

is a huge, is a part of this debate. And my friend from Pennsylvania is right. We are not saying it has to be the whole thing. We are all comers here. I have got my corn here. I have got my soybeans. I have my coal. I have got marginal oil wells in southern Illinois, marginal oil that we can use and recover, and we are still recovering oil from southern Illinois. Bring on the wind, bring on the solar, but we want to bring everything in. The more supply we have, the lower the cost, the Nation will be better off.

Mr. CONAWAY. Before we get away from the coal comments, I want to make sure that, I know my colleagues agree with this, as we look at coal usage, it ought to be clean-burning coal. None of us argue in support of continued CO₂ emissions from coal-fired electricity plants. There is in the works right now a future gen project which is going to be about a billion eight research project. There are four sites that are in the hopper still competing for that one final selection: two in Illinois, two in Texas, one in my district.

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. None in Pennsylvania.

Mr. CONAWAY. That will do the research to be able to learn how to burn all forms of coal from the lignite that we have in Texas to the hard coals in Pennsylvania and Illinois, learn how to burn that coal to generate electricity but yet capture the CO₂, and then take that CO₂ and either sell it back to the oil and gas business to sweep oil reservoirs to enhance the oil recovery, or in many places we will have to learn how to put it underground, deeply buried, permanently buried in the ground so it is not in our atmosphere. That is essential that we get that done, and the sooner the better, because all of us believe coal is a long-time solution to electricity production, but it ought to be clean-burning coal, zero-emission coal-fired plant. That is important not only for the coal plants that we ought to be building in the United States, but India and China are also part of this consortium that is going to develop this technology. China is bringing on a 500-megawatt power plant every 2 weeks or so. India is in a similar mode. They are going to burn coal however they need to in order to generate electricity because electricity and an increased electricity supply drives growth and economies. The availability of the electricity helps drive the growth in these economies. China and India are going to continue to burn coal and spew CO₂ into the atmosphere no matter what we do. So it is in all of our best interests to learn how to burn coal cleanly and take advantage of that 250-year supply that my colleague from Illinois was talking about.

Mr. SHIMKUS. I know that the public, sometimes they don't understand that carbon dioxide is a commodity that is bought and sold, that people want, and we want it in the soda business to give the fizz in your Coke or

your Pepsi, or as my friend from Texas knows, advanced oil recovery. You shove that CO₂ back in the ground, it helps recover that margin of oil that has been harder to recover in the past.

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. One thing I want to mention, what has happened to these high energy prices? Dow Chemical paid \$8 billion for natural gas in 2002, \$22 billion in 2006, and they are now building plants all over the world because we can't afford America's energy. That is the message we need to realize. Many companies are doing that, and we need to prevent that.

Mr. CONAWAY. I want to thank both my colleagues tonight for coming in and sharing this hour and hopefully shedding a little bit of light on an issue that is of interest to every single American. We all use electricity in some form or fashion. It is all important to us.

In the couple of minutes we have left, I want to bring both my colleagues' attention to a study that came out this summer called "Facing the Hard Truths About Energy." This is a study that was done by the National Petroleum Council. It involves some 350 contributors. It was not a new study in the sense that it went out and did the research, but it gathered the research from these 350 participants that cover a very broad spectrum. It included course energy producers. It included environmentalists. It included everybody who might have something intelligent to say about the issues and problems that we face. It was transparent. Everybody got to see what was going on. There weren't any hidden agendas. There weren't any preconceived ideas.

I want to quickly run through the things that this study shows that we must do in the United States. Some I agree with wholeheartedly, and others I am still questioning and understanding the impact. But this study, which I hope over the next several months we are able to show to the American people and have them look at it and understand the issue as you and I do, but this study would say that we need to moderate the growing demand for energy by increasing efficiency of transportation, residential, commercial and other industrial uses. That is one we can all agree with. Expand and diversify production from clean coal, nuclear, biomass, other renewables and unconventional oil and gas; moderate the decline of conventional domestic oil and gas production, which means lifting those restrictions and going after domestic crude oil and increased access for development of new resources; integrated energy policy into trade, economic, environmental, security, foreign policies; strengthen global energy trade and investment; and broaden dialogue with both producing and consuming nations to improve global energy security. Not just energy security of the United States, but global energy security, because a world that has global energy security will be much more peaceful

than a world that is fighting for the energy.

