but the timing is uncertain. Most of the authorities believe that it will be within the next decade: Oil peaking presents a unique challenge. And then I emphasize here, The world, he says, has never faced a problem like this. And the first chart, it said, unprecedented challenges they have experienced challenges like this. Without massive mitigation, more than a decade before the fact, the problem will be pervasive and will not be temporary.

Previous energy transitions, wood to coal to oil, as we just looked at, were gradual and evolutionary. Oil peaking will be abrupt and revolutionary, he says.

In our closing moments, I would like to just say this is the things that they were doing. What they have done is to simplify this bell curve to make it a little triangle because they want to use that to depict the solutions that they are suggesting are possible. On the bottom here is an interesting one, and we see that oil spike hikes have not made any difference in the amount of oil that is available.

This is the production of oil, and this is price spike hike. If making more profiles for oil will stimulate production, then one would have thought we would see a big production peak follow this. Notice we do not really see any big production peak following that.

Now they have simplified this bell curve, and the next chart shows the reason why. This is just a little schematic, and they have a number of alternatives that they could use to fill the gap. The gap is going up like this, and then it is going to fall off, and we would like it to keep on going up so we could keep using more and more, and these are things we would fill the gap with.

The next chart shows what happens if we wait until it happens. Then we have a major, major economic problem because it takes quite a while to get these things going. If we anticipate it by 10 years, we have less of a problem but still a problem. To not have a meaningful problem, we must anticipate it by 20 years. Clearly, we have probably passed that point. By most people’s reckoning, we have passed that point.

The next chart is a little schematic that shows how it looks very well. This, again, is a 2-percent curve. This is a schematic curve, and what it shows is a 2-percent increase in the rate at which we are using it, which has been the rate at which we are producing it. That will slow as we reach peak oil. And notice that the gap starts to occur before we reach peak oil.

I would submit, Mr. Speaker, that what we do not want to do is to try to meet the challenge of filling that gap because, if we do, we only have a really sharp rate on the other side. What we really need to do is to depress our use with conservation efficiency so that we have something to invest in the alternatives that we must invest in. With oil at $60 a barrel, obviously there is not as much as we would like to have or it would be cheaper.

I would like to close by putting up again this chart which I think is so significant. This is kind of a global long-term problem. This is where we are, about halfway through the age of oil. Now, we have been as a world and as a country, as a society, rather grossly irresponsible up to this time.

Mr. Speaker, whether we like it or not, oil will peak. We will start down the other side. We will shift to the alternatives. That will be a much less traumatic transition if we plan for it. And my urging tonight is that we need in our country to address this problem with the kind of an overall commitment we had when we fought World War II, and I lived through that, with the kind of a technical commitment we had to putting a man on the moon and the Manhattan Project. Mr. Speaker, I think that if we have a national, an international program that has those elements in it, that we probably can have a relatively smooth landing. Minus that, we may have what they call a hard landing not just for us but for all of the world.

Mr. Speaker, the great ingenuity of the American people cannot be harnessed, and I hope that we can challenge them so that we will meet this challenge and have a relatively smooth transition.

THE 30-SOMETHING WORKING GROUP

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POE). Under the Speaker’s announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MEKK) is recognized for half the remaining time until midnight, approximately 48 minutes.

Mr. MEKK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to address the House once again. I would like to thank not only the Democratic leader but the Democratic leadership for allowing the 30-Something Working Group to come to the floor again not only to address the Members but also interested parties in how our country conducts its business and how we operate this government that the American taxpayers have allowed us to oversee.

There is a lot going on, Mr. Speaker. I must add a lot of it is quite discouraging when we start looking at how we are conducting business here in Washington, D.C. But I think it is very important and very appropriate for not only Mr. DELAHUNT but Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ and also Mr. RYAN of Ohio to come to the floor to share with the American people things that the Democratic side of the aisle are working on to improve their lives. I can tell the Members try day in and day out, not only in the committees but here on the floor working on behalf of Americans, protecting Ameri-
Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I totally agree. I think we are talking about some basic principles here of which the government that currently rules is not reflective of what is going on in Ohio, in Florida, in the Gulf States, in Massachusetts. We are clearly not addressing issues.

I know my friend from Massachusetts has some comments to make, so I am going to kick it over to him. But I think as we make our presentation tonight, this is not personal with the Republicans, because I think we have all agreed, we have got some good friends on the other side of the aisle. We are just disagreeing with their philosophy of governing.

