

It has now been exactly 12,925 days since the tragedy called *Roe v. Wade* was first handed down. Since then, the very foundation of this Nation has been stained by the blood of almost 50 million of its own children. Some of them, Madam Speaker, died and screamed as they did so, but because it was amniotic fluid passing over the vocal cords instead of air, no one could hear them.

And all of them had at least four things in common. First, they were each just little babies who had done nothing wrong to anyone, and each one of them died a nameless and lonely death. And each one of their mothers, whether she realizes it or not, will never be quite the same. And all the gifts that these children might have brought to humanity are now lost forever. Yet even in the glare of such tragedy, this generation still clings to a blind, invincible ignorance while history repeats itself and our own silent genocide mercilessly annihilates the most helpless of all victims, those yet unborn.

Madam Speaker, perhaps it's time for those of us in this Chamber to remind ourselves of why we are really all here. Thomas Jefferson said, "The care of human life and its happiness and not its destruction is the chief and only object of good government." The phrase in the 14th Amendment capsulizes our entire Constitution; it says, "No State shall deprive any person of life, liberty or property without due process of law." Madam Speaker, protecting the lives of our innocent citizens and their constitutional rights is why we are all here.

The bedrock foundation of this Republic is the clarion declaration of the self-evident truth that all human beings are created equal and endowed by their Creator with the unalienable rights of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. Every conflict and battle our Nation has ever faced can be traced to our commitment to this core, self-evident truth.

It has made us the beacon of hope for the entire world. Madam Speaker, it is who we are.

And yet today another day has passed, and we in this body have failed again to honor that foundational commitment. We have failed our sworn oath and our God-given responsibility as we broke faith with nearly 4,000 more innocent American babies who died today without the protection we should have given them.

Madam Speaker, let me conclude in the hope that perhaps someone new who heard this sunset memorial tonight will finally embrace the truth that abortion really does kill little babies; that it hurts mothers in ways that we can never express; and that 12,925 days spent killing nearly 50 million unborn children in America is enough; and that the America that rejected human slavery and marched into Europe to arrest the Nazi Holocaust is still courageous and compassionate enough to find a better way for mothers and their unborn babies than abortion on demand.

So tonight, Madam Speaker, may we each remind ourselves that our own days in this sunshine of life are also numbered and that all too soon each one of us will walk from these Chambers for the very last time.

And if it should be that this Congress is allowed to convene on yet another day to come, may that be the day when we finally hear the cries of innocent unborn children. May that be the day when we find the humanity, the courage, and the will to embrace together our

human and our constitutional duty to protect these, the least of our tiny, little American brothers and sisters from this murderous scourge upon our Nation called abortion on demand.

It is June 12, 2008, 12,925 days since *Roe versus Wade* first stained the foundation of this Nation with the blood of its own children, this in the land of the free and the home of the brave.

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 Washington (Mr. REICHERT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. REICHERT 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 Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. CUMMINGS 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 Nebraska (Mr. FORTENBERRY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. FORTENBERRY 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 Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

30-SOMETHING WORKING GROUP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to be on the floor of the House of Representatives here in the United States of America to talk about issues that are pressing, representing the 30-Something Working Group. I will be joined shortly by my friend, Congressman MEEK of Florida, who will join us through this discussion.

I want to talk about a couple of issues that are pertinent to what has been going on in our country. I think the most pressing issue that we've been dealing with in this Congress and that, I think, most of our constituents are

dealing with every single day is what is going on with our energy policy here in the United States of America.

We have heard, as Democrats have come into office with Speaker PELOSI's leading this House of Representatives, is that one of the key issues that we're trying to deal with is to make sure that our country is energy-independent and to reduce our dependency not only on oil but especially on foreign oil and to move off of oil in general, into renewable energy, into biodiesel, into solar, into wind, into nuclear, into a lot of these other areas that will allow us to be energy-independent, that will provide for renewable energy and that will provide a stable supply of energy here in the United States.

