donor the donation of any land or interest in land of the Subdivision.

(b) **ADMINISTRATION.**—On acquisition of land or an interest in land under subsection (a), the Secretary shall—

(1) include the land or interest in the boundaries of the Park; and

(2) administer the land or interest as part of the Park, in accordance with all applicable laws (including regulations).

(c) **DEADLINE FOR ACQUISITION.**—It is the intent of Congress that the acquisition of land or an interest in land under subsection (a) be completed not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act.

(d) **RESTRICTION ON TRANSFER.**—The Secretary shall not donate, sell, exchange, or otherwise transfer any land acquired under this section without express authorization from Congress.

**SEC. 4. CRAIG THOMAS DISCOVERY AND VISITOR CENTER.**

(a) **FINDINGS.**—Congress finds that—

(1) Craig Thomas was raised on a ranch just outside of Cody, Wyoming, near Yellowstone National Park and Grand Teton National Park, where he—

(A) began a lifelong association with those parks; and

(B) developed a deep and abiding dedication to the values of the public land of the United States;

(2) during his 18-year tenure in Congress, including service in both the Senate and the House of Representatives, Craig Thomas forged a distinguished legislative record on issues as diverse as public land management, agriculture, fiscal responsibility, and rural health care;

(3) as Chairman and Ranking Member of the National Parks Subcommittee of the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources

of the Senate and a frequent visitor to many units of the National Park System, including Yellowstone National Park and Grand Teton National Park, Craig Thomas was a strong proponent for ensuring that people of all ages and abilities had a wide range of opportunities to learn more about the natural and cultural heritage of the United States;

(4) Craig Thomas authored legislation to provide critical funding and management reforms to protect units of the National Park System into the 21st century, ensuring quality visits to units of the National Park System and the protection of natural and cultural resources;

(5) Craig Thomas strongly supported public-private partnerships and collaboration between the National Park Service and other organizations that foster new opportunities for providing visitor services while encouraging greater citizen involvement in the stewardship of units of the National Park System;

(6) Craig Thomas was instrumental in obtaining the Federal share for a public-private partnership with the Grand Teton National Park Foundation and the Grand Teton Natural History Association to construct a new discovery and visitor center at Grand Teton National Park;

(7) on June 4, 2007, Craig Thomas passed away after battling cancer for 7 months;

(8) Craig Thomas is survived by his wife, Susan, and children, Patrick, Greg, Peter, and Lexie; and

(9) in memory of the distinguished career of service of Craig Thomas to the people of the United States, the dedication of Craig Thomas to units of the National Park System, generally, and to Grand Teton National Park, specifically, and the critical role of Craig Thomas in the new discovery and visitor center at Grand Teton National Park, the Grand Teton Discovery and Visitor Center should be designated as the “Craig Thomas Discovery and Visitor Center”.

**(b) THE CRAIG THOMAS DISCOVERY AND VISITOR CENTER.—**

(1) **DESIGNATION.**—The Grand Teton Discovery and Visitor Center located in Moose, Wyoming, and scheduled for completion in August 2007 shall be known and designated as the “Craig Thomas Discovery and Visitor Center”.

(2) **REFERENCE.**—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the Grand Teton Discovery and Visitor Center referred to in paragraph (1) shall be deemed to be a reference to the “Craig Thomas Discovery and Visitor Center”.

**SEC. 5. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**

There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary such sums as are necessary to carry out this Act.

Mr. ENZI. I yield the floor.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Wyoming for bringing forward this bill on behalf of Senator Thomas, who was such a force in this Chamber and especially a force on behalf of his State. It is a very appropriate thing to do.

**CREATING LONG-TERM ENERGY ALTERNATIVES FOR THE NATION ACT OF 2007—Continued**

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER.** Under the previous order, the Senator from New Hampshire is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I rise to talk about an amendment I wish to offer—I will offer it later—relative to

the tax package that was just introduced relative to this Energy bill.

Today, for those of us who live on the east coast, we would like to be able to buy ethanol at a reasonable price. In fact, we would like to be able to buy ethanol at all. The problem is, for ethanol to be shipped to the east coast, it has to go through pipelines. Transportation by truck or tank car is not viable, and thus ethanol, because of its components, cannot be shipped and is not stable in going through pipelines. So the east coast really does not have too many options for purchasing ethanol.