Enhanced science and engineering capabilities and create long-term opportunities for research and development in all phases of the energy supply and demand system. And finally develop the legal and regulatory framework to enable carbon capture and sequestration. In addition, as policymakers consider options to reduce carbon dioxide emissions, provide an effective global framework for carbon management, including establishment of a transparent, predictable economywide cost for carbon dioxide emissions.

A couple of their findings unrelated directly to their recommendations were that the majority of the U.S. energy sector workforce, including skilled scientists and engineers, is eligible to retire within the next decade. The workforce must be replenished and trained. These are millions of jobs across a broad spectrum, from rough-necks all the way to the smartest scientists, that we have got in this country.

So I want to thank both my colleagues for coming to us tonight. We have 1 minute to close. JOHN, anything? JOHN, anything?

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Well, I guess I think the thing we need is we need an energy policy. We need to get serious about energy. Energy, in my view, is the number one challenge of America. I've said this in many speeches; I think it equals terrorism and the security of America. But if energy prices continue to skyrocket and we cannot compete in the global economy and the average American can't get a workingman's job, we are going to be a country in trouble. We are going to be a country that is not first rate. We are not going to be the leader of the world.

Energy availability and affordability should be the number one issue in the Congress. It is unlocking the OCS. It is unlocking the Midwest. It is wiser use of energy. It is using less for transportation, more efficiency. In fact, conserving in the next 5 years is probably all we can do, because everything we have talked about takes 5 to 10 years to produce fruit to bring it to market. So I think America's, I think that the real terror threat of this country is available, affordable energy.

Mr. CONAWAY. I want to thank both my colleagues for joining me tonight. As we opened the conversation tonight, I think it is time we quit howling and begin to do something that is important to all Americans.

With that I yield back.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 3074, TRANSPORTATION, HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2008

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida (during the Special Order of Mr. CONAWAY),

from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 110-447) on the resolution (H. Res. 817) providing for consideration of the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 3074) making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4156, ORDERLY AND RESPONSIBLE IRAQ REDEPLOYMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2008

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida (during the Special Order of Mr. CONAWAY), from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 110-448) on the resolution (H. Res. 818) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4156) making emergency supplemental appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

THE NAMING OF EMANCIPATION HALL

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

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, let me first begin by expressing my support of a suspension bill that was offered to this body by Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. MILLER and the ranking minority member on education to help provide emergency funding for Historically Black Colleges and Universities that are seeking some bridge loans for construction projects.

I think that my remarks today in the 60 minutes that I have been allotted under the Speaker's announced policy are very consistent with the historical concept and circumstances for which that bill will be passed into law and hopefully signed by the President of the United States.

Today, Mr. Speaker, we have come to this temple of democracy on this momentous occasion to write a new chapter in the unfolding story of human freedom. Today this body passed H.R. 3315, a bill to name the Visitor Center great hall Emancipation Hall, offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. WAMP), and the gentleman from Illinois, myself, Mr. JACKSON.

The event of emancipation marks one of the most, if not the most significant event in American history, and so too, at least from my perspective, was the passage of this bill. Unfortunately under the rule, it did not afford Members of Congress the opportunity to

have a broader discussion about the significance and the importance of this bill. But I do want to take this time to remind the Nation of the importance of this period and to reflect upon it during this Thanksgiving season.