One of the issues that keeps coming up is: Why don't we keep drilling? Why don't we drill in ANWR? That will solve our problem. I'm sure, in the next special order, the folks who are paying attention to this debate will get the other side of this. But from our perspective and from what the analysts are telling us, if you begin drilling in ANWR and if you start the process today, it will be 10 years from now before you get one drop of oil out of ANWR. If you continue, in 10 years, you will get 40,000 barrels of oil a day in a market that has 80 million barrels of oil. In 20 years, you will get yourself up to about 800,000 barrels of oil a day, and you will reduce the cost of a gallon of gas by 1.8 cents per gallon. Now, that is 20 years from now. So, if we start today, in 20 years, we will have a savings of 1.8 cents per gallon of gas. From our perspective, that is not a long-term strategy.

One of the reasons that it is not a long-term strategy is that we have now currently 68 million acres of land on the continental shelf, onshore, that is eligible to be drilled upon. There are 8,000 leases for drilling on these acres of land, 8,000. Of these 8,000 leases, there are only about a quarter of them that are actually being used or that are being pursued.

What we are saying is, if you have 68 million acres of land and if you have 8,000 leases already to drill on those acres of land, why do we need to go somewhere else up in ANWR—up in Alaska—when we're not even drilling in the areas that we have now in which the oil companies have permission to go and drill? That is the question.

So we have this available to us now, and if we got into the 68 million acres of land, that would produce 4.8 million barrels a day.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Would the gentleman yield.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I'd be happy to yield.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. The geologists with whom we've talked say that they know that there is oil in the ANWR and that they know where the oil is off the continental shelf. I don't know about these other 8,000 leases in the spots that we're talking about, but I would be happy to talk to them about

exploring those if we could work together to get the oil out of the ground and get it to market.

I'd just like to say to my colleague that I know that you want to move toward energy independence. We have a different view on how it has to be done. You'd like to do it in an environmentally safe way, and so would we, but we aren't starting. So I'd just like to say to my colleague:

When are we going to start? In your opinion, how are we going to start, and how long will it take?

The transition to hybrids and to everything else and to get everybody in this country working on these things is a laudable objective, and I agree with you that we should be doing that, but in the interim, we've been just sitting around, waiting for 30 years. The American people, I don't think, can wait much longer.

So I'm sorry to interrupt you, but I'd just like to ask you: Where do we start? When do we start? How do we start if we don't drill?

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Reclaiming my time.

I have a great deal of respect for my friend from Indiana. I wanted to give him an opportunity to speak his peace.

It's not up to us, and that is the point I was going to make. This is already available. It's the oil companies that are not pursuing this. They have the leases. They have the space. They have the okay, but they're the ones that aren't doing the drilling, and that's the point.

One of the reasons is that there is a difference between the certifications. When you have to mine for coal and you get one of these permits and you get the ability to lease, there's a 20-year lease for coal companies, but you have to show that you're diligently developing your mining with coal. Under oil and gas, it's only a 10-year lease that is renewable, but you don't have to show that you're diligently developing the leases and that you're diligently developing the mining in trying to get the oil and the gas out.

So the oil companies have the leases—they have the ability to do it—but the law does not require them to show a diligent developing of a particular resource. That is the problem. So they're holding the leases and are, in our minds, driving up the cost. Now, I think there are some other things going on, too, with commodity markets and whatnot, but this is the gist.

There is a bill that is coming out of Mr. RAHALL's office from the Natural Resources Committee, the Responsible Federal Oil and Gas Lease Act of 2008. I will be happy to share with my colleague and have my staff get to your staff the proper information here because there is no reason why they're not developing it, and that's the problem that we have here.

So look at what is going on in the commodities market. We have passed a bill out of this House of Representatives to try to address that problem. If

we soon pass Mr. RAHALL's bill that will deal with the lease issue and the oil companies' being able to hold onto these leases, I think then we can force these folks to either get rid of the leases and get them in the hands of somebody who will actually do the drilling or they will have to drill it themselves, but you have to show diligence in developing that particular resource that you're going after.

