The sending of Secretary Powell is a good step, but it cannot be a short-lived step or a 24-hour step. We have to engage the brilliance of our diplomacy and make it work. I believe if we sit down at the table of reconciliation, recognizing that this has turned into a crisis, it has been a festering sore from lack of attention for over a year because somebody else had the policies.

I want peace. I want to be one that promotes love and affection, and I am not someone, Mr. Speaker, as I close, I am not someone that misreads the tea leaves. I know what we are dealing with in the Mideast, but I have hope and I believe we can have trust. I believe through engagement and diplomacy we can bring a stability to that area.

I ask the administration and the Congress, I ask Americans, to really get behind the idea of peace in the Mideast.

SENSIBLE ENERGY POLICIES AND PRACTICES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. MCINNIS) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I am a little surprised by some of the comments of the previous speaker. Who does not want peace? But this speaker criticizes the administration because they have not engaged in diplomacy? I wonder what the speaker would recommend after September 11. Should the United States of America have called bin Laden and said, ''Let us engage in diplomacy''?

I would say, with all due respect to the previous speaker, take a look at the history of dealing with Yasser Arafat. Take a look at how many administrations have tried to engage, have come up with different types of agreements. The only common denominator we see throughout that history of engagement is Yasser Arafat. Take a look at every administration.

I am amazed that one would have the gumption, I guess we would say, to stand up here and criticize this administration because they are not engaging in ''diplomacy.''

Some Members of Congress, some of us sometimes, and I refer to all of us as Members of Congress, since when do we know all of what is going on in the Middle East? Maybe before we are so critical of the administration in the height of a crisis in the Middle East, maybe we ought to learn a little bit about what goes on behind closed doors, what are those negotiations that are taking place.

What do we expect Israel to do? What we would do if suicide bombers kept coming into our shopping malls or came over on Passover? That bomb, that suicide bomber on Passover would be like coming into America on Christmas Eve and blowing up Santa Claus. What do we think the response of that country is going to be?

Every nation in this world has an inherent, an inherent right, in fact, an inherent obligation to protect their population, to protect their people.

What do we think the United States of America, and I refer to the previous speaker, what do we think the United States of America would do if somebody started walking into our shopping malls with suicide bombers? Do we think we would engage in a diplomatic fashion with the aggressors? No, we would not engage with them, any more than we would engage in diplomatic discussions with bin Laden.

Once we knew that bin Laden was the person who was in charge, who coordinated, who ordered that devastating blow against our Nation on September 11, I did not hear one American, with the exception of maybe a couple of Congressmen, I did not hear one other American say, gosh, we ought to dial up Mr. bin Laden and we ought to sit down with him and have some diplomatic discussions with him.

□ 2100

My gosh, Mr. bin Laden, look what you have done. You have killed 3,000 people in America. You have killed hundreds of people from 80 separate countries. You have killed men. You have killed women. You have killed children. You have killed mothers. You have killed fathers. You have killed sisters. You have killed brothers. But, Mr. bin Laden, let us sit down and have a diplomatic discussion with you, because if we do not sit down and have a diplomatic discussion with you, we must not be as the previous speaker said, ''engaged,'' and that is upon the premise which the previous speaker criticizes this administration. Look, I think before one criticizes the President or before one criticizes Colin Powell or before one criticizes the efforts, one ought to know what is going on behind closed doors. What are the facts? What kind of contacts have they had? And regardless of where you stand on the issue, what country in the world can continue to sustain suicide bombers coming in with devastating blows against their innocent population? These are not military strikes. These bombers do not have enough guts to meet at the O.K. Corral and have a showdown on Main Street. Instead, they sneak in the back door of a department store and blow it to smithereens.

I heard on Public Radio the other day, Public Radio had this long discussion about a Palestinian woman who was pregnant and who was about to deliver, but she could not deliver because the Israel military had occupied the street and they could not get an ambulance to her so she had to deliver in her home. Not once during that discussion on Public Radio, not once did we hear any kind of discussion about that pregnant mother that was blown to smithereens by a suicide bomber, no chance at all. We have got to be a little fair in our approach here.