Emancipation was more than an act; it was a process. Emancipation was not a date but a period. Emancipation was not an event but the fulfillment of providence that the Arc of history may be long, but it bends towards justice and human freedom. When the American Civil War erupted, both North and South defended their cause as morally just, legally right and constitutionally sound. Northerners and southerners saw themselves as true Americans following in the tradition of the footsteps of the Founding Fathers. North and South used the Constitution as the source of their moral and their legal authority for conducting a war against the other. Both sides saw themselves as standing in the tradition of the American Revolution. Each side contended that it was fighting for freedom and liberty, though certain facts contradicted the beliefs of both. The South said it was fighting to preserve freedom while protecting the institution of slavery. The North said it was fighting for liberty while not initially fighting to grant liberty to the slaves.

President Abraham Lincoln, our 16th President's address to the Sanitary Fair in Baltimore on April 18, 1864, summed up the quandary. He said, and I quote, "We all declare for liberty; but in using the same word we do not all mean the same thing. With some the word 'liberty' may mean for each man to do as he pleases with himself and the product of his labor, while with others, the same word may mean for some men to do as they please with other men and the product of other men's labor. Here are two not only different but incompatible things, called by the same name, 'liberty.' And it follows that each of these things is, by their respective parties," President Lincoln goes on to say, "called by two different and incompatible names, 'liberty' and 'tyranny.'"

He then went on to say, "The shepherd drives the wolf from the sheep's throat, for which the sheep thanks the shepherd as a liberator, while the wolf denounces him for the same act as the destroyer of liberty, especially as the sheep was a black one. Plainly the sheep and the wolf are not agreed upon the definition of the word 'liberty'; and precisely the same difference prevails today among us human creatures, even in the North, and all profess to love liberty."

Today, women, lesbians, gays, bisexual and transgendered Americans, African Americans, Latinos, Native Americans and students see in the word "liberty" one thing. Today for the Titans of Industry, it still means quite another. For the dispossessed, it means for each person to do with himself as they please. For the Titans it means for them to do as they please with

other men and the product of their labor anywhere in the world.

As Lincoln said, "And it follows that each of the things is, by the respective parties, called by two different and incompatible names, 'liberty' and 'tyranny.'"

That is why efforts to name the great hall Liberty Hall will settle for some but still not settle for others the fundamental question of human freedom in the American historical context. For millions of Americans to pass through Emancipation Hall and not Liberty Hall is an important acknowledgment about the process for attaining human freedom in our context as Americans.

Lincoln understood for his time and ours that we must not be confused about the language and the process of human freedom.

□ 2115

Much has been said about Lincoln and his ambivalence about emancipation. I believe when placed in the greater context, clarity emerges in Lincoln's calculation of emancipation. In 1862, Lincoln's announced support of colonization, along with his lack of public support for emancipation, was generating sometimes vicious attacks from militant abolitionists, including a "Prayer for 20 Millions" editorial urging emancipation that appeared in Horace Greeley's New York Tribune. On August 22, a month after the private announcement to his Cabinet on July 22 that he intended to issue an Emancipation Proclamation, Lincoln replied to Greeley's editorial with a masterfully written open letter. Here's what our 16th President had to say:

"If there be those who would not save the Union, unless they could at the same time save slavery, I do not agree with them. If there be those who would not save the Union unless they could at the same time destroy slavery, I do not agree with them. My paramount objective in this struggle is to save the Union, and it is either to save or to destroy slavery. If I could save the Union without freeing a single slave, I would do it, and if I could save it by freeing all of the slaves, I would do it; and if I could save it by freeing some and leaving others alone, I would also do that. What I do about slavery, and colored race, I do because I believe it helps to save the Union; and what I forebear, I forebear because I do not believe it would help to save the Union. I shall do less whenever I shall believe what I am doing hurts the cause, and I shall do more whenever I shall believe doing more will help the cause."

Lincoln was reiterating his central thesis, that the purpose of the war was preservation of the Union, but in light of the intransigence of the border States, he was publicly hinting that he might have to do something more, including emancipation to save the Union. In this open letter, Lincoln was saying "if," but he had already concluded in his mind "that" the only way to save the Union was to free the slaves.