When you see here tonight, with some great charts that Tom Manatos from our staff has put together for us, the kind of spending that our country is doing in Iraq and the kind of cuts that we have here in the United States, when you see the tax cuts, the amount of money and the cuts that are in the budget in specific programs that are geared towards the middle class, Medicare, Medicaid, and the level of sacrifice that average people are being asked to make here, it is unbelievable.

When you talk about Delphi going bankrupt; Ford came out last week, they are going to cut 30,000 jobs and close 10 plants. The economy may be growing, but average middle Americans are not seeing it in their paychecks, and they are seeing tremendous increases in their energy costs and gas and heating oil and the like. I know you have been very instrumental in a variety of ways in Massachusetts to help with that.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Speaker, I think the point that our colleague Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ was making about arithmetic and the fact that, despite the rhetoric, the reality is that the deficit will increase as a result of the actions that this Republican majority will take during the course of this week in concert with the Republican Senate in terms of spending cuts and tax cuts, these so-called reconciliation bills.

I think it is important to note a very disturbing statistic that was referred to in a Wall Street Journal article, and that is that the Federal Government’s budget deficit in December, in December 2005, the month just concluded, was in excess of $600 billion for a single month. That is an increase of some 43 percent from a year earlier, that is from November of 2004, and a record high for any November in American history.

So the direction that this country is headed with the economic policies that are debated and voted on, again recognizing that there is a Republican majority, I would submit are heading our country into some 43 percent from a year earlier, that is from November of 2004, and a record high for any November in American history.

So the direction that this country is headed with the economic policies that are debated and voted on, again recognizing that there is a Republican majority, I would submit are heading our country into

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Well, Mr. DELAHUNT, I must add to just say this, that we are compassionate to the oil companies. We are giving them money when they are making record-breaking profits. So when oil companies say, well, Congress, when we get an<ref>2230</ref> and simply think of that figure, $83 billion.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Just to clarify that, we are running an $83 billion deficit just for one month, just for the month of November, which means we do not have the money; we are not taking in the money to pay out the bills, and we have got to go and borrow the money. And this $83 billion in the gentleman from Massachusetts was talking about, we are borrowing it from China. We are borrowing it from Saudi Arabia. We are borrowing it from Japan, and we have to pay interest on it.

So we are running up a tab here for the next generation that is not fair. And we are doing things to the next generation, our generation, our generation, that we are going to eventually have to pay the bill.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, there was a time and a place that we could say future generations, but we are talking about right now. We are talking about cutting free and reduced lunches for children. We are talking about cutting money out of the veteran affairs. The Republican majority in this budget is instructing through legislation the Veteran Affairs Committee to cut over $650 million out of veteran affairs.

I do not understand. We can talk about future generations as it relates to the budget and the $27,000-plus that they already owe at birth, but let us talk about what is happening right now. The lines are going to get longer for veterans. Under Medicaid, children will not get eye examinations because of this cut.

I could see it if we were to say, Mr. Speaker, we did not have the money for this. But we are giving the money to millionaires. We are giving the money to billionaires.

Mr. DELAHUNT. We are also giving money to the Iraqi people and denying it to American people.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Well, Mr. DELAHUNT, I must add to just say this, that we are compassionate to the oil companies. We are giving them money when they are making record-breaking profits. So when oil companies say, well, Congress, when we get an<ref>2230</ref>
troops’ families first. We want to put our veterans first. We want to put a child that did nothing but was born as an American child first. That is what we want to do. We want to do away with the culture of corruption and cronyism and incompetence. What is wrong with that?

So, Mr. DELAHUNT and Mr. RYAN and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, when we talk about future generations, we have to talk about now in the present. We are not talking about Republican families will suffer from this. They will suffer just as bad as independents and Democratic families.

So I think it is important that we should be alarmed, that Americans should be alarmed. These are the very same individuals, I am sorry, I have to pull my chart out; Mr. DELAHUNT, you can’t say this enough, these are the folks that are saying, Trust us, we know how to operate the government.

Then you have a President that could not do one thing by himself, $1.01 trillion. In 4 years, that has trumped 42 presidents. In 224 years of presidencies, of all the crises we have had, this President seems to have done it in 4 years.

You would think that cities would be a shining example of the Federal government mitigating after all of this money has been borrowed from foreign nations. No, cities are putting levies and millage and going out to the taxpayers asking for more money, a penny here, a penny there. Meanwhile, back at the ranch, people are getting tax cuts, millionaires are getting tax cuts on the backs of the very people that we are trying to provide a government for.