So that's really the main issue here, and I appreciate the opportunity to bring that up and to further expound on that point because it puts the ball right back in the court of the oil companies'.

So, on all of these prongs, whether it's futures or whether it's the leases or whether it's the \$14 billion in subsidies that the taxpayers have given the oil companies, on each of these issues, we're trying to change the policy, and we want to join with the Republicans to help us to do that because a lot of this oil and gas is available to be developed, to be explored, to be used here in the United States of America.

Not only that, there is a bill that we passed, I think, in 2005 that would allow a 50 percent tax credit to build refineries. That is one of the other points that has been made, which is of the refineries. Why aren't there more refineries? Refineries now are only working at 85 percent capacity.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Would the gentleman yield.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I would be happy to yield. I'm going to yield to you because you're my friend, but I'm going to have to leave, so I'm not going to get a chance to rebut you guys, but go ahead, because Mr. WESTMORELAND and I are going to be on Fox later, so we'll be glad to take that up over there.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. The reason I wanted to talk to you really briefly before Mr. WESTMORELAND and I take this hour is that we're going to have to work together to solve this problem. On its face, for us to say that the oil companies with these leases really don't want to exercise the ability they have to drill doesn't make sense.

The problem we have with energy right now is that China is buying an awful lot of the oil, and India is buying a lot of the oil. The appetite for energy is growing at a very rapid rate, even here in the United States, and we're not keeping up with the production necessary to keep the prices down. The oil companies want to drill. They want to make this money. They want more refineries.

You and I don't know each other really well, but what I'd like to say to you is that I'd like to sit down with you and with some of the oil companies executives and talk to them about the drilling problem and about the lease problem. Maybe there's something we can do by talking to them to get this thing off dead center. But to sit around and say they're not drilling where they should when the world needs more energy doesn't make any sense. We need more refineries. Everybody knows that.

As you were talking a minute ago, we want to move toward energy independence, but that's going to take time as well. So I would like to work with you and with other Democratic leaders—Mr. RAHALL and others—and see if we can't get some of the oil execs in without beating them over the head about, you know, taxes on them and just say, "What do we need to do to get you to do exploration in a clean way and to get this energy to market as quickly as possible?" I'd like to talk to you about it and see about that.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Reclaiming my time.

I'd like to chat with you about it. I think it would be important to have Mr. RAHALL involved in that conversation.

□ 1815

Our argument on this side, and I think it is not a *prima facie* case here, these are the facts that have been explored. They have the leases, they have the land, there is nothing preventing them from doing it. You have a 50 percent tax cut on refineries. They still haven't done that. And we are giving them \$14 billion to help develop this stuff. I mean, how much more do you need? And you are the most profitable industry in the country.

So it leaves folks like us to say, you know, you are obviously not doing things properly, because the price of oil is going up.

And I agree, obviously China and India are a major component of this. No one is saying it will be \$20 a barrel if we implement this stuff. But if you talk about it, most people are saying anything between a 10 and 100 percent increase because of the commodity trading, which probably puts it somewhere in the middle at 40 percent, which would be 40 or 50 bucks a barrel. That alone would reduce it to about 90 bucks a barrel.

Now, drilling has increased by 66 percent since 2000, so there is more drilling going on to try to keep pace with that. But the prices have increased. Last Friday a barrel of oil increased more in one day than it cost 10 years ago. That is a significant increase, and you can't say there are some shenanigans going on here.

All we are asking is, I think if we pass something like the Responsible Federal Oil and Gas Relief Act of 2008, if we say that you have to diligently develop those leases that you have, I think that would be a piece of this argument, to say you got the lease, you are not allowed to sit on it. Either develop it or give it to someone else.

No one here is saying we are going to be off oil tomorrow. What we are saying is we don't want to be in the same situation a decade from now or two decades from now because we opened up ANWR and saved 2 cents a gallon. That is not going to get us where we want to be. And the sooner we take the brain power here in the United States of America and put it to work to develop some of these alternative energies, the better off we are going to be.

