

ALERT

Updated December 24, 2009

Congressional Speeches on the Iranian Threat

U.S. Senate

Arizona

- [Minority Whip Jon Kyl \(R-AZ\)](#)
- [John McCain \(R-AZ\)](#)

Alabama

- [Jeff Sessions \(R-AL\)](#)

California

- [Barbara Boxer \(D-CA\)](#)

Connecticut

- [Chris Dodd \(D-CT\)](#)
- [Joseph Lieberman \(I-CT\)](#)

Delaware

- [Ted Kaufman \(D-DE\)](#)

Florida

- [Bill Nelson \(D-FL\)](#)

Indiana

- [Evan Bayh \(D-IN\)](#)

Iowa

- [Charles Grassley \(R-IA\)](#)

Kentucky

- [Jim Bunning \(R-KY\)](#)
- [Minority Leader Mitch McConnell \(R-KY\)](#)

Maine

- [Susan Collins \(R-ME\)](#)

Massachusetts

- [John Kerry \(D-MA\)](#)

Michigan

- [Carl Levin \(D-MI\)](#)

Minnesota

- [Al Franken \(D-MN\)](#)
- [Amy Klobuchar \(D-MN\)](#)

Nevada

- [Majority Leader Harry Reid \(D-NV\)](#)

New Jersey

- [Robert Menendez \(D-NJ\)](#)

New York

- [Kirsten Gillibrand \(D-NY\)](#)
- [Charles Schumer \(D-NY\)](#)

North Dakota

- [Kent Conrad \(D-ND\)](#)
- [Byron Dorgan \(D-ND\)](#)

Oregon

- [Jeff Merkley \(D-OR\)](#)

Pennsylvania

- [Robert Casey \(D-PA\)](#)
- [Arlen Specter \(D-PA\)](#)

Texas

- [John Cornyn \(R-TX\)](#)

Utah

- [Orrin Hatch \(R-UT\)](#)

Wyoming

- [John Barrasso \(R-WY\)](#)

U.S. House of Representatives

Alabama

- [Parker Griffith \(D-AL\)](#)

American Samoa

- [Eni Faleomavaega \(D-AS\)](#)

Arizona

- [Ann Kirkpatrick \(D-AZ\)](#)

Arkansas

- [John Boozman \(R-AR\)](#)

California

- [Howard Berman \(D-CA\)](#)
- [John Campbell \(R-CA\)](#)
- [Dennis Cardoza \(D-CA\)](#)
- [Elton Gallegly \(R-CA\)](#)
- [Wally Herger \(R-CA\)](#)
- [Darrell Issa \(R-CA\)](#)
- [Barbara Lee \(D-CA\)](#)
- [Daniel Lungren \(R-CA\)](#)
- [Tom McClintock \(R-CA\)](#)
- [Speaker of the House Nancy Pelosi \(D-CA\)](#)
- [Dana Rohrabacher \(D-CA\)](#)
- [Ed Royce \(R-CA\)](#)
- [Loretta Sanchez \(D-CA\)](#)
- [Adam Schiff \(D-CA\)](#)
- [Brad Sherman \(D-CA\)](#)
- [Jackie Speier \(D-CA\)](#)
- [Diane Watson \(D-CA\)](#)
- [Henry Waxman \(D-CA\)](#)

Florida

- [Lincoln Diaz-Balart \(R-FL\)](#)
- [Alcee Hastings \(D-FL\)](#)
- [Ron Klein \(D-FL\)](#)
- [Connie Mack \(R-IL\)](#)
- [Tom Rooney \(R-FL\)](#)
- [Ileana Ros-Lehtinen \(R-FL\)](#)
- [Cliff Stearns \(R-FL\)](#)

- [Debbie Wasserman Schultz \(D-FL\)](#)
- [Robert Wexler \(D-FL\)](#)

Georgia

- [Phil Gingrey \(R-GA\)](#)
- [Hank Johnson \(D-GA\)](#)
- [Tom Price \(R-GA\)](#)
- [David Scott \(D-GA\)](#)

Hawaii

- [Mazie Hirono \(D-HI\)](#)

Illinois

- [Jesse Jackson Jr. \(D-IL\)](#)
- [Mark Kirk \(R-IL\)](#)
- [Dan Lipinski \(D-IL\)](#)
- [Mike Quigley \(D-IL\)](#)
- [Peter Roskam \(R-IL\)](#)
- [Aaron Schock \(R-IL\)](#)

Indiana

- [Dan Burton \(R-IN\)](#)
- [Mike Pence \(R-IN\)](#)

Kansas

- [Jerry Moran \(R-KS\)](#)

Kentucky

- [Geoff Davis \(R-KY\)](#)

Louisiana

- [John Fleming \(R-LA\)](#)

Maryland

- [Donna Edwards \(D-MD\)](#)
- [Majority Leader Steny Hoyer \(D-MD\)](#)
- [Chris Van Hollen \(D-MD\)](#)

Massachusetts

- [Barney Frank \(D-MA\)](#)

Michigan

- [Dave Camp \(R-MI\)](#)
- [Carolyn Kilpatrick \(D-MI\)](#)
- [Thaddeus McCotter \(R-MI\)](#)
- [Candice Miller \(R-MI\)](#)
- [Gary Peters \(D-MI\)](#)

Minnesota

- [Michele Bachmann \(R-MN\)](#)
- [Keith Ellison \(D-MN\)](#)
- [Erik Paulsen \(R-MN\)](#)

Missouri

- [Russ Carnahan \(D-MO\)](#)
- [Ike Skelton \(D-MO\)](#)

Nebraska

- [Jeff Fortenberry \(R-NE\)](#)

Nevada

- [Shelley Berkley \(D-NV\)](#)

New Jersey

- [Scott Garrett \(R-NJ\)](#)

- [Rush Holt \(D-NJ\)](#)
- [Christopher Smith \(R-NJ\)](#)

New York

- [Gary Ackerman \(R-NY\)](#)
- [Michael Arcuri \(D-NY\)](#)
- [Eliot Engel \(D-NY\)](#)
- [Nita Lowey \(D-NY\)](#)
- [Carolyn Maloney \(D-NY\)](#)
- [Michael McMahon \(D-NY\)](#)

North Carolina

- [Howard Coble \(R-NC\)](#)
- [Virginia Foxx \(R-NC\)](#)
- [Patrick McHenry \(R-NC\)](#)

Pennsylvania

- [Joseph Pitts \(R-PA\)](#)
- [Allyson Schwartz \(D-PA\)](#)
- [Glenn Thompson \(R-PA\)](#)

South Carolina

- [Bob Inglis \(R-SC\)](#)

Ohio

- [Minority Leader John Boehner \(R-OH\)](#)

Texas

- [Louie Gohmert \(R-TX\)](#)
- [Kay Granger \(R-TX\)](#)
- [Al Green \(D-TX\)](#)
- [Gene Green \(D-TX\)](#)
- [Jeb Hensarling \(R-TX\)](#)
- [Sheila Jackson Lee \(D-TX\)](#)
- [Pete Olson \(R-TX\)](#)
- [Ted Poe \(R-TX\)](#)
- [Pete Sessions \(R-TX\)](#)

Virginia

- [Minority Whip Eric Cantor \(R-VA\)](#)
- [Gerry Connolly \(D-VA\)](#)
- [Jim Moran \(D-VA\)](#)
- [Frank Wolf \(R-VA\)](#)

Washington

- [Cathy McMorris Rodgers \(R-WA\)](#)
- [Dave Reichert \(R-WA\)](#)

Rep. Gary Ackerman (D-NY)

December 15, 2009

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of a sanctions bill that I believe will strengthen the Obama administration's ability to conduct effective diplomacy. The world, and I mean both our allies and others, needs to know that the U.S. Congress is dead serious about sanctions should diplomacy fail to resolve the real concerns about Iran's nuclear program. For those who worry that sanctions may lead to conflict, I would suggest that the opposite is true. With Iranian proliferation on the horizon, what is feckless is reckless. If you don't want war, it seems to me that you absolutely must back the toughest possible political and economic sanctions.

It is true that sanctions alone are almost certainly not going to be sufficient to force the Iranian regime to change course. But if we are serious about stopping Iran's race for nuclear capability, we must apply the maximum possible pressure by enhancing our capacity for unilateral sanctions, as we're doing today, by implementing crippling multilateral sanctions, and by developing a strategy that applies more comprehensive pressure than just diplomatic engagement followed by sanctions.

President Obama's offer of direct engagement with Iran already helped to heal a variety of political woes, but by itself, diplomacy and political and economic sanctions may still leave too much initiative in Iranian hands. If the Iranians remain recalcitrant and sanctions are applied, no matter how crippling--and I want to make it perfectly clear that I want them to be absolutely suffocating for the regime--the initiative is still left to the ayatollahs to decide when they've had enough.

Tragically, I suspect President Obama is soon going to have to decide whether an Iranian nuclear weapon is truly unacceptable in the full meaning of that word and with the full knowledge of what that means. The best thing that we can do to help avoid that terrible moment of truth is to act affirmatively on the bill before us today. (*Congressional Record*)

June 19, 2009

Madam Speaker, I want to express my appreciation to the Chairman and to Mr. Pence for the resolution before us. I think it is critical for the House to address the remarkable events that are taking place in Iran.

We are seeing a nation--an entire nation--rise up. What is happening in Iran is an inspiration to all of us who believe that there is such a thing as universal human rights.

We do not want--and we are not attempting--to choose Iran's rulers. Who rules Iran is a question for the people of Iran. And as we expect all nations to respect our sovereignty, so too must we respect the sovereignty of other nations.

But we are not blind. And we must not be mute.

We have seen gunfire and truncheons deployed against peaceful protesters and marches. We have followed the wave of repression against activists, reporters, and all forms of communication. We know about the crackdown and arrests of Iranians who call for freedom and reform. We have watched mobs of thuggish enforcers terrorizing students and citizens in their dorms and homes.

But we have also watched the unbelievable, quiet courage of millions of Iranians marching, and we have watched their numbers growing every day. We have seen them insist on non-violence in the face of provocation and assault. And we have heard their impatient but persistent call for justice.

And this nation knows what that call for justice sounds like. The Rev. Martin Luther King, Jr. wrote from the Birmingham jail that “Injustice anywhere is a threat to justice everywhere. We are caught in an inescapable network of mutuality, tied in a single garment of destiny. Whatever affects one directly, affects all indirectly.”

Bound up in the revolutionary documents of our founding, and in our Nation’s unique role in the struggle for human freedom, is a special responsibility. We have an obligation that the resolution before us answers. We are all witnesses. And we are bound to support the courageous and decent people in Iran who are struggling for their rights and their freedom.

This resolution is measured and careful, but meaningful. And it deserves the strong support of every Member. (*Congressional Record*)

Rep. Michael Arcuri (D-NY)

June 25, 2009

Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to say how thankful I am to live in such a great country, a country where we have inalienable rights guaranteed to us by our Nation’s founding documents, and the knowledge that our government is set up to protect those rights.

We know that we are guaranteed the right to peaceful, public protest, and we see many great Americans utilizing that right here in Washington, D.C., on a daily basis. It is not until haunting and disturbing images of blatant violence and oppression run across the front pages of our newspapers and TV screens that we realize how important these rights are.

The people of Iran are expressing themselves peacefully in the streets, and are being viciously attacked by armed guards and police. The violence needs to end now, and the people of Iran should be heard.

I want to commend President Obama for his leadership and his judgment in such a difficult and intense foreign policy crisis, and I agree with his resistance to instigate a foreign nation

through demagoguery, a distinct difference from the carelessness that sometimes was used by administrations in the past.

Let me be clear, I know the world understands that the United States will always vehemently oppose oppression and violence against a nation's people and we will do everything we can to ensure this type of behavior is not tolerated. I thank President Obama for his thoughtful leadership on this matter and offer my support in the future. (*Congressional Record*)

Rep. Michele Bachmann (R-MN)

February 3, 2009

Madam Speaker, I rise to share my profound disappointment in the continued extraordinary anti-Israel rhetoric and policies of Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad. He is again endorsing a conference that denies the horror--indeed, the existence--of the Holocaust and that places blame for much of the world's woes with the people of Israel.

Tehran's Sharif University of Technology conference, entitled "Holocaust? A Sacred Lie by the West," is in and of itself disturbing. It is evidence that the hatred that underlies the violence in the Middle East is, regrettably, alive and well. But, for the head of a nation to lend the imprimatur of government support to such an event is real cause for alarm. President Ahmadinejad, in his statement of support for the conference, stated that the "Zionist regime is the 'illegitimate child' of the Holocaust phenomenon." This is dangerous rhetoric.

There are millions of peace-loving peoples in the Middle East--Israelis, Palestinians, Iranians, Iraqis; indeed from every nation of the region. They will never be able to experience peace and security as long as hatred like this is spoken, taught, and endorsed by the leaders of the region.

Mahmoud Ahmadinejad has just announced his intention to run for another term as Iran's President. I am hopeful that the people of Iran will send him a message that they want to live in peace with their neighbors and that they want to put an end to the cycle of violence and hatred that conferences like this one epitomize. (*Congressional Record*)

Sen. John Barrasso (R-WY)

June 16, 2009

QUESTION: The president says he's not going to intervene in Iranian affairs, but he says he is concerned about the disputed election. Is that enough, do you think, in terms of the president being outspoken on what's happening?

SEN. JOHN BARRASSO: Well, for right now it is. I mean, clearly, all of us want free and fair elections, and we see what's happening there. The pictures that are coming out really tell the story. I think people were surprised all across America when we saw that the election

results were called so early with Ahmadinejad proclaiming himself the winner when that really wasn't clear to any of us.

So I am hoping that they work to finding a solution and do a fair count, and I'm not sure that people are going to be able to get that. I'm going to also watch very closely what the military does, if they're going to change sides in all of this.

QUESTION: Senator, at this point do you think a fair count is possible? I mean, even if they go back and claim to recount the ballots that are there, you know, is anyone going to believe in that result? What would be -- what would be a fair outcome at this point?

BARRASSO: I think it's going to be very hard for people around the world to believe that there is a fair outcome. So the president clearly has his hands full with this and with other matters affecting the economy.

As you know, I was at the AMA meeting yesterday for his health care talks. That's also a big part of what he's trying to deal with. So there's a -- the world continues to be a dangerous place around the world with what he's dealing with Iran and clearly what's happening with the U.S. economy. (*MSNBC Interview*)

Sen. Evan Bayh (D-IN)

October 1, 2009

On Thursday in Geneva, the United States will begin face-to-face, multilateral negotiations with representatives of Iran's regime and offer them a final chance to verifiably terminate their illegal nuclear program or face the strongest sanctions in the history of their republic.

The pivotal talks also will help to answer a fundamental question at the heart of Iran's future: Will the country's ruling clerics choose to behave as leaders of a rational nation-state and embrace policies based on a cost-benefit analysis of what is in their national interest?

Or will they embrace global confrontation, driven by religious extremism and hatred of Israel, the United States and Western civilization?

Recent events do not inspire optimism. Iran's provocative missile tests this week come just days after the disclosure of a secret Iranian nuclear enrichment facility at Qom. The smoking-gun revelation of a covert atomic facility unsuitable for civilian energy production — revealed as global leaders gathered in New York to discuss the regime's behavior — unmasked the true nature of Iran's nuclear program.

To date, President Barack Obama has skillfully handled this complex challenge. The administration's repeated offers of engagement have put Tehran on the defensive and made it much more difficult for Iran's leaders to blame the West for their problems. No one can question the sincerity of American entreaties to peacefully negotiate to resolve our differences with Iran.

Obama's personal diplomacy with Russian President Dmitri Medvedev last weekend may have opened a new pathway to persuade Russia and perhaps China to endorse meaningful international action. Medvedev acknowledged last Friday that Iran's nuclear program had violated U.N. Security Council resolutions and called on the country to comply with international inspections. It remains to be seen, however, if Russia and China will follow through with support for tough new sanctions.

Multinational diplomacy can succeed only if it is backed by the credible threat of meaningful action. While robust multilateral sanctions are highly preferable, the United States must be prepared to act unilaterally should other global powers decide to place their own economic interests above the cause of global security.

The disclosure at Qom adds new urgency to our efforts to change Tehran's strategic calculus. Iranian leaders respect strength and are contemptuous of weakness. Only by eschewing half-measures and endorsing consequential penalties can we impress upon the Iranian regime that its security is undercut, not enhanced, by its nuclear pursuits. We need to embrace a sanctions regime commensurate with the threat posed by a potentially nuclear-armed Iran.

Israel perceives this scenario to be an existential threat, a view informed by Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad's repeated threats to annihilate the Jewish state. Neither Israel nor the international community can afford to take even a small risk that Iran might acquire and misuse a nuclear weapon.

Thus, Iran faces a stark choice in Geneva: Accept intrusive, verifiable International Atomic Energy Agency inspections of its uranium enrichment facilities, or face what Secretary of State Hillary Clinton calls "crippling" economic penalties.

Congress is preparing to push through strong unilateral measures to defend our national security and preserve regional stability in the Mideast. My legislation, the Iran Refined Petroleum Sanctions Act, strikes at Iran's Achilles' heel: the country's reliance on refined petroleum imports for its domestic economy.

Despite its vast crude oil resources, Iran has limited refining capabilities and depends on gasoline imports for approximately 30 percent of its domestic consumption. Pressuring suppliers to reduce their exports of fuel to Iran could force the regime to choose between the fuel on which its economy depends and its expensive nuclear program. My bill, which I introduced with Sens. Joe Lieberman (I-Conn.) and Jon Kyl (R-Ariz.), would give the president expanded authority to ban foreign firms from doing any business in the United States if they are involved in exporting gasoline or other refined petroleum products or equipment to Iran.

The Bayh-Lieberman-Kyl bill has been co-sponsored by a rare and broad coalition of 76 senators, including some of the most liberal and conservative members of our chamber. We have put politics aside in pursuit of a policy to deter the Iranian regime from continuing down its present path.

Today, all companies doing business in Iran, as well as their investors, would be wise to consider the likelihood of imminent congressional action on this and other sanctions legislation.

While we all hope that Iran's leaders seize this historic opportunity to change course, prudence demands that Congress prepare for a different approach should Iran continue to reject meaningful negotiations over its nuclear program.

We must not let Iran use the Geneva talks as another opportunity to deny and delay. With each day that passes, Iran is producing more fissile material. According to published reports, it now has accumulated enough low-enriched uranium to make a rapid sprint to the nuclear finish line. Our window of opportunity to stop Iran from acquiring nuclear weapons is quickly closing. The atomic clock is ticking, and we have seen with India, Pakistan and North Korea that it can run out sooner than we think.

Obama is right to affirm that all options remain on the table should diplomacy fail. Sanctions against Tehran may not work, but they must be tried.

The pro-democracy uprising occasioned by the recent disputed presidential election exposed powerful divisions in Iranian society. Ratcheting up economic and financial pressure on the Iranian government is our last, best chance short of military action to convince the regime that changing course is the only viable path to international legitimacy. (*Politico*)

June 4, 2009

ED SCHULTZ:

Senator Bayh, after this speech today, do you think Democrats are going to line up behind the president when he starts talking about direct talks with the Iranians?

SEN. EVAN BAYH:

I don't think there will be any objection to direct talks, Ed, as long as they're realistic talks. And that means having a deadline so the Iranians just can't kind of slow-walk us to the point where they're having a nuclear test the way the North Koreans did the other day, and also having some real consequences if they don't come to the bargaining table and aren't willing to compromise.

So talks, yes, but you've got to be realistic about it. And I personally am rather skeptical about whether the Iranians will eventually agree to have only a civilian nuclear program and forego their quest for nuclear weapons.

SCHULTZ:

What should be the president's next move in dealing with the Iranians after this speech today?

BAYH:

I think he ought to tell them, look, there's a window of time here with a deadline for us to try and work this out. We want to meet you halfway.

You can have access to a civilian nuclear program. The Russians are willing to work with us on that for you, as he indicated in the speech. But if by the deadline you're unwilling to go there, then there will be real consequences.

And Ed, I would start with their importation of refined petroleum products and gasoline. That is Iran's Achilles' heel. And they are hurting right now because the price of oil, although up recently, has been far below what it was. And that might be the kind of thing that would get them to make some serious concessions and not just talk about it and try to and slow-walk us until this has become a fact. (*Interview on MSNBC's The Ed Show*)

Rep. Shelley Berkley (D-NV)

December 15, 2009

Mr. Speaker, I rise expressing my strong support for H.R. 2194.

I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time and for his leadership on this issue. He has successfully navigated a very difficult terrain and I believe he has found the right moment to bring this bill forward.

It is now abundantly clear once again that Iran is not serious about negotiation: a new U.S. president tried to take a different approach, extending his hand in friendship to the Iranian

regime. In exchange, the Iranians continued to show their clenched fist of deception and dishonesty. All the while, evidence mounts that Iran gets closer each day to developing a nuclear weapon.

A nuclear Iran poses as much of a threat to the U.S., to Europe, to the Middle East, as it does to Israel. With this bill today, we show the Iranians that we will use every tool we have to stop them from obtaining a nuclear weapon. We want to avoid war, but we must not take any option off the table.

And to my colleagues I say: if you want to avoid war, support this bill. If it succeeds, the military option won't be necessary. But without this bill, without sanctions, and without an Iranian regime that is willing to negotiate, I fear a nuclear Iran will be inevitable as will a far stronger option to eliminate its threat.

I thank the gentleman again. (*Congressional Record*)

October 13, 2009

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Iran Sanctions Enabling Act, which helps State and local governments do their part to divest from Iran.

The Iranian regime represents a threat to us, to Israel, and to our allies throughout the Middle East and beyond. Their president has threatened to destroy Israel and has repeatedly denied the Holocaust. Iran's leaders have sought to destabilize the entire Middle East and are sparking an arms race in that region. In the last few weeks, we have seen just how far the Iranians are willing to go to conceal their weapons programs, and only time will tell how many more hidden nuclear sites we will find there.

With this bill today, we help our States and local governments to play a role in the international effort to halt Iran's march toward nuclear weapons. As is so often the case, they have not waited for us to act. I am proud that, in June of this year, my home State of Nevada passed a law to help make sure our State Public Employee Retirement System does not invest in Iran, or in companies that do a large amount of business with Iran. Steps like this will help to show just how determined we are--on every level--to stopping Iran's nuclear threat.

We must do everything we can to stop Iran from obtaining nuclear weapons. The UN Security Council must act now, and place further sanctions on Iran. UN member states must do their part to enforce the already-existing sanctions. We in Congress will soon pass our own further sanctions, and I hope we will continue to give our government the tools it needs to further tighten the screws on Iran's financial sector. We must use every tool available to us before it is too late.

I urge support for this bill. (*Congressional Record*)

June 19, 2009

I thank the gentleman from California for yielding and for his steady leadership on this and so many other issues, the ranking member Ileana Ros-Lehtinen, and I thank the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. Pence) for his leadership on this and so many other Middle East-related issues as well.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution and in support of the people of Iran whose voices deserve to be heard in a free, open and democratic way. We are not here today to discuss the outcome of this election or involve the United States in the internal politics of Iran. The American people, through their elected representatives, are here today to stand with the people of Iran and people all over the world who yearn to express their opinions and to exercise their right to free speech and fair elections.

It takes an enormous amount of courage to stand up to your government in a repressive society, and the American people applaud those heroes who face intimidation and oppression for expressing their views. I am personally in awe of the Iranian people and hope others will learn by their example. I also support President Obama, who I believe has steered an excellent course for dealing with this situation. While some have called upon him to condemn the Iranian government more forcefully, I believe it is essential that the United States not interfere in this remarkable debate and public demonstration. What the world is watching unfold in Iran is condemnation enough of what is happening in that country. We should, however, encourage free speech, free elections and nonviolence for all the parties involved. It's a wise course, and I believe it is one we would have benefited from in years past.

I thank the gentleman from California once again. I encourage all of my colleagues to support this legislation. I support it totally. (*Congressional Record*)

June 10, 2009

I am here to speak in strong support of this resolution. I think it's a very important one and one that needs to be stated in this legislation and stated far more often. The fact of the matter is that Iran poses an existential threat to the entire civilized world. It is as much a threat to the United States and Europe and the Arab countries in the region as it is to Israel. A nuclear Iran cannot be allowed to happen. The only difference is that the President of Iran, Ahmadinejad, has singled out Israel for particular hatred and contempt and has threatened to wipe Israel off the map.

We have learned after Adolf Hitler that when the leader of a country threatens to exterminate you or wipe you off the map, you ought to take them seriously. So you have a President of Iran that is desperately attempting and rapidly attempting to acquire nuclear capability, not necessarily for peaceful means but for military means and a threat to Israel to wipe it off the map.

I suggest to you that this is a very dangerous combination, and that is why this resolution is important. And I thank the gentleman very much for introducing this amendment. I urge all of my colleagues to support it. (*Congressional Record*)

June 10, 2009

We can talk for hours about the existential threat of a nuclear Iran to Israel. But what I'd like to do in the minute or two that I have before I yield to Congressman Engel is, I want to mention the sacrifices that Israel has made in the name of peace.

When there was an opportunity to make peace with Egypt, something that had never been done before, the Israelis gave back the Sinai to the Egyptians, and there's been a peace, a cold peace, but a peace, for all of these years.

When there was extraordinary pressure to leave Lebanon, the Israelis withdrew from Lebanon. And what was their reward? They ended up with Hezbollah on their northern border and a war.

When Prime Minister Sharon decided that he would unilaterally withdraw from the Gaza, one would have thought that the Palestinians would have used this opportunity to demonstrate to the world that they were capable of self-governance. Instead of that, they have rained 8,000 rockets on Israel proper over the last 3 years.

I believe that Israel exercised extraordinary restraint before they finally went into the Gaza to end this bloodshed and carnage against their own people.

I understand how the Israelis feel, how tentative they are right now about sitting down and moving towards a two-state solution without any assurances. What is the guarantee, after they left Lebanon and got Hezbollah, after they left the Gaza and got Hamas, that if they leave the West Bank, what is going to happen then?

Do you want a terrorist state living side by side with the democratic State of Israel?

I don't think anybody wants another failed terrorist state. We have to make sure that doesn't happen.

Mr. Speaker, I join my friend and colleague Eliot Engel here tonight to talk about one of our strongest allies, and the only longest-standing democracy (Lebanon held free and fair elections on Sunday, June 7, 2009) in the Middle East: Israel. Under attack for its entire existence, Israel has stood up to threats, enemy armies and countless terrorist attacks, and yet has demonstrated throughout that it is committed to peace and stability for all people within its borders.

President Obama and Secretary Clinton have recently renewed America's efforts to make peace between Israel and the Palestinians. We applaud those efforts. We all want peace in the Middle East.

In the 1970s, after three straight decades of conflict with Egypt, Israel reached a peace agreement with the Egyptians. The courageous Egyptian president Anwar Sadat traveled to Jerusalem and addressed Israel's Parliament, and Israel returned to Egypt the Sinai desert, which had been captured in Israel's self-defensive war in 1967.

In the 1990s, after a long and bloody intifada, after Saddam Hussein rained SCUD missiles on Israel for weeks on end, Israel once again extended her hand in peace when President Clinton brought together Israeli Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin and former PLO leader Yasser Arafat on the White House lawn.

And in this decade, Israel once again showed her commitment to peace, against all odds. Despite the threat from Hezbollah in the north, Israel pulled back from Lebanon. And despite getting nothing in return, Israel withdrew from the Gaza Strip, in order to give the Palestinians there an opportunity to create a forward-looking and flourishing economy there.

Time and time again, Israel has taken the necessary steps to make peace with their neighbors, and shown their eagerness to make peace. That is why we embrace President Obama and Secretary Clinton's efforts to climb this mountain once again.

Unfortunately, though, we have too often seen Israel's gestures toward peace met with violence. In Lebanon, we saw Israel's withdrawal followed by attacks from Hezbollah. In 2006, those became so severe that Israel was forced to retaliate to protect her own citizens. Even today, Hezbollah continues to re-arm, in contravention of UN Security Council Resolution 1701, which demands their disarmament so that the people of Lebanon can live without this terrorist scourge in their midst.

And just this past winter, Hamas showed they are not interested in building a successful society in Gaza, in building jobs, businesses, schools, infrastructure, or hospitals. Instead, they shelled Israeli towns constantly, without any provocation. Dozens of rockets fell on Israelis each day, targeting citizens who were not "settlers" in "occupied territory" but were residents of areas that have never been disputed Israeli territory.

When Israel finally did retaliate against these attacks, critics accused them of using "disproportionate force." I'd like to ask those critics: would they have preferred more Israelis died in the Hamas rocket attacks? Would that have been proportionate?

And, all the while, Israel faces a growing threat from Iran, which relentlessly pursues nuclear weapons, in contravention of their own treaties, of international law and of Security Council resolutions. President Ahmadinejad continues to deny the Holocaust and threatens Israel with annihilation should Iran ever succeed in producing a nuclear weapon.

How can one nation withstand so many threats to their very existence? How can any nation hope for peace under such pressure?

And yet, despite it all, Israel has remained incredibly strong and amazingly hopeful at the same time. They have built up their defenses and protected their citizens while--at the very same time--extending olive branches, negotiating and sitting down with their adversaries.

So, we stand here together, ready to embrace peace and ready to make peace so that Israelis, Palestinians and all people of the Middle East might finally live in security. But we are also here to say that Israel has not been the problem. They have been ready to make peace at any time and are ready today. But the question is: do they have a partner for peace?

Are the Palestinians ready for peace? Do they have a government that can stop terror? Will they recognize Israel's right to exist? Will they abide by past agreements they signed? Will they turn over Israeli soldier Gilad Shalit? The Palestinians must answer those questions before I, for one, will believe that Israel's overtures will be met with peace, rather than more violence.

Mr. Speaker, Israel stands ready for peace, American stands ready for peace, and we welcome President Obama's efforts to broker an agreement. We wish him great success in this endeavor and we call on the Palestinians to do their part: to renounce terror, to accept Israel's right to exist as a Jewish State, to turn over the captured Israelis and to abide by past agreements. (*Congressional Record*)

Rep. Howard Berman (D-CA)

December 15, 2009

Mr. Speaker, this bill has one overriding goal: to prevent Iran from achieving a nuclear weapons capability. The prospect of a nuclear-armed Iran is the most serious and urgent strategic challenge faced by the United States, and we must use all of the diplomatic means at our disposal--including tougher sanctions--to prevent that from becoming a reality.

A nuclear-armed Iran would spread its influence by intimidating its neighbors; it would, with near impunity, continue to support terrorists and destabilize the Middle East; it would spark an arms race in the region that would tear the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty to shreds; and, most frightening of all, it could, in the light of Iran's repeated threats to wipe another nation off the map, result in the actual use of nuclear weapons.

When one considers the regime's ideological nature, the fact that it sent thousands of children to their deaths in the Iran-Iraq war, and its current disregard for the human rights of its own citizens, it is clear the Iranian regime is anything but a rational actor, and we certainly cannot take the chance that a nuclear Iran would behave responsibly.

With each passing day, the situation becomes more urgent as Iran takes additional steps to develop its nuclear weapons capability. By many estimates, it would have that capability by sometime next year, and even the predictions that they could not be ready to deliver a bomb

within 5 years have to be reevaluated on a shorter time frame based on recent revelations about Iran's nuclear program.

In September, Iran's efforts to construct a new secret uranium enrichment facility were exposed to the world. And what was Tehran's response when the international community rightly condemned it for that action? To declare that it will build 10 more.