So, Mr. DELAHUNT and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ and Mr. RYAN, if we can’t do it by himself with a Republican majority who made this country more dependent on foreign countries like China, Saudi Arabia, Japan, borrowing $1.05 trillion, I cannot say that enough. In 4 years, that has trumped 42 presidents. In 224 years of presidencies, of all the crises we have had, this President seems to have done it in 4 years.

You would think that cities would be a shining example of the Federal government mitigating after all of this money has been borrowed from foreign nations. No, cities are putting levies and millage and going out to the taxpayers asking for more money, a penny here, a penny there. Meanwhile, back at the ranch, people are getting tax cuts, millionaires are getting tax cuts on the backs of the very people that we are trying to provide a government for.

So, Mr. DELAHUNT and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, it keeps going: $157.8 billion; a $377.6 billion deficit the year after that. We are getting a little better; we go back to $319 billion. Now we are at $323 billion. So the track record here is that there was one dip in the whole time that this President has been in office, and now we are climbing back again.

Yet, supposedly, we just passed the Deficit Reduction Act. If you are going to zero in on the incompetence, talk about the fact that the 9/11 Commission just came out with a report grading this administration and this Congress an F on the necessary follow-up to their recommendations. There is still no unified list of terror suspects for use by air travel screeners. There has been a misallocation of funds in terms of Homeland Security money. You have big city police and firefighters, between agencies, city to county and station to station, could not talk to each other because their communications systems do not line up. They could not talk to the FBI. That has not been fixed. It is just unbelievable. They are still cutting. They are still cutting. They are still cutting the budget, and they are cutting taxes. They are giving more money to wealthy people, not just your run-of-the-mill average wealthy person, but the top two-tenths of 1 percent of the wealthiest people in America, people who make more than $1 million annually.

So, Mr. DELAHUNT, you talk about an economic tsunami. The policies that have been going on in this administration and in this Congress, it is not just an economic tsunami. What the American people have been hit with is Hurricane Republican. You really cannot describe it any other way, because they have been hit by an economic tsunami they have been hit by Rita, they have been hit by Wilma. And instead of fixing it, instead of addressing the problems that the American people need addressed, they have now been hit by Hurricane Republican.
leave until we pass this tax cut for millionaires and billionaires and special interests. We are not going to leave until they get what they want or what we want them to have.

Instead of them saying, We are not going to leave until we make sure that Americans do not have to pay three times as much for heating and oil. We are not going to leave until we put forth a bipartisan health care plan. We are not going to leave until veterans get their fair share out of the Federal Government and we do what we are supposed to do. And we are not going to leave until we pressure this administration to come up with a strategy for Iraq because as we were talking earlier, the bottom line is is it for everything that has happened in Iraq, and maybe Mr. Ryan will want to elaborate on this little more, there has been a time

Mr. Speaker. I think the American people are wrong or Congress is wrong or the prerogative to say that this Mem-

ber is wrong or Congress is wrong or that Senate is incorrect, we can say the same thing under this democracy, Mr. Speaker. I think the American peo-

ple have risen up. It is not a question if they have arrived yet to this conclu-

sion, that we need a plan. We need a plan so our troops know clearly what we are asking of them, so the Defense Department needs a plan in just like the State Department and replace them with diplomats. Just like Mr. Murtha has said, we need a diplomatic solution to Iraq.

Yes, we can do things on the horizon. Yes, we can come in and carry out op-

erations here and there, but to have our troops carrying out convoys on the grounds of Iraq so that the insurgency can continue to pick off 10 and five and eight American families. I think we all in this House should be passionate as if we had children in harm’s way. Period. Dot.

If my son or daughter were there, I would want a plan, a plan to where it just does not move based on what the President says about stay the course. Stay the course for what? Stay the course for what? For the elections? We have a plan there. We know when the elections are going to happen. The insur-

gents know when their government would be brought down. But to say if we reveal that then it will hurt our oper-

ations there. Rhetoric.

So I think it is important if we are going to stay here, and I am prepared to stay, I am prepared to stay until we deal with the real energy crisis that we have here at home, until we deal with health care, until we make sure that jobs are secure here in America, until we make sure the real budget that is going to decrease the budget and we are record breaking.