One option is to buy it from the Caribbean countries that produce it or from Brazil. Unfortunately, there is a tariff in place on Brazilian ethanol which amounts to 54 cents a gallon. That is a tariff which those of us on the east coast are subjected to and the effect of which is the price of ethanol is arbitrarily overstated.

This tariff was put in place quite a while ago and was put in during a period when the production of ethanol was not commercially viable because the cost of oil was still very low and when corn production was not oriented toward ethanol production. So this tariff was put in purely as a protective tariff for the purpose of allowing the corn industry in the Midwest to be successful in developing ethanol—at least that is the representation.

However, that position no longer has viability. The simple fact is that the corn industry in the Midwest is doing extraordinarily well because not only is it still a major feedstock for most of the traditional animal use to which it is applied, but it is also being used aggressively for the production of ethanol. In fact, we are looking at about 7 billion gallons of ethanol being produced this year.

Under this bill, for the purpose of gasoline replacement, it will be required that we have 36 billion gallons produced by the year 2022. So we are putting in place mandates which will absolutely require an expansion in the use of ethanol of dramatic proportions, which we should, and which will therefore raise the ship of the production of ethanol by the use of corn in the Midwest or sugar beets in the Northern Plains States as a form of producing ethanol. Therefore, they should not be concerned about the threat or the potential threat or the alleged threat of having ethanol come into this country from other producers in the Western Hemisphere, such as Brazil, because that is not going to affect their price and it is not going to affect their production capability.

Secondly, we still have in place in this bill and under the agricultural bills which we passed in the Senate a \$3 billion annual subsidy for corn production—a \$3 billion annual subsidy. The irony is we are subsidizing a product which is now extraordinarily productive and which has great viability—corn production—and, in fact, the cost

of which has gone up so much that we are hearing complaints from many of the various farm communities, such as cattle producers who need corn, because the price has gone up so much as a result of the demand for corn. But at the same time, we are making it virtually impossible, because of the protective attitude of the Midwest on the issue of corn production for ethanol, to bring into the Northeast and into the Eastern States ethanol at a viable price and at a competitive price.

Our goal basically as an economy should be to get ourselves off oil, to move away from oil, and to move to ethanol production, which is the most efficient and cost competitive.

So the Northeast and the Eastern States should be allowed to purchase ethanol from Brazil without this arbitrary tariff that was put in place many years ago and continues.

In addition, if you just want to look at it on the basis of purchasing an overseas product—and some will argue this is just going to underwrite the foreign production of an energy source, ethanol, in Brazil—you can make that argument, but as a practical matter, if you make that argument, you have to ask yourself, would you rather buy ethanol from Brazil or oil from Venezuela because essentially the choice is just about that stark. You can buy your ethanol from Brazil or you can buy Venezuelan oil.

By making Brazilian ethanol more competitive and taking off this arbitrary 54-cents-a-gallon increase, which people from the East have to pay, you will actually make ethanol a more viable product in the East and thus reduce our reliance, for example, on Venezuelan oil or, for that matter, Middle Eastern oil. I personally would rather be buying ethanol from a country such as Brazil than buying oil from the Middle East or from Venezuela.

So the arguments for eliminating this tariff are myriad. They are that we should be purchasing ethanol at the most competitive price, that the Northeast and the East cannot purchase Midwestern ethanol anyway at a competitive value because it cannot be shipped by pipeline because it is so combustible.

The original concept of protecting corn producers in the Midwest no longer has viability in light of the fact that we have mandated an ethanol usage in this country that is going to absorb just about every ounce of corn produced, and we see corn prices are already at extraordinarily high price and that has put a lot of pressure as a feedstock commodity on various other industries, such as cattle production; and that it makes no sense in light of the \$3 billion subsidy which we already have in place for corn to require people in the Northeast—who are paying that subsidy, by the way, through their taxes—to also have to pay an inflated price for ethanol which is produced in Brazil. If we are going to choose to use overseas sources of energy, which we

are going to have to on the east coast, at least for the foreseeable future, why wouldn't we choose ethanol produced in Brazil over oil produced in the Middle East or Venezuela?

