

Americans who disapprove of the way President Bush has handled Iraq.

The point is that the American people are speaking out. They are speaking loudly about the U.S. role in Iraq. They are sick and tired of reading reports of more young soldiers being killed, leaving behind grieving widows and children and parents and friends and communities. They, like me, believe that more than 2,000 American soldiers killed is 2,000 too many. They think 2,000 soldiers, just think about it, 2,000 soldiers is an entire Army division gone. They know that for every insurgent killed, three more rise up to take their place.

They are tired of watching bombs go off in Iraqi cities, killing innocent civilians and American soldiers. They want to see the U.S. continue to support Iraq nonmilitaristically by assisting the Iraqi people build their war-torn economic and physical infrastructure. They want the United States to help in a nonmilitaristic role.

Members of Congress are actually joining this debate, too. There are no fewer than five Members of this House who have policy proposals to end the war, and 127 Members joined me in voting for the amendment I offered in May to this year's defense authorization bill expressing the sense of Congress that we need to end this war.

On the other side of the Capitol, Senators KERRY, KENNEDY, FEINGOLD and others have offered their plans for Iraq as well.

I held an informal hearing last month to address how the United States can achieve military disengagement. Thirty other Members of Congress joined me at this hearing, listening to military, academic and governmental experts discuss the best way to end this devastating war.

Clearly the majority of the country has started the conversation about these issues. It is necessary that the President join in. Mr. Speaker, individuals around the country have given us their plans to end the war. It is time for the President to give us his plan, the goal of which needs to be bringing the troops home to their families.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. SCHIFF addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DEFAZIO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take my Special Order at this time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

ENERGY PRICES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EMANUEL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, we are in the midst of an energy crisis. Gas is at \$3 a gallon, and utilities are now predicting that families could pay as much as 70 percent more to heat their homes this winter. Natural gas prices are so high that the Energy Department predicts that the average natural gas bill for every family will be about \$350 more this winter. Home heating oil used by many in the Northeast has skyrocketed. But while American families struggle with sky-high energy bills, and oil and gas companies are facing an entirely different picture, an entirely different crisis, to be exact, what to do with all their profits.

For example, yesterday Exxon Mobil reported that its profits increased by 75 percent in the third quarter alone; their revenues, more than \$100 billion. Shell Oil said that their earnings increased by 68 percent. ConocoPhillips' third-quarter earnings surged 89 percent, and BP reported a 34 percent rise in quarterly earnings.

To summarize, as American families are struggling with massive energy bills, both at the pump and home heating, energy companies are reaping huge profits.

Now, Henry Hubble, Exxon Mobil's vice president, said, "You have got to let the marketplace work." As a Democrat, I could not agree more, which is why I oppose what my Republican friends try to do, which is provide the oil companies \$16 billion in taxpayer subsidies. To quote again the executive from Exxon Mobil, "You have got to let the marketplace work."

My view is we have got to stop corporate welfare in its worse take. If you are making \$100 billion or a run rate of \$100 billion, profits are at \$9 billion for one quarter, the taxpayers should not be footing the bill, both at the pump and on April 15 when they are subsidizing corporate America, big oil. This is corporate welfare at its worst. The corporate oil companies should take their historic profits and use them, in my view, to execute their business plan. The taxpayers should not be subsidizing big oil's business plan. You are in the energy business. Drill for oil. Taxpayers should not be subsidizing it for \$16 billion.

Remember, college grants, the Pell grant system for college education in this country is a little less than \$12 billion a year. Our corporate subsidy, taxpayer subsidy, for corporate America for big oil is \$16 billion. It is more than we actually give for college assistance for people going to college. And they are making, just one company alone, \$100 billion, \$9 billion profit.

Right now Americans pay twice. Once at the pump, once on April 15, subsidizing big oil.

Again, Exxon Mobil's vice president, "You have got to let the marketplace work." Therefore, give us back the money we are subsidizing you. That is not the free market when we are subsidizing corporate America. It is corporate welfare. It is time for corporate big oil to get off the welfare roles and start executing their business plan.

While Congress subsidizes big oil to the tune of \$16.5 billion, we have cut home heating assistance to the elderly. What Congress would subsidize big oil for \$16 billion and cut home heating assistance to senior citizens? A Republican Congress, but of course.

The energy bill we passed earlier this year contained \$14.5 billion in subsidies to the energy industry. A few weeks ago we just had not done enough; in a refinery bill, a bill for oil and gas companies, which they did not even ask for, this Republican Congress gave them another \$2 billion in subsidies.

This week the Resources Committee marked up a bill which would allow oil companies to drill near the coral reefs of Florida and in the pristine Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. Yet at the same time, we are cutting the low-income heating assistance program that helps the elderly and those most vulnerable in our country. It is notoriously underfunded. As part of the energy policy Congress authorized an increase in funding to energy assistance to \$5 billion. However, we only allocate \$2 billion. Some of us voted to try to bring that up to snuff so we could do the full assistance for the elderly low-income, those most vulnerable, and we are underfunding it; therefore, a cut in the program.

My view is it is time we stop subsidizing big oil and stop having the taxpayers who are very stretched, do not ask them for \$16 billion when you have record profits throughout the energy industry and are cutting assistance to our elderly and most vulnerable. We can do better. We need a new set of priorities, and we need to change the direction of this country to reflect the values of the American people and their generosity.