I want to say this in closing out the comments here, an editorial from the Lafayette Daily Advertiser. I talked about this one a month ago. This one is from Florida (Ms. Wasserman Schultz) because we went through Wilma. We were here fighting on behalf of Hurricane Katrina victims and survivors. Mean-

while, while we are fighting, a hurri-

cane hits our district. Now we are hav-

ing to talk about not only Katrina, but Rita, Wilma, and a number of other storms. This could be in a paper in a Member’s district soon: “Tax Cuts to the Rich Shouldn’t Come At Gulf Coast Expense.”

Let me take one paragraph from here:

“We can’t afford a levee protection system for south Louisiana, but we can afford to give away $56 billion over the next 5 years to people who don’t need it.”

Now this is what the paper is saying. It is not what I am saying.

There is not enough money to help the people pay their mortgage on unin-

habitable homes. The insurance compa-

nies will not pay for, but we will give millions to millionaires, $32,000 extra each year in tax breaks.

Like I said, if it was a perfect world at this point, I would assume that it would be okay, but it is not. We have Americans living in tents. We have Americans thinking about, I heard some Members coming to the floor talking about Christmas, Hanukkah, Kwanza, you name it, the high reli-

ious season that we are getting into now. Meanwhile, we are giving notices to Americans that you are going to be evicted, a judge had to step in and say not so. A judge had to step in.

We have Members here that are throwing rocks at the judiciary. I say thank God for the judiciary in this case. Someone needs to stop this cul-

ture of corruption and cronyism and incompetence. And I would add incom-

petence as it relates to evicting Ameri-

cans. Not just that predictions of break-

ing spending money over in Iraq right now with no plan, no plan to say we need to take the training wheels off the Iraqi Government and let them know. Just like we can have elections on time, we can have a redeployment plan on time and we are offering that op-

tion.

I ask some of my Republican col-

leagues on the other time, and some of them are, a very small group, but I asked them to be able rise up be-

cause I was hearing in the very near future, and I say do the very near future, when they start looking at what we were doing and, guess what, what

the Republican majority was not doing under the circumstances, I think that there is going to be a price to pay po-

litically for the inaction that they have not taken.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Some-

time incompetence is benign. We all inter-

act with people who make mis-

stakes, who maybe are not up to the par that we would like them to be. But not when the stakes are this high, not when we are talking about the people who are running the Government of the United States of America, not when incompetence results in debts.

The thousands of people that are harmed or died as a result of Katrina, incompetence hurt them or killed them. Governor Blanco today, thank God for technology, we talked about that last week a little bit. E-mail tech-

nology allows us to know now as op-

posed to what goes in a paper shredder, that the White House, Homeland Secu-

rity, and FEMA all knew what was going on down in Louisiana. Or imme-

diately following Katrina and as she was approaching; and they either did nothing or did not know what to do.

That kind of incompetence is dan-

gerous. When it is benign you can look the other way and you can sort of throw up your hands and say, well, those are just things you have to deal with when you encounter incom-

petence. We cannot allow incom-

petence to reach the heights that we had this country.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that that incompetence has characterized this administration for the past 5 years. And I say that with no glee. I say that purely from a concern about the quality of life that our people are experiencing here in this country as a result of miscalculation, incompetence, and a blind belief and denial of reality.

Do you remember prior to the war we were told by the Secretary of Defense, and now I am going to quote Mr. Rumsfeld, “When it comes to recon-

struction, before we turn to the American taxpayer, we will turn first to the resources of the Iraqi Govern-

ment and the international commu-

nity.”

His deputy Paul Wolfowitz, he made the following statement: There is a lot of money to pay for this that does not have to be U.S. taxpayer money and it should come with the assets of the Iraqi peo-

ple. We are dealing with a country that can really finance its own reconstruc-

tion.

If you remember the name of Presi-

dent Bush’s chief economic adviser, Larry Lindsey, when he predicted that the cost of the war with Iraq would range somewhere between 100 and $200 billion, he was dismissed, he was fired.

I do not want tonight to talk about intelligence and the issue of weapons of mass destruction and links to al Qaeda, et cetera, et cetera; but there has con-

sistently been mistakes and mis-

calculations because there is such a conviction of righteousness, if you will.
Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, can I make a comment?

We have the poster here from Newsweek that has our esteemed leader in a bubble and it is called the “Isolated President.” And I think this goes to exactly what the gentleman was just saying and what Ms. Wasserman Schultz was just saying and what Mr. MEEK of Florida was just saying.