The Iranian nuclear issue could have been resolved without further sanctions. President Obama has offered Iran an outstretched hand, but regrettably Iran has not unclenched its fist. The regime has refused to endorse even a confidence-building measure--agreed to by its negotiators in Geneva--that would have seen Iran ship most of its low-enriched uranium abroad to be further enriched for use in Iran's civilian nuclear medical research reactor. That deal would have bought everyone significant time, delaying Iran's nuclear-arms clock for up to a year as negotiators dealt with the heart of the issue: Iranian compliance with the U.N. Security Council requirement that it suspend its enrichment program altogether. By rejecting the deal, Iran retains its full stock of low-enriched uranium, enough to serve as the basis for one nuclear bomb, and it forces the world to respond urgently.

The bill before us today is an important part of that response. It would take advantage of Iran's considerable dependency on refined-petroleum imports. It would sanction foreign companies that sell refined petroleum to Iran, or help Iran with its own domestic refining capacity, by depriving those companies of access to the United States market. And in so doing, we are asking no more of foreign companies than we currently demand of American firms. I believe the passage and implementation of this act would have a powerful effect on the Iranian economy, and I believe it would force unpalatable budgetary choices on the Iranian regime, vastly increasing the domestic political cost of pursuing its nuclear program.

That said, I want to reiterate that my overriding goal in moving forward with this legislation is to prevent Iran from developing a nuclear weapons capability. As we move toward a likely conference with the Senate, most likely early next year, and as the administration continues its efforts to pursue stronger multilateral sanctions, I am open to making adjustments to the bill that would make it as effective as possible in meeting that objective, including providing incentives to other nations to join us in supporting a strong multilateral sanctions regime. One possibility would be to provide an exemption for companies whose host nations are already enforcing robust sanctions in their national law.

But for now, it is sufficient to say that Iran has had ample time to respond positively to President Obama's generous engagement offer. Regrettably, the response has been only one of contempt. It is time for this body to act.

I urge the support of this legislation. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.
(Congressional Record)

Madam Speaker, I have heard, I guess, three reasons put forth about why people should not support this legislation.

The first is some hint of a belief that Iran is not pursuing a nuclear weapons capability. Our report lists activity after activity that Iran has undertaken to hide its activities from the IAEA to build enrichment facilities that have no purpose in the uranium enrichment program and to talk about neutron triggers, which only have one purpose, which is to detonate a nuclear weapon. It is a country that has been offered by Russia, with the support of the P5, a chance for a nuclear energy program, and it has spurned all of those offers to pursue this. To me, there can be no serious doubt about that.

The second argument is that they get a nuclear weapon, and we can contain them. For the reasons I gave in the beginning and because I believe it totally destroys the nonproliferation regime, containment is not the right policy.

The third argument is that these sanctions are going to hurt the Iranian people. Well, I was here in 1986 when we took up a prohibition on any new investment, not investment in the energy sector, but any new investment in the apartheid regime of South Africa.

What was the argument against it? Banning new investment, curtailing economic growth, hurting the majority of the population in South Africa. Don't do it. Don't wreak havoc on the poor people.

We did not listen to that argument. We enacted those new sanctions. Europe soon followed in banning new investment. The South African business community went to the regime in South Africa and pointed out the economic devastation they faced if they continued with their apartheid policies.

It is ludicrous to think that the people who are risking their lives and their liberty and their limbs and who are doing everything they can to express their opposition to this regime in Iran are going to turn into a unifying force behind that regime because the price of oil gets higher. We are working with them to weaken that regime and to stop this nuclear weapons program. (*Congressional Record*)

October 13, 2009

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1327, the Iran Sanctions Enabling Act of 2009, and I commend my friend Mr. FRANK for his leadership on this important issue.

This bill will allow state and local governments and educational institutions to divest from companies that invest \$20 million or more in Iran's energy sector. I am hopeful that the threat of divestment will persuade companies not to do business with Iran, and that this additional economic pressure will help deter Iran from pursuing a nuclear weapons capability or supporting terrorism.

Several states and localities have already begun the process of divestment, and I expect that a divestment bill will soon be introduced in the state legislature in my home state of California. The legislation before us, H.R. 1327, will provide federal legal protection for these actions,

allowing them, in the case of Iran, to place their moral sensibilities ahead of their fiduciary responsibilities. As such, this is not a sanctions bill per se--it creates no new sanctions on Iran or on companies that invest in Iran.

The reasons that states and localities divest may vary--whether in response to Iran's pursuit of nuclear weapons, its support for terrorism, its abysmal disregard for human rights, or its fraudulent elections and their brutal aftermath. The timing of this bill, just a few short months after the elections and the subsequent crackdown--and in the midst of the ongoing crisis of regime legitimacy--certainly makes it an appropriate response to those ugly events.

I strongly support this legislation, and I urge all my colleagues to do likewise.

(Congressional Record)

September 26, 2009

Tehran could soon have humankind's most frightening weapon if substantial diplomatic progress is not made in the coming days.

The United States, along with its partners Russia, China, Britain, France and Germany (known as the "P5 plus one"), will sit down on Thursday with a representative of Iran. From the American perspective, the principal item on the agenda is Iran's illicit nuclear program. Iran's leaders have said they are prepared to talk about virtually anything but that. If diplomacy does not rapidly deliver results, the United States will have to adopt tough measures to stop Iran from obtaining nuclear arms.

For years Iran spurned diplomatic overtures to address the threat posed by its nuclear program. Meanwhile, its efforts have progressed to the point that it already has enough low-enriched uranium to produce fuel for at least one nuclear bomb. Tehran's admission this week that it has secretly constructed a second enrichment plant suggests that its program may be further along than we had imagined. We do not have much time to wait.

I support President Obama's efforts to engage Iran. Thanks to these efforts, no one will be able to say that we failed to do everything possible to give Iran a diplomatic way out. But there is more than ample reason to be skeptical that the regime in Tehran intends to come clean about its nuclear program.

Friday's revelations about the second uranium enrichment plant cast a particularly dark shadow over Iranian intentions, and they come after more than 20 years of deception and stonewalling by Tehran.

It is critical that we set clear timelines and benchmarks by which to judge Iranian intentions as well as unambiguous consequences if Iran fails to meet the criteria. The window for Iran to demonstrate seriousness of purpose should start with the Oct. 1 meeting and, as Obama has indicated, should close by the end of the year.

If Tehran is serious about engagement, it should agree early on to meaningful steps, such as a “freeze for freeze” in which Iran does not add to its enrichment capabilities -- including halting construction on the second enrichment facility, as verified by the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) -- in exchange for an agreement that no additional international sanctions would be imposed during this period. Iran must also agree to verifiably suspend nuclear enrichment by year’s end. Were that to happen, the international community could enter into detailed negotiations with Iran about all issues of concern and the incentives that could be offered in exchange for a satisfactory understanding of Iran’s nuclear intentions and assurance that Iran would not be able to acquire a nuclear weapons capability.

But if, as I expect, that scenario does not come to pass, we should be ready immediately to impose what Secretary of State Hillary Clinton has called “crippling sanctions.” Iran’s economy is in terrible shape, and the regime no longer can take for granted the support of its citizens. The best conduit for such sanctions would be a mandatory U.N. Security Council resolution. That would require the difficult-to-obtain acquiescence of Russia and China. Failing that, multilateral agreement by the Europeans, Japan, Australia and Canada to impose coordinated financial, trade and investment sanctions would be a serious alternative. If even that proves impossible, I believe the threat posed to our national security by the possibility of a nuclear-armed Iran obligates the United States to impose sanctions unilaterally.

The Iran Refined Petroleum Sanctions Act, which I, along with Rep. Ileana Ros-Lehtinen, the ranking Republican on the House Foreign Affairs Committee, introduced, provides such authority to act. The bill, which has more than 300 co-sponsors (its companion in the Senate has 75 co-sponsors), provides President Obama with a mandate to increase the level of financial penalties against Iran and would prevent companies that facilitate the provision of gasoline and other refined petroleum products to Iran from doing business in the United States. Much of the world’s trade is conducted through international financial transactions in dollars that must be cleared through American banks. So if the United States were to prevent any bank doing business with Iranian banks from clearing dollar transactions, the Iranian banking system would collapse. And because Iran has to import 25 percent or more of its daily demand for refined petroleum, its economy would be seriously impaired if it were denied those imports. Indeed, a credible threat of both these sanctions might provide the best chance to persuade the Iranian regime to agree to suspend its nuclear enrichment.

To have a sanctions bill ready for the president’s signature by early next year, we must start the process for passing it now. I intend to bring our bill to committee for consideration next month. Should negotiations with Iran not succeed and should multilateral sanctions not get off the ground, we must be prepared to do what we can on our own. (*Washington Post*)

September 25, 2009

“The news that Iran has been secretly constructing a second uranium enrichment plant is deeply disturbing and casts a heavy shadow over the negotiations scheduled for next week. Iran’s intention to build nuclear weaponry and its efforts to disguise that intention could not

be clearer now -- and we have no idea what other aspects of its nuclear bomb project it may be working on in secret. There can be no doubt in anyone's mind that Iran has been lying to the international community for years about its allegedly peaceful nuclear intentions. Today's news reinforces my determination to bring the Iran Refined Petroleum Sanctions Act before the Foreign Affairs Committee for consideration next month." (*Press Release*)

June 19, 2009

Every day since Iran's election, the streets of Tehran have been filled with demonstrators, and each day this past week the number seems to be growing. Even state-run media in Iran has put the number of demonstrators in Tehran at "hundreds of thousands." One British newspaper reports that there were a million demonstrators in Tehran yesterday.

What do these demonstrators want? Are they simply in favor of the candidate Mir Hossein Mousavi? Or are they making a more profound statement about the Iranian regime?

Nobody knows exactly. We do know one thing, though: The demonstrators feel their intelligence was insulted and their dignity assaulted by the high-handed manner in which the results of the June 12 election were handled. They want justice. This morning the Supreme Leader offered none.

It is not for us to decide who should run Iran, much less determine the real winner of the June 12 election, but we must reaffirm our strong belief that the Iranian people have a fundamental right to express their views about the future of their country freely and without intimidation.

The Iranian regime is clearly embarrassed by the demonstrations and has not shrunk from using violence to stop them. At least eight demonstrators, and quite likely a number more, have been killed, and hundreds have been injured. The regime has also tried to ban media coverage of the demonstrations. Foreign journalists are consigned to their homes and offices. Several have been expelled from the country. Cell phone coverage has been frequently blocked in order to limit communication among the protesters, and the regime has interfered with the Internet and taken down many opposition Web sites.

We cannot stand silent in the face of this assault on human freedom and dignity. I repeat that we have no interest in interfering in Iran's internal affairs. That era has ended. This resolution affirms the "universality of individual rights" as well as "the importance of democratic and fair elections." Beyond that, it simply expresses its solidarity with "Iranian citizens who embrace the values of freedom, human rights, civil liberties, and the rule of law." I don't know how many of the demonstrators fall into that category, but I do know that many of them do.

This resolution also condemns the bloody suppression of freedom. It is not a judgment on who won the Iranian elections; it is an acknowledgment that we cannot remain silent when cherished universal principles are under attack.

Mr. Speaker, I want to just offer my appreciation to our ranking member and to the gentleman from Indiana for working together on a resolution which puts the House of Representatives on the side of the people of Iran, and with that, I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting this resolution.

My friend, the ranking member, correctly cited a whole series of very important issues that we and the United States has with the Government of Iran; and she is correct. Just this quick note about what the gentle lady from Florida pointed out at the end of her comments. The reason I worked to bring this resolution up--this resolution is not about a recitation of all those issues. It's about an affirmation of something that this House of Representatives has done in places all over the world, whether it is in Tibet or in Cuba or in Eastern Europe or in the Middle East or any other region, to reaffirm our commitment to stand for certain fundamental universal principles involving human rights, participatory democracy and the affirmation of the rights of the people of any country. Today it's about the people of Iran.

And then simply to say that there are many American interests in U.S.-Iranian relationships. This resolution is not about American interests. It's about American values, which I believe are universal values: the values of the rule of law, of participatory democracy, about individual liberty, and about justice. And it is on behalf of those universal values, not American interests, that I urge this body to support this resolution. (*Congressional Record*)

April 30, 2009

Madam Speaker, our nation has a vital national security interest in ensuring that Iran does not possess nuclear arms or achieve the means to produce them on short notice. My bill, the Iran Refined Petroleum Sanctions Act (IRPSA), is designed to help prevent Iran from developing a nuclear weapons capability.

This legislation requires that any foreign entity that sells refined petroleum to Iran--or otherwise enhances Iran's ability to import refined petroleum through, for example, financing, brokering, underwriting, or providing ships for such activity--will be effectively barred from doing business in the United States. The same would be true for any entity that provides goods or services that enhance Iran's ability to maintain or expand its domestic production of refined petroleum.

Because of its limited refining capacity, Iran is forced to import roughly one-quarter of the gasoline and other refined petroleum products it consumes from other countries. Without this outside help, much of the Iranian economy would grind to a halt. It seems hard to believe that one of the world's leading oil exporters could find itself in this position, but it is reality--one that can only be attributed to shockingly poor planning and administration by the Iranian regime.

I and the other co-sponsors of this bill therefore believe that this measure could have a powerfully negative impact on the Iranian economy, rendering it more difficult for the Iranian government to continue to fund a nuclear program that the international community has

repeatedly called upon it to suspend. Our goal, of course, is not to punish the Iranian people, but to maximize the chances that we can persuade the Iranian government to accede to the will of the international community.

Let me be clear: I fully support the Administration's strategy of direct diplomatic engagement with Iran, and I have no intention of moving this bill through the legislative process in the near future. In fact, I hope that Congress will never need to take any action on this legislation, for that would mean that Iran at last has complied with the repeatedly-expressed demand of the international community, as embodied in five separate U.N. Security Council resolutions, to verifiably suspend its uranium enrichment program and to end its pursuit of nuclear weapons once and for all.

The larger purpose of my bill is to demonstrate to one and all--but particularly to the Iranian regime--the importance that the U.S. Congress places on the Iranian nuclear issue. I share President Obama's conviction that it is unacceptable for Iran to possess nuclear weapons and his determination to seek a diplomatic solution to this issue. However, should engagement with Iran not yield the desired results in a reasonable period of time, we will have no choice but to press forward with additional sanctions--such as those contained in IRPSA--that could truly cripple the Iranian economy. In that respect, I am pleased that Secretary of State Clinton has said that she is already intensively engaged with our allies and other key states in the international community for the purpose of, in her words, "laying the groundwork for the kind of very tough sanctions that might be necessary in the event that our offers are either rejected or the process is inconclusive or unsuccessful."

This legislation is offered in that spirit. (*Congressional Record*)

House Minority Leader John Boehner (R-OH)

September 25, 2009

"Today's announcement about Iran's secret nuclear facility is further confirmation of its pattern of deception and denial. For years, the regime in Tehran has done everything in its power to hide the truth that it is committed to building a nuclear bomb to threaten the United States and our allies. The IAEA must be allowed into the country to conduct immediate, unimpeded, and comprehensive inspections, and there must be full transparency regarding the results of those inspections.

"This revelation should put the international community on notice that its collective willingness to give the Iranian regime 'one more chance' is not working. How will we respond to a regime that refuses civil liberties, denies its citizens free and fair elections, and aims to dominate a critical region through violence, terrorism, and nuclear weapons? How will we respond if Iran does not let inspectors in? Why should we feel confident they are being honest about anything else?

"The United States should not participate in direct negotiations with Iran – negotiations that will further legitimize this brutal regime – until we have answers to these important questions.

Unfortunately, the Administration has not, to date, given Iran reason to believe we are serious about preventing them from acquiring or developing a nuclear capability, especially in light of the Administration's recent policy decision regarding missile defense in Central Europe and its public remarks about Israel and the Middle East peace process. The United States and our European allies must demonstrate a willingness to quickly impose meaningful sanctions against the regime in Iran. We can do so even if other nations like Russia and China refuse to join this effort, and we should. Finally, Congress needs to get serious about moving a sanctions bill, and it needs to do so now." (*Press Release*)

June 16, 2009

WOLF BLITZER: Iran is erupting right now with anger and death. The presidential election is being disputed and there's blood and protesters on the streets. Some people here in the United States are urging President Obama to be more forceful in his reaction to what's going on.

Let's bring in Congressman John Boehner, the top Republican in the House of Representatives.

Congressman, I suspect -- I don't know, but I suspect you might be one of them. What do you think of the way the president has reacted to what has gone on in Iran?

REP. JOHN BOEHNER: Well, Wolf, I think the situation there is very serious. And I think it's a real opportunity for President Obama to really make a strong statement and take a strong stand with regard to what the leadership over there is doing. It's pretty clear that they've had serious election difficulties. The people in Iran believe in democracy. They believe in the rule of law, and they -- I think they believe that this election's been stolen.

BLITZER: What do you want him to do, the president?

BOEHNER: I think the president, who said that he wants dialogue, I think he has an opportunity to say, "We're not going to have any dialogue if this is the way you're going to treat your people." And so he has an opportunity to make a very strong statement. (*Interview on CNN's The Situation Room*)

Rep. John Boozman (R-AR)

October 21, 2009

Mr. Speaker, first of all, I want to thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. *Kirk*) for bringing forward this important resolution.

I rise today in strong support of House Resolution 175, which condemns the Iranian regime's continuing persecution of members of the Baha'i faith, Tehran's notoriously cruel regime,

which for decades has denied the people of Iran their fundamental human rights and civil liberties.

While the most recent demonstration of the regime's brutality and authoritarianism was the crackdown in the aftermath of the June leadership selection process; for years, Iran has made a special example of the Iranian Baha'is, oppressing them without respite.

In addition to seizing Baha'i communal property, the Iranian Government prohibits the community from officially assembling; bans them from practicing or teaching their religion; excludes them from the national pension system and from public universities; prevents them from inheriting property; and jails them on account of their faith or on trumped-up charges of espionage.

Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to adopt this resolution, which condemns the Iranian regime's despicable conduct.

Mr. Speaker, totalitarian regimes everywhere, hiding behind the false excuse of state sovereignty, are eager to combat any progress in human rights and freedoms and are eager to expand their repression as far as others will allow them to do.

The Baha'is and countless other Iranians have been robbed of a better future for almost 30 years by a regime which offers nothing but more misery. Therefore, the United States must continue to make clear in both word and deed that the spread of religious freedom and human rights worldwide is not merely an ideal but an imperative. Now is the time for all responsible nations to stand four-square with the Baha'is of Iran in their moment of need. (*Congressional Record*)

Sen. Barbara Boxer (D-CA)

December 23, 2009

Mr. President, I rise today to renew my appeal to the Government of Iran to immediately release the three American hikers--Shane Bauer, Sarah Shourd, and Josh Fattal--who were detained by Iranian authorities in July.

According to available information, the three young adults, who are all graduates of the University of California, Berkeley, inadvertently crossed an unmarked border into Iran while hiking in the Kurdistan region of northern Iraq.

Shane, Sarah and Josh have now been held in semi-isolation for over 140 days without charge, access to legal representation, or information on the current status of their case and future proceedings. This is deeply troubling and incredibly difficult for their families.

I recently spoke to the Iranian Ambassador to the United Nations on behalf of the hikers to reiterate my call for their release. I also asked that they be able to call their families and continue to be visited by Swiss consular officials.

During this holiday season, Americans from all walks of life are celebrating and renewing ties of family, friendship, and good will.

The extended absence of these young Americans from their families is particularly painful during such a festive time. As such, I call upon the Iranian authorities to immediately release Shane, Sarah and Josh so that their families can welcome them home. (*Congressional Record*)

Sen. Jim Bunning (R-KY)

March 9, 2009

Madam President, we have had sanctions against Iran on our books since 1987. They, along with other multilateral efforts, have served to put a financial chokehold on Iran's rogue behavior. Now is the time to enforce these sanctions and deny Iran the financial capital it needs to fund its nuclear proliferation and support for international terrorism. This is why I have offered an amendment requiring the State Department to provide Congress with the report of potential violations of existing Iranian sanctions under the Iran Sanctions Act of 1996.

Under the act, a company is found in violation of our sanctions if it invests more than \$20 million in 1 year in Iran's energy sector. Since enactment, companies have invested more than \$29 billion in Iran's energy sector. This does not include the \$70 billion in pending transactions that are known about, most of which are long-term contracts to purchase Iranian gas and oil.

As it stands, the State Department is not required to provide any type of report to Congress or publish in the Federal Registry a list of potential violations of our sanctions against Iran. Time and time again, I have asked the State Department for transparency on this issue, as well as imposing some sort of timeline on ruling on pending investigations of existing sanctions. The State Department has no enforceable guidelines on these sanctions and, thus, gives them little or no teeth. As it stands, pending investigations of companies in violation of our sanctions laws have gone on as long as 10 years. Furthermore, since enactment, there has only been one found violation of the Iran Sanctions Act by a French company. Through the use of a Presidential waiver, this violation was totally waived.

My amendment is in no way seeking to change or remove this flexibility. It simply asks the State Department for a report on pending violations of our existing sanctions laws against Iran.

I have long said that the danger of a nuclear Iran poses one of if not the greatest threat to our national security. As this rogue nation continues to ignore three U.N. Security Council resolutions, the time for Congress to act is now. I ask my colleagues to join me and support the Bunning amendment. Now more than ever, we need to tighten our economic chokehold on Iran. (*Congressional Record*)

Rep. Dan Burton (R-IN)

December 15, 2009

I thank the gentlelady for yielding, and I thank the chairman for bringing this to the floor. God bless you, my son.

Let me just say that I have heard the arguments from the opponents of this legislation. And my question to them would be, well, what is the alternative? You mentioned one, two, three, four, five, six--seven reasons why we shouldn't do this, but Iran is developing a nuclear weapons system.

If you look at The Times and the BBC, they say very clearly that confidential intelligence documents obtained by The Times showed that Iran is working on testing a key final component of a nuclear bomb, and it is the mechanism that explodes the nuclear bomb. Now, we've been waiting and waiting and waiting for years for them to stop the development of a nuclear weapon, and they keep giving us all these reasons why they shouldn't be stopped and why they're not doing it and all kinds of chicanery; but the fact of the matter is they continue on the path toward a nuclear weapon.

Now, we get a large percentage of our energy from the Middle East. Israel is not going to sit by and let their country be threatened with annihilation. They're not going to let Iran develop a nuclear weapon, especially since Ahmadinejad said he wants to wipe them off the face of the Earth. So if they develop a nuclear weapon and a detonating device, like they're working on right now, Israel is going to do something about it. Now, do we want a major conflagration in the Middle East that would threaten the energy that we get in this country? We get about 40 percent of our energy from the Middle East. If you mess up the Persian Gulf, if you have that whole area explode, you're going to see all kinds of problems in getting oil from the Middle East. And we're not energy independent. Everybody in this country is going to suffer because it's going to hurt our economy from top to bottom.

So I wish my colleagues would stop and think, do we let them just go on and not do anything about it, or do we start ratcheting up the pressure on them, put a little pressure on them, make them stop developing this nuclear weapon system? Because if they don't, the alternative is unthinkable. (*Congressional Record*)

October 14, 2009

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I appreciated what my colleague just said about the banks, and one of the things that I think we ought to focus on in addition to that is that we are not energy independent and we're not allowed the drill off the Continental Shelf or in the ANWR in Alaska or do other exploration for a number of reasons, not the least of which is, quote-unquote, environmental.

But at the same time we won't allow offshore drilling here, we just gave Brazil \$2 billion so they can drill off their shores. It just doesn't make any sense to me. We ought to be spending that money here at home exploring for oil so we can move towards energy independence. We have a 400- or 500-year supply of natural gas and we have plenty of oil if we just could go get it, and we can do it in an environmentally safe way.

Now the reason I bring that up is because one of the big problems we face is we get 35 to 40 percent of our oil from the Middle East, and one of the big problems facing the United States and the world right now is Iran. Iran has been developing a nuclear program, a nuclear weapons program for some time, and our position in the United States now, under the new administration, is to try to work with them, to talk with them to stop them with their nuclear development program. And if they don't, we're going to try to get a sanctions bill passed.

Now, we have a bill sponsored by the chairman of the International Relations Committee, Mr. *Berman*, that has over 300 cosponsors--I happen to be one of them--and we believe we ought to bring that bill to the floor as quickly as possible to try to put pressure on Iran to stop the development of the nuclear weapons program.

But the administration, I think, has suggested we should wait. They were trying to bring China and Russia on board, and China and Russia are not going to be on board. So we should do it by ourselves and we should do it expeditiously.

Let me tell you why I think it's so important. If Iran continues down this path, Israel--whom Iran has said they want to destroy--will have no choice but to defend itself. They cannot let Iran develop a nuclear bomb and a delivery system. If they do that, they will be able to destroy Israel and millions of Jews in Israel in a very short period of time. It will be another Holocaust.

So what will happen? If they get too far down the path, if we don't put pressure on them to stop--and they don't stop--I believe Israel will have no choice but to attack Iran. And if they attack Iran, that could end up in being a major conflagration in the entire Persian Gulf area.

Now, why is that important to us? We get 35 to 40 percent of our energy from the Persian Gulf area. If that goes up in smoke, we will lose 35 to 40 percent of the energy that we have in this country because we're not energy independent.

The lights that we have, the gasoline in our cars, the fuel we use to heat our houses, everything that needs energy will suffer, and we will have severe economic problems if this problem isn't dealt with before a tragedy occurs over there.

This really bothers me. We tried to work with North Korea some time ago during the Clinton administration. We even had an agreement with them that they would stop their nuclear development program if we gave them some things, and we did. And what did they do? They lied and they went ahead with their program, and they are a nuclear power. They're using missiles that would be intercontinental in scope, testing them over the sea of Japan right now. And they've done that a number of times.

So we have to worry about them. We have to worry about North Korea and what they're going to do next. Can you imagine what it will be like once Iran develops a nuclear weapons program? They are committed to destroying Israel. They are committed to forcing their view of religion and religious beliefs on much of the rest of the world, and it could be a real problem for us. They don't like America very much either. And so we have a myriad of problems facing us if we don't get on with putting as much pressure as possible on Iran and doing it right now.

As we speak, they're developing their nuclear weapons program. They said they're going to let U.N. nuclear experts come in and police the area and see what they're doing. I don't believe that. I believe they will let us see one or two spots, but they're going to go on with their nuclear development program.

We must put pressure on them now. We must put pressure on them immediately, because if we don't, we're toying with a major problem, a major economic problem for America as well as a possible holocaust in that part of the world in the very near future. (*Congressional Record*)

July 9, 2009

I thank my colleague for yielding.

You know, I think the American people would like to see us debate the issues that they're very concerned about on this floor, and there are many of these issues we're not going to be able to debate because of this closed rule.

I'd just like to cite a couple of amendments that I introduced that I think the American people, many of them, would really like to hear debated.

One of them was a sense of Congress bill or amendment that would expand the economic sanctions against Iran. Iran is a terrorist state developing nuclear weapons. A sense of Congress resolution saying we should put severe economic standards on them, sanctions on them, and get our allies to do it, is something that should have been debated and passed, because I think Americans are concerned about this terrorist state and they want us to stop their nuclear program and to put pressure on them.

Another amendment would have prohibited funds from being used to establish diplomatic or commercial ties in or with Iran until these changes are made, until they stop their nuclear development program, which threatens the Middle East oil supplies, our energy supplies, and the whole world.

Finally, we had one that dealt with putting pressure on terrorist organizations until they recognize Israel's right to exist. I think all of us support Israel and we want to make sure Israel's right to exist is guaranteed. So why wouldn't we want to have an amendment on the

floor which said that the organizations that are trying to destroy Israel should be put under extreme pressure to make sure that they recognize Israel's right to exist?

Finally, one of the things that really concerns me is the United Nations is going to spend almost \$900,000 in legal fees for Benon Sevan. He is the man who ran the Oil-for-Food program, and it was a corrupt program. He was working with Saddam Hussein.

The man has fled the country. He has been charged with bribery and wire fraud, and the U.S. Federal and State prosecutors are looking for this guy, and they're using our taxpayer dollars to defend him, to help him with his legal fees.

What I said in this amendment is we should withhold the amount of money that would go for his legal fees from our commitment to the United Nations, and I think the American people would agree with that.

So I can't understand why the chairman and the members of the Rules Committee didn't make these in order. I hope in the future they will be a little more openminded about this, because the American people want these issues debated in the people's House.

(Congressional Record)

June 4, 2009

BRIAN KILMEADE: Ten members of Congress wrote a letter to President Obama talking about what should be in his speech today and what should be considered into the content of the speech. As you know, a short time ago he delivered that historic address. One of those people who wanted certain points hit is Indiana Congressman Dan Burton, the ranking member of the Middle East Subcommittee and member of the House Foreign Relations Committee.

Congressman, that is the moment that you want to talk about -- We want to get rid of all nuclear weapons -- does that include us; does that include Israel?

REP. DAN BURTON: Well, first of all, Brian, I thought that he came down pretty hard on Israel, while at the same time he was reaching out to Iran and other countries without really going into some of the details that really concern me.

Iran is developing a nuclear program. He said that he would allow that for peaceful purposes. But at the same time, they are not complying with the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty; they're not allowing inspections; and there's a great many of us that believe they're developing nuclear weapons.

And so when he starts talking about a nuclear-free world, he ought to be talking about, in my opinion, Iran not going ahead with their nuclear program unless there's absolutely complete guarantees of Israel's right to exist, number one; and number two, there's not going to be any weapons program and that can be guaranteed. And I don't believe that's the case right now.

MR. KILMEADE: But Congressman Burton, didn't he in fact say we cannot have a Middle East arms race and it's got to stop? And you know, you can have nuclear energy, we allow that -- I'm just paraphrasing -- but it has to stop?

REP. BURTON: Well, you know, Ahmadinejad in Iran has said that one of his top goals is to destroy Israel completely. And he's developing a nuclear program and we believe it's a nuclear weapons program.

So when you're talking about doing away with all nuclear weapons, you've got to make sure that it's all inclusive and Iran is not stopping. And I certainly don't want them to go ahead with their nuclear program unless we know for sure, without any doubt, it's not going to be used for weapons purposes. And I don't think that can be guaranteed right now.

MR. KILMEADE: And what I worry about too -- and I know you do -- how much longer are we going to wait? I mean, our hand has been outstretched now for five months, maybe even longer, and we've gotten nothing in return and Iran continues to move forward with their nuclear program. In fact, their last statement said, consider it a done deal. Let's talk about something else. It's off the table.

REP. BURTON: Well, that's one of the things that worried me about his speech. A lot of it was very good, but when he talks about the Middle East and he talks about Iran, it just didn't make any sense right now.

There's no way to guarantee that Iran is not developing a nuclear weapons program and I believe they are. And Israel is threatened severely.

Israel has reached out to the Muslim world by giving Gaza back and they've even talked about a Palestinian state. But all of these entities -- Hamas, Hezbollah and others -- have said Israel's right to exist should not be guaranteed. In fact, they've talked about Israel being destroyed time and again.

So Iran's developing this nuclear weapons program. And it's very troubling that he said that he thought they ought to go ahead with their program right now. (*Fox News Interview*)

April 28, 2009

Mr. Speaker, over 2 years after disappearing on Kish Island in Iran, Robert Levinson, who my colleague has just described as a U.S. citizen and a resident of Florida, remains missing. During that time, the regime in Iran has continually obstructed efforts by the United States Government to investigate Mr. Levinson's disappearance. As Senator Bill Nelson stated on January 13 of this year at a hearing of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, in Iran "the door has been closed at every single turn."

Mr. Levinson is a 28-year veteran of the FBI and the Drug Enforcement Administration. He and his family, including his wife and seven children, deserve our every effort to determine his status and hopefully to secure his freedom and safe return home. Therefore, I strongly support House Concurrent Resolution 36, which urges the Iranian Government to intensify its cooperation on Mr. Levinson's case, with the Swiss Embassy in Tehran, and to share the results of its investigation with the FBI.

This legislation also urges the President and U.S. allies to raise Mr. Levinson's case in all appropriate multilateral and bilateral forums and expresses our sympathy to Mr. Levinson's family during this very difficult and trying time.