So, 68 million acres, 4.8 million barrels a day, 44.7 billion cubic feet of natural gas, this is the direction we need to be going in. This is the direction that I think Americans want us to go in, Mr. Speaker. This is the direction that the Speaker and the Democrats want to lead this country in.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. We are happy to. You guys are going to have more time on my Special Order than I am.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. I just want to ask you one question and give you time to rebut it, and I will leave.

To my friend Mr. RYAN, you mentioned not being able to use our technology. In the energy bill that we passed in January of 2007, section 526 really limits the government agencies' ability to use fuels that could come from our technology. It says we cannot use these fuels, such as oil from shale, fuel made from that, for NASA, our military or other government agencies.

Could you kind of rectify that and how that relates to what you are saying? Because I agree with you, we have some of the smartest people in the world here that can look at some of the technology that has been in place in Europe for years of coal-to-liquid. But how does that translate in your energy policy, compared to what you are saying about the technology? Because I certainly agree with you about the technology, but I don't necessarily agree with the energy policy.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Well, regardless of how we develop it, I think this is what we have done. We put billions of dollars into research and development, and we will continue to put more into research and development, maybe even over the protests of some of the folks on your side of the aisle.

But you could talk about oil shale and you could talk about all of these the other issues. We have 68 million acres right now, there are 8,000 leases, and you folks keep talking, Mr. Speaker, the other side keeps talking about going up to ANWR, when we have 68 million acres already to be tapped, 8,000 leases ready to develop this. They are only using a quarter of them. Go ahead and drill. But why do we have to go up to ANWR, when we already have the ability to do it now? That is all we are saying.

So, yeah, we should use technology to figure out other ways to develop oil and the coal-to-liquid. As long as you are sequestering the CO₂, speaking on behalf of myself now, I don't have any problem with it. You have nuclear plants that are going on and permits and leases for moving that process forward.

So this is going to be a comprehensive bill and a comprehensive approach to all this. But when you have the oil companies getting \$14 billion, you have the commodities problem that you have, and you have them buying leases and holding them because they don't have to diligently develop, like they

have to do for coal, you get skyrocketing gas costs, and that is what we are trying to fix here.

The oil companies have more incentives than they could ever possibly need. They have been getting \$14 billion in basically corporate welfare. They get a 50 percent tax credit to develop a refinery, and they still haven't done that. So these issues are hanging around here, and we are trying to change it and the rhetoric from the other side is we got to go to ANWR, when we already have the ability to address these problems here.

So I think we have a comprehensive approach on how to fix this problem. It is much different. And, again, to just say, you know, Mr. Speaker, it was the other side. They were in charge for 6 years, had the House, had the Senate, had the White House, and we are currently living under their energy policy and the Bush economy.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. If the gentleman will yield for just one second, I know you have to leave and I just want to say one thing real quickly, if you don't mind.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I will be happy to yield.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. You know, you can blame us, we can blame you. We can go all the way back to the Carter administration when we had lines. You are a fairly young man, you probably don't remember. But there were lines around the block and people coming with five gallon cans to get gas because we didn't have any. There is probably enough blame to go around.

The problem is we are in an economic crisis right now that is not going to get any better until we work together. I have been down here railing against you and the Democrats for the last three or four or five weeks saying you guys are the reason that gas has gone up a buck-and-a-half in the last 2 years. You can blame us if you want to. But the people who are watching on television and the people around this country right now are paying 4 bucks-plus a gallon and they want us to work together. I would like to sit down with you and others like you and try to figure out a way to get this problem solved.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Reclaiming my time, you are exactly right. We could sit here, Mr. Speaker, and blame each other about whose fault it is. I say that as a point of clarification, because one is now you have solutions that you didn't implement while you were in, they didn't implement while they were in, Mr. Speaker. So I think that is an important point to make.

But the discussion here today is look at what the Democrats have done. We are trying to repeal the \$14 billion in corporate welfare. We are trying to crack down on the commodities futures trading. We are trying to make sure that oil companies can't just hold leases and not develop them, and not develop them and diligently pursue the natural resources that are there. That

is what we are saying. The other side is saying, go to ANWR. Now, that is not a solution.