In addition, there is another argument, which is that if the Midwest is so concerned about having this tariff in place, they seem to be cutting off their nose to spite their face because the practical matter is that the more ethanol that is used on the east coast where the population of this country is concentrated to a large degree, the more the east coast will become dependent on ethanol, and when we get over this hurdle of moving ethanol through pipelines or other ways of moving it from the Midwest to suppliers and producers, we will see there is a demand that has been created, and at that point we will have a competitive commodity, one presumes, with the Brazilian ethanol.

There is no logic to continuing this arbitrary tax on people from the Northeast and the East relative to the price on ethanol, a 54-cent-per-gallon tax. It should be repealed, and therefore I will be offering an amendment to repeal this tariff.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from Alaska is recognized for 5 minutes.

THIRTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF THE TRANS-ALASKA OIL PIPELINE

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I rise this evening to acknowledge the 30th anniversary of the first drop of oil passing through the Trans-Alaska Oil Pipeline. This is truly an engineering marvel which is a central component of the transportation of oil from the largest single domestic source in America's history—Prudhoe Bay—to the rest of the United States, where it powers industry and provides jobs to this day.

Alaska has been called a lot of different things, some not too complimentary, unfortunately. You may remember the term "Seward's folly." This was after the United States approved the purchase of Alaska from Russia in 1867 which got the State of Alaska, the territory, for \$7.2 million. "Seward's folly" was a reference to Secretary of State William Seward, who was an advocate for the purchase.

Alaskans themselves dubbed it "Seward's icebox," reflecting the sentiment Americans had toward our supposedly barren, dark, ice-covered land. But we soon recognized there was far more than just dark, barren, empty land. It was not an icebox but instead a lush, resource-rich, and stunningly beautiful land.

Gold was discovered in the 1890s, and black gold, or oil, was discovered about 75 years later. While oil is often viewed in a negative context these days, the fact remains that this black gold has enabled America to grow into the economic power it is today.

Alaskan oil, quite honestly, could not have been found in a more inconvenient place. Prudhoe Bay, which is

the location of the massive 1968 discovery, contained oil in ground that was permanently frozen up to 1,000 feet deep in the northernmost section of the State with three mountain ranges between it and the nearest ice-free port.

Seven oil companies got together to discuss how they might move the oil to the lower 48 States. There were several options that were proposed at the time. One of them was a water route that would use large ice-breaking tankers—essentially plowing through the ice—to get the oil down to the lower 48 market. A second option was a water route using submarines. A combined land and water system with a Trans-Alaska Pipeline and shipments from a southern Alaskan port was the third option and the option that was considered to be most feasible for several different reasons from the technical, the economic, and the legal issues that surrounded it.

The third option, this Trans-Alaska Pipeline, raised so many concerns and so many problems that for many it seemed an impossible task. The southern two-thirds of the proposed route was the most seismically active area in North America. This was the location of the very famous 1964 earthquake centered out of Valdez. The southern portion also contains a very high avalanche threat. Permafrost, which is the permanently frozen ground, runs about half the length of that pipeline route. You will find permafrost in that area. These all presented an unprecedented engineering challenge. The pipe would have to span a distance greater than the distance between Oregon and Mexico or, to put it in perspective as to where we are here, it would be the equivalent distance of going from this Capitol in Washington, DC, all the way south to Orlando, FL. That is the distance our Trans-Alaska Pipeline covers today.

Also, keep in mind we are not only talking about an incredibly long 800-mile pipe, but it is a stretch of land that includes thousands of rivers, three mountain ranges, and we have air temperatures ranging from minus 80 degrees below in the wintertime to a positive 95 degrees in the summer. So the challenges that faced the Nation as they looked to this engineering feat were quite incredible.

There were also political obstacles that were pretty steep. Environmental concerns, which, quite honestly, mirror the modern-day debate over oil development in the Coastal Plain of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, resulted in a 50-50 Senate tie on the vote for the pipeline's approval. Vice President Spiro Agnew cast the tie-breaking affirmative vote in this Chamber about 34 years ago.