I am amazed, to me, the more and more I hear the anti-Jewish rhetoric, the anti-Israel rhetoric, I would like to ask any of you who are perpetrators of that kind of comment, what would you do if somebody walked in one of your relative's house and blew it to smithereens? Do as the previous speaker said? Call them on the phone and say let us have some diplomatic engagement or be subject to criticism because you went over and you tried to eliminate the person who has done everything they can to destroy you.

I am no expert on the Middle East. I read about it every day. I spent time today flying on the plane, most of my time; my reading was on the Middle East. I grab all the information I can about the Middle East. But I am awful careful before I jump out and criticize the administration on their policy on the Middle East unless I think I have got a better answer. And, frankly, I do not know what the solution in the Middle East is. But I do not think the solution is to criticize our leaders because they have not sat down so-called sat down and had diplomatic engagement. Anybody that alleges that there has not been diplomatic engagement in the Middle East shows a very clear demonstration of a lack of knowledge of history. There has been time and time and time again of diplomatic engagement in the Middle East.

Of course, everybody wants to settle it peacefully. We would like to have settled issues peacefully prior to September 11. But sometimes the aggressor offers you no choice. Do you realistically think that on September 12 America thought that one of the options we had was to sit down with bin Laden and to have ''diplomatic engagement'' with this villain, with this man so full of hatred that he killed thousands of innocent people with one strike? And if he is alive, you can be sure he is not thinking about diplomatic engagement. He is not thinking about anything to further his religion. He is thinking about an evil strike, how else can he get back at the United States of America. Tell me what the mind was, what kind of sound minds of these suicide bombers or these perpetrators, for example, on September 11. They did not target one specific group. They did not care whether they were Muslims. They killed Muslims in those towers. There were people of the Islam faith that were killed. They killed people of 50 different nationalities from 80 different countries. They did not discriminate between men and women, between children and mothers and fathers and so on.

Sometimes I am surprised at the remarks, although having been here for a few years I am getting kind of used to it; but sometimes I am a little surprised at the remarks made on this House floor, and especially to have in my opinion to stand up here at the height, hours after they have just had

another event in the Middle East and to have some who would describe it as audacity to criticize this administration because they have not sat down and held hands and talked peace. Again, it shows a complete lack of knowledge of the history of the Middle East.

I think all of us would be much further ahead, and I think it would advance the interests of this country and advance the interests of our constituents if, when we discuss a subject like the Middle East, at least we have some extensive background in it, at least we come in with some historical knowledge of the subject of which we offer ourselves experts. I think we ought to have that responsibility.

I do not think we ought to come in here half-cocked and start criticizing the administration in the Middle East hours after what is alleged to be, I do not know what is on the TV, alleged to be a 10-year-old suicide bomber, a 13-year-old suicide bomber. Tell me how you can sit down with people who would take a young child, strap bombs on them and throw an ambush in against another country, and you tell me about diplomatic engagement. Talk to me about a bomber that goes in on Passover, which again is like Christmas Eve, like blowing up Santa Claus at Christmas here in the United States, tell me how many people would be excited to have diplomatic engagement with those kind of people.

Let us be honest about it; there are evil people in the world, and there are people that have to be dealt with on their own terms. There are a lot of people in this world that they do not like this touchy-feely stuff; they do not understand that kind of thing. They understand strength and they understand fear. And if they can get fear over strength, that is exactly how they weaken the strong.

Now, I do not mean to get all riled up up here, but I think all of us have an obligation whether the administration is Democrat or Republican, I think we all have an obligation before we criticize the administration within hours of a suicide bomber, that we learn a little information instead of standing up here and saying no diplomatic engagement. What we need is engagement, engagement.

Give me a break. Look at the history of the Middle East. We are trying to figure out the answer. There is engagement 24 hours a day over there in the Middle East. Some of the brightest scholars our country has ever produced have not figured out what to do in the Middle East. I would be awful careful. I would be a little cautious about criticizing people who are a lot more engaged in the Middle East than those of us sitting on the floor of the House of Representatives. That is not to take away the right to question, or the right to visit with these people or understand that history and then have a debate here. But gosh darn it, we ought to learn a little bit more about the subject before we pretend to be expert on the floor.