So the discussion that we are having here is that your side is saying, go to ANWR and drill, and we are saying there is 68 million acres, 8,000 leases, and they are only using a quarter of them. The oil companies are holding them. They could get 4.2 billion barrels a day, and they are not doing it. That only leaves one conclusion.

I guess we are kind of blaming each other. But if you put up drilling in ANWR or drill in what we have now and focus billions of dollars on an alternative energy policy and strip the \$14 billion from the oil companies and make sure that if they get leases they got to use them and make sure that there is not all kinds of monkey business going on in the commodities market, that is our solution, which your side votes against.

We are going to have an election. You guys are going to say drill in ANWR, we are going to say alternative energy, and the people are going to decide. So we can blame each other all we want, but the people are going to hear our position, they are going to hear your position, and they are going to hear the presidential candidates' positions, and they are going to decide who they want to vote for.

I believe and our caucus believes that when we get the message out that there are already 68 million acres to be developed, there are 8,000 leases being held by the oil companies, that they are only using a quarter of them, that it will look like our friends on the other side are standing shoulder-to-shoulder with the oil companies. And we are going to have a vote at some point on Mr. RAHALL's bill that will allow and force the oil companies that if they have leases to use them, that you may fall on the one side of that and we may fall on the other, and then the people will have that vote to decide on.

I am getting a bit redundant, but we want to make sure our friends who are just kind of passing through the debate catch both sides.

The gentleman from Indiana, I know he is a busy man, but if you have time tonight, me and your partner in crime there will be on Fox TV, on Hannity & Colmes, to further this discussion, and I very much look forward to it.

I think my partner in crime, Mr. MEEK, is not here, will not be here, and I will take your thank-you's later, because you had more of my special order than I had.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. If the gentleman will yield just real quickly, I would like to say this to you as you leave. I would like to see a number of you—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will suspend.

Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Will the gentleman yield just for a second?

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Well, you are going to get the next hour.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I know, but I would like to talk to you before you leave.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman want to yield, or yield back?

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I yield back the balance of my time. I will wait and listen to you.

ENERGY POLICY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WESTMORELAND) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Speaker, I am glad Mr. RYAN was here, and we will continue this discussion, I am sure.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Will the gentleman yield just for one second?

Mr. WESTMORELAND. I will.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Before you leave, let me say I think what would be very illuminating for the American people is for you and three or four of your colleagues who have some expertise in this area to come down with three or four of our colleagues and sit down and discuss in logical way these issues you are talking about, because we all want the same thing. So I would like to talk to you about that after we are through here, and maybe we can work something out in the next week or two.

Thank you, Mr. WESTMORELAND.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Thank you.

As we continued listening to my friend and colleague Mr. RYAN talk about the amount of land that is open for drilling, it is only 3 percent of the Outer Continental Shelf. That is only 3 percent of it. There are only 6 percent of the Federal lands on shore that are open to drilling. Now, these oil companies may hold some of these leases, but why would you want to drill on something that did not have oil? I don't think that makes good sense.

He is talking about the \$14 billion tax. Well, you know, I am not the smartest guy in the world, but I had an economics teacher, Colonel Walford, in high school, who made it very clear to me that taxing a producer or manufacturer did not lower the price to the consumer. You don't have to be an economist to understand that if you raise taxes on somebody, it is not going to lower the price to the consumer.

Now, the other thing is that the majority has been in control for 17 months. When they took over, the price of a gallon of gas was \$2.26. Right now it is up over \$4. I believe it was in April of 2006 that then Minority Leader PELOSI, now Speaker PELOSI, made the statement that the Democrats had a commonsense plan to bring down the skyrocketing price of gas. Now, it was probably \$2.08 then, right at \$2. So I don't know where this plan is.

They passed an energy bill in about January of 2007 that Mr. RYAN referred

to, and in that energy bill they had specific language that said our government could not use certain alternative fuels. So they are saying one thing and then doing something else, and it is real confusing to the American people.