It took 38 months, billions of the final \$8 billion pricetag, and 1,347 State and Federal permits later for the construction to begin on one of the most ambitious engineering endeavors in the history of the world. During construction, thousands of would-be job seekers

flocked to Alaska, and those workers battled the cold in the winter that caused the equipment to freeze up, and in the summer they battled sunken bogs when digging the concrete supports that allow the pipeline to shift in order to deal with the temperature changes and the seismic activity. They solved problems such as installing the pipe in both Atigun Pass and Thompson Pass, incredibly steep terrain just outside the southern terminus in Valdez. The terrain is so steep there that workers had to be tethered to the peaks by cables to keep them from falling down the slopes.

Mr. President, I think I have probably used my 5 minutes. I ask unanimous consent for an additional 2 minutes.

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

Ms. MURKOWSKI. I thank the Chair.

Along the way, those working on this pipeline made major engineering advances, learning how to insulate the pipe and how to keep the permafrost ground frozen so that the pipe didn't sink out of site. When the project was completed in 1977, 3 years after construction started, we had a new domestic supply of oil made available to the United States—the single largest domestic source it has ever had.

On average, the Trans-Alaska Pipeline—we call it TAPS—now sees just over 800,000 barrels of oil pass through it each day. This is 231,000 barrels per hour and 22,000 gallons per minute. So, in other words, in the time I have been standing to address you, Mr. President, it has transported about 100,000 gallons of crude.

At peak production, TAPS provided the United States with about 2 million barrels of oil a day, or 30 percent more than Saudi Arabia does today, and nearly as much oil as the entire Persian Gulf provides our country today. And Alaskan oil, unlike Middle Eastern oil, does not come from unstable regimes, does not hinder our foreign policy options by bonding us and our allies to such regimes, and is not at risk of being cut off due to instability. We have been a stable domestic supplier of the oil needs of the United States for over 30 years.

The pipeline has turned out to be a much better deal than originally anticipated. The dire predictions of environmental disaster have been proven false. There have been minor spills, we acknowledge, but the environment and the wildlife have been unaffected by the Trans-Alaska Pipeline. Our caribou numbers have actually grown along the pipeline area, with estimates of up to sixfold in terms of the herd. Moose and bear have not been affected, and little oil has been added to the environment. All land spills have been completely cleaned up.

Additionally, while Prudhoe Bay was originally forecast to contain 9 billion barrels of recoverable oil, we will actually recover twice that much, about 18 billion barrels, by the time that field is depleted.

We recognize the days of abundant Prudhoe Bay oil are dwindling. We have produced about 15 billion barrels of oil, leaving only about 3 billion barrels remaining to recover. Output has fallen by more than 7 percent a year recently. According to the Energy Information Administration, Prudhoe Bay production will be down to 270,000 barrels per day by 2030, a level so low that the pipeline likely will not be able to function in winter's cold and may become inoperable. That could "shut-in" billions of barrels of future heavy oil deposits in the Greater Prudhoe Bay area and perhaps hamper oil recoveries from elsewhere in northern Alaska and the OCS off the State's coast.

In the meantime, U.S. oil imports have grown to account for 58 percent of our current net oil consumption. Twenty years from now, that number is forecasted to climb to 68 percent.

So I ask my colleagues and the American people, as we remember today what Alaska and the Trans-Alaska Pipeline system has given to our country, to consider also what Alaska could provide for America's future. The decision truly lies in the hands of Congress.

Mr. President, I appreciate the time, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of turn.

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

#### EMPLOYEE FREE CHOICE ACT

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, historians who take a clear-eyed look at the last 30 years will tell you, and in particular economists will tell you, productivity has been rising, our economy has been expanding, and the workers responsible for our Nation's prosperity have not reaped anywhere near their share of the benefits which they have earned.

In 2005, the real median household income in America was down almost 3 percent from the median income in 2000. That is understanding that productivity has sharply increased among American workers. In Ohio, median income was down almost 10 percent. Meanwhile, the average CEO makes 411 times more than the average worker. As recently as 1990, the average CEO made 107 times more; so from 107 times more than the average worker in 1990 to now, 411 times more than the average worker.