I listened to the gentleman from Florida's (Mr. WELDON) discussion, who was two or three speakers back. I commend what the gentleman said. I think a lot of what the gentleman said, a lot of what he pointed out was accurate. How do you address the situation where somebody continually sends suicide bombers, not against your military targets, but against your shopping malls, against your citizens, into restaurants, one of them was a wedding reception? I think the gentleman's points were pretty valid.

The Middle East is a tough situation. Afghanistan is a tough situation. OPEC, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GEKAS) said it very well. Take a look at OPEC. OPEC, so-called allies of ours, OPEC has taken every advantage they can to manipulate the price of oil so that they can take a lot of those revenues, frankly, and direct them against U.S. interests. Now look, it is a free market system. We are capitalists, and OPEC has a right to do that. But we should not just sit by and be idle.

What happens? Take a look at the old Adam Smith theory. If you come into a community and you have a product that people need, but you continue to gouge the people and gouge the people and gouge the people, and you have a capitalistic society like our society is, what happens? Somebody in that community is going to say, you know something, the gentleman's product over there, the product he is selling, he is gouging us on it. I think I can get a product that offers the same benefits his product does. I can sell it at a cheaper price. I will not gouge the people. I will sell more of the product, and in the long run I will actually make more money.

I think that kind of leads us into a discussion I wanted to talk about this evening and that is energy and production of energy in this country. I have heard, and unfortunately, without trying to be too partisan, but it is reality, it is kind of a general philosophy of the Democratic side, well, what we need to do is more alternative energy methods, and we need to conserve more, but no more exploration or limit the exploration. Let us go into conservation and alternative energy.

I agree with two of the three points that the Democrats are saying. In fact, a lot of what they have said on the first two points were presented by the Republican side. Number one, of course, we ought to look for alternative energy. That is exactly what happened in my previous example here. The guy comes into town. He starts gouging on a product. The people in the community start looking for alternatives so they are not subject to the rule of that individual. That is exactly what we have to do with energy. I wholeheartedly endorse, wholeheartedly endorse that we look for alternative methods of production of energy. But that does not mean we should go on some white elephant chase.

We hear continually if you do not subsidize this or you do not subsidize that, you do not support alternative energy. The fact is it has got to make some sense. It has got to have a realistic chance of succeeding, and then I think the government should get behind it.

We have been able to develop a lot of things throughout the history of our Nation. Our Nation is one of the greatest nations in the history of the world because of our innovative capabilities, because of our innovation. And when the challenge is in front of us, we can accomplish that. Even that said, it will take some time. Twenty years from now, 30 years from now I project that people back then will look at the way we transmit electricity through wires and say, Why did they ever use wires? They will have some other type of system to transmit electricity. They will look back at what we had today and say, Wow, what an antiquated way to provide our energy. Their furnaces will probably be the size of a drinking cup. There are lots of things that will change in the next 30 years, but it will take time.

In the meantime, conservation alone, which is very, very, very important, will not fill the gap between oil needs and oil production. What fills that gap right now is OPEC. And the less we are able to produce out of our own resources, the more we have to buy from OPEC. The more we buy from OPEC, the more we feed this problem in the Arab countries, the more we provide resources for these countries to turn around and use them against us and the more susceptible we become to their whims.

For example, yesterday, Saddam Hussein, our old pal over there in Iraq, a guy who poisons his own populations, decides on a whim we will stop, no more production for the United States and Israel, no more oil for the next 30 days or until Israel pulls out of the occupied lands, whichever comes later. You know, what we have become is dependent on madmen like this. The tail is trying to wag the dog. That is exactly what is out there.

That is why unlike people who say, look, the only way out of this energy crisis is conservation and alternative energy, the fact is there is a third element, and that is you have got to continue to produce resources until these other two completely fill, or significantly fill, that gap.

I think the easiest thing every one of us can do, every person in this Nation can do is conservation. And it is really easy to do. There is a lot of conservation that can take place without an inconvenience to your life-style. There is a lot of conservation that we can do that is of no pain, no economic pain to you. As I just said, no inconvenience to your life-style. But we have got to do it. All of us can participate in it.

