huge bureaucracy that would have been created by that government-run health care system proposed by Senator CLINTON when she was the First Lady of the United States. I think it was back in 1993.

But this chart, produced by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, reflects all of the regulations and mandates of the Boxer climate tax and it indicates the complexity of what has been proposed here, and why I guess it shouldn't be surprising that the pricetag comes in at $6.7 trillion, and where the Federal Government, through a growth in the bureaucracy, an intrusion in the freedom and lives of the American people and small and large businesses alike, will be the one that will choose the winners and losers in this system, who gets the goodies and who does not; who gets permission to operate their powerplant and who does not. That is why the price of gasoline, that is why the price of electricity is expected to go through the roof as a result of this bill.

I agree with the Senator from Tennessee, Senator CORKER, who called this bill the ''mother of all earmarks.'' There has been a lot of discussion about earmarks here and lack of transparency in the way Congress spends money. Well, this bill, if it is passed and signed by the President of the United States, would empower the Congress to dole out earmarks with a complete lack of transparency, in a way that would allow massive Government intrusion in the free market system. That is why the Wall Street Journal dubbed this bill ''the biggest government reorganization of the economy since the 1930s.''

The National Association of Manufacturers has estimated the economic impact on my State, the State of Texas. We are fortunate now. While some parts of the country are suffering through a headwind when it comes to the economy, we are doing pretty well, relatively speaking. Unemployment is at 4.1 percent. A lot of new jobs have been created, a lot of opportunity. We have seen a lot of growth in the population because people are moving to where the jobs and the opportunities are. But under the Boxer climate tax bill that we have before us on the floor of the Senate, it is estimated that 334,000 of my constituents would lose their jobs.

Why would they lose their job? Because this bill would be like a wet blanket on the economy, raising electricity prices, raising gas prices on everything from agriculture to small businesses, and it is estimated that it would cost the average Texas household $8,000 in additional costs. Now, that is on top of the $1,400 that most Texas households are currently having to pay because of increased gas prices due to the obstruction of Congress in failing to allow development of American natural resources, an American solution to our energy crisis. It would be a $52 billion loss to the Texas economy. As you see here, it is estimated that electricity prices would go up 145 percent and gasoline prices 147 percent.

I am sorry the assistant majority leader refused to allow us to offer an amendment designed to lower gas prices, because I can't think of any more urgent, any more targeted relief we could offer the American people today than to provide some relief for the pain at the pump. I think that should be our highest priority as we go about the process of developing a clean energy future for this country, as we transition out of an oil-based economy into one for renewable forms of energy and increased nuclear capacity, and one that will improve the climate at the same time.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a quick question? I don't want to use the Senator's time.

Mr. CORNYN. I will yield.

Mr. INHOFE. I want it made clear today, as we go into the debate, that when we look back at the clean air amendments of the 1990s, we had something like 180 amendments considered at that time and we had it on the floor for 5 weeks. This goes much further than those amendments did, and yet they are cutting us off.

Let us make it very clear: The Republicans on this side of the aisle want to debate this bill, want to vote, we want recorded votes on amendments, and we want to vote on the bill itself.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma is absolutely correct. That is why 74 Senators—I believe 74—voted for the motion to proceed, so that we could get on the bill, so we could offer amendments, and we have a list of amendments we wish to offer. We wish to have debate on those amendments because we think the impact of this proposal would be dramatic on the American people and on the economy and would, in all likelihood, not accomplish the goal Senator BOXER professes to want to accomplish.

If in fact we impose this Draconian bureaucracy and this huge expense on the American people, and our competitors in China and India are not going to do it, we are going to put people out of work in Texas while people in China and India are going to continue to do what they are doing now and enjoying the prosperity caused by their access to the energy which they need to grow their economy. This bill would do nothing to impose the same restrictions on them, the same high prices on them that the Congress proposes to impose on the American people, including my constituents.

So rather than increasing gas prices by 147 percent, I would hope our friends on the other side of the aisle would reconsider and let us take up that most urgent issue in the minds of most of our constituents: How do we bring down the price of gas at the pump? I suggest the first thing we should do is take advantage of the natural resources God has given this great country of ours, which Congress has put out of bounds because of the moratorium on that development going back to, I believe, 1982.

Mr. President, I yield the floor

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WHITEHOUSE). The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, how much time do we have on our side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The first 30 minutes has expired. It is now the majority's time.

Mr. INHOFE. I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

REMEMBERING SENATOR CRAIG THOMAS

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, I wish to add my voice of love, respect, and a very deep feeling of comradeship with the good Senator from Wyoming who has died—Senator Thomas. My family has been associated with Wyoming for many years. In a sense, their Senators have been Senators whom we have related to. Senator Thomas, Senator ENZI, now a new Senator, these are people we feel very strongly about. I have particularly strong feelings about both—about Senator ENZI because of his willingness to come to a coal mine in West Virginia and actually write a bill that rewrote 30 years of our mine inspection laws, and Senator Thomas simply because as member of the Finance Committee he was always an even, steady voice—levelheaded. You could trust him. He was totally a man of his word, and I will miss him greatly.

PREWAR IRAQ INTELLIGENCE

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, I am pleased to report to the Senate that the Senate Intelligence Committee has completed its review of prewar intelligence related to Iraq. Today the committee filed with the Senate and released to the public the two final reports of what has been called phase 2 of the review. One of these reports examines the public statements of senior policymakers prior to the war and compares those statements to the intelligence that was available to those senior policymakers at the time they made those statements. The second report looks at the intelligence activities of individuals working for the Office of the Under Secretary of Defense Policy.

The first of these reports, report on public statements, has obviously been the most controversial aspect of the committee's work on prewar intelligence. That was inevitable. Much has been said and much has been written since the beginning of the war about how we got into it. In the end, the committee did conclude that the administration repeatedly presented intelligence as fact, when in reality it was unsubstantiated and often contradicted what they were saying, or even was nonexistent.

The committee's July 2004 report found that the prewar assessments on