I thank my good friend and colleague Mr. Wexler, the chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Europe, for introducing this resolution.

This is the kind of thing, Mr. Speaker, that everybody in the world ought to be concerned about. We have a young reporter who has disappeared over there and is unaccounted for. Mr. Levinson is unaccounted for. This Government of Iran should join the family of nations and start being like everybody else and admiring and living up to the human rights that we all respect and admire.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time. (*Congressional Record*)

Rep. Dave Camp (R-MI)

December 15, 2009

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2194.

I am deeply concerned that Iran continues to pursue nuclear capabilities in defiance of the international community. The Iranian leader's abhorrent statements against America and Israel are outrageous.

Both current and previous Administrations view Iran as a profound threat to U.S. national security interests, a view that reflects my position as well.

We must address the situation. I have continually supported efforts to give U.S. Presidents the tools and capabilities needed to prevent Iran from acquiring nuclear weapons, and I continue to do so today.

I wholeheartedly agree with the goal of H.R. 2194. I believe we need to expand sanctions to refined petroleum resources to prevent Iran's nuclear proliferation. However, while domestic sanctions are critical, it is also important that our allies participate in an international coalition so that combating Iran's nuclear proliferation is a multilateral effort.

This bill, like other Iran sanctions bills that have preceded it in this chamber, was referred to the Ways & Means Committee. Usually on Iran bills, Foreign Affairs and Ways & Means

discuss and agree jointly on the provisions in the bill that fall within the jurisdiction of my Committee. These conversations have always been very productive in the past. This process provides the best possible outcome, because it respects the strength and thrust of the bill, as well as positions the legislation to give our Administration the best chance at continuing to cultivate and maintain international multilateral pressure.

We are still in the midst of that process for the bill now under consideration, and the bill we are voting on reflects the starting point of that process, not the end result. The aspects of the bill within the jurisdiction of Ways & Means that the two Committees are still discussing include the bill's provisions addressing the President's waiver authority, the structure and content of the additional mandatory sanctions, and certain definitions.

Although we have not completed our discussions, I can nevertheless offer my full support to this bill because of the Foreign Affairs Chairman's commitment to continue working with the Ways & Means Committee on these outstanding issues.

In light of that commitment, it is my expectation that bona fide, good-faith discussions between Ways & Means and Foreign Affairs will continue as this legislation proceeds in the legislative process. (*Congressional Record*)

Rep. John Campbell (R-CA)

June 19, 2009

This country has always stood with those around the world yearning for freedom, a voice and a better future. Whether those people were in Nazi Germany, Communist Eastern Europe, apartheid South Africa, or any other number of places around the world, we have stood with the freedom fighters. It is now time for us to stand with those in Iran who seek freedom from one of the world's most oppressive, most dangerous and most dictatorial regimes.

I hope this resolution is not the end, but is just the beginning of the support that this government, both in Congress and the White House, gives to those people. (*Congressional Record*)

House Minority Whip Eric Cantor (R-VA)

December 15, 2009

I thank the gentlelady, as well as the gentleman from California, for their leadership, and bringing this bill to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, a nuclear Iran would be a game-changing development that poses irreparable damage to global security and stability. Yet, with each passing day, the regime in Tehran brazenly forges ahead to make this nightmare scenario a reality.

These are times of sharp partisan rancor in our Nation's Capitol. But today we have the chance to come together to take a major step forward in the interests of world peace. The time for decisive action to head off Iran's nuclear program is now. By passing the Iran Refined Petroleum Sanctions Act, we send the overdue message that the cost of doing business with Iran is too much to bear.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation leverages our economic muscle to punish any individual or company who sells or ships gasoline to Iran. It offers one of our best chances to convince Iran that it is firmly in its interest to abandon its nuclear ambitions.

As Iran takes a more belligerent approach to its nuclear program, the United States will not fall asleep at the wheel. We must lead. With the passage of this bill, we must, and will, rally the international community in order to stop the Middle East from moving irreversibly toward nuclearization.

Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of the Iran Refined Petroleum Sanctions Act. (*Congressional Record*)

October 1, 2009

It's a defining moment for the administration and its new policy of engagement with our enemies. As Iran moves inexorably towards becoming a nuclear power, the U.S. will join Great Britain, France, Russia, China and Germany Thursday in Geneva in an effort to prod the Islamic Republic to change course. The unfortunate reality for President Obama is that there is absolutely no evidence that Iran is willing to reach any agreement acceptable on U.S. terms – much less use negotiations for any purpose other than to buy more time for its illicit nuclear enrichment activities.

Engaging Iran on the nuclear issue is nothing new. Attempts by Great Britain, France and Germany from 2003 to 2005 to negotiate a suspension of the Islamic Republic's nuclear program were an exercise in futility. As both sides talked, Iran only stepped up its enrichment activities. In the same vein, Iran rejected a generous U.S.-supported Western package of political and economic concessions offered three years ago by the West in exchange for a stop to Iran's nuclear program.

The key point is that we have been down this road before – and it has reached a dead end. This time around we simply don't have the luxury of time. The U.S. ambassador to the IAEA says that Iran already has enough low-enriched uranium to build one bomb. Meanwhile, the revelation that Iran has been secretly constructing a second uranium enrichment facility on a military base exposes the ludicrousness of Iranian claims that their nuclear program is for peaceful purposes.

The world understands the danger of a nuclear Iran. It knows that the ultimate weapon in the hands of the ruling clerics would allow the world's most notorious state sponsor of terrorism commit nuclear blackmail against whomever it pleases. And the nuclear arms race this

unpleasant development would set off across the Middle East isn't exactly in the best interests of world peace.

That's why tomorrow in Geneva our bottom line must be an immediate halt to Iran's nuclear enrichment capabilities. No exceptions, no excuses. We also must insist that Iran gives the International Atomic Energy Agency unfettered access to its new nuclear facility near the city of Qom and all of its other facilities.

If – or shall we be honest and say, when - Iran holds true to its insistence that its nuclear program is off the table, President Obama should not delay in rallying the international community around the program of “crippling sanctions” that Secretary Clinton has threatened. A beefed-up regime of international sanctions against Iran's banks, energy sector and import-export industry can inflict very heavy pain against Iran's leadership.

The Iranian regime brutally suppresses its own citizens, sponsors terror against our troops in Iraq and against free nations around the world, and thumbs its nose at international law. Yet even as we head into negotiations predestined to fail, the temptation remains to bury our heads in the sand, hope and pray that somehow this time Iran will act differently, and play along with Iran's stalling game. This is a mistake because it gives Iran the idea that regardless of what it says or does, the West will inevitably come crawling back to the table out of desperation.

President Obama is following through on his controversial pledge for the United States to sit down and talk with Iran. But in doing so he cannot be afraid to call Iran's bluff and pursue a different course. He must treat Iran's government as the oppressive and unyielding engine of terror that it is, not as the trustworthy and compromising rational actor we all wish it could be. Should he expeditiously follow through on the heavy sanctions Iran deserves, the president will have the support of a clear majority of Congress. (*Politico*)

September 25, 2009

“Iran is a real-time security threat to the United States, Israel, and our allies around the world. A nuclear Iran is closer than many thought it was yesterday, and the problem is getting worse by the day, not better.

“The existence of a second uranium enrichment facility not only undercuts the Administration's policy toward Iran, but leaves little doubt that terrorist nations are not to be trusted or negotiated with diplomatically. Congress should act immediately to give the President the tools he needs to implement sanctions on Iran by passing the bipartisan Iran Refined Petroleum Sanctions Act.” (*Press Release*)

July 9, 2009

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, the legislation before us provides \$2.22 billion worth of vital security assistance to the State of Israel, our most dependable and democratic ally in the Middle East. The funding in this bill will help ensure Israel maintains its qualitative military advantage in the region. That means Israel can defend itself against the existential threat posed by Iran and against Iranian terrorist proxies, Hamas and Hezbollah, both sworn to Israel's destruction.

A strong Israel means a more stable Middle East. A weakened Israel only gives momentum to the radicals in the region determined to sow discord and harm U.S. interests. Joint cooperation with Israel has also yielded tangible benefits to America since Israel is a leader in methods of fighting terrorism and preventing civilian casualties in terrorist attacks.

Mr. Chairman, there is no doubt in my mind that Israel is a pillar in the national security interests of the United States, and it is, in my opinion, essential that we provide this assistance to Israel because it is in the best interests of the United States. That's why I support this legislation, and I urge my colleagues to do the same. (*Congressional Record*)

June 19, 2009

Mr. Speaker, the Iranian regime's brutalities are on full display for the whole world to behold. I rise today in sympathy with the victims of Iranian political oppression who have been injured or killed, protesting the outcome of their election. I salute the leadership of the gentle lady from Florida and the gentleman from California for bringing this resolution forward, as well as the gentleman from Indiana for his leadership on this and so many issues, and the way that the gentle lady from Nevada spoke.

It is America's moral responsibility to speak out on behalf of the protection of human rights wherever they are violated. And regardless of the outcome of the Iranian election, make no mistake where the power in Iran lies. It lies with a clerical regime who conducts its most egregious activities in the dark, hidden from the world's eyes and, thus, escaping media attention. The Iranian Revolutionary Guard Corps quietly funnels weapons and funding into terrorist groups from Iraq to Afghanistan, from Lebanon to Gaza. Iranian centrifuges enrich uranium at nuclear plants often hidden from weapons inspectors. And terrorist groups make voyages to Iran to receive training at unspecified locations. This is the regime we are talking about, and this week the true colors of that regime are on broad display. We must rally the world around the cause of the Iranian people. I urge the administration, I urge President Obama to follow the lead of this House, to speak out on behalf of the Iranian people and their quest for freedom and human rights. (*Congressional Record*)

June 17, 2009

Madam Speaker, I rise today in sympathy with the victims of Iranian political oppression who have been injured or killed protesting the outcome of their election.

Yet regardless of whether Ahmadinejad or Mousavi wins, we must not maintain any illusions about where true power in Iran rests.

That would be in the hands of the Islamic Republic's clerical regime, extremists determined to advance Iran's nuclear program and use terrorism to bully other states in the region.

Much of the regime's most egregious activities are done in the dark, hidden from the world's eyes and thus escaping media attention. The Iranian Revolutionary Guard Corps quietly funnels weapons and funding into terrorists groups from Iraq to Afghanistan to Lebanon to Gaza. Iranian centrifuges enrich uranium at nuclear plants often hidden from weapons inspectors. And terrorist groups make voyages to Iran to receive training at unspecified locations.

But this week the true colors of the Iranian regime are on broad display. With the whole world watching, the Iranian regime has been embarrassed--called to account seemingly for the first time. This is an opportunity we cannot squander. Let us rally the world around the Iranian people. Let us use this opening to show the international community how dangerous the Iranian regime is--and why a nuclear Iran is flatly unacceptable.

Regrettably, the President and Democratic leadership in congress are failing to respond to the growing threat a nuclear Iran poses to the world.

Today we call on President Obama to immediately condemn the violence the Iranian regime is perpetrating against its citizens. We call on the Speaker to immediately bring to the floor and consider the Iran Petroleum Sanctions Act. The bipartisan bill, sponsored by Chairman *Berman* and Ranking Member *Ros-Lehtinen*, would impose sanctions on the radical Iranian regime while they continue to seek nuclear weapons and destabilize the Middle East.
(*Congressional Record*)

June 2, 2009

House Republican Whip Eric Cantor (R-VA) today issued the following statement after President Obama suggested that the Mideast peace process and our interests have been harmed by the failure of the United States to be "honest" with Israel, then that Iran might have a 'right' to nuclear energy:

"As Palestinian terror shows no sign of abating, President Obama's insistence that it is in America's best interest to pressure Israel sends the wrong message to the region. Where is the outrage at the Palestinians' continued refusal to recognize Israel as a Jewish state? Where is the concern for their failure to root out the terrorists in their midst?

"Palestinian terror and the refusal to recognize Israel stand directly in the way of peace, yet this is only one part of the process. It is misguided to assume that if we deal with the Israel-

Palestinian question, somehow all the problems in the Middle East – including in Iran – will be solved.

“President Obama’s suggestion that Iran may have some right to nuclear energy is dangerous and I strongly disagree. Iran forfeited any right to nuclear energy when it made the decision to illicitly enrich uranium to levels that can be used for nuclear weapons. Access to nuclear energy is an irreversible process, and the United States cannot trust the aspirations of the world’s foremost state-sponsor of terrorism.” (*Press Release*)

Rep. Dennis Cardoza (D-CA)

July 9, 2009

Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

House Resolution 617 provides for consideration of H.R. 3081, the Department of State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs appropriations bill for the fiscal year 2010, under a structured rule.

The rule provides for 1 hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations.

The rule waives all points of order against the bill and its consideration except those arising under clause 9 or clause 10 of rule XXI. The rule also waives points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI.

The bill makes in order the amendment printed in part A of the committee report and the amendments printed in part B of the committee report accompanying this resolution. Each amendment is debatable for 10 minutes. Finally, the rule also provides one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, the legislation that we will consider today, H.R. 3081, funds the Department of State, Foreign Operations, and related programs for fiscal year 2010.

This bipartisan bill reflects four key priorities: it protects our national security and combats terrorism; provides critical resources to meet global health and development challenges; ensures adequate oversight and accountability of our foreign assistance; and most importantly reforms and rebuilds America’s diplomatic and development capacity.

In total, the bill provides \$48.8 billion for fiscal year 2010. This is \$3.2 billion less than the President’s request, and \$1.2 billion below the fiscal year 2009 enacted level including supplemental funding, a reasonable level of funding during these unprecedented fiscal times.

To protect national security and combat terrorism, the State-Foreign Operations appropriations bill provides \$2.2 billion to Israel, provides \$2.7 billion in assistance for

Afghanistan and \$1.5 billion for Pakistan, and it provides \$1.8 billion total in economic and security assistance for Egypt and Jordan, two of our key allies in the Middle East.

It also requires a report on the status and progress of diplomatic efforts to prevent Iran from acquiring nuclear weapons, and it continues a reporting requirement on bilateral and multilateral sanctions against Iran . Further, it prevents the Export-Import Bank from providing financing to any energy producers or refiners that contribute to Iran's refined petroleum resources.

The bill also continues to take aim at the war on drugs by setting aside \$319 million for Mexico and Central America for counternarcotics and law enforcement programs. It also includes \$520 million for Colombia to fight narcotics and criminal gangs and to promote alternatives to drug production.

The State-Foreign Operations bill makes great strides in increasing global health by providing funding increases for international HIV/AIDS treatment and prevention, tuberculosis and malaria prevention, safe water and hygiene, and child and maternal health programs. These global health investments are critical, not just in saving lives overseas, but in protecting the health of countless Americans from disease.

The State-Foreign Operations bill also ensures that the United States continues to meet our moral and humanitarian obligations abroad. The bill provides funding for countries facing long-term development challenges, improving foreign agriculture and food security programs and helping countries struggling with food shortages, supporting basic education needs, helping displaced people around the world with food, water, shelter and other basic needs, and providing lifesaving assistance during worldwide natural disasters.

It also provides \$450 million for the Peace Corps. This is \$77 million above the President's request, which accelerates the President's commitment to expanding the Peace Corps, one of the most valuable programs our government can fund.

The lack of capacity in our civilian agencies has resulted in an increased reliance on American troops to carry out diplomatic missions. Besides placing an additional workload on our already overburdened troops and taking their focus away from their critical core missions, it is not in the best interests of our Nation to place diplomatic missions with our military.

Secretary Clinton, Secretary Gates, and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff have all stressed the need to increase the capacity of the State Department and USAID. As such, the bill provides resources to hire 1,000 new State Department personnel and 300 new USAID personnel so our country can take the necessary steps to begin rebuilding and restoring our diplomatic capabilities that we shortchanged and underappreciated for far too long.

Finally, the bill also improves and continues the Democrats' commitment to oversight and accountability. It provides nearly \$150 million for activities of the Inspector General of the Department of State and USAID, as well as for the Special Inspectors General for both Iraq and Afghanistan reconstruction. In addition, this bill reverses years of accounting gimmickry through supplemental appropriations. Instead, it provides upfront, honest and transparent

accounting of the true costs of meeting our critical foreign policy and national security initiatives.

Mr. Speaker, this is a good bill. In these tough economic times, it is also a fair bill. And, most importantly, this is a bipartisan bill that goes a long way towards restoring the strength and capabilities of the United States both here and abroad.

I commend the chairwoman, Mrs. *Lowey*, for her admirable efforts in ensuring our needs are met, both here and abroad, and to ensure that the national security and foreign policy commitments of the United States remain strong for many days to come.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time. (*Congressional Record*)

Rep. Russ Carnahan (D-MO)

October 27, 2009

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of S. Con. Res. 45, a resolution encouraging the Government of Iran to allow the American prisoners Joshua Fattal, Shane Bauer and Sarah Shourd to reunite with their families in the United States as soon as possible.

On July 31, 2009, these three American hikers were taken into custody by Iranian officials near northern Iraq. They were seized because the Iranians said they had crossed into Iranian territory while on a hike in a rural region near the Iraq-Iran border.

The three hikers certainly had no malicious or devious intentions. The area they were hiking through, part of Iraqi Kurdistan, is mountainous but not obscure. In fact, it is becoming increasingly popular with tourists. If the three Americans did, indeed, cross into Iranian territory, they almost certainly did so unknowingly and unintentionally.

At the time of her capture, 31-year old Sarah Shourd was teaching English in Damascus, Syria, where she was living with her boyfriend, Shane Bauer--a writer and photojournalist. Their friend and fellow University of California--Berkeley alumnus, Joshua Fattal, was traveling with them in Iraqi Kurdistan. Their adventure in Iraq turned into a nightmare when they were seized by the Iranians.

This important resolution calls on the Government of Iran to provide these three innocent, young Americans, at a minimum, the opportunity to speak with their families by phone. It also encourages the Government of Iran to free them so they can be reunited with their families in the United States as soon as possible.

Of course, Joshua, Shane and Sarah are not the only Americans currently being held in Iran. The Iranian-American scholar, Kian Tajbakhsh--an urban planner with a doctorate from Columbia University--was arrested in July, and was sentenced last week to 15-years' imprisonment for his involvement in the peaceful demonstrations that followed the July 12 election fraud.

Another Iranian-American, 71-year old Reza Taghavi, has been imprisoned since May 2008 without a trial or formal charges.

In April, this body passed House Concurrent Resolution 36, regarding the case of the former FBI agent, Robert Levinson, who has been missing in Iran since 2007.

As the United States and the international community engage Iran on its nuclear weapons program, we must not forget the plight of these innocent Americans. I commend Undersecretary of State William Burns for raising this issue with his Iranian counterpart at the October 1 Geneva meeting. I encourage him to continue to do so at all subsequent meetings with Iranian officials until our fellow citizens are freed.

A New York Times editorial this past Saturday said it well, entitled “More Iranian Injustice.” The editorial called for the immediate release of the imprisoned Americans, and it went on to read, “Iran may sit at the negotiating table with the United States and other world powers, but it will never earn the respect it craves if it continues these kinds of human rights abuses.”

I commend Senator *Arlen Specter* for introducing this timely resolution in the Senate, and I commend our colleague from Pennsylvania, *Allyson Schwartz*. This deserves our deep appreciation for their leadership on this issue.

Madam Speaker, we care passionately about the freedom of our fellow citizens, and it is in that spirit that I urge all of my colleagues to support this important resolution. (*Congressional Record*)

Sen. Robert Casey (D-PA)

September 29, 2009

Mr. President, I rise today with respect to Iran’s nuclear program. The Iranian regime, discredited this summer by the deplorable repression of peaceful pro-democracy demonstrators across the country, has reached a new low on the international stage. The disclosure of the uranium enrichment facility near the city of Qum should serve as a wakeup call for those who believed that Iran’s nuclear program was only for peaceful purposes. It continues to deceive the international community about its nuclear intentions and program development. It continues to threaten our ally Israel. It continues to disregard its international commitments. And yes, Mr. President, it continues to directly threaten the national security interests of the United States.

As the Administration begins talks on Thursday, we in the Senate should be prepared to do our part and pass tougher sanctions on the Iranian regime to compel its compliance with international standards. We have a responsibility to provide the Administration the tools it needs to maximize pressure on this increasingly intransigent regime.

I applaud the Administration's approach in recalibrating U.S. engagement in the world. At a minimum, this international effort will restore America's long held reputation of an honest broker, of a country that values diplomacy, and of a country that values relationships with allies and welcomes new ones. Internationally, the U.S. is on better footing than it has been in years. Ties with allies have been strengthened. Those on the fence, like Russia and China, are showing signs of cooperation on issues that are critical to our national interests. And our adversaries, not sure how to demonize the United States like they used to, are on their heels. The Administration's diplomatic offensive has put us into a position where we have a strong coalition going into these important discussions on Thursday.

The events of last week are unfortunate evidence of the Iranian regime's deceit, defiance and disregard for international standards for peace and security.

First, on Monday, the Iranian regime sent a letter to the IAEA, disclosing the existence of the second refinement facility, a site that U.S. and Israeli intelligence reportedly have been tracking for years. This missive denied that the site was intended for nuclear purposes though the 3,000 centrifuges were clearly meant for weapons grade refinement. Moreover, the site was buried deep underground and under protection by elite revolutionary guard. Not the typical protocol for a peaceful energy site.

On Wednesday, Mr. Ahmadinejad used his time on the rostrum at the UN, not to welcome a new day of engagement with the international community, but in typical fashion to rail against Israel. This desperate attempt to direct attention away from his own internal political problems as well as his government's deceitful nuclear program, once again showed that this regime is not a responsible actor on the world stage. Iran's people recognized this last June by voting against Ahmadinejad and his brand of politics. The world witnessed on live TV how Ahmadinejad views the democratic process as his people paid dearly for the audacity of their vote.

And finally, over the weekend, Iran's news service reported three rounds of missile tests, including those capable of hitting Israel. Gen. Hossein Salami, head of the Revolutionary Guard Air Force, said that the drills were meant to show that Tehran is prepared to crush any military threat from another country. This erratic display will actually weaken Iran's hand in Geneva, and will hopefully serve to convince our Russian and Chinese friends that the Iranian regime is not a credible actor, nor a reliable trading partner.

And so after this disturbing, but strangely predictable week of Iranian behavior, American negotiators will head to Geneva. This is the first official and direct meeting with Iranian negotiators in 30 years. Leading the American delegation is Ambassador Bill Burns, one of America's most respected diplomats. Having served in Russia, Ambassador Burns is well placed to address the complex international dimensions to this diplomatic problem. We will be well represented in Geneva and I wish Ambassador Burns and his team all the best in what will surely be a challenging assignment.

Iran is not going into these negotiations on sure footing, while the international community has never been more united. Led by the United States, Britain, Germany and France, opposition to Iran's nuclear program is based in fact, rooted in a willingness to engage and

backed up with a clear and firm message – an Iran with nuclear weapons is unacceptable under any circumstances. Let me repeat: An Iran with nuclear weapons is unacceptable under any circumstances.

This message is gaining a stronger resonance with Russia and China. President Medvedev's comments at the University of Pittsburgh indicated a willingness to consider sanctions. This is a potentially remarkable breakthrough because if the Russians are willing to support international sanctions, the Chinese could be left alone among the P5+1 group. While China relies on Iran for a substantial fuel imports, I trust that they are carefully weighing their need for energy against Iran's increasingly erratic and irresponsible behavior. The opportunity cost of doing business with this regime has increased considerably and may now be too high a price to pay. I hope that the Chinese will support international efforts to pressure this regime at this critical time with the understanding that these efforts could ultimately result in a more reliable and stable partner in Tehran.

It is next to impossible that the Iranians will be able to prove that its nuclear sites are for peaceful purposes by Thursday. The Administration needs to be ready to move quickly and build on international momentum created over the past week, to pressure this regime. And that is why we in the Senate need to be ready to play our part, support the Administration and move on sanctions. We currently have two proposals on Iran pending before us.

First, the Iran Sanctions Enabling Act, is a measure introduced by Senator Brownback and myself last May which would allow state and local government pension funds to divest from companies that do more than \$20 million in business with the Iranian energy sector. Second, the Iran Refined Petroleum Sanctions Act, sponsored by Senators Bayh and Kyl, explicitly empowers the president to impose new economic sanctions on foreign firms involved in the export of gasoline and other refined petroleum products to the Islamic Republic of Iran. I am co-sponsor of this bill along with more than 75 of my colleagues.

The Iran Sanctions Enabling Act is modeled on similar legislation passed in response to the genocide in Sudan. Eighteen state legislatures have passed individual Iran sanction measures and our legislation would bring these state efforts into line with federal law. When President Obama was in the Senate, he introduced an earlier version of this legislation. It was right in 2007, and it is right now.

Analysts have estimated that Iran requires \$20 billion annually in investments for its oil and natural gas sector. That sector directly provides funding for Iran's nuclear program as well as its support for international terrorism. Iran will only cease its illicit nuclear program, end its support for terrorists in Hamas and Hezbollah and stop arming militant groups in Iraq when it is compelled to pay an economic price.

We are entering a crucial phase in President Obama's strategy of engagement with Iran where Tehran will face a true test. I hope that the October 1st negotiation will lead to a freeze in Iran's nuclear enrichment efforts, and ultimately, a nuclear weapons free Iran. Will the regime accept the president's genuine offer of dialogue and comply with international nuclear standards? Or will it continue a losing strategy that serves to deepen its isolation?

If last week is any indication, Congress should be prepared to hand the President the leverage he needs to send a message to the Iranian regime that America cannot and will not accept an Iran with nuclear weapons. The Administration needs all the tools at its disposal to increase pressure on the regime, diplomatically, politically and through more stringent economic sanctions. I call on my colleagues to listen to legislatures in so many states across the country who have passed divestment measures. The American people do not want anything to do with investing in this regime. Let's pass divestment and petroleum sanctions and send a message to this regime and the international community that a nuclear-armed Iran is unacceptable. (*Congressional Record*)

June 16, 2009

Mr. President, the first subject I wish to discuss is the Iranian elections. I wish to convey some brief remarks on the remarkable events we have been witnessing unfolding in Iran in the last couple of days. It is too soon to tell what will happen. We do not know if Iran's brittle theocratic regime will hear out the voices of reform emanating in such powerful fashion from the streets of Iran today. We do not know if a credible investigation of serious electoral irregularities will occur, but I am confident that the events of this past weekend will be recorded in the history books as a major milestone for the democratic aspirations of the Iranian people. While the hard-liners who continue to rule Iran today may further entrench their power in the coming days, they are only planting the seeds for their ultimate defeat by their response to the democratic voices with the kind of force and suppression we have seen play out on television.

It is a promising sign that Iran's supreme leader has called upon the all-powerful Guardian Council to review the electoral results and assess the claims of serious irregularities, including vote rigging and ballot fraud, in the national election. However, we should not get our hopes raised that justice is imminent.

In the last Iranian Presidential election in 2005, there were also serious questions of fraud raised after Mr. Ahmadinejad came out of nowhere to win the Presidency following a runoff vote. Yet the final results of that investigation were never published, and thereafter Mr. Ahmadinejad's declared victory stood firm. Because of that precedent, I am skeptical that the Iranian regime will engage in an honest review of this election count.

President Obama and his senior national security team have refrained from extensive commentary on the election in recent days. That is as it should be. The U.S. Government should not give the Iranian regime any flimsy rationales for further crackdown on protestors and reformist leaders. However, administration officials, led by Vice President *Biden*, have made clear that the strategy of diplomatic engagement with Iran's leadership to bring a peaceful resolution of Iran's nuclear program will continue, regardless of who may comprise that leadership or how they may have assumed power. That, I believe, is the right strategy. We must deal with Iran as it is, not as we may wish it to be. For far too long, the United States deprived itself of the power of its diplomacy on the mistaken insistence that Iran agree to a set of preconditions before talks could even commence. Talking to your enemy can never be

viewed as a concession. The United States spoke to the Soviet Union during the worst excesses of the Cold War, but diplomacy cannot be the only option that the United States pursues with Iran. The President knows this and has reaffirmed that other options are open to the United States on multiple occasions.

Any effective strategy toward Iran must offer the regime a clear choice when it comes to its nuclear program, and here is the choice; it is either one or the other. Come into compliance with the multiple United Nations Security Council resolutions and reap the benefits of economic engagement and warmer diplomatic ties, choice No. 1. Or choice No. 2 for the Iranian regime: Face continued economic sanctions and international isolation that will steadily worsen if Iran continues to engage in illicit nuclear activities. It is either one or the other, and the regime has a choice to make before the world. Effective diplomacy is successful if it can fully convey that choice to the decision makers in Iran.

The Congress can also play a useful role here in elucidating the consequences Iran faces when it makes its choice on its nuclear program. Some might call it the “good cop, bad cop” strategy; I simply prefer to call it diplomatic leverage that our negotiators can employ if and when they do sit down at the table with Iranian representatives.

For those reasons, I am proud to have joined my colleague *Sam Brownback* in introducing the Iran Sanctions Enabling Act. This legislation would authorize State and local governments as they see appropriate to direct divestment from, and prevent future investment in, companies that hold investments of \$20 million or more in Iran’s energy sector.

There is a growing divestment movement across the country in response to Iran’s accelerating nuclear program, its support of Hamas and Hezbollah, and hateful statements against Israel perpetrated by its President and others in Iran’s senior leadership. Unfortunately, the Federal courts have ruled that divestment actions undertaken against a single nation may not predict the President’s constitutional authority to enjoy exclusive authority over our Nation’s diplomatic relations; thus, State and local governments undertake divestment measures with some legal jeopardy. The Justice Department has taken legal action against State and local governments in cases involving other nations. This act, the Iran Sanctions Enabling Act, protects the rights of State and local governments to ensure that their pension funds and other investment funds are not invested in companies that do business with a regime such as Iran. It is carefully targeted to focus only on financial ties with Iran’s energy sector, to hit Iran where it is economically most vulnerable.

The bill includes a sunset provision to lift this authorization once the President certifies that Iran has ceased providing support for acts of international terrorism and has ceased the pursuit of weapons of mass destruction. I am proud to have assumed the lead Democratic role on this legislation, taking over for President Obama, then Senator Obama, who served in the lead role when he was in the Congress.

Secondly, let me also take a brief moment to comment on the Iran Refined Petroleum Sanctions Act of which I am proud to be a cosponsor with the majority of the Senate. The bill would clarify existing legal ambiguity by authorizing the President to sanction foreign firms

involved in supplying Iran with refined gasoline and/or assisting Iran with increasing its refining capacity.

Iran is forced to import as much as 40 percent of its annual gasoline consumption due to the fact that much of its refining infrastructure was destroyed during the Iran-Iraq war in the 1980s. Economic sanctions in place since then have limited outside foreign investment. Targeting Iranian gasoline consumption is a promising venue for increasing our leverage on Iran's leadership. The Iranian people, I believe, may question why the regime prioritizes a nuclear program condemned by the international community at the cost of serious gasoline shortages in Iran.

The images in recent days have been stirring. Just yesterday we witnessed a procession of hundreds of thousands of Iranians, both young people dressed in modern attire and elderly women wearing traditional veils, marching in silence throughout downtown Teheran. Indeed, whenever a chant or shout emerged from the crowd, it was quickly hushed by the crowd, seeking to avoid any provocation for the riot police standing watch to move and break up the march. It is easy to forget, with all the incendiary rhetoric from leaders such as Mr. Ahmadinejad, that the Iranian people remain fundamentally pro-American and envy our democracy and personal liberties.

This week is a dark moment for the Iranian people as their legitimate aspirations for greater reform have been apparently sidetracked by the regime. But I am optimistic on their future and look forward to the day that the United States and Iran can once again be at peace and enjoy mutual respect for and with one another. (*Congressional Record*)

Rep. Howard Coble (R-NC)

September 23, 2009

Madam Speaker, I rise to express my grave concerns over Iran's illicit nuclear program. In the midst of all the attention being paid to issues such as the economy and health care reform, we must not overlook the growing threat that Iran poses to the security of the United States and our allies in the Middle East. Every day, Iran is working to develop the capacity to produce a nuclear weapon, a point from which I fear there may be no return.