But I have something I want to unveil tonight, Mr. Speaker, for the American people. We have got some of it up here. What this is, Mr. Speaker, there have been all kind of petitions on the Internet. I went into a service station in my district and there was a petition there on the counter about the price of gas. There are petitions all over. Our constituents have an opportunity to go on the Internet and sign these petitions or go into their local grocery store or gas station and sign a petition for drilling, against drilling, for any variety of things as far as what the energy costs are that are affecting the average person.

So as I thought about this I said, you know, we need to make this simple. We need to make it so we have a petition for the House of Representatives. We have 435 Members here, and the American people need to know how their Representative would vote.

□ 1830

What would they be voting on? American energy solutions for lower gas prices, the things that we can control, our resources.

You know, China and Cuba are fixing to start drilling 45 miles off the coast of Florida. That's our natural resource, we could be drilling there, but we are not. So we have got 97 percent of the Outer Continental Shelf that we control we are not drilling on, 94 percent of the Federal lands that we have in this country, we are not drilling on. So we have got a real simple thing, bring onshore oil on line, bring deepwater oil on line and bring new refineries on line.

You might realize or might not realize that we haven't built a refinery since the late 1970s. We import, right now—this is probably going to surprise some people—we import 6.9 billion gallons of refined crude oil that's gasoline into this country every year, because we do not have the refining capabilities.

We had a motion to recommit, I believe, on May 22 that Mr. CONAWAY offered that said, within the 90 days, that the government would identify three locations on some of our military bases that have environmental problems, maybe, that the BRAC has closed immediately and in 90 days identify three of those to build new refineries. The majority voted against it. They stand and say one thing, but their actions do something else.

We need to build and expand our refineries, and we need to make this to where our oil companies are willing to invest. But when you import 6.9 billion gallons of gasoline and probably about the same amount of diesel fuel, that we come in.

What we have got is a petition here, and this petition starts out with Alas-

ka at large, it goes out through Alabama and goes all the way through every State in this Union, and we have got everybody a district line.

Now, we just kind of, we had it back here in the corner today and some people came by and said hey, what you got, and I told them it's a petition. What the petition says, "I will vote to increase U.S. oil production to lower gas prices for Americans."

That's pretty simple. It's not convoluted, it doesn't have anything to do with anything other than Americans providing their own resources for our energy. Now, what's wrong with that? We are a country that is known for our resourcefulness.

Mr. RYAN mentioned the technology. Germany, back in the late 1920s, had technology that converted coal to fuel. That was back in the late 1920s. Surely technology has come to where it's better. We have got over a trillion, that is a trillion with a "T", barrels of shale oil out west, a trillion, a trillion, and we are not doing anything with it.

In fact, not only are we not doing anything with it, but Mr. UDALL from Colorado last year passed an amendment that said we couldn't do anything with it, that we couldn't drill, and it passed this House 219 to 215. You might remember, I believe that was the stolen vote. But those are circumstances that we have got, and so we want the American people to know where their Congressman is at.

We have got this petition, we are going to update it, every day we are going to have it back on the floor. I have got two pencils with me today, two markers. If anybody is listening that's still in town, wants to come down, they can certainly come down. I will give them some time to speak and they can tell their constituency why they want us to support us using our natural resources, our resources to provide energy for our people.

I will yield some time to Mr. BURTON of Indiana.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. First of all, let me compliment my colleague from Georgia, because I really appreciate you taking the initiative to actually lay before the American people those who support energy independence, true energy independence and those who don't. I think this will do it. I hope this is publicized across the country so every single constituent of yours, mine, everybody in this country who is paying \$4-plus a gallon for gasoline will know how their representative feels about this issue.

One of the things we were talking about just a few moments ago before our colleague left, which was very troubling, was that he indicated that oil companies were protecting leases, and he didn't want to drill in those places. It's very—it's almost a ludicrous argument.

Because with the demand for oil growing like it has around the world, the need for more oil or energy is apparent. The more oil companies, the