□ 2115

For example, a hot summer coming up. Instead of having the air conditioning set at 68, see if you can get by with 70. Just think, across the country if we had everybody doing that, trying not to idle your car so much, if we just walked out of the room and shut the light off after we left the room, think how much electricity we could conserve.

Take a look at water, and water is a sensitive area for me. I come from the West. My district is Colorado. It is the only State in the Union where all of our free-flowing water goes out. We have no water coming in. Conservation benefits us a lot but conservation alone will not fill the cup that we need filled.

Conservation, we have got a bucket and we have got to go get so much water in that bucket to feed our cows or we have problems, and we do not have an alternative yet that is going to fill up much of the bucket. It puts a little water in the bucket. Conservation puts a little more, but the fact is we have got to drill a well. We have got to get some water out of there or we cannot feed the cows. That is as simple as it is.

So what I am urging my colleagues to do is let us accept the reality that we have to look for production. We have to continue to produce from our own resources, while at the same time urging our constituents and the citizens of this Nation to conserve, while at the same time supporting, giving incentive and encouraging alternative energy production. There are lots of exciting things out there, but we are not there yet but we will be there.

I want to tell my colleagues about an experience. I wish I would have brought it today. Oh, probably a year ago, I was on an airplane and I sat next to a young person, very bright, very capable, it seemed to me. She was about, I guess, 21 years old. I asked her what she was studying, what she wanted to do, and she said what she wanted to do was study energy and how to capture energy in ocean waves. There is energy that is produced every time that water moves. I thought that was pretty interesting.

Then pretty soon she says, look, pulling out a little piece of paper about this long, probably about, oh, an inch and a half long, and probably a half an inch wide, and at the end of it, it had two wires and on the end of the two wires, it was connected to a small light bulb. I do not know what was in the paper material, but there was some kind of material that would conduct power, electricity, and she would wave it like this and the light would come on. She said, there is so much energy in the world that we are not capturing. She said, we think that if we can do that, we can really supply lot of energy needs for our country.

I was pretty excited about it, and that is how our energy is going to be produced one of these days. But in the meantime, do not pretend that we are not relying upon oil. We have got to have those resources. And if you are going to be one of those that do not think we need to be relying on oil, who objects across the board, not to a specific area, where digging oil, for example, might be objectionable to the particular environmental conditions around that particular site, but if you are one of these people that just across the board opposes that kind of production, then you ought to not just talk the talk, you ought to walk the walk. Quit driving your car, quit riding your mountain bike that is made of different resources. I mean, everything we have is reliant on that product, our medicines.

I ride a mountain bike. That is why I used it as an example. I could not have my mountain bike if I did not have those kind of resources available. I could not have the vehicle that we need to get around on our roads in Colorado. We would not have heat, et cetera. My colleagues know the story.

Obviously it is a reasonable approach to take, but it is not a reasonable approach to say stop oil production or no more oil production or do not even bring up the debate of exploring more oil in Alaska. Or, if we do bring up the debate, let us debate solely on a motion, not on facts. Unfortunately, on the House floor, a lot of the decisions we make are driven by emotion.

Has anyone ever wondered when they look at legislation, I do not care whether it is at the State level, maybe even the city level, I have never worked at the city level, but at the State level or the Federal level, has anyone ever noticed that legislation always has a great name to it? Save the animal organization, save the planet, or save small business, et cetera? There is a reason for that, because a lot of the debate on this floor and a lot of debate in the legislative arenas throughout this country are based on emotion.

There are times that while that may be appropriate, there are times where we have an obligation as elected representatives of the people, we have an obligation to stand back and make a decision based also on facts. What are the realities that we are dealing with? If something has not brought it to our attention in the last 48 hours, when a renegade country like Iraq that is obviously producing weapons of mass destruction for use against one target, the United States of America, decides they are going to stop their oil production, maybe it ought to wake us up a little more and say we ought to be ready for this.

What if that oil embargo begins to spread throughout the Middle East? The United States must become less dependent, not more dependent, on foreign oil resources, and the only way we can do it is to continue to advance our technology to develop the resources that we have, while at the same time figuring out alternatives for the future, while at the same time encouraging our populations to conserve.