The president of Iran, Mahmoud Ahmadinejad, has left no illusion of his desire to wipe Israel off the map. Through his emboldened and misguided leadership, Iran has exerted its hegemony throughout the Middle East with complete disregard for the truth and resolute intolerance.

If Iran crosses the nuclear weapons threshold, I have no doubt that this will provoke a renewed race for nuclear arms in the Middle East. Radical political factions throughout the region will be empowered and moderates, who are working to develop a comprehensive peace agreement, will lose their much-needed support. Terrorist organizations such as Hezbollah, Hamas and Al Qaeda will be strengthened and emboldened to pursue a nuclear weapon of their own--which is our worst nightmare.

Thanks to the Internet, we know that democracy and human rights in Iran are an illusion. Some Iranian leaders would argue with that assertion and also contend that their country has no interest in pursuing a nuclear weapons program. We cannot afford to rely on hollow assurances such as these.

We need valid and thorough inspections immediately to verify exactly what Iran is doing with its nuclear program. The only way to deal with Iran's recalcitrant leaders is to leverage our political influence and force them to allow the International Atomic Energy Agency, IAEA, to conduct inspections. Unfortunately for the Iranian people, this means enacting the Iran Sanctions Act and the Iran Refined Petroleum Act, which would result in severe consequences for Iran and its people.

There is no simple solution to Iran's threat. Measures we can take right now include enacting legislation and supporting policies that will force Iran's leaders to allow IAEA inspectors unfettered access to conduct nuclear weapons inspections. There is far too much at stake to rely on promises from the same Iranian leaders who openly profess their desire to wipe Israel off the map, deny allegations of human rights violations, and provoke violence around the world against those who embrace liberty and justice. (*Congressional Record*)

Sen. Susan Collins (R-ME)

September 25, 2009

The revelation that Iran has indeed been developing a covert nuclear facility for several years should prompt the international community to impose tough economic and diplomatic sanctions as many of us in Congress have urged for some time. Stronger sanctions are a critical tool to help thwart Iran's nuclear ambitions.

I also fully support President Obama's call for an immediate inspection of the Iranian plant by the International Atomic Energy Agency. (*Press Release*)

Rep. Gerry Connolly (D-VA)

December 15, 2009

Mr. Speaker, I rise voicing my strong support for H.R. 2194 because America's patience is not limitless.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to strengthen the hand of the Administration and our allies to address the threat of a nuclear Iran. I proudly cosponsored the Iran Refined Petroleum Sanctions Act, which gives the President the authority to impose stiffer economic sanctions targeting Iran's oil production. The bill adds such activities as selling refined gasoline or supplying equipment for construction of oil refineries to the list of prohibited activities under the Iran Sanctions Act.

In January President Obama made a fundamental shift in our diplomatic strategy with Iran. He extended an olive branch with the hope of initiating the first serious talks with Tehran in decades, but that approach was conditioned on the Iran leaders being willing and equal partners.

Unfortunately, those leaders have consistently rejected our overtures and continue to develop Iran's nuclear capabilities in defiance of repeated demands from the United Nations that it suspend such activities. Missile tests in the spring and fall of this year, coupled with the recent revelation of a secret enrichment facility brings new urgency--as evidenced by the growing support within the international community for further action. Just this week, we learn of yet another secretive program to develop the technological components for triggering a nuclear device.

These new sanctions can and will bring additional pressure to bear on the Ahmadinejad regime. Iran's insistence on enrichment, along with its ties to groups like Hezbollah, is cause for great concern not just in the Middle East. This bill states firmly that U.S. patience is not limitless. I urge my colleagues to support it. (*Congressional Record*)

Sen. Kent Conrad (D-ND)

April 20, 2009

Mr. President, I would like to first address the matter of Roxana Saberi, a young woman from our home State. Roxana Saberi is someone I know. She has interviewed me many times. Roxana is a journalist, and a very good one. She is somebody who had parents with Iranian tradition and legacy in their family. She went to Iran to learn more about her own legacy, her own inheritance. She was always impressed by what she had learned about the Iranian people. She is someone who loves the Iranian people and respects their culture. She is someone who was there in a role as a reporter, providing reports to National Public Radio as well as British Broadcasting. So it was with amazement that we heard of these charges, as Senator *Dorgan* outlined correctly, first being told she was jailed because she had bought a bottle of wine, then told she had filed reports without a proper authorization, and then the stunning news that she was being charged with espionage and put through a 1-day trial in which she was not able to speak in her own defense. These are circumstances which require us to speak out and to ask the judicial system in Iran to provide a swift appeal and allow Roxana to come home. She was sentenced Saturday to 8 years in prison. Her family reports that while she is not being mistreated, she is somebody who is vulnerable. This has been very difficult for her. So we ask the Iranian authorities to give her a swift appeal and allow her to return to the United States.

Roxana is someone I know well. She is a warm, loving person, somebody who is well regarded as a journalist in my home State, someone about whom I think anyone who would meet her would say: Here is someone who is proud of her heritage, proud of the history of the Iranian culture, and somebody who loves the Iranian people.

I was encouraged that President Ahmadinejad has indicated that he would like to see the court provide justice and that he has asked them to take up the appeal swiftly and to give Roxana and her defense all of the opportunities anyone should be able to expect if they are charged with such serious crimes.

I make my own personal appeal here on the floor of the Senate this evening. Roxana is somebody, as I have said, I know well. She is a terrific reporter, has interviewed me many times. There is no question in my mind that Roxana was in Iran for the purpose of preparing a book on the people of Iran and to do reports to NPR, British Broadcasting, and even to outlets back home.

I hope the Iranian authorities will think very carefully about how they are seen on the world stage based on how they treat this young reporter. Like all of us in public life, we are judged by what we do. We are held accountable. I hope the Iranian authorities are thinking very carefully about how they will be seen in this matter. I plead with them to release Roxana and to permit her to come home. She is a North Dakotan. She is someone of whom we are very proud. She is a reporter. She deserves to be released. (*Congressional Record*)

Sen. John Cornyn (R-TX)

September 25, 2009

Today, we have further evidence that Iran has not come clean about the full extent of its nuclear program. Iran remains one of the foremost threats to the United States and peace-loving nations everywhere. Iran's drive to acquire nuclear weapons is a problem, as it continues to pose a tremendous risk to our national security and to that of our important friend and ally, Israel. In my view, all options should remain on the table in denying them these weapons of mass destruction. We must not allow Ahmadinejad to hold the world hostage. (*Press Release*)

Rep. Geoff Davis (R-KY)

June 3, 2009

Madam Speaker, as a former enlisted soldier and Army officer, the lives and safety of our servicemen and -women has always been one of my top priorities. Chairman Conyers and I are, therefore, calling for the prompt negotiation of a bilateral naval agreement between the United States and Iran.

In January of 2008, Iranian Revolutionary Guards naval speedboats engaged in provocative actions against three U.S. naval vessels, showed little to no regard for maritime safety, and the event very nearly escalated into an armed conflict between the United States and Iranian vessels.

The Strait of Hormuz is one of the most crowded shipping lanes in the world. A conflict in the strait would have dire consequences for the world's oil supply and the international economy. An average of 15 tankers carrying between 16 and 17 million barrels of crude oil pass through the strait each day, making these waters one of the most strategically important oil choke points. The Department of Defense has stressed the importance of preventing future naval interactions in the region from escalating. The U.S. has a significant long-standing naval presence in the Persian Gulf, protecting our soldiers and marines in theater and international shipping lanes critical to global commerce. A military-to-military negotiation of bilateral "Incidents at Sea" agreement between the U.S. and Iran would codify vessel-to-vessel communications and improve safety, similar to the agreement during the Cold War.

I ask you to join Chairman Conyers and me in support of this agreement." (*Congressional Record*)

Rep. Lincoln Diaz-Balart (R-FL)

July 9, 2009

Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would like to thank my friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. Cardoza) for the time.

I would like to thank Chairwoman Lowey and Ranking Member Granger for their efforts on this important legislation. This bill provides almost \$50 billion in funding for a number of U.S. government programs and activities, including the State Department, the U.S. Agency for International Development, foreign economic and military assistance, contributions to international organizations, and international broadcasting programs.

In today's world, foreign assistance is as important to our national interest as it is ethical. I am pleased that the legislation recognizes our shared democratic values and our special friendship with Israel, and includes \$2.2 billion in Foreign Military Financing programs, FMF assistance, for that great friend and ally.

Our aid to Israel is especially important as the ruthless tyranny in Iran threatens to wipe it off the face of the map and rockets continue to rain down on Israel from terrorist groups, whether they be Hamas or Hezbollah. Israel is a true friend and partner of the United States, and we must now, more than ever, show unwavering support for our friends, not only through this legislation, but through every other available means.

I am deeply concerned about the funding provided in this legislation to the United Nations Relief and Works Agency. Without determining that the agency does not have members of Hamas on its payroll, U.N. agencies such as that, for example, such as the so-called Human Rights Council, a club of tyrannies, do not deserve American taxpayer support, just like the useless embarrassment that is the Organization of American States.

Now, there are some good things, very good things in this legislation.

The legislation provides \$165 million in Economic Support Funds, for example, for Haiti, to help the authorities consolidate democratic gains and promote development.

Since the recent devastating storms hit Haiti, I have called, first on the Bush administration and then on the Obama administration, to grant temporary protected status to Haitian nationals in the United States.

I visited Haiti last month, and my visit reinforced my belief that TPS for Haiti is well overdue. Again, I call on the Obama administration to finally grant TPS for Haitians. The Obama administration needs to stop dragging its feet on this important issue.

I wish to thank the Appropriations Committee for the \$20 million in Economic Support Funds for pro-democracy activities in Cuba in this bill. Those funds will support efforts for a transition to democracy and freedom in the only totalitarian dictatorship in the Western Hemisphere, through support for dissidents, human rights activists, independent librarians and others who risk their lives each day struggling for freedom in that enslaved island, the only country in the Western Hemisphere where free elections have been denied to its people for over 50 years.

The legislation includes \$1.4 billion for the Millennium Challenge Corporation, MCC. Assistance to foreign nations from the MCC is linked to greater responsibilities from those nations. The new responsibilities those developing nations accept in exchange for the funds ensure that the assistance we provide does not go to waste and has the greatest possible impact on those who need the help the most.

I have been a longtime supporter of the MCC. But last year I learned that one recipient country may not be keeping up their end of the bargain. APR Energy, a Florida company, has an ongoing contract dispute with Tanzania, which I understand Tanzania has failed to resolve. I urge the Tanzanian government to comply with both the contract with APR Energy and their MCC compact and expeditiously resolve the dispute with APR Energy pursuant to the law and the utmost transparency.

I have concerns with the increased funding levels in two areas of the bill, the United Nations Population Fund and international family planning. In the past, this United Nations fund has been found to support and participate in programs of coercive abortion or involuntary sterilization. While the international family planning money doesn't go directly to fund abortions, it will go to organizations that promote and provide advocacy for abortion.

I do not think this is an appropriate use of taxpayer dollars. Even though the majority on the Rules Committee last night rejected the Smith-Stupak amendment on this issue, I continue to hope that the issue will be addressed in conference.

I commend the committee, the Appropriations Committee, for recognizing many other important foreign policy priorities in the bill, \$21 million for the American Institute in Taiwan, for example, and over \$740 million for broadcasting through such important media outlets as the Voice of America, Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty and for Radio and TV

Marti. I also commend the committee for maintaining the Greek language broadcasts in the Voice of America and also for wisely providing assistance to promote as much as possible the reconciliation to end the violence in Sri Lanka.

Mr. Speaker, while I support the underlying legislation, I must oppose the rule by which the majority is bringing this bill to the floor. Last month, the majority set a dangerous precedent to limit debate on appropriations bills, debate that historically was almost always considered under open rules, open debate process. Today we are set to consider the sixth of 12 appropriations bills, and every bill considered so far has been considered under a structured rule that severely limits the ability of all Members of this House to introduce amendments and have them debated.

During yesterday's Rules Committee hearing, Appropriations Ranking Member Lewis testified that there is still time to undo the majority's new precedent restricting the ability of Members to offer amendments on appropriations bills. He asked the majority to reconsider the use of structured rules on appropriations bills, to return to regular order, to historical order, to the tradition of an open debate process on appropriations bills. He even offered his services to persuade Members to not offer dilatory amendments which would hamper the ability of Congress to complete its appropriations work on time.

Rules Ranking Member Dreier and I also offered to help Ranking Member Lewis rein in any errant Members, any Members who wished to prolong unnecessarily the appropriations process. I really hoped the majority on the Rules Committee would heed Mr. Lewis' thoughtful suggestion and accept his offer to help move the process along if an open debate process was returned to. However, the majority once again blocked Members from both sides of the aisle from offering amendments.

Mr. Speaker, the majority has simply not understood the damage, unnecessarily, that it is causing this House by closing debate on appropriations bills, by breaking two centuries of precedence. How myopic. How sad.

I reserve the balance of my time. (*Congressional Record*)

June 19, 2009

The Ayatollah Ali Khamenei, the so-called "supreme leader," is the ruthless dictator of Iran. Ahmadinejad is his puppet. In this farcical election, Khamenei overstepped blatantly. The others in the dictatorship who aspired to the puppet presidency are upset.

The Iranian people are utilizing this moment of division in the dictatorship to heroically express their opposition to the dictatorship. The issue is not one of who is entitled to be the puppet president in the Iranian dictatorship. The issue is the Iranian people are entitled to an end of the dictatorship and to live in self-determination and freedom and democracy.

The President of the United States has been silent and confused. The Congress of the United States clearly stands with the Iranian people, and they will prevail. (*Congressional Record*)

Sen. Chris Dodd (D-CT)

December 24, 2009

I thank the Majority Leader for all of his help in trying to move this legislation forward. This comprehensive sanctions legislation would arm the Administration with critical tools to apply additional pressure on the Iranian regime and disrupt its proliferation and terrorist activities at a pivotal time—a time when Iran's leaders continue to flaunt the will of the international community, trample on the rights of its own people, and threaten the national interests of the U.S. and our strongest allies, including Israel.

It is now clearer than ever that tougher sanctions must be a key element of our comprehensive Iran strategy going forward. My primary goal with this bill is to prevent Iran from developing a nuclear weapons capability. That's why this measure passed the Senate Banking Committee unanimously in October, and I had hoped that we would be able to consider it in the Senate and move toward a conference with the House before we went out for the holidays. While I would have strongly preferred that, I recognize that given the delays on health care reform, we will not now have time to do that. I am also aware that the administration continues to have some concerns about how to create incentives in the bill for countries to cooperate more closely with US efforts to impose tough new multilateral sanctions. I believe we have made some progress in our discussions of recent days, and I am grateful that the Majority Leader has indicated his willingness to move forward on the bill as soon as possible after we return. (*Colloquy on Senate Floor*)

September 29, 2009

Mr. President, it has been a tumultuous year in Iran.

The Iranian regime has continued to pursue its nuclear ambitions, fund terrorist activities throughout the Middle East, and repress its own people. The world watched this repression play out in the wake of this summer's illegitimate elections, when brave and peaceful protestors were violently attacked.

If Iran were to acquire nuclear weapons capability, it would pose a significant threat to peace and security in the Middle East, especially to our close ally Israel and others in the region.

For years, the Iranian regime has refused reasonable requests by the international community. And it has failed to meet its obligations under international nonproliferation rules.

That is a threat to both national security and global stability, and it cannot be allowed to stand unchallenged.

President Obama has undertaken an aggressive dual-track approach. He has offered high-level engagement with Tehran, but has matched that carrot with the stick of sustained pressure

through economic sanctions. As the President has warned, Iran won't be allowed to run out the clock.

As chairman of the Senate Banking Committee, I intend to introduce legislation that will arm the administration with the ability to impose tough, targeted sanctions if Iran does not respond to our final diplomatic efforts in the coming weeks.

We must confront Iran's government with its long record of duplicity and deception on the issue of its nuclear facilities.

Last week, President Obama revealed that Iran is building a secret uranium enrichment facility in violation of international rules.

The President and our allies have rightly insisted that IAEA inspectors be allowed to access this facility promptly. And over the weekend, Iran moved forward on provocative missile tests.

In two days, the United States and our allies will begin key talks with Iran's leaders. Unfortunately, Iran's President has already suggested that appropriate limits to his country's nuclear enrichment program are off the table.

Clearly, in light of this growing threat, there is cause for great concern and prompt action on our part.

But there is also cause for hope that Iran might be forced to change course. We have received renewed support from our allies. We have been encouraged by the strong international rejection of election abuses. And we have seen tensions within the Iranian regime begin to break into the open.

It is not too late for a proper resolution. But the road ahead is difficult. It will require sustained diplomatic effort to ensure all of our strategic partners--the Europeans, the Russians, the Chinese, the Indians and moderate Arab states throughout the Middle East join this effort.

We will only succeed if Iran is confronted by the prospect of sustained, progressively intensifying multilateral economic and diplomatic pressure on its government including tougher sanctions.

This week's negotiations should confront Iran's leaders with a clear choice: end its illegitimate efforts to enrich uranium, halt its proliferation efforts, and stop supporting terrorists around the world--or continue to deepen this regime's isolation, and ruin the Iranian economy.

The administration is right to attempt engagement with Iran even as we make clear that biting sanctions will follow if international demands for greater transparency continue to meet with stubborn refusal.

Administration officials have outlined to me a menu of additional tough multilateral sanctions that they are considering imposing. Congress must equip President Obama with a full range of tools to deal with the threats posed by Iran.

In the last Congress, the Banking Committee approved comprehensive legislation to impose tough new sanctions on the Iranian regime; authorize investors to divest from companies active in Iran's energy sector; and combat black-market networks spreading weapons around the world. Unfortunately, floor consideration was repeatedly blocked by a small minority.

Given the rising stakes, I intend to work with my committee colleagues, including Ranking Member Senator Shelby, to press forward similar sanctions legislation in the next few weeks.

I want to congratulate Senators Lieberman and Bayh for their leadership on this issue, including their legislation to impose further sanctions on entities involved in importing gasoline to Iran or in assisting Iran's efforts to expand its domestic refining capacity.

Iran's energy sector is a key source of revenue to the government--and Iran is especially susceptible because of its dependence on imported gasoline. I will integrate these critical provisions into the legislation.

Our legislation will be targeted and strategic, maximizing the economic leverage of the U.S., our partners and allies, and investors while avoiding the risks of a more indiscriminate approach.

The bill would also expand coverage under the Iran Sanctions Act to include financial institutions, underwriters, guarantors, and other business entities, and extend the applicability of sanctions to oil and gas pipelines and tankers.

It would impose a broad ban on direct imports from Iran to the U.S. and exports from the U.S. to Iran of those few items still able to be so shipped, exempting food and medicines.

It will strengthen existing authority to freeze the assets of Iranians active in weapons proliferation or terrorist activity, and make it clear that U.S. entities who establish a subsidiary to get around sanctions laws will be held liable for the activities of their subsidiaries.

Finally, it would impose new requirements that the President actually make a determination, and report every 6 months to Congress, regarding the sanctionability of eligible investments in Iran's energy sector.

In addition to expanding U.S. sanctions, the bill would also establish a simple formula authorizing divestment from firms which invest significant amounts in Iran's energy sector, with provisions patterned after the Sudan Accountability and Divestment Act enacted 2 years ago.

Many of us believe that Americans should be able to divest from energy firms doing business with the Iranian regime whose policies they abhor, and which indirectly help to prop up the regime.

They should be given the tools they need to make socially responsible decisions. And investors who choose to divest--States, large pension and mutual funds, and others should be held harmless for these decisions. Investing in Iran is risky business, and investors should be fully informed of those risks going in. The bill does not require divestment; it simply permits it.

Finally, this bill will provide incentives for countries to strengthen their export control systems to stop the illegal diversion of sensitive dual-use technology to countries like Iran, and impose tough new licensing requirements on those who refuse to cooperate.

As we confront the realities of a global marketplace, with manufacturers assembling parts of complex machinery such as aircraft and computers from a supply chain spanning the globe, and as regimes like Iran, North Korea, and Syria trawl various trans-shipment hubs for such parts to assemble high-tech weapons, it makes sense to address this problem head-on.

We have developed a way to do this, with an array of carrots and sticks to prod unwilling countries to get serious about developing and implementing tough, comprehensive export control rules and systems.

Our allies continue to work closely with the US to increase economic and diplomatic pressure on Iran.

I believe our legislation will complement and reinforce those ongoing diplomatic efforts, and send a clear signal to Iran's government of what's in store if they continue to flaunt the will of the international community.

Congress will be moving forward on the same timetable that the President and our allies have set for this fall, to underscore to Iran's leaders the huge price they will pay economically, politically, diplomatically, and otherwise if they do not change course.

The government of Iran must come clean on its nuclear program, which as President Obama observed last week represents a direct challenge to the basic foundation of the international nonproliferation regime. I hope my colleagues will join me in supporting efforts in the coming weeks to make clear to the Iranians that we in Congress stand with President Obama in our determination to confront this problem forcefully, and urgently, before it is too late.

Mr. President, we will have our hearing on October 6 in the Senate Banking Committee. My intention is to, shortly thereafter, a week or so, combine the proposals offered into one strong, comprehensive sanctions bill. I, as well as others, believe we should take no options off the table and that we understand the implications of the statement.

Most of us agree every effort ought to be made to resolve this matter short of the use of military force. Obviously, that option remains. I believe we are proposing a sanctions regime, along with the needed cooperation of other nations around the world, that will send an unequivocal message--and nothing would be more important at this hour than to send that

clear united message from this body and the other body--of our determination to use all the tools available to us to bring about the desired change we seek.

By adopting this strong legislation, my hope is they will understand how serious we are in our determination to achieve the common goal sought by the administration and us in this body.
(*Congressional Record*)

Sen. Byron Dorgan (D-ND)

July 23, 2009

Mr. President, this is a piece of a wing of a Soviet Backfire bomber. We did not shoot this plane down. This was sawed off of a wing of a Backfire bomber that would have carried nuclear weapons, presumably, to threaten our country. But under something called the Nunn-Lugar Cooperative Threat Reduction program that we engaged in with the countries of the former Soviet Union, bombers were destroyed--oh, not by bullets, but they were sawed in half and the wings were taken off and so on.

This is a tube of copper, I show you, from the electrical wiring of a Russian submarine that carried nuclear weapons targeting this country. This was ground up by the Cooperative Threat Reduction program. The submarine was not destroyed by American bullets. This is part of the Cooperative Threat Reduction effort.

This, I show you, is a hinge from a nuclear weapon on top of a missile that was in the Ukraine, presumably aimed at an American target. Where this missile once sat now grows sunflowers in the Ukraine.

The Cooperative Threat Reduction Program--now, why is that important?

Mr. President, we have a lot of threats to this country, but none is as great as the threat of a nuclear warhead being exploded in a major American city or any metropolitan area of this world, for example.

Here, as shown on this chart, is how many nuclear warheads we have. This is from the Carnegie Endowment in 2009. They estimate the number of nuclear warheads that exist on the planet--Russia, about 14,000 nuclear weapons; the United States, 10,500 nuclear weapons; China, about 125; France, about 300; Britain, about 160 nuclear weapons; Israel, 80; India, 50; Pakistan, 60, and so on.

Let me tell you a story, if I might. It is a story that has been written about extensively. In fact, it was the lead for a book called "Nuclear Terrorism," written by Graham Allison.

It was 1 month after 9/11/2001. It was October 11, 2001, when, at the Presidential daily briefing to President George W. Bush, George Tenet, the then-head of the CIA, informed the President that a CIA agent code named Dragonfire had reported that al-Qaida terrorists possessed a 10-kiloton nuclear weapon, evidently stolen from the Russian arsenal. According

to Dragonfire, the CIA agent, it had been smuggled into an American city, probably New York City. Again, at the President's daily briefing, 1 month to the day after 9/11, it was said that al-Qaida had smuggled a 10-kiloton stolen nuclear weapon into perhaps New York City.

The CIA had no independent confirmation of it, but in the hours that followed, the Secretary of State, the National Security Adviser, and others struggled with the question of whom do you call to talk about the threat and how do you do it without the news media putting out a bulletin that there is a rumor that a stolen 10-kiloton Russian nuclear weapon is in an American city without causing panic and mass exodus?

So they tried to determine what to do about this and analyzed: Was it plausible, possible that al-Qaida terrorists had stolen a 10-kiloton nuclear weapon? The answer is yes. Did the Russians possess 10-kiloton nuclear weapons? Yes. Did they have good command and control over them, absolute command and control? No. Was it possible, having stolen it, that the terrorists could have smuggled it into New York City or, perhaps, Washington, DC? Yes. And could the terrorists detonate it? The answer is yes. If it were trucked, for example, to Times Square and exploded, would half a million people be killed instantly? Yes.

But they did not tell anybody. They did not tell the mayor of New York. They sent nuclear weapons search teams to New York. The President sent teams to New York but did not inform anybody, for obvious reasons.

About a month later, while there were a lot of people having an apoplectic seizure about this prospect, it was determined that perhaps the report by the CIA agent, Dragonfire, was not credible.

Now, think of that. Think of the unbelievable angst about the potential of one rather small nuclear weapon, a 10-kiloton nuclear weapon, having been stolen on a planet where there are 25,000 of them--most of them much larger than that. Think of the angst about the potential of having one stolen by a terrorist group and exploded in the middle of an American city. That is just one weapon, and there are 25,000.

There are a lot of people who are good thinkers and very experienced in these areas who will tell you, including former Defense Secretary Perry and others, that there is a very high probability that within the coming 10 years there will be a nuclear weapon exploded in a major city.

So with all of the talk about planes and ships and all of the issues in this bill, this issue of the threat reduction, with \$400 million-plus in this bill--the threat reduction that allowed us to dismantle nuclear weapons, cut off the wings of an adversary's bombers, grind up the wiring, and destroy the submarines--that is critically important. The question for us is, What are we going to do to reduce the number of nuclear weapons and to stop the spread of nuclear weapons around the world? Because almost certainly there will be an explosion of a nuclear weapon in a metropolitan area at some point in the future unless we provide the leadership in arms talks and arms reductions. It is our responsibility to lead. It falls on our shoulders to bear this burden to lead.

I know there are some who would say: Do you know what, that is a sign of weakness to be talking about reducing nuclear weapons. I am not suggesting reducing America's strength or allowing America to be undefended. I am suggesting the world will be a much safer place if we do not have 25,000 nuclear weapons, and this world will be a much safer place if we find a way to stop the spread of nuclear weapons. Every day now, we see the spectacle of Iran . Iran possessing a nuclear weapon? That is scary. North Korea. We do not know how many weapons North Korea has, but the Carnegie Endowment says perhaps less than 10.

But what do we do now? What do we do to decide we are going to be involved in a very aggressive way leading the world in the nonproliferation of nuclear weapons and beginning to reduce the number of nuclear weapons?

We are operating now under what is called the Strategic Offensive Reductions Treaty, also known as the Moscow Treaty, that our last President negotiated. It required the United States and Russia to have no more than 2,200 operationally deployed nuclear weapons. It does not mean that is the limit. That is just the operationally deployed limit. They can have far more nuclear weapons than that. By 2012, they had to be down to 2,200 operationally deployed. It does not restrict delivery vehicles of any kind--missiles, ships, planes. It does not have any verification measures, and it expires in 2012.

There is another treaty called the START Treaty, which was superseded by the treaty I just described. But some parts of the START Treaty are still in force because it does have verification and onsite monitoring and confidence-building measures and it does limit delivery vehicles. But that limitation is going to expire, and that START Treaty expires at the end of this year.

So the point I want to make today simply is this: We are talking about a lot of very important things, and I think the bill put together by the chairman and ranking member, this Defense authorization bill, is very important. I understand that. We need an Army, a Navy, the Marines, the Air Force. We need them well equipped. This is a troubling world in some corners. We face an enormous threat of terrorism. We face a lot of different threats.

We must keep our eye on the ball. We, above all, here in the United States have a responsibility to provide the leadership that is necessary to stop the spread of nuclear weapons, and to try to push and push and push for agreements that would reduce the number of nuclear weapons.

As I said before, when, again, a CIA agent code named Dragonfire shows up and says to the CIA, I have picked up information which indicates there is one nuclear weapon that has been stolen and it is in the hands of terrorists, and it is now in New York City, ready to be detonated, when that happens next, we had better worry a great deal if we haven't prevented it, if we haven't taken all of the steps necessary to say, that can't happen. That report in October of 2001 turned out to be false, but all of the post mortems by experts understood that it could well have been true, and all of the elements could have been accurate. A weapon could have been stolen, smuggled into the city, detonated and a half a million people within three-quarters of a mile of Times Square would have died immediately. If that would have happened the world would never be the same. Everything will have changed.

So it seems to me we have a responsibility to aggressively pursue arms control agreements. We have an opportunity now, and a responsibility to pursue aggressively, even in legislation such as this, the reduction of nuclear weapons and delivery vehicles to try to see if we can step back from the abyss and actively engage with other nuclear powers to do things that will tighten controls, and in a very significant way, prevents the opportunity from other nations, and especially rogue nations, and especially, most especially, terrorist groups, from acquiring nuclear weapons.

We know, we have the history, that Osama bin Laden has been fascinated with and has wanted to acquire the mechanics for nuclear weapons and the materials for nuclear weapons for a long time. We know that. Al-Qaida is still there. As far as we know, Osama bin Laden is still leading al-Qaida. It is pretty unbelievable to think about that. On 9/11 we were told there isn't one acre on this Earth that would be safe for the person who designed the attack against our country, but it is now 8 years later and we are told in the public briefings by our CIA that the greatest threat to our homeland is al-Qaida, a reconstituted al-Qaida. The terrorist threat which is the greatest threat to our homeland is a reconstituted al-Qaida with training camps where they are designing attacks against our country.

Let us hope that we are able to make the kinds of efforts and provide the kind of leadership that singularly says to the world: It is this country that leads the way to stop the spread of nuclear weapons, and it is our country that wants to reduce the number of nuclear weapons on this planet. No, that won't make us weaker; I don't suggest any approach that would ever weaken this country relative to its adversaries. But it will certainly strengthen the future of this planet if we reduce the number of nuclear weapons below the 25,000 nuclear weapons that now exist as well as take very significant steps to stop other countries and certainly to prevent forever rogue nations and terrorist organizations from acquiring nuclear weapons. That needs to be job one. We don't talk nearly enough about it. We don't talk about the subject as much as we should. But I wanted to bring this issue to the floor during this discussion because it is in this bill, Cooperative Threat Reduction, which we know works and which we have funded in the past and will continue to fund in this bill again, and is something that addresses the issue of not just building more weapons but actually finding ways to engage with our adversaries to reduce the weapons that can, frankly, threaten the existence of this planet.

Mr. President, I yield the floor. (*Congressional Record*)

April 20, 2009

Mr. President, 2 days ago, Roxana Saberi from Fargo, ND, was convicted of espionage by an Iranian revolutionary court and sentenced to 8 years in prison after a very brief trial that was held behind closed doors.

I have said very little publicly about this case. But when the sentence was announced, I said I thought it was a terrible miscarriage of justice. I don't come to the floor today to inflame the

passions about this issue, but I wish to, for a few moments, say some words about Roxana Saberi and to urge the Iranian Government to do the right thing and release this young woman from prison and allow her to come home to the United States.

Roxana Saberi is not a spy. She is an Iranian American. She was born and raised and educated in Fargo, ND. Her father is Iranian, which means she has dual citizenship. She went to Iran as a journalist because she is interested in the culture of the country which her father came from.