The comments that Secretary Wolfowitz made and Secretary Rumsfeld just were not true. The comments about the tax cuts and what they would do for average people just did not turn out to be true. And about the war and how we would progress just did not come to be true. And the bubble here symbolizes all these people like Mr. Lindsey who are saying, no, it is going to cost us $200 billion and they fire him. And the general who said we are going to need a couple hundred thousand troops in order to do this properly, and they dismissed him too. It turns out that we needed all these troops there.

It just seems that this administration does not want to hear from other outside viewpoints in order for us to fix this problem.

Now Mr. MEEK was talking about what I found very interesting. I have the President’s speech here that he was talking about earlier, and the President talks about the first milestone we had was the transfer of sovereignty at the end of June. And the second milestone, the election, and the third milestone, if we had these milestones as Mr. MEEK said, these benchmarks, when we were going to transfer, when the election was going to be, when the interim government was going to take place, then December 15, which is coming up in just a day or two, we had benchmarks.

So why would we not have benchmarks for when we are going to get out? That is all we are arguing here.

No Child Left Behind, in which we all agreed on, the Republican majority has not funded it, which was a key element, but we agreed that schools need to be accountable, and if you do not hit certain levels, you are not helping kids.

Accountability, the President talks a lot about accountability. We need to just say, Mr. President, this administration, Mr. Secretary, you need to be accountable, need to be accountable in Iraq, accountable for the budget deficit, accountable for cutting food stamps and giving tax cuts to the top 1 percent. You need to take responsibility for that.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, let me just insert one more thing because the Newsweek cover just says it all. In Bush’s world, in the President’s world, you do not have to have accountability. You do not have to put numbers on anything you do. You do not have to say what percentage prepared the troops have to be, and you are never wrong.

I have had to teach my kids, and they love to insist that they do not make mistakes. That is the orientation of a juvenile. My young children do not understand that sometimes they are wrong and this is okay and that you should learn from your mistakes. But in Bush’s world, in the President’s world, that does not happen. Because he is the President, he apparently has surrounded himself with people who either cannot convince him that he is wrong or he has surrounded himself with people who insist on agreeing with him all the time.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. So when they say after 5 years of all of the misrepresentation and all of the lack of accountability and all of the incompetence and the consequences of the President’s administration, the culture of corruption that we have here, when you come to us 5 or 6 years later, in the midst of a war and a huge budget deficits, and you say to the American people just trust us, it becomes very difficult for us to just trust.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Speaker, I am going to refer in a moment to this chart to my left, but I think in fairness we need to note that just this past week, for the first time, President Bush has acknowledged that mistakes were made. I want to commend him for that, and I know we all share that. He acknowledged in the form of a chart that the multibillion dollar reconstruction of Iraq, and I am using his words now, has ‘been uneven’ and hobbled by corruption, misplaced priorities and insurgent attacks.” This report is from the Washington Post. It is dated December 8. It goes on to state: “In an unusually stark assessment of the situation in Iraq,” the President “described several strategic errors in managing a rebuilding effort that he said proceeded in ‘fits and starts.” By leaving one thing from his mistakes,” the President said “the administration has reshaped its approach.”

I think it is important that we note that. We welcomed that. But it is long overdue, and now, we are anticipating receiving in the next several months a request, a supplemental request, for an additional $100 billion. Let us talk about what our priorities are in terms of the American people and our involvement in Iraq.

I was here when a supplemental budget came before us. I, and others, advocated that rather than just simply giving this money for reconstruction to the so-called interim government that was put in the position of using all the money, other major donor country insisted, clearly providing favorable terms and conditions and years to repay, but that they would be reimbursed so that their children and grandchildren would not have to confront the magnitude that we see in terms of our deficits.

Look at this chart for a minute. We are cutting $505 million on student loans and the interest, therefore, will be higher. That is a cut to a generation of students that we need to be engaged at the highest level to compete in this global economy. Yet, at the same time, we are providing $508 million of transportation and communication, including construction of 28 railroad stations in Iraq’s southern provinces, and we will never see a dime of that. That is a giveaway. That is a grant. Despite the words of Secretary Rumsfeld and Secretary Wolfowitz, that said that we would not have to pay a dime of American taxpayer dollars, what we are doing is we are funding that project and cutting necessary programs for Americans, and we are giving it away.