As I said earlier, we do not have to go out to our constituents and ask for a great sacrifice for them to conserve. There are a lot of things a lot of us can do in our everyday living that can help conserve energy that will not impact us at all, like turning off the light switch. I mean, even if we do not run the water the whole time we brush our teeth, put the toothpaste on the toothbrush, put a little water on there, brush our teeth, have our water off, then have the water on, the average person runs, by the time they are done brushing their teeth, if they brush their teeth for the 2-minute prescribed time to keep away from the dentist, how many gallons of water run through the sink, if one has the faucet on? Two or 3 gallons of water for someone to brush their teeth.

These are the kind of things if we just turn it off while we are brushing, brushed and then turned it back on, we would probably use less than a tenth of a gallon. Those are simple things. They did not impact us. Our teeth are not any less clean and we feel better because we have helped with a challenge that our country faces.

There are a number of obligations that as Congressmen I think we owe to the people that we represent. One of them is the future, to secure this Nation for the future, and it means not only secure the Nation in the future for energy, not only to secure the future generations for things like education and health care and a good economy and a government that does not override the ability for individual freedom, the right of private property ownership. These are all elements that are very strong that I think have to be passed to the next generation.

I also I think what must be passed to the next generation is the necessity to be strong, strong in security for our people, and a part of that is assuring that we have the natural resources to defend ourselves against blackmail by a country like Iraq, against security threats by renegades like bin Laden.

On September 11, a lot of people said what a huge hit against the United States. Obviously it was a horrible, horrible disaster for the United States of America. But take a look at the things that went right. It did not cripple the United States of America. Oh, sure it hurt us, and many, many, many families suffered horrible tragedies. Our country suffered but our country did not buckle.

Our country responded because previous people, people ahead of us that served in Congress, prepared this country over decades, prepared us in the sense that we have a strong National Guard, prepared us in the sense that we have a strong Army and Marine Corps and Air Force; that we had the capability through our intelligence services to figure out who did this grievous act to us; that we had the hospital facilities and the EMTs and the firefighters and the police officers and the local organizations and the statewide organizations and the monetary contribution

of our citizens to keep on our feet. We kept on our feet. They did not knock us off our feet. They broke a rib, but they did not knock us off our feet.

That is because the great leaders of this country have prepared this country in the same sense that we have to prepare this country for the future, and that is the capability to sustain an attack, to be able to turn around and stop the attacker in a military sense.

What is going on in the world today is tragic. What is going on in the Middle East, obviously. I mean, I wish my colleagues knew the solution. I am not sure anybody has got it figured out there yet, but the reality of it is that no matter how long we pray, I know it is very helpful, and I do it a lot, no matter how long we pray, no matter how much we hope, and touchy-feely things we do, the reality of it is the world will never know total peace, but we can go a long way towards that.

The best way we can go towards that is to negotiate from a position of strength, and that is exactly what the United States, its leadership in the past, they have placed our country in a position of strength, and that is the obligation that every one of us on this House floor has to future generations, to continue to keep this great Nation of ours in a position of strength, to allow this great Nation and its future generations to go forward from a position of strength.

From a position of strength this great Nation has helped hundreds of millions of people throughout the world. From this position of strength our Nation can help many, many other nations throughout the world. We can help escape poverty. We can help escape tyrannism. We can help escape communism. And we can go on and on, but it all starts with the core of our strength. We cannot help our neighbor if we are not strong.

We need to be strong. We are strong, but we need our commitment to stay strong. That means a strong defense. That means a strong educational system. That means a strong welcome system. It means a strong energy policy. Working together, I think we can continue the strength of this great Nation.

So I look forward to working with my colleagues in the future, but let me summarize by saying a couple of things. Number one, I think it is a mistake for my colleagues to take this microphone, as I witnessed this evening, and criticize this administration for not being diplomatically engaged, as if diplomatic engagement has not taken place in the Middle East for decades.