I know Roxana and her family, and let me tell you a bit about the young woman who sits today in a prison in Iran. Roxana was born in Fargo, ND, 31 years ago. Her father Reza is an Iranian, her mother Akiko is Japanese. She is a 1994 honors graduate of Fargo North High School. She was active in music and soccer and key club and dance. She is a member of that high school's hall of fame. She earned a double major in French and communications in 1997 from Concordia College in Moorhead, MN. She was active in music and a sports star in soccer. She reported for the campus television and newspaper. In 1997, she was selected as Miss North Dakota. In 1997, she was one of the 10 finalists in the Miss America Pageant. When she received her Miss North Dakota title, Roxana said her aim was to encourage other young people to appreciate cultural differences. That ambition led her to a career in journalism.

In 1999, she completed a master's degree in broadcast journalism from Northwestern University in Chicago, IL. In 2000, she received a master's degree in international relations from Cambridge University in England. She moved in 2003 to Iran as a freelance journalist. She reported for National Public Radio, Fox News, and the BBC. This is a young woman of great accomplishment. She has two master's degrees, she has a great education, and she so celebrated her culture that she wanted to spend time in the country of Iran, where her father was born, and she did reporting in the country of Iran. She stayed in Iran after her press credentials lapsed in 2006. She stayed to write a book and complete work on a master's degree in Iranian studies and international relations.

At the end of January in this year, Roxana was picked up and sent to prison. She was held nearly 2 months without charge in a prison outside of Tehran. As I indicated, this Saturday she was convicted of espionage and sentenced to 8 years in prison. The trial was a brief closed-door trial, and this young woman was not allowed to speak in her own defense.

Since Roxana Saberi was convicted and sentenced on Saturday, President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad has sent a letter to the Tehran's prosecutor saying Roxana's rights must not be violated in any way and he asked the prosecutor to ensure that she is allowed to offer a full defense in her appeal.

In addition, the head of Iran's judiciary has ordered a "quick and fair" appeal of Roxana's case. Perhaps they understand that because of worldwide attention to the imprisonment of this young woman, Iran's credibility is on trial as well. When Iranian authorities review Roxana's cases, they will see she has not been granted the basic human and judicial rights that are guaranteed--or supposed to be guaranteed--under Iran's Constitution and penal code.

As I said, she was arrested in late January, she was held without charge and kept without communication with her family for weeks before being allowed to call her parents in Fargo, ND. It took about 6 weeks before she was allowed to see the lawyer who was hired by her parents. At first, she was told she was imprisoned because she bought a bottle of wine, and the person who sold her the bottle of wine had reported it to Iranian authorities. Then she was accused of working as a journalist without a valid press card. Finally, she was accused of espionage, of spying for the United States, and at the trial--conducted behind closed doors, according to her lawyer--was not allowed to speak in her own defense.

Roxana Saberi's parents have traveled to Iran to work on their daughter's behalf. They say they have been treated courteously by Iranian officials. They have now been able to visit Roxana in prison, and they have been allowed to work with the lawyer and speak to the press. I visited with Roxana's father today and a couple times last week. He is enormously gratified at the outpouring of support for Roxana from all around the world. President Obama, I know, has spoken of this issue, Secretary Clinton, media outlets around the world and nongovernment organizations, foreign governments and the European Union have all appealed on her behalf. Roxana's father has indicated she has not been abused in prison but that she is frail, has lost weight, and he fears she may not survive in prison for a lengthy term.

Some have said this case suggests we shouldn't have any dialogue or discussions with Iran. I think quite the opposite. One of the difficulties of this case is that an American citizen has been imprisoned unfairly in Iran and then charged and tried and sentenced unfairly. We have no embassy and no Ambassador in Iran, so we must work through the Swiss Embassy, which is the protecting power for American citizens in Iran.

My hope is that as a result of what has happened internationally and as a result of what we have heard from President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad and the chief of Iran's judicial system, the Iranian authorities will understand this is a travesty of justice; that this doesn't meet any standard of fairness and that Roxana Saberi is not--is not, I repeat--a spy. My hope is the Iranian authorities will decide enough is enough, and they will allow this young woman to be freed from prison and to travel back to this country.

She is an American citizen, born, raised, and educated in this country. The Iranians make the case she is an Iranian citizen. That ignores the fact that she was born and raised and educated here. She is an American citizen. To have an American citizen imprisoned in Iran, held 2 months without charge, and then charged in a closed-door trial with espionage is, in my judgment, an affront to fairness, and I think it is an unbelievable miscarriage of justice. My fervent hope is the Iranian authorities will do what should be done in this case and recognize that a miscarriage has occurred. They have the ability and the capability to rectify it.
(Congressional Record)

Rep. Donna Edwards (D-MD)

December 15, 2009

I would like to thank Chairman *Berman* for yielding.

I rise today disappointed that I am here to support the Iran Refined Petroleum Sanctions Act. I am disappointed because it's the extraordinary lack of cooperation and duplicity on the part of the leadership in Iran that brings us to that point.

Though I share many of the concerns expressed by the opposition, like many, I was hopeful at the beginning of the year with the new President and administration that we would approach Iran differently and that the leaders in Iran would respond likewise. Sadly, the leadership of Iran, particularly following their flawed elections, has been anything but forthcoming and cooperative. They have thwarted the international community. They rebuffed a viable plan for transfer of low-grade uranium and materials for a true civilian nuclear capacity.

They have led the world community along with the belief that they were negotiating fairly and with integrity. Instead, they are pursuing enrichment. This posture on the part of the Iranian government is both unfortunate and misguided, attempting to test President Obama's resolve and commitment to transparency, deterrence and accountability.

It's my hope that our actions today will enable additional leverage for President Obama and his team within the governing multilateral institutions and negotiating countries. I think the Iranian leadership has to understand that the United States is both serious about engagement and accountability. (*Congressional Record*)

Rep. Keith Ellison (D-MN)

June 19, 2009

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the drafters of the resolution. I think it is carefully drafted, and I think it is clear that the universal values of freedom that are expressed in the resolution are done with a great amount of prudence, and I think that's right.

I think it is also important to understand that when the Congress of the United States speaks a lot of people listen, and so it's important to not allow the Congress to be used as a tool in what was essentially an internal fight in Iran. And so I would urge caution and urge the United States Congress to stand up and speak about the universal values that we care about: Democracy, freedom, due process of law, lack of violence in terms of solving political disputes, and not allow ourselves to be used as a weapon against the people who we are, in fact, trying to help, which is the people of Iran. (*Congressional Record*)

Rep. Eliot Engel (D-NY)

December 15, 2009

Madam Speaker, only a few short months ago the world learned of the secret Iranian nuclear enrichment facility near the city of Qom. If there was any doubt that Iran was trying to build nuclear weapons, this revelation dispelled any shred of that doubt.

The facility, kept secret from the International Atomic Energy Agency, was built deep in a mountain on a protected military base. This is how a country conceals a nuclear weapons program and defies U.N. Security Council resolutions, not how it develops peaceful energy technologies.

Although Iran is a leading producer of crude oil, it has limited refining capability. This bill will increase leverage against Iran by penalizing companies that export refined petroleum products to Iran or finance Iran's domestic refining capabilities. It's my hope that the administration will apply these additional sanctions to make absolutely clear to the Ahmadinejad regime that the world will not accept its nuclear ambition.

The U.S. and our allies in the U.N. Security Council have recognized that a nuclear-armed Iran would be a danger to the Middle East, to our ally, Israel, and to the nuclear nonproliferation regime. A nuclear-armed Iran is simply unacceptable, and we must support this sanction. To my colleagues who say that sanctions don't work, it only hurts the local population, the same argument, discredited argument, was made against South African sanctions. That worked. These sanctions will, too.

Support the legislation. (*Congressional Record*)

June 23, 2009

Madam Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to commend the brave people of Iran who have been demonstrating in the streets of Tehran for freedom and democracy and demanding that they have a free and fair election.

The election that was held was obviously neither free nor fair. It was fraudulent. And the declared winner, President Ahmadinejad, obviously lost the election.

The people of Iran deserve better, and I want to commend those brave people. They remind me of the people in Tiananmen Square. They remind me of the people in Prague during the Prague spring of 1968. They remind me of people everywhere who stand up against oppression and stand for freedom.

I want the brave people of Iran to know that we in the United States are with them. We support them. We are against fraudulent elections. We are against dictatorships. We are against mullahs ruling the country without any real democracy.

And I would say to these people the United States is with you and we are watching.
(*Congressional Record*)

June 10, 2009

You know, Israel withdrew from Gaza. People say, well, Israel needs to withdraw from the territories, from the settlements and there will be peace, land for peace. Well, Israel withdrew from Gaza and got land for war. I mean that's exactly what's happened, with rockets being fired on Israel from the very part in Gaza that Israel left.

The Arab countries, as a whole, need to start normalizing relations with Israel. We can start with Saudi Arabia on down, to show that they are really serious about peace. They need to stop the terrorist infrastructure and end the incitement.

And you know what? Gaza, as Ms. Berkley pointed out, is a terrorist organization in control-- I'm sorry. Hamas is a terrorist organization in control of Gaza. And what Hamas needs to do is recognize Israel's right to exist, abide by all previous agreements that the Palestinians have signed, and renounce terrorism permanently. Otherwise, why should Israel negotiate with a government that denies its very right to exist?

The United States is right in saying that Hamas is a terrorist organization. And by the way, Representative Berkley and I do not believe that we should provide aid to Gaza until Hamas meets these conditions.

So there are people who also say that the Palestinian-Israeli problem needs to be settled before there can be peace in the region. That is nonsense.

The problem with Iran has to be settled before there can be peace in the region. We all know that Iran is developing nuclear weapons. We all know that Ahmadinejad has threatened to wipe Israel off the face of the Earth. We all hope he loses in his election this week. But whoever replaces him is not going to be much more of a moderate than he is.

And so Israel has the absolute right to defend its security, and the United States, as Israel's greatest ally, should not be putting pressure on Israel to make unilateral concessions up front. That is very, very important.

When President Obama said the bond between Israel and the United States is unbreakable, then we ought to show that in our actions as well as our words.

So I thank the gentlewoman for sharing this time with me. I know we are going to continue to fight for strong U.S.-Israel ties. (*Congressional Record*)

April 22, 2009

Just the other day, the United Nations, shamefully, had a so-called "conference" on racism, dubbed Durban II, held in Geneva. The United States boycotted this charade, rightfully so, and I want to commend President Obama for making the decision to boycott because Durban I turned into a tirade of racism against Israel, of racism against the Jewish people, anti-Semitism, and we knew that so-called "Durban II" would be the same. Sure enough, it was.

When that lunatic, the President of Iran, Ahmadinejad, got up and made hateful speeches against Jews, against Israel, anti-Semitic speeches, it really made a mockery of this whole so-called "Durban II." This conference was supposed to attack racism, not deal and aid and abet racism. Ahmadinejad, shamefully, was the only President of any country to address this charade.

The United Nations, unfortunately, only discredits itself when it has conferences like this, and I'm glad. It was the right thing to do that the United States boycotted. As for the European nations, many walked out in disgust, and that was also good because that showed that racism, anti-Semitism and beating up on Israel was not going to be tolerated.

I commend the President, and I am glad the United States stood tall. (*Congressional Record*)

Rep. Eni Faleomavaega (D-AS)

December 15, 2009

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2194, the Iran Refined Petroleum Sanctions Act of 2009, aimed at checking the government of Iran's clandestine effort to acquire a nuclear weapons capability.

That effort is particularly troublesome given the country's ongoing support of international terrorism and its programs to develop ballistic missiles. An Iranian regime armed with nuclear weapons and the systems to deliver them, and no compunction about targeting innocents, will present a grave security threat to the United States, the Middle East and the entire globe. And make no mistake: Iran has global ambitions, now encompassing the Pacific Islands. Last year, for example, Iran provided a \$200,000 scholarship fund to the Solomon Islands for students living there to study medicine in Cuba. This year, the Solomons voted in favor of a U.N. resolution regarding the seriously-flawed Goldstone Report on the Gaza conflict.

Meanwhile, today's Washington Post reports that Iran's indigenous scientific and technical capabilities appear to have put Teheran on the threshold of becoming a nuclear weapons state. And as Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton noted yesterday, diplomatic engagement with Iran over its nuclear activities, "has produced very little in terms of any kind of a positive response from the Iranians."

H.R. 2194, sponsored by the Chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, the distinguished gentleman from California, Mr. BERMAN, provides the Administration one more instrument for its diplomatic tool kit: explicit authority to impose additional sanctions on the Iranian regime if it fails to abandon its quest for nuclear weapons.

While I hope that the President will not have to exercise that authority, I believe having it available will increase his diplomatic leverage. It is time for the government of Iran to heed the call of the international community and abandon its nuclear ambitions. I ask my

colleagues in the House to reinforce that call by supporting H.R. 2194. (*Congressional Record*)

Rep. John Fleming (R-LA)

September 30, 2009

Mr. Speaker, in the last few days, Iran has proven its threatening nature by conducting three rounds of missile tests, reminding us of the growing nuclear threat of Iran. Iran continues to show contempt towards the U.S. and the rest of the world through its nuclear development and the support of worldwide terrorism. Furthermore, it poses an existential threat to Israel, one of our most important allies.

Iran does not need to develop further nuclear fuel for energy, as it is a net exporter of oil even now. Rather than prepare for and deter this threat, the President has chosen to appease Moscow and Tehran by disabling a missile defense initiative with no concessions in return.

This reckless decision comes on the heels of the administration's double-digit cuts to missile defense funding and F-22 development. A Commander in Chief's first priority should always be national security, yet this decision is appeasement of current and potential enemies.
(*Congressional Record*)

September 29, 2009

The three of us here this evening spent really an awesome time in Israel during August. But I want to take you back in time, Mr. Speaker, in history 71 years to today. Literally 71 years to today, and what we see in the newsreels. And that was that Lord Chamberlain waved a stack of papers in front of the camera and he uttered, We have peace in our time. And what was he talking about? He had just come from a meeting with Herr Adolph Hitler, and along with France and a few other nations, but not Czechoslovakia, they had come to an agreement to cede to Hitler the Sudetenland, which at that time was the strategic part of Czechoslovakia that was so necessary for their protection. He ceded that. Of course, Hitler claimed that it was mostly populated with Germans, but, nonetheless, Lord Chamberlain and others agreed to let him have it. And we know that today as a policy of appeasement.

He also said that he actually went there for the purpose of honor and peace. And then Winston Churchill, who was in the Parliament, replied that he went there for honor and peace but he returned with neither. Because we know that within months, Hitler began a very aggressive campaign and went on to, of course, not only take Czechoslovakia but also Poland. And, of course, as we say, the rest is history.

And what is that history? The history is that there were 20 million people killed during World War II, Mr. Speaker; 6 million of them were Jews. And in visiting the Holocaust Museum in

Israel, in Jerusalem, Yad Vashem, something very interesting, I think, occurred in my mind that I never thought about until it was brought out.

We saw a lot of very interesting things there. A lot of personal stories about families who were broken apart, most of whom died in the Holocaust, people who were in death camps, a lot of personal letters and books and eyeglasses and things like that that told individual stories. We know the factual parts of this. We have all seen the documentaries that talked about the gas chambers and the ovens. And we, of course, have heard about and read about the Final Solution and Hitler's attempt to take executing human beings to a whole new scientific level, which he was able to achieve. Nothing before and nothing since has been done.

But the important thing, Mr. Speaker, about this that we must understand that really teaches us a second lesson today: The first one being the danger of appeasement, but the second is that while the Jews were being carted off to the death camps, and, of course, many of them attempted to reach safe harbor in the United States and many other countries and were denied that and, in fact, in many cases were thrown out of other countries, there was no one to speak up for the Jews. No one, not even the United States. Even we have the blight of having turned our backs on the Jews. And there was no state, there was no country to speak up for the Jews, who at that time lived in many places of the world. And because of that, after World War II and all the countries began to come together, it was decided that the Jews would have their own homeland.

And of course we know that the U.N. provided for that, and what was then called Palestine today is called Israel. Israel is a state, and that's so important because now Jews have a country to stick up for them. They have a people who will never back down from an evil dictator like Adolf Hitler. They will stand up for their people, and they will stand up as our ally against these things.

But the interesting thing is it's often said that what we don't learn from history is destined to repeat itself. And what we have today is a Hitler-like figure, Mr. Speaker, of course, Ahmadinejad, who is saying many of the same things that Adolf Hitler said in those days, giving the same threats.

Very few people took Hitler seriously when he said that he intended to kill the Jews, and that is what he did. Now we have Ahmadinejad who is making the same statements, and we watch before our very eyes he's building a nuclear arsenal.

And what are we doing, Mr. Speaker? Well, we are talking about sanctions. And how effective are these sanctions going to be when it's necessary to have Russia and China to help us with that? And of course, all we are getting from them is rhetoric. In fact, the only thing structurally that's been done in all of this discussion is we've given up missile defense in the Czech Republic and in Poland. So we are already beginning the appeasement process in this world while we have another Hitler-like figure out there beginning to plan the destruction of the Jews once again.

So I think we need to stand, Mr. Speaker, with our brothers and sisters in Israel, in their protection. Because in as much as Israel is so capable of taking care of itself--we all know just what a small strip of land that is--and while Israel can protect itself in many ways, there is no way that Israel can protect itself from an intercontinental ballistic missile with a nuclear warhead, and that is precisely what Iran is doing today.

And apart from that, Iran is exporting terrorism around the world. We know that Hamas and Hezbollah; we know that al Qaeda--who is providing al Qaeda, Mr. Speaker, with the weapons they are using to kill our own sons and daughters? Again, it's Iran. So Iran is emerging as, I guess--Ahmadinejad and certainly the mullahs behind him, are really, I think, showing a tremendous parallel to pre-World War II Germany.

And I think that we need to learn from the lessons of the past, and that is that number one, we should never allow a policy of appeasement. It never gets peace and it never gives honor. It always leads to war. It's always a matter of people overseas, folks who really are out for the destruction of others, it gives them an opening to attack other countries.

And then secondly, never again should Israel be without its own country and certainly without its friends around the world. Never again should we have a situation, Mr. Speaker, as we did during World War II that was a holocaust which, of course, we know that Ahmadinejad denies to this day.

And there are many that say, look, this is just a little strip of land out there in the middle of the desert. You've got Arabs out there and you've got Jews and they're fighting over this land. Really, if you think about it, the Jews occupied this land as far back as 3500 B.C. Islam didn't even come into existence until thousands of years later, and in fact, we know that Christianity started even before Islam.

So of course there have been three major religions that have existed there and still exist there today, and as far as I'm concerned, they can exist there forever. But I think that there's no reason to think that there isn't a legitimate right for Israel to claim that as its own state.

And in summary--and this is, I think, to kind of tie it all together, Mr. Speaker--we talked about the issue of the two-state solution, and Mr. Netanyahu believes that is the way to go. We should have two states: a Palestinian state and a Jewish state. But remember that Israel is a democracy, and just simply by being outgrown by Palestinians or Muslims, it could lose its status as a Jewish state. And I think that it's essential that we not only support this two-state solution in supporting Israel, but that we support the right for Israel to exist as a Jewish state and always will. (*Congressional Record*)

June 18, 2009

Mr. Speaker, recently elections were held in Iran with the Iranian Government declaring Ahmadinejad the landslide winner over pro-reform challenger Mr. Mousavi.

Mousavi is claiming the results of these elections should be voided because of fraud and other irregularities as people went to vote. He is calling upon his supporters to remain vocal and protest the results of this election, and they are turning out in the tens of thousands, but many have been killed. In response, President Ahmadinejad has tried to minimize anyone with an opposing viewpoint, physically threatening any form of dissent and shutting out the media and communications.

The accusations of voter irregularities must be investigated, a fact supported by Vice President Biden. But until this election is certified, the people of Iran should be supported in their pursuit of peaceful protests, if they so choose. Also, dissidents should be allowed to protest without violence against them.

More importantly, I call upon our President to not be timid, but to speak out firmly on this subject. Either it is a democracy with a legitimate government, or it is a tyrannical dictatorship.” (*Congressional Record*)

Rep. Virginia Foxx (R-NC)

June 19, 2009

Madam Speaker, this week the world heard the cry of millions of Iranians who seek the right to a free and fair election. In response, Americans from all walks of life have taken up the cause of liberty for Iranians who crave real freedom and not sham elections.

I am proud to join the United States Congress to stand with freedom-loving people everywhere in support of the people of Iran and to call for an end to the brutal and violent suppression of peaceful protesters. We will not stand by in silence and watch the forces of radicalism attempt to squelch the public outcry in Iran against last week’s election irregularities.

The Middle East is ready for another real democracy, a nation where the voices of every citizen are heard and where the government works for the people and not against the people. Over the past few years the bellicose regime in Tehran has spewed an endless line of anti-Western vitriol and insists on threatening the existence of the state of Israel--one of the few beacons of real freedom in the Middle East. It is now obvious that the average Iranian has grown weary with their authoritarian leadership.

The ongoing crackdown on free expression and the rights of journalists along with the censoring of communication with the outside world has simply shown the true colors of the dark Iranian regime desperately trying to hold its grip on power. The people of Iran deserve better. They deserve freedom. And today the House of Representatives has given voice to their historic plea in the hallowed halls of Congress. (*Congressional Record*)

May 20, 2009

With Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu in Washington this week, it's important that we refocus on the unique relationship the U.S. shares with the Nation of Israel. This year is the 61st anniversary of the State of Israel. But 61 years of existence does not mean that Israel no longer faces profound threats to its very survival. Chief among those is the threat of a nuclear-armed Iran and Iran's continuing aggressive stance towards Israel in the region.

Making matters even more urgent, Iran announced today that it has successfully test-fired a missile that is capable of striking Israel in addition to U.S. military installations in the Middle East and parts of Southeastern Europe. With his typical rhetorical hammer and anvil, Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad said that with today's missile launch, Iran is sending a strong message on the nuclear front: "Today the Republic of Iran is running the show."

While I doubt that this is the case, it is increasingly clear that Iran relishes its role as Middle East troublemaker and is nowhere near giving up its troubling belligerent stance toward our Israeli allies. Yet despite the threats and instability that proliferate in the Middle East, Israel has proven to be a steadfast ally to the U.S. and a model of a free and open democratic state in this troubled region. Since the time of its creation more than 60 years ago, Israel has served as an example of democracy and equal rights for her neighbors. Israel has also proved to be a steadfast ally to the United States in a variety of ways, particularly within our country's diplomatic efforts in the Middle East.

Since its founding in 1948, the State of Israel has served as a democratic anchor in the Middle East. Like the United States, the Israeli Declaration of Independence protects freedom of speech, freedom of religion, a free press, free elections and many other tenets of a free society. Israel established a democracy in the midst of a politically tumultuous region and by guaranteeing the basic rights of her citizens, sets herself apart from her authoritarian neighbors. Israel prides herself on women's rights and equal pay for women in the workforce. The first female Prime Minister, Golda Meir, was elected in 1969, just 21 years after the formation of modern Israel. Women now serve as the Foreign Minister, Speaker of the Knesset and Chief Justice of the Israeli Supreme Court. Furthermore, Israel has recognized the necessity of providing equal rights regardless of gender or race and deserves to be commended.

Not only is Israel an example for her neighbor as a thriving democracy where citizens' rights are protected through the rule of law, she has also been an avid supporter in the global war on terror. The U.S. and Israel are continually working together to develop sophisticated military technology and improve Israel's defense systems and soldier protection. In the interest of global freedom, I hope and am confident that this friendship will continue in the future."
(Congressional Record)

Rep. Jeff Fortenberry (R-NE)

November 6, 2009

Mr. Speaker, this week holds special significance for our Nation, especially for the courageous U.S. diplomats and military personnel who were captured when militant student activists stormed the U.S. embassy in Tehran 30 years ago on November 4, 1979.

Their 444-day hostage ordeal in Iran is forever etched in our Nation's memory. You cannot understand what is happening in the Middle East today without reference to this event. I introduced this resolution to remind us of the hostages' triumph in adversity, of the difficult lessons our policymakers learned during that grueling episode, to commemorate their service to our Nation and to honor those brave soldiers who were killed and wounded in a valiant rescue attempt.

Our diplomats took a difficult assignment at a difficult time in the Middle East. Their courageous witness to the principles that we hold dear, just civil order and recourse to the orderly address of grievances, stands as a reminder of what is at stake now in the ancient land of Iran, a choice for peace and cooperation or a choice for repression, fear, and isolation.

The quest for national prominence and prestige to which Iran understandably subscribes, absent the enduring values we have been fortunate to see enshrined in the U.S. Constitution, as well as the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, is an empty quest. In his oft cited work, "Democracy in America," Alexis de Tocqueville in essence concluded that America is great because America is good. We must constantly remind ourselves that the ongoing challenge to our Nation or any nation lies in the quest for what is good. This is the measure of greatness in a civilized world.

Greatness not to dominate, but to liberate. Greatness, not to rule and coerce, but to govern wisely and with the consent of the people who seek to determine their own destiny within the framework of the just rule of law.

This is the challenge before Iran today. To be a force for good in a region challenged to rise above long-standing grievances and injustices, to be a force for good in a world threatened by greed, terror and tyranny, or not.

When President Ronald Reagan welcomed the former hostages to the White House on January 27, 1981, he stated, "We hear it said that we live in an era of limit to our powers. Well, let it also be understood, there are limits to our patience." It is my hope, Mr. Speaker, that by honoring these brave men and women, we may inspire people throughout the world to work tirelessly for the freedom and justice they deserve and settle for nothing less.

It is also my fervent hope that in recognition of this 30th anniversary, the people of the United States and Iran may embark on a new relationship that fully reflects the noblest aspirations for life and liberty. (*Congressional Record*)

Rep. Barney Frank (D-MA)

October 13, 2009

I am somewhat encouraged by what appears to be some progress in negotiations between the United States and many other nations and Iran. I believe, as do I think, almost everybody in the House, perhaps not everybody, but almost everybody, that nuclear weapons in the hands of the Iranian regime would be a terrible thing for the world to have to deal with, and I am very supportive of our efforts to mobilize the necessary multinational coalition to impose the kind of sanctions that will stop this.

In that context, I have worked closely with the Chair of the Foreign Affairs Committee, the gentleman from California, Mr. *Berman*, on sanctions legislation, and I believe that he is correctly coordinating closely with the administration on the timing of broader sanctions legislation.

The bill we are discussing right now is one that has previously been passed by this House. It was blocked in the Senate in the previous administration because the State Department argued against it, and I think the time has come for us to do it.

It does not in itself impose any sanctions. What it does is to make it very clear that Americans who are deeply concerned about the prospect of Iranian nuclear power and other aspects of Iranian governance, that they are able to act on those. In particular, this bill says that no one in this country ought involuntarily to have his or her money put to the support of the Iranian economy.

It has two provisions. First, it would protect States which have decided to divest from companies that are invested in Iranian energy operations from being preempted by the Federal Government.

The State of Massachusetts, my home State, some years ago passed a bill saying not that no one in Massachusetts could do business with Myanmar, as the dictatorial rulers of that country now call what was once Burma; they said that they did not want State money, money from the State of Massachusetts, to be involved in ways that would be supportive of that regime. The State Department challenged that on the grounds of Federal supremacy in foreign policy, and the Supreme Court upheld it.

What we do today is to say not that States can make foreign policy, but that States have the right to control their own funds. The staff has given me a list of about 20 States that have enacted legislation to divest from Iran and several other States that have adopted policies of divesting from Iran.

Part of this bill today protects those States which have made the decisions by their own democratic processes from having the Federal Government come in and say, no, we are the Federal Government, we are in charge of foreign policy, and you must continue to invest in Iran.

Secondly, we have had a movement of citizens that say to various investment vehicles, we do not want our money invested in Iran. What this says is that if people who are contributors to an investment fund go to that investment fund, whatever it is, and say, we don't want our

money helping to bolster the economy of that regime in Iran, withdraw our funds from those companies, that the company can't be sued.

What we have had is the investment vehicles have often said, I think sometimes frankly not entirely meaning that this is the real reason, oh, well, we can't do that, because we are mandated to get you the best possible dollar return, and if we withdraw here, we will be accused of having used other criteria.

Now, in fact it has been, I think, fairly clear that when you have a very large entity investing broadly, withdrawal from no one cause is going to cause a problem. But that is still the fear that was cited. So what this bill does is to give a very narrowly drafted protection to the investment managers against being sued because they respond to a claim from their own contributors to that fund who don't want to be supporting Iran.

As I said, it does not mandate any divestiture. It does protect State governments from having their money put where they don't want it to be, and it protects entities that do investments from being sued if they were to give in to the moral argument that their funds should not go for this or that country.

There are a couple of technical changes to the bill as introduced which provide that the exceptions are very narrowly drafted just to this. It is, in fact, about the Iranian energy section, and I believe those in America who want to make these decisions should be protected in doing so.

It is the fantasy of the President of Iran, among many fantasies, most of them malign, that somehow it's the American Government that's been opposed to them and that the broad reach of the American people would be more sympathetic. The important point to stress here is that this bill does not do anything at the Federal level. This bill empowers State governments and private citizens to give vent to their own understandable extreme dislike and fear of the Iranian Government.

So let's be very clear. This is a bill that will have effect to the extent that the activities of the Iranian Government increase the revulsion many Americans feel at those actions; not at the people of Iran, but at the Government of Iran. If, in fact, some of the hopeful signs were to look better, then this bill will not have much of an impact.

So, to the great extent, whether or not this bill has a real impact will depend very much on what the Iranians do. And so I appreciate the cooperation we've gotten on both sides. And I stress again, this is a bill that empowers American citizens, American local and State governments, and whether or not this leads to action will depend very much on future actions by the Government of Iran. (*Congressional Record*)

Sen. Al Franken (D-MN)

December 5, 2009

Madam President, I rise today to talk about Shane Bauer, Sarah Shourd, and Josh Fattal. These three young Americans have been in custody in Iran since July 31, 2009. That is more than 4 months.

Shane is from Minnesota, where his devoted mother, Cindy Hickey, still lives. I have been in constant and close touch with Cindy over the phone, and last month I was able to meet with all the families of the young hikers, and they have been back in Washington again this week. I have to say, they are a remarkable group of people who want nothing more than to be reunited with their children. On behalf of their families, I have come to the floor today to urge the Government of Iran to make a humanitarian gesture and release these young Americans so they can be together with their families again.

As many of you know, Josh, Sarah, and Shane were hiking near the Iraqi-Iranian border in a remote region that is famous for a beautiful waterfall when they were taken into custody by Iranian authorities. The Iranians have indicated that the Americans strayed across the border in this remote region. There can be no doubt that it was an accident. Four months later, Josh, Sarah, and Shane remain in prison in Iran.

The Iranian Government has allowed the Swiss Embassy, in its capacity as protection power for U.S. interests in Iran, to have consular access to them twice during the time they have been held. I hope this will continue, and continue more regularly.

The Swiss have been enormously helpful in working with us to resolve the situation to bring these Americans home.

I have been assured by one of the Swiss that Josh, Sarah, and Shane were all in decent physical condition as of the last visit. But it is also clear the imprisonment is taking its toll on these young people.

The President of Iran has indicated that their case will be examined expeditiously and with compassion, which is encouraging. President Ahmadinejad first made that statement around the time the U.N. General Assembly met this past September.

These young American tourists find themselves in unfortunate circumstances. One thing is clear: These circumstances do and should have nothing to do with politics. I hope that Josh, Sarah, and Shane's situation can be resolved on the same basis--as purely a human gesture by the Government of Iran. I understand that people on all sides tend to get caught in the middle of geopolitical events they have nothing to do with. That is a cycle that can and should be stopped. We do not want to perpetuate that cycle. Above all, I hope the Iranian Government will recognize that these Americans have committed nothing more than an innocent mistake and want nothing more than to be brought back together with their families. The Americans should be released.