Let me explain it another way. In the Agriculture Committee a couple of months ago, a young woman in her mid-thirties, with a 9-year-old son, came and testified about food stamps. The average food stamp beneficiary in our country gets about \$1 per meal per person. She and her son got about \$6 a day for food stamps. She works full time at a \$9-an-hour job. She has no health care benefits. She gets a food stamp benefit. She is president of the local PTA at her son's school. She volunteers to teach Sunday school. And

she is active in the Cub Scouts for her son. She works, as I said, full time, making \$9 an hour, and gets a small food stamp benefit.

She says at the beginning of the month she serves her son porkchops a couple of times, and as the month goes on she takes him to a fast food restaurant once or twice, but by the last couple of days of the month she sits at the kitchen table with her son and doesn't eat. Her son asks her what is wrong, and she says she's just not feeling well. She simply runs out of money at the end of the month. This is somebody playing by the rules.

Later in the day, on the Banking Committee, a committee on which I sit with the Presiding Officer from New Jersey, Secretary Paulson was testifying, the Secretary of the Treasury, and I told him the story of this lady from Middletown, OH.

He said: Senator, you have to understand we have had 2½, 3 percent economic growth in the last year. Things in our country are going well.

Yes, things are going well in terms of profits for corporations. Things are going well in terms of top executives. But too often they really aren't. Just look at this chart from 1946 to 1973. Economic opportunities for poor and working families grew. The incomes of the country's workers are divided. The lowest 20 percent, second lowest, middle, and then the top 20, top 40 percent, and the top 20 percent here. Families who worked hard and played by the rules had a real chance of getting ahead. You can see those from 1947 to 1973, the lowest 20 percent of our wage earners had the highest growth in income; those who made the most had the lowest. So we are seeing all boats rise—boats rising a little faster for those in the lowest incomes.

Beginning in about 1973 and through to 2000, workers at the bottom and in the middle began to share less and less of the wealth they created. Even though their productivity was going up, their wealth didn't, their wages didn't. Economic growth flattened out for those same families. You can see there is still economic growth at the lowest 20, 40, 60 percent, but the fastest growth in incomes was in the top 20 percent. That was in 2000.

As the economic pie got bigger, the slice for most Americans got smaller. Here you can see the most devastating news of all in the last 4, 5, 6 years. The only people who had economic growth in this country were the top 1 percent. These are the five quintiles. The top 1 percent are the only ones who had economic growth, and those at the bottom fell the furthest and further behind.

Historians will also say that in 2006 the middle class spoke up and sent a message to Congress demanding change. This Congress raised the minimum wage for the first time in a decade. This Congress is fighting for fair trade like never before. And I speak today, Mr. President, in support of the Employee Free Choice Act, which goes

to the heart of the plight of working families to reap the benefits of the productivity they created, to provide a home and health care and pensions for themselves and a college education for their kids.

The Employee Free Choice Act is a historic step for working families. It would give workers the right to organize so they can fight for fair wages and decent benefits. The efforts of labor organizers more than 100 years ago finally led to the progress made seven decades ago with the signing of the Wagner Act. The rights that became law then ensured fair pay and decent working conditions.

But more and more employers chose to flout the law by intimidating workers and suppressing union activities. All across Ohio, I talk with workers who have tried to form a union and who share with me the tactics taken by some employers—not all but some employers—to prevent workers from organizing.

I talked with Bill Lawthorn from Macomb, OH. Bill and his coworkers wanted a union so workers would be treated with the respect and dignity all laborers deserve. They hoped with the union they would get fair and decent wages, a decent retirement plan, and decent health care benefits. According to Bill, the company responded with threats, with intimidation, and harassment.

Bill said the company threatened to fire him even if the campaign for the union failed. The union lost the election, and the day after, Bill, in fact, was fired. Since then, various labor boards have held the company's actions were illegal. Bill has not been reinstated, though, or seen 1 cent of backpay, even though his firing was illegal. That is why we need the Employee Free Choice Act.

Despite the struggle, despite doing odd jobs to pay the bills and relying on friends, family, and neighbors, Bill says, if he had the chance to do it all over again, he would do everything exactly the same because he knew he was right. It was the right thing to do, he said, and the Employee Free Choice Act is the right thing to do.