CONGRATULATING THE CHICAGO WHITE SOX ON THEIR WORLD SERIES VICTORY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Speaker, after 88 years of anguish and torment, baseball

fans in the Chicagoland area can breathe a sigh of relief. This past Wednesday the Chicago White Sox clinched their first World Series championship since 1917. Led by their always colorful manager, Ozzie Guillen, the team got off to a fantastic start this season. However, in true Chicago baseball fashion, they found themselves in a rough stretch during the latter part of the season, and many doubted their potential. But in the end it was the camaraderie and teamwork throughout the whole season that led this team to victory.

As a lifelong Chicagoan born on the south side and raised on the north side, I want to offer my congratulations to the White Sox organization and White Sox fans everywhere.

Mr. Speaker, if the Boston Red Sox and the Chicago White Sox can make it happen after nearly nine decades, perhaps 2006 will prove to be a victorious year for yet another baseball team with a legendary drought, the Chicago Cubs. Here's hoping.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MEEHAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. MEEHAN addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. STUPAK addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate being recognized. I have got a couple of things I wanted to talk about this afternoon as we wind up what has been a very busy week here in Washington. We have had our plate full, and have worked aggressively on issues that are of importance to the American people, and certainly are of importance to my constituents in Tennessee. But over the past week and during this time as we have been plugging away working on the budget for this Nation, working on how we reform government, we have watched a group of

Democrats from across the aisle come down here during the evenings, and every evening they talk about everything that they believe the Republican majority is doing that is wrong. They talk about everything that they think is wrong with America, they talk about everything they think is wrong with our employers, and they talk about everything they think is wrong with American families and with the values that we hold dear.

You know, I do not think they think we are doing a thing right. I do not think they think there is much right with America. And if you turn to C-SPAN any given evening, and you see a bunch of people down here complaining, that is them, because they are tuned up, and they are going to it every evening with the negativity and what is wrong, what is wrong.

The left in this Congress does not want to see spending cuts, and they certainly do not want to see tax relief. They are not interested in reducing the size of the Federal Government. They want to grow it. And when they talk about wanting to grow it and add more to it, guess what? They are talking about using American taxpayer money.

□ 1345

It is going to take the money out of your pocket to pay for their want list. And what I cannot help but notice day after day when listening to the left in this body criticize everybody and everything and complain about everything is the tremendous level of self-indignation.

It is the sort of self-righteous indignation that you typically see coming from some of the TV talk show pundits, but lately it seems to be a hallmark of the Democratic House talking points that they are outraged about spending. Their solution is to propose more and more spending, but they are going to tell you they are outraged with the spending. They are going to tell you they are outraged with the deficit. They are going to tell you they are outraged with the debt. But more and more spending, more and more spending, that is what they want.

They are outraged that government failed in the Katrina response. Yet they want to make that inefficient and ineffective bureaucracy bigger and more powerful. At the same time as they are making it bigger and more powerful, guess what, they want to make it more centralized.

They are outraged, absolutely outraged that we have high gas prices, yet they oppose domestic exploration for oil. They oppose refinery construction. They oppose refinery expansion. And this is not something new. This is something that they have been opposing for years. My goodness, some of them even worked with former President Clinton. They are outraged about gas prices, but you know what, I guess they are not outraged that former President Clinton vetoed drilling in ANWR. Now, you know you cannot have it both ways.

They are outraged that Social Security is going to run short of funding, but they do not want to reform it, and they do not want to address that; but they are going to be outraged about it. They are outraged that this war on terror is not over, yet they take every opportunity they can possibly take. They come down here and any time that they can find the time they want to talk about withdrawing from Iraq and appeasing the very world leaders who let the Middle East get away with terrorism for decades before we took a firm stance. But they are going to tell you they are outraged that this war is not over. They have known it is going to be a long war. We have all known that.

Mr. Speaker, I guess they think they have got the market cornered on outrage. Maybe they do. Maybe they do. I mean, it seems that there is nobody around that does outrage better than the Democrats. As my mother used to say when people would get upset, she would look at them and say, Just rave on, rave on. You can talk all day long. That talking is not going to accomplish one thing. Actions will accomplish things.

But, Mr. Speaker, in order to get from outrage to action it takes something to fill in that void and that is called ideas, and ideas is something they just do not have. Now, maybe the outrage makes for great TV ratings on reality shows; but you know what, this is not a TV show. What this is is real life. It is the U.S. House of Representatives. It is a governmental body that works to construct the laws that you and I and my family and your family, everyone lives under; that free enterprise functions under; that we work under each and every day.

But you know, we do not hear ideas coming from the other side when they come down here and claim that we are not doing anything right and that everything is wrong. They are not laying out an alternative agenda because they cannot agree on one. They want to make the government agencies we have got bigger. They want a bigger, more centralized government. They want more Federal control. They want more Federal mandates on local government, and they want your money to come and pay for this.

I hope that my constituents in Tennessee understand this and are listening to this because Federal mandates are something that they are tired of, and I hope that they are listening. I hope the American people realize they want a bigger government. They want to grow it. They want more Federal control on our State and local governments. They want more Federal mandates on local governments, and they want the money out of your pocket to come and pay for it.

They want to make the taxes we have got on the books higher. They want higher taxes. They want higher rates, higher fees, more taxes and in more areas of your life. They are the