In the meantime, I hope Josh, Sarah, and Shane will be able to speak with their families by phone immediately. That would be the first direct contact they have had since their detention over 4 months ago.

As we approach the holiday season and the end of the year, this is an especially important time for families to be together. That is not an American value or an Iranian value, it is a human value. It is my fervent hope that Josh, Sarah, and Shane will be brought back together with their families now. I urge the Government of Iran to make a humanitarian gesture and make that family reunion possible. (*Congressional Record*)

Rep. Elton Gallegly (R-CA)

May 7, 2009

Madam Speaker, I rise to recognize the threat Iran's potential nuclear weapon capabilities have on the Middle East, the world, and particularly Israel.

In March, President Obama offered to open a dialogue with Iran. His olive branch was immediately met with scorn by Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad. Iran has not cooled its international animosity since then, as noted by Defense Secretary Robert Gates as recently as Tuesday.

Talk is fine if it is premised in achieving realistic goals, but the Iranian regime has used past efforts at negotiation to delay and divide the United States and our allies in our efforts to turn Tehran from a nuclear enrichment program that clearly could be used for nuclear bombs.

Time for an open hand policy is running out. I believe it is time to up the stakes on Iran.

One way to accomplish that would be to pass the Iran Threat Reduction Act, H.R. 1208, which was introduced by Foreign Affairs Committee Ranking Member Ileana Ros-Lehtinen. H.R. 1208, of which I am an original cosponsor, would extend current U.S. sanctions until the president certifies Iran has dismantled its weapons of mass destruction program and ceased its support for international terrorism. It also would significantly increase U.S. pressure on Tehran to do both.

The bill would sharply increase U.S. efforts to stop the shipment of refined petroleum and natural gas products to Iran, as well as materials needed for building or maintaining oil and gas pipelines. Furthermore, the bill completely prohibits U.S. importation of most Iranian products. It also denies U.S. foreign tax credits to Americans engaged in business activity with Iran that is prohibited by U.S. law.

March 17 marked the 17th anniversary of the bombing by Iranian proxies of the Israeli Embassy in Buenos Aires that killed 29 and wounded 242. It is but one of hundreds of attacks Iran has made against Israel and the United States in a war Iran seems committed to continue.

Without direct Iranian support, Tehran's proxies, Hamas in Gaza and Hezbollah in Lebanon, would be far less formidable foes for Israel. Without Iranian Revolutionary Guards and Iranian weapons, the United States would have suffered hundreds of fewer casualties in Iraq.

Madam Speaker, the time for talk has ended. The United States should increase the pressure on Iran immediately. I therefore urge my colleagues to cosponsor the Iran Threat Reduction Act and I urge leadership to bring it to the floor for quick passage. (*Congressional Record*)

Rep. Scott Garrett (R-NJ)

June 19, 2009

It has now been 1 week since the Iranian people went to the polls to elect their new political leader. And in the last 7 days, the results of the election have been questioned, the media in Iran has been suppressed, thousands of demonstrators have protested, and some of these demonstrators have been injured and killed. Yet this very morning the supreme leader of Iran compared the election to a family disagreement. He offered no apologies for the deaths of the civilian protesters and, instead, simply blamed the Western media for being Zionist-controlled.

As a Member of Congress, I am appalled at this response and the apparent mockery of a fundamental democratic freedom, the freedom to protest and report on one's own government. We know the demonstrators were harassed rather than defended, and we know that Internet connections were cut and cell phone services disabled. Even foreign radio and television satellites were jammed.

So I ask, is this the behavior indicative of a country that recognizes liberties? I was proud earlier today to vote for H. Res. 560 and express my support for the Iranian citizens who recognize the need for their voices to be heard. (*Congressional Record*)

April 2, 2009

Madam Speaker, I rise today to draw attention to Iran's mission for nuclear proliferation. If Iran were to acquire nuclear weapons, the repercussions would be detrimental to our global security. A nuclear Iran would not only pose a threat to the United States and our allies, but would also destabilize an already volatile Middle East region.

Under the guise of energy production, Iran is today actively seeking to acquire nuclear weapon technology. This fact is supported by United Nations inspectors who have found that certain aspects of the Iranian nuclear program are useful only for developing nuclear weapons.

Recently, Iran has further developed its nuclear weapons production capability. In December, Iran constructed a domed containment center adjacent to a heavy water reactor in Arak. This structure makes it impossible to monitor the reactor by satellite. In the past three months, Iran has installed nearly 1,500 centrifuges. As a result, it could take only 2 to 3 months for Iran to enrich uranium to weapons grade. Furthermore, Iran has recently acquired 2,200 pounds of low enriched uranium--enough for one first-generation nuclear bomb.

A nuclear Iran would significantly impact the surrounding region. The repercussions would be felt not only by Middle Eastern countries, but also by countries around the world. The possible outcomes could range from a Middle Eastern nuclear arms race to the sale of nuclear technology to terrorist organizations such as Hezbollah and Hamas.

It is widely accepted that Iran is one of the largest sponsors of terrorism; this reality has been published in the Central Intelligence Agency's World Factbook analysis of Iran. The United States, the United Nations, and the European Union have all placed economic sanctions on Iran due to Iran's sponsorship of terrorism. Hezbollah, a terrorist organization formulated and supported by Iran, is responsible for numerous terrorist attacks; the most infamous of these attacks occurred in Beirut on October 23, 1983 when Hezbollah detonated a bomb inside a U.S. Marine Barracks and killed nearly 300 servicemen.

It is imperative that we in Congress do everything we can to prevent Iran from obtaining nuclear weapons. I am pleased by the recent steps taken by my Congressional colleagues to ensure that this event never takes place. Specifically, I was encouraged that the Financial Services Subcommittee on International Monetary Policy and Trade held a hearing about H.R. 1327, the Iran Sanctions Enabling Act, on March 12. Afterward, I urged Chairman *Barney Frank* to schedule a markup of H.R. 1327 sometime before the April recess.

In closing, I urge my fellow Members to support taking the necessary steps to limit Iran's access to nuclear weapons. We must convince Iran to turn away from its current, dangerous course of action. (*Congressional Record*)

Sen. Kirsten Gillibrand (D-NY)

September 23, 2009

Time To Get Tougher On Iran

Amid the media firestorm over Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad's annual propaganda turn on the world stage addressing the UN General Assembly, let's not lose sight of the need to get tougher on Iran.

The Iranian regime's foreign and military policies present an existential threat to Israel, the region, and the rest of the world.

Iran is aggressively arming and training Hamas and Hizbullah, groups intent on destroying Israel.

For years, the Iranian regime, by its interference in that country, has attempted to undermined American efforts to build a stable Iraq.

And despite Ahmadinejad's protestations otherwise, Iran's nuclear ambitions advance by the day.

I had the privilege of visiting Israel this month to meet with Prime Minister Netanyahu and his top military and intelligence advisers. We discussed a wide range of issues, particularly the threat posed by Iran.

After these discussions, my conviction has only grown that the global community must come together to stop Iran's nuclear program and growing negative influence in the region.

Today, because of Iran, Hizbullah has rockets that can threaten Ben Gurion Airport, and Hamas possesses specialized Iranian rockets designed to be smuggled through tunnels into Gaza. Iran's support has strengthened the ability of these terrorist groups to inflict harm on innocent civilians.

Many experts believe Iran's capability to launch a nuclear bomb is getting dangerously close, and Iran's continuing enrichment program increases its ability to intimidate and influence its neighbors. From discussions with Israeli leaders, it is clear that a nuclear Iran not only threatens Israel, our great friend and ally in the Middle East, but could incite a nuclear arms race in the Gulf resulting in a nuclear weapon or dirty bomb in the hands of terrorists.

A nuclear Iran cannot be tolerated.

Ahmadinejad and other leaders have lost significant legitimacy following broad-based election protests. The ruling Iranian regime has formed a government despite popular unrest. I see two possible courses for the regime: it will seek to bridge divisions with the international community or it will hasten the country's nuclear enrichment path.

In recent weeks, we have only seen more stall tactics from Iran - attempts to deflect attention from the nuclear program and focus on a variety of economic, political and other international issues.

The permanent UN Security Council members have agreed to meet with Iranian chief nuclear negotiator Saeed Jalili on October 1. While these talks should proceed, we cannot condone additional delays allowing for the continuation of Iran's efforts to build military nuclear capabilities.

As Ahmadinejad takes the stage this week, it is important for the global community to move forward on a plan to stop Iran's nuclear weapons program.

First, we need to back President Obama's efforts to engage Iran. I support the president's decision to change course from the previous administration's unilateral foreign policy approach, which undermined our ability to successfully engage our allies and address the threat of a militarily nuclear Iran.

America's sincere invitation to Iran gave the regime an opportunity to rebuild its international standing and lawfully engage in a civilian nuclear program that would address its economic needs. Having strengthened again the Western alliance, the U.S. is now in a position to forge international pressure on Iran to live up to its obligations.

Second, we must combine engagement with increased sanctions. Congress needs to provide the president with all the tools necessary to combine tough sanctions with diplomacy to head off the Iranian threat. The Senate has had over six hearings on the subject of Iran this year.

But we must also take concrete action. We should pass the Iran Refined Petroleum Act, which targets companies that assist Iran's petroleum refining capacity, and the Iran Sanctions Enabling Act, which would protect our state and local governments as they divest from companies that invest in Iran's energy sector.

Because Iran lacks the ability to refine its internal oil and gas resources, its economy depends on importing refined petroleum and bringing in foreign companies to build domestic refining capacity. In fact, Iran imports approximately 40 percent of its refined petroleum needs.

Without cheap oil, Iran cannot fix its serious economic problems. Passing these new, tough sanctions targeting Iran's energy sector would give America needed leverage to convince the Iranian regime to temper its nuclear ambitions.

Third, the U.S. must work strategically with Russia and China, the two UN Security Council members that have been most reluctant to impose sanctions. Gaining their cooperation with respect to Iran will make America and the world safer.

I support President Obama's decision to abandon plans championed by the previous administration to build a missile-defense system in Poland and the Czech Republic, particularly if the decision moves Russia to end its sales of weapons to Iran, cease its

development of Iranian gas fields and nuclear facilities, and support increased sanctions as a way to end Iran's nuclear ambitions.

And we should, together with our allies, find ways to help China address its energy needs without investing in Iran.

My hope is that President Ahmadenijad's visit will inspire American officials to take these proactive steps immediately. Certainly, the safety of Israel, the United States and the world depends on it. (*The Jewish Press*)

Rep. Phil Gingrey (R-GA)

October 16, 2009

Mr. Speaker, I rise today as a proud cosponsor of H.R. 1327, the Iran Sanctions Enabling Act of 2009. Iran's ambition to become a nuclear power is unquestionably clear, and now is the time for debilitating sanctions that will curtail this dangerous path.

Despite the assertions of Iranian leaders that they seek to enrich uranium for peaceful purposes alone, their actions and obfuscation suggest otherwise. Further, President Ahmadinejad has continued to cause international frustration through comments he made at the United Nations summit in September. His efforts also go far beyond words. On numerous occasions, Ahmadinejad has tested mid to long range missiles, and in February 2009, Iran launched a low-orbit rocket that is the necessary first step to firing an intercontinental ballistic missile. Further, intelligence sources point to Iran's ready capability of firing short, medium, and long range missiles that endanger our brave men and women deployed in Afghanistan and Iraq.

I therefore do not support President Obama's cuts to missile defense in the FY10 National Defense Authorization Act. In fact, I believe that we are putting our friends and allies at risk, as well as the eastern shore of the United States. However, if this chamber is forced to rely so heavily on economic sanctions, we must encourage and enable American divestment from Iran to squeeze their economy to a point that will rein in their dangerous ambitions.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support this bill. (*Congressional Record*)

Rep. Louie Gohmert (R-TX)

June 15, 2009

Madam Speaker, you know there is blood in the streets in Iran tonight. It's the morning over there, but blood is running in the streets. People have been outraged at what they say was the stealing of an election.

So does it help to have a President who has continued to make clear he would meet with the ruthless denier of the Holocaust--with this totalitarian, mean-spirited, unjust, unfairly elected leader? It doesn't. Messages go around the world when you say you'll meet with a tyrant without preconditions.

May God be with those who are trying to see that justice is done, and may our leaders be led to keep their mouths shut when it hurts others." (*Congressional Record*)

Rep. Kay Granger (R-TX)

October 8, 2009

Madam Speaker, the global threat of Iran's nuclear program is growing every day. The luxury of time has vanished and the need for Congressional action is absolute.

What we already knew about the Iranian nuclear program, compounded with the recent revelations of an additional uranium enrichment facility outside of Tehran and Iran's continued testing of long-range missiles, only continues to build on an already disturbing scenario.

The Iranian regime is furiously building its nuclear program and threatening anyone who walks the streets of Paris, Beijing, London and New York. Every day that goes by without weakening the regime or its ambitions, the world becomes less safe. We MUST act now.

I wholeheartedly support increased sanctions and divestment efforts and hope the U.S. Congress responds immediately to provide these critical tools to the President.

The United States needs to show strong leadership to show the world that we are serious in taking down this imminent threat from Iran. U.S. actions should be matched by other world leaders--especially Russia and China. (*Congressional Record*)

Sen. Charles Grassley (R-IA)

June 17, 2009

I think, in rhetoric, very definitely because don't we want to promote democracy wherever we can around the world? It's one of our goals. And they presumably want democracy in that country. I mean, they portrayed democracy by having their debates and their multi-candidate elections and the secret balloting, et cetera, et cetera.

If the votes aren't counted right, shouldn't we be speaking up for democracy be a fact as well as fiction? (*Grassley News Teleconference*)

Rep. Al Green (D-TX)

December 15, 2009

Madam Speaker, today we will impose sanctions. We will sanction with this legislation or we will sanction the unacceptable status quo, to which I say not on my watch.

Let history record that even if I could not do enough, I did do all that I could. I support sanctions to avert a tyrant from acquiring nuclear weapons of mass destruction capable of creating an inferno unlike that which even the mind of Dante could imagine. To act later may be to act too late.

I rise in support of the Iran Refined Petroleum Sanctions Act (H.R. 2194). This legislation will restrict refined petroleum imports to Iran by strengthening the President's authority to impose sanctions on companies that provide refined petroleum or help Iran maintain or expand its domestic refining capabilities.

While Iran is one of the largest producers of crude oil, it lacks adequate refining capability to meet its own domestic needs for gasoline and is forced to import 25 to 40 percent of its refined petroleum needs.

This legislation will prevent Iran from importing the gasoline it needs as a way to put pressure on the Iranian government to suspend its uranium enrichment program.

For over a decade, the United States has played a central role in diplomatic, political and economic efforts within the international community to deter Iran from gaining nuclear weapons capabilities.

H.R. 2194 continues those efforts and is particularly important in light of recent intelligence indicating that Iran continues to advance its nuclear program.

The latest International Atomic Energy Agency, IAEA, resolution adopted by the Board of Governors on November 27, 2009, notes with serious concern how Iran has constructed an enrichment facility at Qom in breach of its obligation to suspend all uranium enrichment related activities.

Many experts believe that with further processing of low-enriched uranium, Iran could have the capability to produce a nuclear weapon by the end of this year, reinforcing the sense of urgency to address this threat.

A nuclear-armed Iran would lead to a nuclear arms race and increase the likelihood that such weapons might actually be used against the United States and our allies.

As such, it is a threat not only to the Middle East, but to the entire world.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation and hope that it will be an effective step towards preventing such a threat. (*Congressional Record*)

Rep. Gene Green (D-TX)

December 15, 2009

Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 2194, the Iran Refined Petroleum Sanctions Act of 2009.

Since the U.S. first placed sanctions on commercial relations with Iran in 1996, the Iranian government has not only failed to comply with its international obligations, but has further intensified its efforts to develop nuclear weapons. Most recently, Iran has rejected demands from the International Atomic Energy Agency to halt construction of a previously undisclosed uranium enrichment facility near Qom. It has also announced plans to build ten additional enrichment facilities.

While I fully support the President's efforts to engage the Iranian government diplomatically, Congress must show Iran that failure to reach an agreement will not be without consequence. H.R. 2194 facilitates this goal by weakening Iran's energy sector, which the Iranian government relies on for 80 percent of its revenue. This legislation specifically targets Iran's petroleum refining industry due to its heavy reliance on foreign assistance and trade. The choice for Iran will be either to meet the demands of the international community or risk diplomatic and economic isolation.

The risk of nuclear weapons proliferation and its accompanied threat to regional stability in the Middle East lends increased urgency to passing this legislation. I urge my colleagues to support House Resolution 2194 and supply the President with the tools he needs for reaching a diplomatic solution with Iran. (*Congressional Record*)

Rep. Parker Griffith (D-AL)

October 8, 2009

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address the American people about the current situation in the Middle East. On September 28, Iran launched and tested a Shahab-3 missile which has a range of 1,200 kilometers and puts American soldiers and our allies in the Middle East in danger. These tests must be met with stern opposition.

Having recently returned from Israel and Egypt, I had the opportunity to meet with officials and members of the defense community who are directly involved in their missile defense decisions. I was able to see firsthand the stability and security that American missile systems provide for our allies. Recently, the administration announced a change of plans, eliminating missile silos in Poland and radar in the Czech Republic, which raised concerns both in our missile defense community and among our international allies. Clearly this logic must be questioned as a successful launch of the long-range Shahab-3 missile shows that we must protect our allies in the region and, most importantly, the eastern United States.

These Iranian tests demonstrate a need for ground-based interceptors, if not on Poland, then on the eastern coast of the United States. American safety and security is essential to our soldiers abroad and citizens at home. Because national defense is a nonpartisan issue, we in Congress will work together to make sure our decisions are well thought out and executed. (*Congressional Record*)

Rep. Alcee Hastings (D-FL)

December 14, 2009

Mr. Speaker, one of the great privileges we have is to come here and speak about those who have departed life and to pay condolences and commiserate with their families.

Last week, three persons that were very dear to me died. They are Isaiah ``Ike" Williams, a classmate of mine in law school from Jacksonville; C. Bette Winbush, the first black city commissioner in St. Petersburg; and the Reverend Samuel George, a Presbyterian minister that lived in Pittsburgh but in my earlier career worked in Fort Lauderdale. All three of these people fought their entire lives for tolerance and equality. The Reverend George taught me a great deal about ecumenism and interdenominational undertakings.

Their courage brings to mind for me the courage, turning away from their work, to those that are in the streets in Iran who are protesting their government as I did with Reverend George and C. Bette and Ike and are saying to their government that they should be free and have the opportunity to protest.

I just want those Iranians to know, as I give condolences to my friends that have all departed, that they are not alone. And one of the things that we used to say in the civil rights movement, the whole world is watching. (*Congressional Record*)

Sen. Orrin Hatch (R-UT)

October 6, 2009

Mr. President, today I rise in strong support of Senator *Lieberman's* and Senator *Sessions'* amendment No. 2616 which will provide \$151 million for the research and development of the two-stage ground-based interceptor missile.

I have always believed in having a plan B. Throughout my life I have learned the colloquial wisdom found in the saying "do not put all your eggs in one basket" has great merit.

In fact, in its most simplistic form, our Nation's strategic deterrent has been based upon the principle that you always need a backup plan. Specifically, for over 45 years our Nation's ultimate security guarantee for ourselves and our allies has been our Nation's nuclear triad composed of intercontinental ballistic missiles, bombers and submarine-launched intercontinental ballistic missiles. The idea was simple: If one leg of our defense system was

knocked out or somehow rendered inoperable, the two other legs would maintain a more than credible deterrent.

Times have changed. But the continuing need for the triad was recently reaffirmed by Dr. James Schlesinger who was one of the principal members of the recently published final report of the Congressional Commission on the Strategic Posture of the United States.

However, the events of September 11 only underscored a new threat phenomena that is referred to in military circles as the asymmetric threat. Simply put, an asymmetric threat is the tactics which are used by our new adversaries, such as terrorists and rogue regimes, to counterbalance our Nation's traditional strengths in conventional warfare. The example which is seared in the mind of each American was the hijacking and crashing of civilian airliners on September 11.

Asymmetric threats are not just limited to terrorist activity and those nations which support it. It is also found in those nations which are developing ever more sophisticated ballistic missiles and even the ultimate weapon, the nuclear bomb.

But the asymmetric threat that I wish to discuss today is Iran's ballistic missile program. Though the President argues the Iranians are a decade away from deploying an intercontinental ballistic missile, this was not what our military experts were telling us just a few months ago. Specifically, the Air Force's National Air and Space Intelligence Center published an unclassified version of its Ballistic and Cruise Missile Threat report in April 2009--just 5 months ago--that "Iran has an ambitious ballistic missile and space launch development programs and, with sufficient foreign assistance, Iran could develop and test an Intercontinental Ballistic Missile capable of reaching the United States by 2015."

The report goes on to say "in late 2008 and early 2009 it launched the Safir, a multi-stage space launch vehicle, that can serve as a test bed for long-range ballistic missile technologies. The [Iranian] 2009 test successfully placed a satellite in orbit."

These conclusions are supported by the testimony of General Craddock, who while still Commander of U.S. European Command stated this March that "Iran already possesses ballistic missiles that can reach parts of Europe and is developing missiles that can reach most of Europe By 2015 Iran may also deploy an Intercontinental Ballistic Missile capable of reaching all of Europe and parts of the U.S."

These are serious assessments and no doubt the President has good reason to believe the threat has changed and therefore made the decision to drop plans to deploy our ground-based midcourse interceptor, called GBI, to Europe. However, I am also mindful of the point the distinguished Senator from Connecticut made when he introduced his amendment. He astutely reminded the Senate that in 1998 the North Koreans tested their long range Taepodong missile just 7 days after our intelligence community concluded that North Korea was 3 years away from having that capability.

Which brings us back to the question: should we have a plan B?

We did until 2 weeks ago.

That plan B was to deploy a European-based GBI system to intercept intercontinental ballistic missiles fired from the Middle East at the United States and our European allies. According to the Bush administration this system was scheduled to be completed by 2013--2 years before our intelligence estimates, until recently, believed Iran would have an intercontinental ballistic missile.

However, under the new strategy, which relies on the continued development of the SM-3 missile, we and our allies must wait until 2018 to have a similar capability as planned by the previous administration and offered by the GBI in 2013. We also must remember the 2018 SM-3 deployment date can only be reached if everything goes according to plan--an all too rare occurrence in modern weapons development.

Not much of a plan B when one remembers that Iran has received extensive outside assistance in developing their ballistic missiles. For example, the National Intelligence Center concluded the Iranian Shahab-3, which has a range of 1,200 miles is based on the North Korean No Dong missile. In addition, Anthony Cordesman and Martin Kleiber in their 2007 book titled "Iran's Military Forces and Warfighting Capabilities" wrote that as early as October 1997 "Russia began training Iranian engineers on missile production for the Shahab-3." The authors also pointed out that allegations have been made that various Chinese companies had assisted in Shahab-3s final development.

This, of course, begs the question what other outside assistance could the Iranians receive which could speed their development of an intercontinental ballistic missile?

That is why Senator *Lieberman* and Senator *Sessions*' amendment is so important. It provides us with a plan B. It continues the deployment of a two-stage GBI. This is not a pie-in-the-sky plan. Our Nation has already deployed a three-stage GBI in Alaska and California and until 10 months ago the Department of Defense believed the two-stage system could be deployed by 2013.

Therefore, I urge my colleagues to support the Lieberman-Sessions amendment to provide funding for a plan B which could provide us with capabilities to intercept Middle East ICBMs launched against our interests and allies years before the President's plan. (*Congressional Record*)

Rep. Jeb Hensarling (R-TX)

December 15, 2009

Given the state of Iran's nuclear ambitions and its poor record at transparency, it continues to be clear that the United States must lead the world in pressuring Iran to give up these ambitions. There is no option.

Iran's energy sector is the backbone of its economy and provides the majority of its government's revenue. Iran's energy infrastructure is deteriorating badly. It is in need of modernization. Without this modernization, its energy sector very well may deteriorate and, along with it, consequently, its economy and possibly even its regime.

The Iran Refined Petroleum Sanctions Act gives the President an important tool to help persuade the Iranian regime to peacefully give up its nuclear ambitions. A nuclear-armed Iran is unacceptable. It could provide rogue nations and terrorists with nuclear technology. It constitutes the looming threat to the national security of the United States.

Iran's behavior not only jeopardizes the stability of the region but threatens the very existence of many of our allies in the Mideast, particularly the state of Israel.

I enthusiastically encourage all of my colleagues to support the Iran Refined Petroleum Sanctions Act. (*Congressional Record*)

Rep. Wally Herger (R-CA)

May 7, 2009

Madam Speaker, as Congress commemorates the 61st anniversary of the independence of Israel, I rise to express my deep concern that the future of this nation is gravely threatened by Iran's pursuit of nuclear weapons.

Iran's radical regime only desires the demise of Israel and longs for regional dominance. It is now on the cusp of acquiring the weapons needed to potentially achieve both.

Nations that value liberty and peace must stand strongly against Iran's dangerous behavior. The United States must confront this looming crisis with resolve and strength.

I have cosponsored the Iran Sanctions Enabling Act, which would significantly undermine Iran's lucrative energy sector. Congress should pass this legislation and show our steadfast support for Israel. (*Congressional Record*)

Rep. Mazie Hirono (D-HI)

June 26, 2009

Madam Speaker, today I would like to recognize Neda Agha-Soltan, this brave young woman who was shot and killed while en route to join the thousands of Iranians in Tehran who were demonstrating against the Presidential election result.

Neda, whose name means "the voice" in Farsi, was but one of the many women in Iran demanding that their voices be heard and that their votes be counted and their human rights respected.

Like many other Americans and people from around the world, I have been deeply moved by the images of Iranian women who have had the courage to speak their minds in defiance of a regime that seeks to suppress them.

I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the memory of Neda and in supporting all of the courageous women in Iran who are raising their voices and fighting for the fundamental freedoms and human rights that we so often take for granted. (*Congressional Record*)

Rep. Rush Holt (D-NJ)

October 13, 2009

Mr. Speaker, I rise today as a cosponsor and supporter of H.R. 1327, the Iran Sanctions Enabling Act. The apparent pursuit of nuclear weapons capability by the Government of Iran cannot be met with silence. Iran's history of concealing its nuclear facilities and programs has rightfully alarmed the international community about Iranian Government's ambitions. The revelation last month of a previously undisclosed uranium enrichment facility under construction near Qom adds to a growing list of deeply troubling actions by the Iranian regime. President Obama stated clearly that this new facility does not appear to be configured for the production of fuel for nuclear power reactors. Iran has a responsibility to fully comply with the International Atomic Energy Agency inspections and to definitively clarify the status and nature of the Qom site.

Unfortunately, the mistrust and skepticism surrounding the Iranian nuclear issue are a result of more than Iran's covert efforts. The provocative and threatening rhetoric that we have come to expect from the President of Iran is cause for great concern both for our allies, such as Israel, and for our own interests in the region. In addition, we have witnessed the Iranian regime carry out brutal acts of violence against Iranian citizens as they gathered peacefully to express their political beliefs. The United States cannot ignore this violation of basic human rights, but neither can we ignore the stark reminder about the potential consequences of a nuclear weapon in the hands of a government that expresses such disregard for the lives and liberties of its own citizens.

Taken together, the Iranian Government's actions are inconsistent with those of a nation seeking peaceful nuclear energy technology. It is incumbent upon the Government of Iran to demonstrate unequivocally to the international community that it is not attempting to cultivate nuclear weapons.

Until the Iranian regime fulfills this responsibility, Iran will face the consequences of noncompliance with this internationally recognized obligation. The provisions of the Iran Sanctions Enabling Act should be part of those consequences. This bill would authorize state and local governments to divest their assets from, and prohibit investment in, any company that invests \$20 million or more in Iran's energy sector. It also protects from legal action any asset managers who choose to divest assets from, or avoid investing in, persons or companies with the same level of financial ties with Iran's energy sector. These are common sense

measures that enable state and local governments or individual U.S. citizens to choose not to allow their financial investments to support companies or persons that contribute to the prosperity and strength of the current Iranian government.

I firmly believe that the United States must do everything in its power to prevent Iran from further destabilizing the Middle East by obtaining a nuclear weapon, and I am encouraged by the Obama administration's vigorous diplomatic efforts to achieve that end. The Iranians should be given credit for their recent tentative agreements to meet international expectations, but these words must be matched with sincere and transparent actions that convince the international community of Iran's peaceful intentions. To that end, I note that the provisions of H.R. 1327 would terminate upon certification by the President that Iran is no longer designated a state sponsor of terrorism and has ceased the pursuit of nuclear, biological, and chemical weapons. It is my hope that this sunset clause serves as a potent reminder to the Iranian government that while all actions have consequences, the United States always stands ready to match positive actions with positive consequences. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation. (*Congressional Record*)

House Majority Leader Steny Hoyer (D-MD)

December 15, 2009

I thank the chairman for yielding. I want to thank the chairman, and I want to thank Congresswoman *Ros-Lehtinen* for her leadership as well.

Madam Speaker, every Member of this Chamber understands the deep danger inherent in a nuclear Iran. That danger includes a new nuclear arms race as Iran's regional rivals scramble to build competing arsenals, plunging the Middle East into an ever-greater instability and the world into a new era of proliferation.

The danger includes as well a "nuclear umbrella" for groups like Hamas and Hezbollah, terrorist organizations who may take any advantage of their state sponsor's protection to stage more brazen and deadly attacks on Israel, certainly, but on all the rest of us as well.

And the danger includes on a more basic level a new era of fear for all those in range of Iran's missiles, fear that could equal or surpass what we ourselves experienced during the worst days of the Cold War. And all of those consequences, Madam Speaker, will be felt even if Iran's missiles remain on the launch pad or if its nuclear weapons remain buried. Could we imagine those weapons being used? We would be foolish not to as long as those weapons are in the hands of a regime whose President denies the Holocaust, stokes hatred, and openly threatens its neighbors and the United States of America.

In the months since last summer's election, we have seen the character of the Iranian regime more clearly than ever. We have seen it in the dissent silenced, in opposition leaders threatened and jailed, in peaceful protesters beaten and shot for the crime of demanding that their votes be counted. We have seen a regime founded on violence and on violent disregard for the opinion of its people and the opinion of the world community.

Even so, our administration has, and I think correctly, in my view, pursued a policy of engagement with Tehran. That engagement reversed years of diplomatic silence that did little to slow Iran's growing nuclear program. It showed the world our patience and our commitment to addressing the common threat through diplomacy. And it gauged Tehran's honest willingness to resolve the crisis at the negotiating table. America's policy of engagement always came with a time limit, time for Tehran to negotiate in good faith or, as so many Members have said on this floor today, to show that it was only using talks as a cover for continuing enrichment of uranium.

Sadly, time is running short and there is still no diplomatic agreement. The enrichment continues and the threat grows. The past months have brought revelations of secret Iranian facilities, a lack of cooperation with the International Atomic Energy Agency, and a refusal to comply with Security Council demands to suspend enrichment.

Just today The Washington Post reported that "Iran has learned how to make virtually every bolt and switch in a nuclear weapon, according to assessments by U.N. nuclear officials, as well as Western and Middle Eastern intelligence analysts and weapons experts." That language is in the paper today. That is why this is the right time to bring strong economic pressure to bear on the Iranian regime.

None of us want military conflict. Economic sanctions are not as effective as we would like them to be. But we just recently heard from a leader, the Chancellor of Germany, that a nuclear armed Iran was unacceptable. Angela Merkel spoke from this rostrum. This is not only a perception of the United States; it's a perception also of those who live in Europe, even more proximate to the nuclear threat that would be caused by Iran armed with nuclear weapons.

The bill was designed by Chairman *Berman* and his committee to target Iran's economy at one of its weakest points by penalizing companies that help Iran import or produce refined petroleum products. Even though it is an oil producer, Iran imports a great deal of the refined petroleum that powers its economy.