In 2005 alone, 31,000 employees were awarded backpay by a very conservative pro-business National Labor Relations Board due to retaliatory firings and unfair labor practices. I repeat, 31,000 employees were given backpay because, according to the National Labor Relations Board, they were fired illegally and unfairly.

Many companies decide to fire union supporters. Even if employees later successfully prove their case, the penalties all too often are an insufficient deterrent. These practices must end. The Employee Free Choice Act is the first step.

For the first time in our history, our sons and daughters do not have the opportunities their moms and dads had. A son, in 1994, earned 5 percent higher wages than his dad did in 1964. You can

see how wages went up in that generation. But in 2004, a son's wages were down 12 percent from what his father made in 1974. You can see, too many kids are pessimistic about their futures.

We cannot continue this course. Unions are an agent for change. History will show that this Congress responded to the ever-increasing gap between the haves and have-nots. Fair trade, fair wages and benefits, the right to join a union—all three are basic to a society where work is rewarded and worker intimidation is not tolerated. Majority Leader REID is committed to moving forward on fair trade issues, on fair wages and fair benefits issues, as we already have, and equally importantly, the right to join a union.

The Employee Free Choice Act is a major step for working families. I urge my colleagues to support it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I first would like to express my appreciation to the distinguished Senator from Ohio for his advocacy for better trade policy for our country. I also appreciate his graphic illustration of what is happening in our country now, when sons are making less than their fathers.

It is difficult to comprehend, but that is the position in which we find ourselves, so we need a better trade policy, and we certainly need to pass the card check and Employees Free Choice Act.

I appreciate the statement of the Senator from Ohio and his constant advocacy for a better trade policy.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, today I voted in support of the NOPEC amendment to H.R. 6, which was offered by my colleague, Senator HERBERT KOHL. The amendment seeks to prevent OPEC nations from continuing to conspire to limit the supply of oil and to drive up America's already exorbitant energy costs. While I recognize that this is not a perfect piece of legislation, and that it may require the addition of certain clarifying provisions to ascertain its applicability in particular circumstances, I believe that it is a fine first step toward finally holding OPEC accountable for its actions. The time is long overdue for America's working families to send OPEC the message that West Virginians in particular will no longer be content to sit quietly by the side of the road, watching OPEC drive our gas and home heating prices to ever higher levels. This amendment is meant to send a signal—a signal to OPEC nations that the American people are not going to take it anymore. We will no longer be held hostage to OPEC's self-serving energy policies, which line their pockets, at the expense of our pocketbooks.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I will be very brief, but I do want to say that I have been in the Senate now for a number of years, with Republican leaders and Democratic leaders, Democratic majorities and Republican majorities,

and never have we had a situation like we have had this past 6 months. We have to move to cloture on virtually everything—everything. I am going to file, now, tonight, four cloture motions. Never have we had to do this before.

It is common practice, and has been for all the time we have been a Senate, that, because you are dealing with the House, you are offering a substitute amendment that takes place with the Senate bill. Without going into a lot of detail, we rarely in the past had to file cloture on not only the substitute but also the underlying bill. We have to do it on virtually everything. We have never had to file cloture on every motion to proceed. That is what we are having to do now. It is a tremendous waste of the time of the Senate and of the country, but that is what we have to do. That is what I am going to do tonight.

It is going to become apparent, and is to some people, and some writing is taking place on it now, that we had to file so many cloture motions. It is because we have on almost every occasion had to file cloture on everything. It is a struggle to get legislation here to the floor. The minority's goal, the Republicans' No. 1 goal, I guess, at this time is to see that we don't get anything done. But in spite of that, we have been able to get a lot done. It has been difficult. It has been slogging. It has been slow.

We have a list of things we have been able to accomplish, with which I think the country should be very happy—minimum wage; we have been able to get disaster relief for farmers for the first time in 3 years; we passed a balanced budget amendment; we funded the Government with a continuing resolution. We have been able to do a number of things. There is no need to run through the entire list tonight other than to say it is too bad it has been so difficult to get those things done. We are very close to being able to finish the conference on the lobbying ethics reform; 9/11—I spoke to Senator LIEBERMAN earlier this evening, that is basically all done.