I am amazed that while we have a great deal of knowledge available to us, while we can have classified briefings, and many of us receive classified briefings on countries of our choice and so on and so forth, our level of knowledge and our level of expertise on the Middle East, for example, is somewhat limited. I would venture to say that the administration, Colin Powell, Condoleeza Rice, DICK CHENEY, obviously the President, have a little bit more access and a little bit more knowledge of what is going on over in the Middle East minute by minute. We simply have not been able to make ourselves available to that.

So before we criticize the persons that have the knowledge, before we are so critical from the House floor, my colleagues ought to learn a little bit more exactly what is occurring. Because while we were speaking this evening, bullets have flown over there, and it is amazing that while machine gunfire is taking place, while allegedly 10-year-old or 13-year-old suicide bombers are running in to kill one side or the other, it is a little surprising to hear one of our Congressmen or the Congress as a whole maybe, which has not happened, I guess particular colleagues of mine, to stand up here and say, well, we have not diplomatically engaged. If any of us have a better idea that is going to work, not just to get publicity back in our district, if someone has really got an idea that is going to work, if they think they have got a solution for it, advance it. Do not wait till nighttime on special orders to come down here and say, well, how easy it is to criticize you because you are not a diplomatically engaged administration, and what we ought to do, hope for peace, that is how we solve the situation in the Middle East.

We want peace. All peace-loving Americans want peace, and I am quoting directly from some of the previous comments. Well, that is a nice statement to make, but how are we going to solve the problem? What are the nuts and the bolts of the solution? When we have a crisis like the Middle East, I get a little impatient, as I would hope my colleagues get a little impatient, with one of us standing up here and constantly criticizing the administration but never coming up with a solution of their own.

□ 2130

Mr. Speaker, the easiest thing in the world is to criticize. The toughest thing in the world is to lead. I have seen a lot of criticism, but I am not sure how much leadership I am seeing. I am trying to learn everything I can about the situation in the Middle East, and I hope that the administration is doing the right thing; and I have placed my faith in this administration, as I have placed my faith in the United States. I think we are doing the right thing with what we have and what we know.

I hope that our common sense leads us to some type of solution; but I can tell Members this, it would be a cold day in Members-know-where before I would jump up and make the criticisms while the guns are firing. I think we need to be a little more supportive.

RESPONSE TO MIDDLE EAST CRISIS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMMONS). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTSCH) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Speaker, the topic we are going to speak about this evening is, in a sense, a response to what is going on in the Middle East today; and specifically a response in terms of being not just sensitive, but supportive of what the Israelis are trying to do regarding terrorist acts in their country.

The reason I put this chart up first is just to try to lay out a perspective of what has happened in Israel over the last several months. Israel is about 5 million people. The United States is about 300 million people. We are about 60 times larger than Israel. As all Americans know, on September 11, about 3,000 Americans died in an instant. The equivalent number in Israel would be about 50.

Last month in Israel, the Israeli people sustained the equivalent of three September 11's, in the month of March. Since this calendar year, the Israeli people have sustained the equivalent of approximately eight September 11's. I think all of us understand what the United States' response, God forbid, would be, in that type of situation. We understand what the United States' response has been in response to September 11 itself. In fact, I have been very supportive of the President, and I do not think any Member of Congress has not been supportive of the President and America's efforts to eradicate weapons of mass destruction that have a direct effect on the United States. There has been no daylight at all between any of us for those efforts.

I think the President gets it completely about the threat of international terrorism from countries like Iraq, Syria, and North Korea. But unfortunately, the President does not get it in terms of some of his response to the State of Israel, his specific responses that effectively demand that the Israelis withdraw their troops and their activities in terms of cities like Ramalah, Jenin, and Nablut.

From an American perspective, to put it in some light, which is a very appropriate analogy, the United States of America does not have to have our men and women in Afghanistan. We are in Afghanistan because we have no choice but to be in Afghanistan to literally protect ourself at a national security level. We do not want to be there. I think everyone in the world or at least everyone in America understands, we have no national interest. We have no desire, zero, and I think Americans understand that we do not want to conquer Afghanistan, to colonize Afghanistan.

At the same exact level, the Israelis have no desire to be in Ramalah, Jenin, and Nablut. And just as we are concerned about our sons and daughters,