So these sanctions that are proposed will increase the high cost of Iran's self-imposed isolation from the international community. They are also a proportional response because they're exclusively tied to Iran's nuclear program. We should never take sanctions like these lightly.

Even as we stand with the protesters facing down repression at the hands of their own government, we understand that these sanctions will affect the lives of many ordinary Iranians for the worse. But we know that economic pressure has worked before to alter the behavior of outlaw regimes, especially when such pressure is widely supported by the international community, as certainly we must hope these sanctions are. We know that these sanctions are our best tool against the nuclear proliferation that risks the security of millions in the Middle East. And let me say that we have 250,000 or more Americans within range of Iranian missiles.

We know that Tehran can choose at any point to negotiate in good faith, abandon its aggressive nuclear pursuit, and rejoin the community of nations. We shouldn't hope for a change of heart from that regime, but we can hope for a change of behavior: a cold understanding that as long as Iran builds the capacity to catastrophically attack its neighbors, its economy will suffer deeply. These sanctions have the power to force that choice.

I therefore urge my colleagues to adopt this resolution. It is time. It is time to do more than talk. We are willing to talk. We want to talk. But talk without action is not acceptable. Let us pass this resolution, support the administration in moving ahead with the international community on imposing sanctions that will make not only the Middle East but the international community safer.

I thank the gentleman for the time. (*Congressional Record*)

September 25, 2009

“I am highly disturbed by news of a new, previously undeclared uranium enrichment facility in Iran. The presence of this facility, which Iran has deceptively concealed from the international community, is clearly a violation of United Nations Security Council Resolutions. It also raises troubling implications about the nature of Iran's nuclear program; as President Obama said today, ‘the size and configuration of this facility is inconsistent with a peaceful program.’

“President Obama has pursued a policy of engagement with Iran, while making it clear that such an opportunity for engagement comes with a time limit. If Iran is truly interested in serious and meaningful dialogue with the United States, then all facts about its nuclear program must be on the table. Iran must allow the International Atomic Energy Agency full access to this and all other nuclear facilities.” (*Press Release*)

Rep. Bob Inglis (R-SC)

June 19, 2009

I thank the gentle lady and the gentleman for yielding that time, and I saw this morning that the Supreme Leader of Iran said that street challenge is not acceptable. This is challenging democracy after the elections.

Well, we beg to differ and the people of Iran are begging to differ. When you can count paper ballots, millions of them, within a couple of hours, something's funny. And when you declare the results of the election is fine but say there is going to be some investigation, what's the value of the investigation if you've already certified the election?

And so what we're begging to differ with the Supreme Leader of Iran is that it is not challenging democracy after elections. It's saying that the elections were rigged, and rigged elections don't produce outcomes that people can believe in.

Furthermore, what's happening here is we're seeing the real disastrous consequence of having a theocracy, where somebody at the top gets to say--I don't know where he derives his authority--but he gets to say what's what about elections.

We're very thankful, Madam Speaker, to live in a country where that's not the case, where we have elected officials who choose Supreme Court members, who are then confirmed by the Senate and who serve with good behavior. And that is a system that produces confidence among the people, and a free people get to govern themselves.

That's our hope, that's our aspiration for the Iranian people; and we, the people of the United States, should stand boldly with the people in Tehran and elsewhere in Iran who are saying we yearn to breathe free, we want to govern ourselves. This is their moment. We stand in support of them. (*Congressional Record*)

Rep. Darrel Issa (R-CA)

June 19, 2009

Mr. Speaker, it is clear today that some would have us be silent as to the aspiration of the people risking life and limb on the streets of Iran today. We cannot and should not be that way. Yes, it's an internal matter, but it's an internal matter in a country which has been ruled by theocrats for so very long who have denied real free elections, and even when the will of the people was obvious, in fact, want to overturn the will of the people for a President who could be a reformer and give opportunity, particularly to women in this country.

So I urge support for this resolution because it sends the message that we are, in fact, with the people who want freedom. (*Congressional Record*)

Rep. Jesse Jackson Jr. (D-IL)

June 19, 2009

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the nonviolent movement for social change in Iran. I have always maintained that the Middle East is in need of a nonviolent movement for social change, not only in Iran but also in the Gaza Strip, a nonviolent movement in Syria, a nonviolent movement for social change.

Martin Luther King, Jr. once said, "Nonviolence is the answer to the crucial political and moral questions of our time; the need for mankind to overcome oppression and violence without resorting to oppression and violence. Mankind must evolve for all human conflict a method which rejects revenge, aggression, and retaliation."

Today we are not only supporting democracy in Iran, we are also supporting the nonviolent thrust for democracy in Iran, so the conflicts may be settled, Mr. Speaker, without resulting to weapons, to violence and conflict, not only within that country, but among nations.

So, today, Mr. Speaker, we rise today to support the proponents of the nonviolent movement.
(Congressional Record)

Rep. Sheila Jackson Lee (D-TX)

December 15, 2009

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2194, the Iran Refined Petroleum Sanctions Act of 2009. This legislation provides another tool for the President to prevent Iran from developing nuclear weapons by allowing the administration to sanction foreign firms who attempt to supply refined gasoline to Iran or provide them with the materials to enhance their oil refineries. These sanctions would further restrict the government of Iran's ability to procure refined petroleum. Currently, the availability of petroleum products is stagnant in Iran. Private firms have decided that the government of Iran's refusal to cooperate with the multilateral community on nuclear proliferation generates a significant risk to doing business with Iran.

I would like to thank Chairman BERMAN, for incorporating my concerns about the human rights situation in Iran into the findings of this legislation. It is important that we acknowledge that, throughout 2009, the government of Iran has persistently violated the rights of its citizens. The government of Iran's most overt display of disregard for human rights happened in the Presidential elections on June 12, 2009. As I said on June 19, 2009, "we must condemn Iran for the absence of fair and free Presidential elections and urge Iran to provide its people with the opportunity to engage in a Democratic election process." The repression and murder, arbitrary arrests, and show trials of peaceful dissidents in the wake of the elections were a sad reminder of the government of Iran's long history of human rights violations. The latest violations were the most recent iteration of the government of Iran's wanton suppression of the freedom of expression.

It is important that we are clear that our concerns are with the government of Iran and not its people. The State Department's Human Rights Report on Iran provides a bleak picture of life in Iran. The government of Iran, through its denial of the democratic process and repression of dissent has prevented the people from determining their own future. Moreover, it is the government of Iran that persecutes its ethnic minorities and denies the free expression of religion. As we proceed with consideration of this legislation, we should all remember that the sole target of these sanctions is the Iranian government.

Madam Speaker, the government of Iran has repeatedly shown its disdain for the international community by disregarding international nonproliferation agreements. Iran's flagrant violation of nonproliferation agreements was evidenced most recently in the discovery of the secret enrichment facility at Qom. The government of Iran's continued threats against Israel,

opposition to the Middle East peace process, and support of international terrorist organizations further demonstrate the necessity for action.

Iran's recent actions towards the international community reflect a very small measure of progress. Iran's decision to allow International Atomic Energy Agency, IAEA, inspectors to visit this facility was a positive sign, but not a sufficient indication of their willingness to comply with international agreements. The recent announcement that Iran will accept a nuclear fuel deal is also indicative of their willingness to engage in dialogue, though it remains to be seen what amendments that they will seek to the deal. While these actions indicate a small degree of improvement in Iran's position, the legislation before us today demonstrates that only continued dialogue and positive actions will soften the international community's stance towards Iran.

I would also like to emphasize that the legislation before us provides only one tool for achieving Iran's compliance with international nonproliferation agreements. I continue to support the Administration's policy of engagement with Iran and use of diplomatic talks. I believe that diplomacy and multilateralism are the most valuable tools we have to create change in Iran. After those tools fail, I believe that the sanctions are an appropriate recourse. (*Congressional Record*)

December 15, 2009

Madam Speaker, I join my colleagues as a member of the Subcommittee on the Mideast and South Asia on the House Foreign Affairs Committee. Today our committee debated a very important initiative dealing with Iran sanctions. But it is interesting that we find ourselves in one domino effect after another: Iran, Iraq, and then, by extension, Afghanistan and Pakistan.

Today I rise with a plea to this government and to the State Department to save those who are now huddled at Camp Ashraf in Iraq; this government that we have propped up, that we have seen thousands of our treasure lost in Iraq so that we could have a democratic government, so that it would have its own boundaries and its own sovereignty, so it would not be governed and be a puppet of some other country. But yet Iranian dissidents are now huddled, fearful for their lives. In fact, Assistant Secretary of State Jeffrey Feldman said, We're actually more concerned about an Iraqi desire to move Camp Ashraf to someplace else inside Iraq. The expectation is that they would try to forcibly move them to a different location in Iraq and that, too, would lead to bloodshed.

Iraqi authorities under Amnesty International says it must not forcibly relocate 3,400 Iranian opponents and that forced removals of the residents of Camp Ashraf would put them at risk of arbitrary arrest, torture or other forms of ill treatment and unlawful killing.

I've met with Iranians, their families, many of whom are in this camp, a niece, a mother, a brother, and they have no relief. They have no refuge but us. And so it is crucial that we intervene with the present Iraqi Government, seemingly sometimes a puppet of Iran, to not in any way cause the bloodshed and the loss of these dear souls.

All they wanted to do is to be in freedom. Yes, they have disagreement with the present government, but they are refugees in the world order; in the world sense they are refugees, fleeing oppression. And let me tell you where Iraq wants to send these huddled few thousand who simply want to be left alone, who have already been under the eye of the storm, who have seen loved ones lost, bloodshed inside the camp.

And where do they want to send them? To the east of this area is Al Busayyah and to the west is Al Shabaka, the resting place for tribes and migrants who live in the Iraqi desert. Moving sand hills, which in the summer reach temperatures of 158 Fahrenheit under the heat of the sun, prevent growth of plants and creation of waterways and toilets for the migrant tribes. Some of the small and large wild trees which cover a small part of the area are desperate to survive during sandstorms and the relocation of moving sand hills. Many of them have been trapped under the moving sand hills while many others, despite having deep roots, are taken in the sandstorm to locations dozens of kilometers away. This is where the members of Camp Ashraf will be sent--a vast desert of death.

And so it is imperative that this government that we have propped up, that we have sent our soldiers to die for, don't have the authority to kill 4,000 Iranian dissidents who simply want to live in peace and alone. I hope that we can reach our government to provide safe solace for them, which is one of the reasons that I supported H.R. 2194, the Iran Refined Petroleum Sanctions, which deals with the question of who might attempt to supply refined gasoline to Iran or prevent them with the materials to enhance their oil refineries. This is to make a firm stance against Iran's nuclear proliferation, but it is also a stance against its human rights abuses and its penetration in countries around its area, including Iraq, where they cannot seem to be independent enough, that is, the Iraqi Government, that they would do the bidding of the Iranian despotic government and try to move these innocent persons--women, men and children--to a place where they will surely die.

I am grateful in the language that was submitted in this bill, H.R. 2194, that my language was kept that had to do with concerns of human rights in Iran and that this was put in the findings. It is important that we acknowledge that throughout 2009, the Government of Iran has persistently violated the rights of its citizens. Again I believe it is important for the United States to support the dissidents inside Iran who continuously charge the government with an irregular and illegal election. I hope that we can move forward in saving these lives.

Madam Speaker, as I close on Pakistan and Afghanistan, Pakistan is an ally to the United States in trying to bring peace to Afghanistan. (*Congressional Record*)

November 6, 2009

I thank the manager of this legislation, my dear friend from the Foreign Affairs Committee, for yielding.

It is interesting to have this day to commemorate the sacrifice of Americans some 30 years ago who were held as hostages. A few minutes ago I tried to depict and have people be reminded of the tragedy of lost children during the earthquake in China, just visually picture what happened to those children.

It is important as well to revisit visually what Americans had to go through who were held hostage in Iran for more than a year. I saw some old video where I saw soldiers doing pushups and trying to keep themselves busy, Foreign Service personnel and others who were in that embassy that fateful day.

This is an important acknowledgment of a transition that has frozen time for the Iranian people, frozen their rights, their opportunity for freedom and freedom of speech, the understanding of the concept of democracy. As we commemorate, not celebrate, those 30 years, we thank those Americans, those brave Americans who withstood all of that pain of being a hostage, being away from their family members when at the same time we owe them a debt, more than a debt of gratitude.

We owe them the recognition that there are dissidents, Iranians, who are now on the ground fighting against, I believe, an illegally situated government that cannot document that that was a fair process and the brutality that occurred after that election when the Iranians stood up to be able to demand justice and a fair election.

We must push for human rights in Iran. We must push for nonproliferation. We must demand transparency. Of course, their chief executive will suggest that we are demons, that we have no right to interfere into their business.

Well, I would say the name of those brave Americans that lost a lot of their life for a period of time in our history, we owe them our persistence in ensuring that there is an opportunity for freedom and democracy in Iran.

There were those, of course, who lost their lives in the attempt to rescue those individuals. I pay honor and tribute to them. In their name as well we must continue to fight for freedom.

An enormous tragedy occurred yesterday in Texas at Fort Hood, and we respect and acknowledge the loss of those brave men and women. We also say that freedom demands our attention, both in terms of national security but as well for those who sacrifice for us every day.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the 30th anniversary and thank the author of this legislation, of the Iranian hostage crisis, during which 52 United States citizens were held hostage for 444 days. I acknowledge their sacrifice, the days they stayed away from their family and, as well, the sacrifice of those who attempted to save their lives.

I express support for all of those Iranian citizens who now stand in the battle in the fight for human rights. I would argue that this legislation must be shown in action, and I ask my colleagues to support this initiative. (*Congressional Record*)

October 13, 2009

Mr. Speaker, today, I rise in support of H.R. 1327, the “Iran Sanctions Enabling Act of 2009.” This legislation, if enacted, will enhance U.S. capacity to further isolate Iran and pressure the government to abandon its military nuclear program.

The recent discovery of a secret enrichment facility at Qom serves as a clear reminder that Iran continues to flagrantly disregard international non-proliferation agreements, and poses a direct and dangerous threat to the peace and security not only in the Middle East, but also around the world.

Unfortunately, the concealment of the facility at Qom is only the most recent in a long line of deplorable and illegal behavior by the Iranian government. From seeking to acquire nuclear weapons and evade IAEA inspectors, to continuing to threaten Israel and opposing the Middle East peace process, to supporting international terrorism, to its deplorable human rights record--specifically surrounding the recent elections--the government of Iran has consistently acted in a reprehensible and dangerous manner.

The only effective way to achieve lasting peace and prosperity in the region, along with bringing about reforms in Iran’s polity, is to assist the Iranian people in their quest to achieve political, social, and religious liberty. Every government can be judged with the way in which it treats its ethnic and religious minorities, and the current Iranian government gets a failing grade for its treatment of its many and diverse minorities

While the government’s actions in the international community deserve our condemnation, we must distinguish between Iranian people and their government. This fall, I was optimistic that the elections in Iran would serve as a catalyst for change, but given the absence of fair and free elections, coupled with the government’s poor record for transparency and accountability, I believe that the democratic voices in Iran need our help to achieve change.

The results of the recent election clearly showed that there was no chance for Iranian citizens to participate in Democracy. On June 12, 2009, Mahmoud Ahmadinejad was ostensibly re-elected to his second term as President, as a result of the tenth Presidential elections in Iran, held and calculated on June 13, 2009. Subject to official results released by Iran’s election headquarters, out of a total of 39,165,191 ballots cast in the Presidential election, Ahmadinejad allegedly won 24,527,516 votes, which accounts for approximately 62.6 percent of the votes, while his opponent and former Prime Minister of Iran Mir-Hossein Mousavi purportedly secured only 13,216,411 (37.4%) of the votes. Supreme Leader Ali Khamenei announced that he envisions Ahmadinejad as president in the next five years, a comment interpreted as indicating support for Ahmadinejad’s reelection, and so it happened exactly that way.

In the aftermath of an election crisis we must not forget that Iran is marching ever closer to the development of a nuclear weapon, as they continue the pursuit of enriching uranium. Iran’s nuclear program, coupled with its continued military assistance to armed groups in Iraq,

Afghanistan, the Palestinian group Hamas, and to the Lebanese Hezbollah has been the basis for President Obama's characterization of Iran as a "profound threat to U.S. national security interests."

Yet the last Administration's approach of isolationism failed to stop or even slow the escalation of Iran's nuclear development. The recent discovery of a secret enrichment facility at Qom serves as a clear reminder that Iran continues to flagrantly disregard international non-proliferation agreements, and poses a direct and dangerous threat to the peace and security in the Middle East, and around the world.

In that vein we do not want to ostracize Iran, as has been done in the past. This Administration indicated that if Iran refuses to come to the "nuclear bargaining table" by late September 2009, sanctions will resume. This deadline passed, and Iran has not changed. Consequently, it is time that we move to enable effective sanctions to remind Iran that we remain serious in our demands. This bill does not move the U.S. past the point of no return in regards to sanctions, but, it sends a clear message to Iran while enabling more effective sanctions in the future.

Mr. Speaker, although Iran has committed heinous human rights violations, and continues to threaten its neighbors, I do not believe that it is productive to punish Iran for their past delinquencies. Instead, we should use our threats and sanctions to persuade the government of Iran to change its behavior by holding free and fair elections, allowing dissent, and finally ending its military nuclear program. I hope that, one day in the near future, we will lift these sanctions; but, until reforms are implemented, we must remain vigilant in pressuring Iran.

Last year, this body passed H.R. 7112--The Comprehensive Iran Sanction Act, but the Senate failed to follow suit. It is my hope that, this time, our colleagues in the Senate realize how much is at stake and act quickly to pass this legislation.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I urge the passage of this legislation. (*Congressional Record*)

June 23, 2009

Madam Speaker, it is evident by my colleague's remarks that Iran and the dilemma and complexity of its situation has grabbed hold of the hearts and minds of Americans and freedom-loving people around the world.

What struck me was the expression and the tragic incident that caused Neda, who is now known around the world as a symbol of the Iranian movement, to claim democracy in a free election. A 16-year-old who was shot through the heart, who lay bleeding in the street as her father feverishly tried to save her life.

No, Americans are not trying to tell the Iranian people whom they should vote for or whether the election was, in fact, a true election, a fair election. But we as freedom-loving people, who love democracy, who believe in our own country that we should have fair elections, we are

standing with them as they petition their government to stand for the right side of the issue, which is to ask for a new election or a recount.

We also ask that lives are preserved and violence ends. We ask that the opposition be allowed to be heard. And we certainly ask for the ending of the interception of cell phones and the Internet where freedom-loving people would like to be able to speak to each other.

No, we are not advocating violence. We're not advocating intrusion. We are only advocating freedom for Iran. (*Congressional Record*)

June 15, 2009

Madam Speaker, what did happen in Iran just a few days ago? I think this picture evidences that there were voters who felt that what happened did not capture the essence of those who sacrificed and went to vote. Young people, women and urbanites went in massive numbers to vote. In fact, this article suggests that there were polling places even in the United States where Iranian Americans went to vote to, in essence, declare they wanted freedom. They wanted to be able to have the opportunity to live in a democracy, to build their economy.

I would ask the so-called "elected person" to do the right thing or there is shame on this process. I ask for the NGOs of the world and the NDI to stand up and question the irregularities of this election. Stand for people who want peace and a democratic election. Let us raise our voices. The United Nations should raise its voice. No, we're not trying to select the next President of Iran. We're only asking for the people to elect the next President of Iran. Shame on Iran's election process. (*Congressional Record*)

Rep. Hank Johnson (D-GA)

December 15, 2009

Madam Speaker, nuclear weapons are a plague.

If we are to control their spread, international law must mean something. Words must be supported by action.

In recent months, the United States and our allies have engaged in vigorous multilateral diplomacy in an attempt to break through an impasse with Iran over its nuclear program.

Rather than engaging in good-faith diplomacy, Iran has stalled and played games.

So today we must authorize President Obama to impose sanctions on Iran's petroleum sector. Iran's leaders must understand that life will become more difficult every day they defy the

lawful will of the international community. I urge the President to use this authority carefully, patiently, and effectively.

I commend Chairman BERMAN for his diligence and determination in bringing this legislation through Committee and to the floor. I am also proud to have a small claim of co-authorship. I contributed language that highlights Iran's construction of a secret uranium enrichment facility at Qom and demands that Iran disclose any additional covert enrichment facilities.

Iran's acquisition of nuclear weapons will beget similar programs by Iran's neighbors. A nuclearized Middle East is bad for international security, bad for the global economy, bad for the United States and bad for our allies.

Nuclear weapons are a plague. Here we must draw a red line and stop their spread.
(*Congressional Record*)

September 30, 2009

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.Resolution 782. This is a resolution that I have introduced and which demands that Iran fully disclose its nuclear facilities, its nuclear development facilities, and also allow unfettered international inspection of its nuclear program.

The elimination of nuclear weapons is an issue that is certainly very close to my heart, and I would like to see that nuclear weapons actually are removed from the face of the planet. So it certainly goes in the wrong direction were we as a Nation to tolerate another nation, especially Iran, acquiring the technology to develop nuclear weapons.

What's troubling is last week the whole world learned that Iran has concealed construction of an enrichment facility near the city of Qom. And they did that without knowing that our intelligence community already knew that the facility was over there. It just had not been publicly disclosed, as it was last week. I guess one of the motivations for not disclosing it prior to last week was to just see how deep in the bad faith bucket would Iran pull its water from. They had no intention of revealing it. It was secret. They exercised deception to conceal it. So our country's announcement last week I'm sure was not a happy time for the Iranian leadership.

Having set the model for how they will deal with the international community insofar as nuclear enrichment and from that acquiring or building a nuclear weapon, we have to make sure that we reverse that bad faith into good faith if at all possible. One of the ways of doing that is through continued tightening of sanctions and to isolate the country of Iran for continuing to be deceptive about its nuclear intentions and its nuclear program.

So while my resolution, H. Res. 782, does not impose sanctions, it just merely puts the House of Representatives on record, as we approach the Geneva talks coming up on Thursday, that

we want to have disclosure immediately, immediate international inspections, and immediate access by inspectors to its nuclear facilities. That's what this resolution does.

My friend Chairman *Howard Berman* of the Foreign Affairs Committee has a number of options that he is considering with respect to sanctions. So in no way would I want this bill to interfere with other measures that will be coming forward out of his committee. But this is necessitated by haste because of the approaching deadline for the Geneva talks to begin.

We have got wide bipartisan support, and I hope my colleagues will join the 39 Members from both sides of the aisle who have already cosponsored it. (*Congressional Record*)

Sen. Ted Kaufman (D-DE)

July 24, 2009

Mr. President, today, I wish to speak on the Victims of Iranian Censorship, or VOICE, Act which passed last night as an amendment to the Defense authorization bill.

I was pleased to introduce this bill with Senators McCain, Lieberman, Casey, and Graham, and I thank the cosponsors for their shared commitment to this issue. I also thank Chairman Levin and Ranking Member McCain for helping to secure its passage.

The VOICE Act supports freedom of the press, freedom of speech, and freedom of expression in Iran, and authorizes funding for the Broadcasting Board of Governors to expand transmission capability and programming on Radio Farda and the Persian News Network.

It supports the development of technology to counter ongoing Internet censorship, and promotes online U.S.-Iranian educational and cultural exchanges.

Passage of the VOICE Act is especially timely given the suppression of free flowing information in and out of Iran since the June 12 presidential election.

While the people of Iran enthusiastically participated in these elections, it is painfully clear that the long road to democracy does not end there. A true democracy values fundamental freedoms, such as freedom of expression, which is protected under the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

In fact, in 1976, Iran was one of the first countries to ratify--and it is still a party to--this U.N. treaty, which also protects the right to hold opinions without interference, and affirms the right to receive and impart information in writing, print, or through any other media.

Unfortunately, these international obligations have not been upheld in Iran, where the Internet and text-messaging services are monitored and blocked, and U.S.-funded television and radio broadcasting is increasingly jammed. News reporting has been censored, access for journalists has been restricted, and specific media outlets have been targeted and shutdown. Foreign journalists have had their press credentials cancelled and equipment confiscated.

They have been confined to their hotels and told their visas would not be renewed. Foreign press bureaus in Tehran have been closed, and others have been instructed to suspend all their Farsi-language news.

For Iranian journalists, the stakes have been even higher. Numerous Iranian journalists have been detained, imprisoned, assaulted, and intimidated since the elections. And journalists have been instructed to file stories solely from their offices, which has limited their ability to provide timely and accurate news.

Regarding interference of international broadcasting, shortwave and medium wave transmissions of the Farsi-language Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty's Radio Farda have been partially blocked. And satellite broadcasts, including those of the Voice of America's Persian News Network and the British Broadcasting Corporation, have been intermittently jammed.

These are popular services in Iran, which serve as a vital source of news and entertainment for the Iranian people, especially for those seeking access to credible information and news.

Since the election, efforts to suppress the free flow of information have not focused on the media alone. Blogs and social networking sites have been targeted as well, including popular websites such Facebook and Twitter. Short message service in Iran has been blocked--preventing text messaging and jamming internet sites that utilize such services--and cell phone service has been partially shut-down. These restrictions have prevented the free flow of information, and precluded Iranian citizens from accessing unimpeded means of communication.

Iran did not develop this sophisticated Internet-censorship technology on its own. In fact, reports indicate that numerous companies including some with U.S. subsidiaries--have provided Iran with the software and technological expertise to block the Internet, and monitor online use to gather information about individuals.

Unfortunately, little is known about the specifics surrounding these sales, which likely including "deep packet inspection" technology, which, among other things, allows the government to read, block, and censor the Internet. In addition to giving it the capability to spread disinformation by modifying, tampering with, and diverting emails.

This behavior is unconscionable, and unfortunately not enough is known about the sale of Internet-restricting technology to countries including, but not limited to, Iran. That is why the VOICE Act requires a report to Congress examining the sale of technology that has furthered Iran's ability to filter and monitor the Internet, as well as disrupt cell phone and Internet use.

Our bill supports the Iranian people as they take steps to peacefully express their opinions and aspirations, and seek access to means of communication and news. It expresses respect for the sovereignty, proud history, and rich culture of the Iranian people, and recognizes the universal values of freedom of speech and freedom of the press.

Most importantly, it supports the Iranian people as they seek access to unimpeded Internet access, cellular phone communications, and credible news.

I am pleased the Senate has adopted a bipartisan bill that supports the Iranian people as they seek unfettered access to news and other information.

It is critical that we continue to support for free speech, free press, and free expression in Iran and in every country throughout the world. (*Congressional Record*)

June 18, 2009

Mr. President, Senator *Kyl* and I will join in introducing a resolution concerning freedom of the press, freedom of speech, and freedom of expression in Iran.

In the past week, the flow of information in and out of Iran has been suppressed. Voices in Iran have been silenced, and the international right to freedom of expression has been restricted, especially in the press.

I support Iran's sovereignty and deeply respect the will of the Iranian people. While Iran has enthusiastically embraced elections, the long road to democracy does not end there. It also includes fundamental freedoms, such as freedom of expression, which is protected under the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

In 1976, Iran was one of the first countries to ratify this U.N. treaty which also protects the right to hold opinions without interference and the right to receive and impart information in writing, print, or through any other media.

Our resolution supports the Iranian people as they take steps to peacefully express their opinions and aspirations and seek access to means of communication and the news. It expresses respect for the sovereignty, proud history, and rich culture of the Iranian people, and recognizes the universal values of freedom of speech and freedom of the press.

As President Obama said earlier this week:

The democratic process--free speech [and] the ability of people to peacefully dissent.....are universal values and need to be respected.

This is the case not just in Iran but anywhere in the world.

Since the Iranian presidential election on June 12, there have been increased restrictions on freedom of the press in Iran and limitations on the free flow of information. Newspapers and news services have been censored, access for journalists has been restricted, and specific media outlets have been blocked. Foreign journalists have had their press credentials canceled and videos confiscated. They have been confined to their hotels and told their visas would not

be renewed. Bureaus of foreign press agencies in Tehran have been closed, and others have been instructed to suspend all their Farsi-language news.

For Iranian journalists, the stakes have been even higher. Numerous Iranian journalists have been detained, imprisoned, assaulted, and intimidated since the elections on June 12. Journalists have been instructed to file stories solely from their offices, which has limited their ability to provide timely and accurate news. There has also been interference with international broadcasting in Iran, whether through the jamming of radio transmissions or blockage of satellite signals.

Shortwave and medium-wave transmissions from the Farsi-language Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty's Radio Farda have been partially jammed, and satellite broadcasts, including those of the Voice of America's Persian News Network and the British Broadcasting Corporation, have also been intermittently blocked as well. These services are widely popular in Iran, serving as a vital source of communication and entertainment, and attempts to thwart such broadcasts are shameful.

Efforts to suppress the free flow of information have not focused on the media alone. Blogs and social networking sites have been targeted as well, including popular Web sites such as Facebook and Twitter. Short message service in Iran has been blocked--preventing text message communications and jamming Internet sites that utilize such services--and cell phone service has been partially shut down.

These restrictions have prevented the free flow of information and precluded Iranian citizens from communicating with each other. Some Iranians have circumvented these restrictions through proxy Web sites and third-party carriers, and the Internet has served, at times, as the only outlet for communication within Iran and with the rest of the world.

This resolution reinforces the universal values of freedom of speech and freedom of the press. It supports the Iranian people as they take steps to peacefully express their voices, opinions, and aspirations. It condemns the detainment, the imprisonment, and the intimidation of all journalists in Iran and throughout the world.

As President Obama said Tuesday:

To those people who put so much hope and energy and optimism into the political process, I would say to them that the world is watching and inspired by their participation, regardless of what the ultimate outcome of the election was.

This resolution is not about the election in Iran. Rather, it is about the fundamental right to free speech, free press, and free expression of the Iranian people.

Mr. President, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum. (*Congressional Record*)

Sen. John Kerry (D-MA)

December 24, 2009

I appreciate Senator Reid's commitment to move forward with this legislation and his support of the progress we are making towards a UC agreement. We all share the goal of creating maximum leverage in our efforts to prevent Iran from developing a nuclear weapon – this is a vital national security goal of the United States, and obviously of critical importance to our allies in Israel and around the world.

I believe that this legislation has the potential to make an important contribution to that effort. Having the Senate stand united with the Administration behind this legislation would send a very strong and positive signal. That's why many of us are committed to working with the administration and the bill's sponsors to craft an amendment that all can agree on. I know these discussions will be continuing during recess with the intention of reaching a mutually agreeable resolution so that this legislation can be considered as soon as possible when we get back.

Thank you. (*Colloquy on Senate Floor*)

October 1, 2009

Today the Obama administration begins the most important American diplomatic engagement with Iran since the 1979 Islamic Revolution. The public revelation of the Qom enrichment facility and Iran's provocative ballistic missile test on Monday demonstrate what is at stake. Iran has increased its low-enriched uranium 20-fold since 2007, enough to produce, eventually, at least one nuclear weapon after further enrichment.

These are ominous developments. But after years of policy drift and transatlantic disagreement, the US and its allies will enter the talks in a position of relative strength and unity.

Consider the view from Tehran. It is on the defensive – caught red-handed in another nuclear deception. In contrast to the rancorous run-up to the war in Iraq, America and Europe are increasingly reading from the same script and Russia is signaling an openness to further sanctions.

The walkout of dozens of delegates during Mahmoud Ahmadinejad's anti-Semitic speech at the UN last week highlights Iran's diplomatic isolation. Deciding the reputational and political risks are too great, many international banks and oil-trading companies have withdrawn voluntarily from Iran, which must import a third of its refined petroleum.

Domestically, Iran's economy has been devastated by mismanagement, corruption, lower oil prices and fallout from the world financial crisis. Banks and foreign currency reserves are in rapid decline. Iran's oil trust fund, which should hold tens of billions of dollars, has run dry.