The tragedy of it all is that there is pervasive corruption going on in Iraq today with those dollars, and the President has acknowledged that. He has acknowledged the fact that there is corruption today among American taxpayers dollars are being misused and wasted and stolen. Meanwhile, our own people are suffering.
That is wrong, Mr. Speaker. That ought not to be happening, and there is a responsibility on the part of this Congress, because we have not had a single oversight hearing, despite the requests of many Members, including myself, to take a good and hard look at this massive corruption that is ongoing today as we speak in Iraq.

Ms. WASSERNAN SCHULTZ. Just before we close down in our last couple of minutes, we have been talking about the culture of corruption and cronyism and incompetence, zeroing in on incompetence today, and we are about third party validators. It is not just that we say it.

We get e-mail on our 30-Something Web site that responded to some of the things we have been talking about. It was actually a Mr. Miller from Connecticut who said, ‘‘You folks are a great breath of fresh air. I like the theme of a culture of corruption, cronyism and incompetence.’’ Well put, but incomplete. The massive rampant incompetence of this administration,’’ he said, ‘‘is a huge problem, no doubt. But for me, a bigger problem is their fundamental disbelief in democratic processes of checks and balances combined with overwhelming ideological arrogance that allows belief to trump evidence.’’

I could not have said it better myself.
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Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I want to say, and I know Mr. MILLER was being complimentary of us when he said he liked the culture of corruption, but I do not like it. I do not like it.

I do not like coming down here and trying to inform the American people what third-party validators are saying about what is going on down here in a negative way. Because I would hope we could come down here with solutions and work on it and talk about how we are making this better, how we are having oversight hearings and everything else. Do not think for one second we like this. This is going on here and the American people need to hear about it.

30somethingdems@mail.house.gov.

That is 30, the number, somethingdems@mail.house.gov.

Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mr. Speaker, we would like to thank the Democratic leader for the time tonight.

ENERGY CONCERNS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POE). Under the Speaker’s announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) is recognized for the remaining time until midnight.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, thank you for the privilege to speak on the floor of the United States House of Representatives. As I listened to the discussion here this evening, some of my concern was created by my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, and I wish to begin by responding to some of the remarks that were made.

Again, I hear a consistent message of pessimism and really no message of solution or a plan. In fact, I heard a lament that they are right after night not coming up with the real answers for the American people, and I lament the same thing, and I agree with those statements.

First, some of the notes I wrote down as I picked up on some of the discussion that went on here on the other side of the aisle were concerns about the price of gas and home heating. In fact, there is a government report out some few weeks ago that it is going to cost perhaps 50 to 51 percent more for the average American to heat their home this winter as opposed to last winter. And that is all true.

We tried to move energy policy through this Chamber. In fact, we did move some through this Chamber, but we did not move near enough. I called for drilling on the Outer Continental Shelf. I called drilling on ANWR. It looks now like we are going to see the new year without a vote on either one of those things. I hope we do and that we get it passed, because it is the right thing to do. But in that bargain they stipulated no energy development, and here sits this country on 406 trillion cubic feet of natural gas on our Outer Continental Shelf.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KING of Iowa. Yes, I would be happy to yield.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. One of the proposals that we had was to take out the $16 billion in corporate subsidies in the energy bill. Would you be willing to support us on that?

Mr. KING of Iowa. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, I am talking about expanding the energy here in this country. And whether or not you address any kind of subsidies, whether they exist or not, does not affect our overall energy supply except to discourage the development of that energy. And I hope we do and that we get it passed, because it is the right thing to do.

But what I am talking about is that we have 406 trillion cubic feet of natural gas on the Outer Continental Shelf. A lot of it is around Florida, and it is really much of the Florida delegation, and that is not a partisan issue down in this part of the panhandle; but we need to open up that gas, and we need to open it up all the way across for all of America, particularly in the Corn Belt where 90 percent of the cost of our nitrogen fertilizer is the cost of natural gas. It has more than doubled in the last 5 to 6 years. It used to be $2, and the other day it went to $15. That is my point.

So that is a piece of it. But what I am hearing, and my heart really from reading the reports of your discussion tonight that I do take issue with is that adding $1 billion to LIHEAP and talking about corporate welfare does not increase the supply of energy in this country. What I am about is increasing the supply of energy, because there is a law of supply and demand. The more energy we have, the lower the cost.

We cannot sit here and turn up the heat in our homes and turn down the development of energy and expect that we are going to have a viable economy. In fact, it is economic suicide for a country with an energy component of our economy like we have to not develop that energy. And if we are going to be bringing it in from just across the Caribbean, from a place like Venezuela, which is a place