We have a difficult schedule. Why? Because of having to jump through every procedural hoop. It would be different if we were doing it because of people who didn't like immigration. I understand that. But we are doing it on everything we bring through the Senate.

#### CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. REID. I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BROWN). The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

#### CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the Bau-

cus tax amendment No. 1704 to H.R. 6, the Energy bill.

Max Baucus, Jay Rockefeller, Kent Conrad, Jeff Bingaman, John Kerry, Blanche L. Lincoln, Charles Schumer, Amy Klobuchar, Byron L. Dorgan, Ron Wyden, Maria Cantwell, Ken Salazar, Daniel K. Akaka, Daniel K. Inouye, Sheldon Whitehouse, Sherrod Brown, Harry Reid.

#### CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. REID. I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

#### CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the Reid substitute amendment No. 1502 to Calendar No. 9, H.R. 6, the Energy bill.

Jeff Bingaman, Barbara Boxer, Patty Murray, John Kerry, Robert Menendez, Kent Conrad, Pat Leahy, Russell Feingold, Jack Reed, Christopher Dodd, Ken Salazar, Joe Biden, Frank R. Lautenberg, Daniel K. Inouye, Dianne Feinstein, Jay Rockefeller, Byron L. Dorgan.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on the first cloture motion I filed, the mandatory quorum required under rule XXII be waived.

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

Mr. REID. Mr. President, on the one I just filed, I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum call required under rule XXII be waived.

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

#### CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. REID. I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

#### CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on Calendar No. 9, H.R. 6, Comprehensive Energy legislation.

Jeff Bingaman, Barbara Boxer, Patty Murray, John Kerry, Robert Menendez, Kent Conrad, Pat Leahy, Russell Feingold, Jack Reed, Christopher Dodd, Ken Salazar, Joe Biden, Frank R. Lautenberg, Daniel K. Inouye, Dianne Feinstein, Jay Rockefeller, Byron L. Dorgan.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum call required under rule XXII be waived.

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

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I was going to ask, on a number of these matters, unanimous consent that we move forward on them. I am not going to do that tonight. I only appeal to my friends, the Republicans, that they take a look at this and find out if it is absolutely necessary that we have these cloture votes. If we follow

through on all these, we will have to work both this weekend and part of the next weekend. I hope we do not have to do that. If it were productive time, it would be one thing, but it is basically a waste of time.

#### FREE CHOICE ACT OF 2007—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. President, as I indicated, I was going to ask consent that the Senate proceed to consideration of Calendar No. 66, H.R. 800, the Free Choice Act of 2007, at a time to be determined by the majority leader following consultation with the Republican leader, but I am not going to do that.

#### CLOTURE MOTION

I now move to proceed to Calendar No. 66, S. 800, and send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

#### CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 66, H.R. 800, the Free Choice Act of 2007.

Harry Reid, Ted Kennedy, Patty Murray, Bernard Sanders, Charles Schumer, Russell D. Feingold, Jack Reed, Barack Obama, Christopher Dodd, B.A. Mikulski, Pat Leahy, John Kerry, Robert Menendez, Claire McCaskill, Debbie Stabenow, Frank R. Lautenberg, Joe Biden, H.R. Clinton.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum required under rule XXII be waived.

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

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I now withdraw the motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is withdrawn.

The Senator from New Jersey is recognized.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, am I next in the order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Parliamentarian shows the Senator from New Jersey is to be recognized for up to 10 minutes and then the senior Senator from New York for up to 10 minutes.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I rise in strong support of the Employee Free Choice Act, of which I am proud to be an original cosponsor. This bill will level the playing field for workers seeking a voice at work and ensure they have the freedom to choose to join a union without coercion. I applaud Senator KENNEDY for his passion to move this bill forward and his relentless fight to improve and uphold the rights of workers.

Some may ask why this change is needed. They may think that in 2007, in this great democratic Nation, the right of an employee to seek representation in their workplace is alive and well. It should be. But the fact is, under current law, there are loopholes that have