The bloody repression in Iran's streets since June has compounded the damage. Iran's ruling elite is divided, and the regime's legitimacy is openly challenged – internally – as never before.

For years, the regime counted on bombastic language from Washington to distract its public from problems at home. No longer. Today there is no obscuring the fact that Iran is choosing repression over democracy.

For our diplomacy to have any success, two things are vital.

First, if Iran is not willing to negotiate in good faith, it must understand the consequences. Pressure is not an alternative to engagement; the two strategies complement each other.

UN Security Council sanctions are the most potent pressure, but there are also other levers. Insurance companies could be prohibited from insuring the Iranian tanker fleet. Export credit guarantees for Iran could be ended. Travel bans on human rights abusers could be enacted, Iranian assets seized, arms sales curtailed and investment bans enacted. Neighbours could cancel plans for natural gas pipelines linking Iran to the region's energy distribution architecture. Some have proposed unilateral sanctions against foreign companies. While the prospect of such sanctions may goad other countries to action, we need to ensure unilateral efforts do not undermine the prospects of tougher international action.

Second, we must be willing to take yes for an answer. An important lesson of Iraq is that intrusive inspections can work. Our ability to detect and monitor the Qom enrichment facility for years before publicly revealing it is encouraging. One objective should be a more expansive inspections and monitoring regime to prevent Iran from diverting nuclear material to a "break-out" military programme.

While diplomacy with Iran was never going to be easy, the summer's unrest has only increased the difficulty. In agreeing to talks, Iran has expressed an unexpected interest in discussing democracy and human rights. This is a conversation America should welcome, and an opportunity to demonstrate to the Iranian people that progress on the nuclear issue will not come at their expense.

Engagement may well fail. Ayatollah Ali Khamenei's deep distrust of the US is no secret. The abuses of this summer may be the regime's curt answer to US president Barack Obama's outstretched hand. Given the turmoil, Iran may not even be capable of undertaking a sustained, strategic dialogue with the outside world.

And yet, it remains vital to seek a diplomatic solution to the stand-off. The international community is finally in a position to force Iran to choose either pariah status or a more constructive relationship with America and the world. Certainly the real possibility of either military conflict or a nuclear-armed Iran compels us to give diplomacy a chance. (*Financial Times*)

September 25, 2009

“In light of Iran’s continuing deception, the international community must step up its demands that Iran halt its enrichment and reprocessing work, answer the International Atomic Energy Agency’s questions, and provide IAEA inspectors with the full complement of access and transparency they require.

“President Obama has offered Iran every opportunity to open a constructive diplomatic dialogue on its nuclear program. To this point, there is no evidence that Iran intends to reciprocate. I continue to support engagement with Iran, but now is the time to supplement engagement with more robust international sanctions. That’s the only way to dramatically increase the economic and diplomatic pressure on Iran from the outside and help leverage pressure on the regime from its own population which wants a different relationship with the world. Tehran must make a fundamental decision on whether it wants to continue its pariah status or enter a more constructive relationship with the world.” (*Press Release*)

Rep. Carolyn Kilpatrick (D-MI)

December 15, 2009

Madam Speaker, yesterday, the U.S. House of Representatives voted and passed H.R. 2491, the Iran Refined Petroleum Sanctions Act. While Iran has been noncompliant with both United States and United Nations demands that it stop nuclear enrichment efforts, I could not, in good faith, support this initiative. My vote of “present” on this measure should not be interpreted nor misunderstood about a lack of concern regarding the prospect of a nuclear armed Iran. It does not.

Like many of my colleagues, I have significant reservations regarding Iran's violations of its obligations under the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty. The recent rejection by Iran of international organizations to inspect their nuclear capabilities and the threat of expanded nuclear enrichment programs continuing unchecked practically mandate that Congress and President Obama continue to work together. This combined effort must be toward increasing pressure on Iran if multilateral diplomacy reaches no reward. Congress must support President Obama's diplomatic efforts to help curb Iran's activities relating to their nuclear program. Congress must also support this administration's efforts to guarantee human rights and democracy for all people, especially women, in Iran. Congress must continue to forge with the President an all-out effort for diplomacy that is often difficult, but necessary.

H.R. 2491, as enacted, could very well threaten the diplomacy sought by the President. If enacted, the bill could punish the people of Iran who are suffering from its denial of democracy. Over the past few months, we have seen firsthand the discontent amongst Iranians with their government. As a nation, we have a responsibility to ensure that our policy decisions, particularly sanctions, are implemented in a manner which does not detrimentally impact those not at fault. Broad, wide-reaching sanctions on gasoline will not only hit the people of Iran the hardest, but are unlikely to directly impact the government at all. I am not against sanctions. In fact, I think sanctions in light of Iran's dissonance are not only

appropriate but needed. However, targeted sanctions that impact those with whom we are at odds versus those that target an entire country are the best way to approach such an important decision.

While it is essential to curtail nuclear threats world-wide, sanctions must be seen as an option only after diplomacy has failed. In his letter to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee last week, Deputy Secretary of State James Steinberg stated that the Obama Administration was "entering a critical period of intense diplomacy to impose significant international pressure on Iran," and that sanctions, "might weaken rather than strengthen international unity and support for our efforts." As we proceed in these important times, we must do so carefully, and in a manner that achieves the desired short-termed effect while remaining in accord with our long-term goals.

The decision whether to levy sanctions, particularly in the face of potential threat to peace, is of the utmost importance. Today, H.R. 2194 was brought to the floor under expedited procedures that limit debate and bar amendments reserved for non-controversial legislation. While the bill received overwhelming support, it does not make the subject matter any less controversial.

Iran has had decades of unilateral measures with practically no effect. In order for any sanctions to fully take effect, it must be multilateral. The unilateral approach of this legislation, combined with the potential unintended consequence it may have for the people, and the legislation's curtailing the waiver authority of President Obama so as to undermine the President's flexibility and pursuit of a dual track of diplomacy and unified multilateral pressure, are my reasons for my vote of present on this measure.

I look forward to working with my colleagues to improve this legislation. My goal is to ensure that any sanction bill, signed into law, protects the interests of the United States, ensures that the President can negotiate from a position of strength along our international partners, ensures that human rights and democracy grow for the people of Iran, and prevents another nation from being armed with nuclear weapons. (*Congressional Record*)

Rep. Mark Kirk (R-IL)

December 15, 2009

Mr. Speaker, Congressman *Andrews* and I are the two grandfathers of this bill and its policy. After 4 1/2 years of working on this legislation, I strongly support this bill, especially its underlying policy, which is the last best hope for diplomatically ending Iran's nuclear weapons program.

In January of 2005, I wrote to the Secretary of Defense with a comprehensive analysis of Iran's economy, discovering a critical weakness. Despite its status as a leading oil exporter, Iran has so mishandled her domestic energy supply that the regime relies on foreign sources of gasoline for 40 percent of its needs.

In 2005 and again in 2006, Congressman *Andrews* and I introduced the congressional resolutions calling for a multilateral restriction of gasoline deliveries to Iran as the most

effective sanction to bring their leaders into compliance with their commitments under the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty.

In 2007, we introduced the Iran Sanctions Enhancement Act to extend current sanctions to the provision of gasoline to Iran. This year, Congressman *Brad Sherman* and I re-introduced the Iran Diplomatic Enhancement Act. This bill today is modeled after our bipartisan legislation.

A restriction of gasoline deliveries to Iran administered through multilateral sanctions and enforced by the world's most powerful navies will pit our greatest strength against Iran's greatest weakness, all without a shot being fired. For the bill to succeed, the Iranians must believe also that it will be enforced, otherwise we will go down a failed policy of diplomacy in the absence of effective sanctions. My hope is that the Senate quickly takes up action on this bill, and then the administration provides needed enforcement.

I want to truly thank the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, Chairman *Berman*; our ranking member, *Ileana Ros-Lehtinen*; Congressman *Andrews* and Congressman *Brad Sherman* for all working with me. This has been 5 years of my life working on this legislation. This is bipartisan legislation which offers the last best diplomatic hope to resolve this problem. (*Congressional Record*)

October 21, 2009

Mr. Speaker, as the author of this important resolution, I rise in strong support, and I urge its adoption.

I want to thank the chairman and ranking member for bringing up this resolution on the floor today, and I want to thank Mr. *McGovern* for helping garner bipartisan support for this effort.

As many of my colleagues know, my district is home to the North American Baha'i Temple located in Wilmette, Illinois. The Baha'i faith was founded in Iran 165 years ago on principles of peace and tolerance. Baha'is are a gentle and nonviolent people. They follow the teachings of Baha'u'llah, who taught respect for Moses, Jesus and Mohammad, teaching respect and tolerance around the world.

Yet, since the Iranian revolution of 1979, the Government of Iran has committed a deliberate campaign of discrimination, harassment, detention, arrests, imprisonment, and the execution of one of their largest religious minorities. Based solely on their religious beliefs, Baha'is in Iran are now denied jobs, are robbed of pensions, are stripped of property rights, and are forced to endure the barbarous desecration of their holy sites as well as forced to watch their leaders being imprisoned and executed.

Last spring, seven leaders of the Baha'i community were arrested and detained in Tehran's notorious Evin prison. Their trial date has been repeatedly postponed as they languish in prison without legal resource. Although no charges have been publicly filed, Iranian news agencies report that these individuals will be charged with "espionage for Israel, insulting

Islam, propaganda against the Islamic Republic, and spreading corruption on Earth.”
Conviction of these crimes carries a penalty of death.

We know what happened the last time the Iranian regime struck the Baha’i community leadership. In August of 1980, all of the members of the National Spiritual Assembly of the Baha’is were executed. We should do all we can to prevent such a crime against humanity from being committed again.

As the President pursues his negotiation policy with the brutal Iranian dictators, we should not forget the kind of people we are dealing with. Iran denies its citizens basic human rights and is persecuting its minorities and executes what they call apostates. If our diplomats ignore Iranian Baha’is and silence the voice of Iranian human rights activists, America will have failed a great moral test in Iran.

Today, the House of Representatives sends a signal to the Iranian regime, and it contains an important message. The U.S. Congress will expose this regime that murders innocent women and children in the streets and denies citizens basic human rights. To the dictators in Iran we say, release your political prisoners, especially release your Baha’i prisoners, and end your ignorant and uncultured persecution of the peaceful Baha’is.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Ken Bowers, the secretary general of the National Spiritual Assembly of the Baha’is, and Juana Conrad, the deputy secretary, for their steadfast devotion to their fellow Baha’is worldwide. I also want to thank the Local Spiritual Assemblies in Arlington Heights, Deerfield, Glencoe, Glenview, Northbrook, Palatine, Vernon Hills, Waukegan and Wilmette for contributing to our community and calling attention to this human rights abuse.

Thank you also to Hans Hogrefe from Chairman *Berman*’s hardworking staff and Jeff Philipps and Richard Goldberg of my staff for bringing this to the floor. A special thanks to Kit Bigelow and Shastri Purushotma from the National Spiritual Assembly of Baha’is of the United States for their dedication and pursuit of religious freedom and human rights for Baha’is worldwide.

I cannot for the life of me think of what’s going on in Iran that she would commit such crimes against 330,000 peaceful Baha’is in Iran. I am worried that the Iranian intelligence service and ministry has now registered the address of every Baha’i and every Baha’i business in the country. I am worried that they have already labeled Baha’i businesses as ineligible for government contracting.

We have seen the bureaucracy of a new Kristallnacht formed in Iran. I worry that with this bureaucracy now fully formed, we could see a tremendous human rights abuse occur against hundreds of thousands of peaceful individuals. That’s why this resolution is so important, not just to call attention to crimes that have been committed, but to a potential crime against humanity, which, in my judgment, the dictators of Iran are fully capable of committing. That’s why this institution rises to its fullest potential, underscoring the point that America is not the most powerful, best nation in the world because we are rich or have a large military,

but because we represent the moral authority of a democratic people representing the dignity of each individual on this planet.

I urge adoption of this resolution and thank the Members. (*Congressional Record*)

October 13, 2009

Mr. Speaker, as the lead Republican sponsor of H.R. 1327, the Iran Sanctions Enabling Act, I rise in strong support and urge my colleagues to pass this bill. We know that certain international corporations still invest billions of dollars in Iran's energy sector--in effect, subsidizing the regime's nuclear program. If states and local municipalities want to divest public funds from investments in such companies, the Federal government should support their decisions.

The Iran Sanctions Enabling Act would authorize state and local governments to divest from firms with investments of \$20 million or more in Iran's energy industry. Arizona, California, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Louisiana, Maryland, Michigan, Indiana, New Jersey, Colorado, New York, Ohio, Texas, and Washington have all enacted some form of divestment laws. The Iran Sanctions Enabling Act would encourage more states and local communities to take similar action.

With Iranian uranium enrichment accelerating--and the recent disclosure of a secret uranium enrichment site at Qom--the window for effective diplomacy is starting to close. To avoid conflict, we must pass effective sanctions and provide our diplomats with greater leverage. H.R. 1327 is a good first step--but it cannot be the last. I urge Speaker Pelosi and Chairman Berman to move H.R. 2194, the Iran Refined Petroleum Sanctions Act, to the floor for immediate consideration. This legislation, modeled after my Iran Sanctions Enhancement Act of 2007 and Iran Diplomatic Enhancement Act of 2009, would extend current sanctions to companies that supply gasoline to Iran. Iran's dependence on foreign gasoline remains its greatest weakness--and offers the greatest hope for diplomacy to succeed.

In addition, the President must take steps to fully implement current law. The Iran Sanctions Act was enacted in 1996 as an important measure to deny Iran the resources to further its nuclear program and to support terrorist organizations. According to the law, a firm that invests more than \$20 million in Iran's energy sector is determined to be a violator, and is subject to a range of sanctions. The Congressional Research Service has identified more than 20 firms that likely violate the Iran Sanctions Act. Nevertheless, no Administration has ever enforced this law. I urge my colleagues to sign the Kirk-Klein letter to President Obama urging him to enforce the Iran Sanctions Act without delay. (*Congressional Record*)

October 1, 2009

The United States revealed a secret underground uranium enrichment facility near Qom, Iran. U.S. officials told us they were carefully observing it for “several years.” But earlier this year, the Director of National Intelligence, Dennis Blair, provided written congressional testimony that the intelligence community has “no evidence that Iran has yet made a decision to produce highly enriched uranium.”

There is a glaring contradiction between the administration’s revelation and Blair’s testimony. I urge Members to cosign the bipartisan Kirk-Berkley letter calling on Director Blair to account for contradictory testimony on the growing Iranian threat.

The 2007 National Intelligence Estimate on Iran downplaying the threat now appears to be a glaring Intelligence failure. According to the Wall Street Journal, the main authors of that NIE, Van Van Diepen, Tom Finger, and Ken Brill, should be accountable, too.

Congress should ensure that key officials get this right, especially on Iran. (*Congressional Record*)

September 17, 2009

History is not kind to leaders who sacrifice our Polish allies. News reports indicate that our administration will end plans to build the long-planned American missile defense site for Poland. That site, carefully picked by the Pentagon, is directly under the flight path an Iranian missile would take if shot at the American people.

The U.N. reports that Iran has accelerated its production of uranium. And last February, Iran became the first new nation to orbit a satellite when its newest and most powerful missile worked. Iran, a state sponsor of terror, now makes the longest range missile of the terrorist world.

The administration’s decision is particularly ironic because Poland just announced it would be sending more troops to serve alongside Americans in Afghanistan. America is going to let Poland down, sending a message of weakness to our Polish allies and the people building Iran’s new missile arsenal. (*Congressional Record*)

July 9, 2009

Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I’m pleased to join Chairwoman Lowey at the beginning of the consideration of this bill making appropriations for fiscal year 2010 for the Department of State, Foreign Operations,

and Related Programs. This bill funds programs that safeguard our national security and promote U.S. interests abroad.

It was first founded under the auspices of the Marshall Plan under the understanding that good diplomacy and development can dramatically reduce national security problems and troop deployments for the United States.

I want to commend Chairwoman Lowey for her bipartisan work on this bill. She's listened to concerns of Members on this side of the aisle and worked to address them.

I also want to thank the staff both on this and the other side of the aisle for so many long hours of work on this. That's Nisha Desai-Biswal, Craig Higgins, Steve Marchese, Michele Sumilas, Cecilia Alvarado, and Courtney Dunn. I also particularly want to thank Ann Marie Chotvac, Mike Ringler, Alice Hogans, and Jason Small.

I know that Ms. Lowey and Ranking Member Granger, who is out today, appreciate their personal office staffs' work on this bill, especially Ann Vaughan and Rachel Carter. And I particularly want to thank my staff, particularly Rich Goldberg.

Now, on this legislation, we make one big key change, and that is with regard to the International Atomic Energy Agency's new report on the Iran nuclear program and related responses of the United States to their report. They showed that after producing low-enriched uranium at a rate of 40 kilograms per month over a 21-month period, Iran has now increased its stockpile by 60 percent in just 6 months, doubling its rate to over 80 kilograms of enriched uranium per month.

We know that Iran's greatest weakness remains her economic dependence on foreign gasoline. And we can all agree that the United States taxpayers should not be asked to help increase the supply of gasoline to Iran, especially now, especially after what we saw after the Iranian elections. Surprisingly, this is exactly what our taxpayer dollars have been doing.

In 2007 and 2008, the U.S. Export-Import Bank approved two separate loan guarantees totaling \$900 million to expand the largest refinery owned by Reliance Industries Limited, an Indian company that provides roughly one-third of Iran's daily import of gasoline. In effect, the U.S. taxpayer is underwriting the increased supplies of gasoline to Iran.

This bill includes the Kirk-Sherman amendment to prohibit further use of taxpayer dollars to guarantee or insure or extend credit to any company that supplies gasoline to Iran. I think that is a very important step that leads off to legislation that Chairman *Berman* and I have put forward that we hope, later in the year from the authorizing committee, that will begin to truly squeeze Iran and her need for foreign gasoline.

Now with regard to the overall bill, I am disappointed that we have departed from the tradition of considering appropriations under an open rule. I first worked on the Foreign Operations bill of fiscal year 1984. I was taught appropriations at the foot of Appropriations chairmen Jamie Whitten and Bill Natcher. It was under these historic chairmen that we always

considered appropriations bills under an open rule, protected under clause 2 of rule XXI that only monetary amendments could be offered.

Now we have departed from the long tradition established by Jamie Whitten and Bill Natcher. The rule that governs this bill makes in order only eight of 89 amendments, a 90 percent death rate for amendments in the Rules Committee on what used to be an open rule.

I would suggest that the partisan pressures under Speaker Wright, under Speaker Foley, were as bad or worse as now, but we are responding with highly restrictive rules that I think hurt our committee in the long run. I hope that we can address this soon and return to what I would call the Whitten-Natcher tradition.

Now let me turn to the substance of this bill, the product of work of especially Chairwoman Lowey and Ranking Member Granger.

The American people are aware that we face many global challenges that are well addressed in this bill. The funds provide security assistance to our allies in support countries living in some pretty dangerous neighborhoods.

There is another reality of this bill and that is the financial crisis that we see and that we are helping countries through so that they do not collapse, triggering some sort of new global economic down-turn.

The allocation given to the subcommittee, \$48.8 billion, is an amount, when strictly compared to last year's base, that is very high. But the administration has pledged to eliminate the wartime supplemental spending in favor of a regular appropriations process. If it sticks to that plan, then funding levels in this bill appear to be much more reasonable, and it includes programs for State and USAID operations that I support.

I have to admit, though, I remain in doubt whether the administration really will not request a supplemental next year. In fact, I probably would lay a dollar bet with anyone that we probably will see a supplemental. I hope not. Chairman Murtha has already suggested that supplemental funds may be needed to sustain our troops because of the 302(b) allocation that his Defense Subcommittee received that in his view may not cover all of the FY 2010 needs. In that case, I hope we could restrict funding under this bill.

Now, I know Chairwoman Lowey and Ms. Granger have worked together on a number of very good governance provisions such as language to strengthen oversight of hiring, training and deployment of new staff funded by this bill; and a provision that launches a comprehensive review of roughly \$8 billion in global health funding provided by this bill. Too often we forget that the United States has made the largest commitment of health funding ever in the history of mankind. It is something that the United States hasn't yet received enough credit for.

They also agree to language that closely mirrors the fiscal year 2008 bill which prevents U.S. taxpayer dollars from going to organizations that support or participate in involuntary or

coercive methods of family planning, and that was the bipartisan commitment that Chairwoman Lowey just alluded to.

The bill also includes amendments from several of my colleagues offered in full committee, particularly like a provision requiring the Secretary of State to report to Congress on deals brokered with foreign nations that receive detainees from Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, like Palau.

The June 10, 2009, New York Times reported that the United States has agreed to provide Palau with \$200 million in return for receiving 17 suspected Uyghur terrorists from Guantanamo Bay. Now, according to the CIA Factbook, Palau has a population of only 20,796 people. Its GDP is only \$164 million. Under this commitment then, the U.S. would be paying the Republic of Palau nearly \$11.7 million per Uyghur terrorist.

With average incomes in the United States of \$56,000, \$200 million would support incomes of over 3,500 Americans; with tuition at \$25,000 a year annually, it could put 7,000 students through college for a year. And \$200 million also compares poorly to the cost of Guantanamo Bay itself. Guantanamo Bay, as a total facility, cost just \$54 million to build. This would be four times that amount for just 17 Uyghurs.

There is also an amendment in this bill for new oversight and sunset restrictions on funding provided to the International Monetary Fund in the fiscal year 2009 supplemental, and language affirming intellectual property rights protections for U.S. energy and environmental technologies, critical in the G-8 discussions right now and the coming Copenhagen discussions in which China and India have pledged to require compulsory licensing over all climate change and energy technology. Compulsory licensing is a code word for stealing U.S. patents. There will be no green jobs if that provision goes through in the Copenhagen treaty. I am very happy that the House voted nearly unanimously on the Larson-Kirk amendment to prevent that.

Now, Chairwoman *Lowey* has also described highlights of the bill. I will simply reiterate three very important items *related* to our national security. This bill includes \$1.4 billion for the expanded work of the Millennium Challenge Corporation, a \$525 million increase to support prosperity and security of our partners around the developing world, a very important program that underlies the key point you cannot have long-term development without policy reform. You can build a dam, but if the government steals everything, all you will have is an empty structure a few years later. The MCC works to address that very problem in an effective way.

When taken together with supplemental funds, this bill fully funds our security assistance request for our strategic allies in the Middle East like Israel, Egypt, and Jordan, and continues the fight against illegal drug trafficking in this hemisphere. I think especially with Ranking Member Granger's full backing, we have full funding for the pending request for Mexico and Central America by providing \$7 million above the request, also for continued gains made in Colombia.

In summary, this bill is focused on furthering foreign policy and national security interests. It monitors the wise use of our tax dollars and achieves some fairly balanced solutions to some complex problems leading to what I hope will be a fairly bipartisan debate today. I reserve the balance of my time.

...

Let me just say this bill also contains one last program--and then I will close--and that is called the Near East Regional Democracy program. It used to be called the Iran democracy program, and I hope that's still exactly what it does. We're providing \$40 million for this, and it's very important. Following the suppression of democracy in Iran, we're particularly concerned about key minority groups there. The Azeris, representing 40 percent of the country, including the leading candidate for president whose vote was suppressed; the Kurds that we worked with so well in northern Iraq; and the Baluch, in which a significant Iranian military presence is there. And I want to pay particular attention to the plight of the Baha'i. The National Assembly of the Baha'i Faith is located in my district; but this is the faith that was founded in Persia, now Iran. There are 330,000 Baha'is in Iran right now. Under this regime, we have now seen that they have been told to register their businesses and place of address, that this is the bureaucratic machinery that we have seen in other countries in other uniforms before. It is the machinery of oppression and potentially worse. We have seen now that just following the time President Ahmadinejad claimed that he had won the election--remembering, of course, that in 150 Iranian cities, the votes totaled more than the number of people living in those cities--that just following their claim to have won the election after only 2 hours of counting the ballots, that he moved against the Baha'i leaders, putting them on trial for their lives in that country. The Near East Regional Democracy program can help us build alternative voices in that country, all the more important.

Let me close on this bill by saying that this bill has one key and major component, which is assistance to the State of Israel for us. In my view, land for peace generally means no land and even more war, as we saw with Israel's withdrawal from Gaza where an area that used to be used for agricultural produce is now used for mortars and rockets against southern Israel, especially Sderot and Ashkelon. My worry is that we might have more of that kind of adventurism by the other side further if we see instability in southern Lebanon and especially on the West Bank. This legislation helps us underscore our commitment to the Israeli Air Force, their missile defense system and, especially, to their army to at least encourage the states in that region to make sure that no adventurism like we saw, especially in 1973, can move forward against our best allies in the Middle East. My hope is that we have very strong commitment for this on the floor today and in the United States Senate because I think this bill, more than any other, makes any potential conflict in the Middle East less likely; and that is good for us all.

With that, I recommend passage of the bill. I want to commend our chairwoman and our greatly missed Ranking Minority Member Kay Granger, who's out today, for bringing us a bill that adheres to the key principle that I try to follow at every possible turn, and that is the aphorism that we say, that partisanship should end at the water's edge. In my service in the United States military, I generally found that when we were being shot at, they weren't

shooting at Democrats or Republicans. They were shooting at American citizens. The United States has bipartisan interests overseas, and this bill fulfills this.

I yield back the balance of my time. (*Congressional Record*)

June 8, 2009

Madam Speaker, on Friday, the International Atomic Energy Agency submitted a report on the Iranian nuclear program. After producing low-enriched uranium at a rate of 40 kilograms per month over a 21-month period, Iran has now increased its stockpile by 60 percent in just the last 6 months, doubling its rate to over 80 kilograms per month.

With 5,000 centrifuges now active, Iran is producing enough enriched uranium to produce two nuclear weapons per year, one for them, one for Hezbollah.

The IAEA now reports that Iran has denied inspectors access to the Arak heavy water reactor since August of 2008, where we suspect they will try to produce plutonium.

Mr. Moussavi, the leading candidate for President in Iran, told Der Spiegel, I will not suspend uranium enrichment. On April 13 he said to the Financial Times, No one will stop suspension.

No matter who wins the Iranian elections on Friday, we know that the production of fissile material useful in this oil-producing country only for nuclear weapons is accelerating.
(*Congressional Record*)

April 21, 2009

Madam Speaker, the U.N. Security Council has voted five times highlighting the violations of Iran, a party to the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, for its uranium enrichment activities.

According to the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), as of January 31, 2009, Iran has produced more than 1,000 kilograms of low-enriched uranium hexafluoride, which is 30 percent higher than previous IAEA estimates.

If we are serious about stopping the emergence of a nuclear Iran, our window for effective diplomacy is starting to close.

Former Secretary of State Madeleine Albright is a strong proponent of “enhanced diplomacy.” History teaches that negotiations in the absence of effective sanctions are likely to fail. Negotiations following effective sanctions are likely to succeed.

When it comes to Iran, we already know the most effective sanction: a gasoline restriction.

A close look at Iran's economy reveals a significant weakness. This top OPEC nation lacks the required refining capacity to meet domestic demand for fuel and must import some 40 percent of its gasoline.

That's right: Iran depends on foreign gasoline.

Nearly all of Iran's imported gasoline is provided by just five European companies--the Swiss firm Vitol, the Swiss/Dutch firm Trafigura, the French firm Total, the Swiss firm Glencore, and British Petroleum. The majority of tankers carrying gasoline to Iran are insured by Lloyds of London. An interruption in the supply of gasoline to Iran would considerably impact the Iranian economy and significantly bolster diplomatic initiatives.

Just last year, then-Senator Obama suggested "banning the export of refined petroleum to Iran," and said such a restriction "starts changing their cost benefit analysis" and "starts putting the squeeze on them."

That is why I am joining with Congressman BRAD SHERMAN in introducing the bipartisan Iran Diplomatic Enhancement Act of 2009, which would extend current sanctions to any activity--including production, brokerage, insurance, and tanker delivery services--that contributes to Iran's ability to import gasoline or refine petroleum domestically.

Only from a position of strength can we expect diplomacy to succeed. A restriction of gasoline deliveries to Iran offers the best chance to stop Iran's uranium enrichment program using the soft power of the United States and our allies. (*Congressional Record*)

February 13, 2009

"In Germany, they first came for the gypsies, and I didn't speak up because I wasn't a gypsy. Then they came for the Bolsheviks, and I didn't speak up because I wasn't a Bolshevik. Then they came for the Jews, and I didn't speak up because I wasn't a Jew. Then they came for the trade unionists and I didn't speak up because I wasn't a trade unionist. Then they came for the Catholics. I didn't speak up then because I was a Protestant. Then they came for me, and there was no one left to speak up." --Martin Niemoller, a Lutheran pastor arrested by the Gestapo in 1937.

Madam Speaker, then they came for the Baha'is.

The Baha'i Faith is the youngest of the world's independent monotheistic religions. Founded in Iran in 1844, it now claims more than 5 million adherents in 236 countries and territories. Gathering worshipers from nearly every national, ethnic and religious background, the Baha'is preach tolerance, diversity and equality.

To an Islamic dictatorship that denies its people basic political and human rights, this religion founded in Iran on the tenets of religious tolerance remains an anathema to the Supreme

Leader. And the world is standing by as Iran's state-sponsored persecution of its Baha'i minority nears its final stages.

In 2006, Iran's Armed Forces Command Headquarters ordered the Ministry of Information, the Revolutionary Guard, and the Police Force to identify members of the Baha'i Faith in Iran and monitor their activities.

In that same year, we saw the largest roundup of Baha'is since the 1980s. The Iranian Interior Ministry ordered provincial officials to "cautiously and carefully monitor and manage" all Baha'i social activities. The Central Security Office of Iran's Ministry of Science, Research and Technology ordered 81 Iranian universities to expel any student discovered to be a Baha'i.

In 2007, the situation worsened. More than two-thirds of the Baha'is enrolled in universities were expelled once identified as Baha'is. Police entered Baha'i homes and businesses to collect details on family members.

Twenty-five industries were ordered to deny licenses to Baha'is. Employers were pressured to fire Baha'i employees and banks were instructed to refuse loans to Baha'i-owned businesses. Baha'i cemeteries were destroyed.

In November 2007, three Baha'i youths were detained for educating underprivileged children.

The following month, the Iranian Parliament published a draft Islamic penal code, requiring the death penalty for all "apostates"--a term applied to Baha'is and any convert away from Islam.

On May 14, 2008, seven members of Iran's national Baha'i coordinating group were arrested. This is reminiscent of the mass disappearance and assumed murder of all the members of the National Spiritual Assembly of the Baha'is of Iran in August, 1980.

On August 1, 2008, the U.S. House of Representatives passed H. Res. 1008, condemning the persecution of Baha'is in Iran and calling for the immediate release of all Baha'is imprisoned solely on the basis of their religion.

Our bipartisan voice bought the Baha'i leadership some time--but it appears only 6 months.

This week, the Government of Iran charged the seven Baha'i leaders with "espionage for Israel, insulting religious sanctities and propaganda against the Islamic republic." Deputy Tehran Prosecutor Hassan Haddad declared, 'The charges against seven defendants in the case of the illegal Baha'i group were examined..... and the case will be sent to the revolutionary court next week.'

It is time for the international community to act.

Today, along with my colleagues Jim McGovern and Brad Sherman, I am introducing a bipartisan resolution calling on the Government of Iran to immediately release the seven Baha'i leaders and all others imprisoned solely the basis of their religion.

I urge President Obama and Secretary Clinton, in concert with the international community, to publicly condemn Iran's persecution of its religious minorities and demand the release of these seven community leaders." (*Congressional Record*)

Rep. Ann Kirkpatrick (D-AZ)

October 14, 2009

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 1327, the Iran Sanctions Enabling Act of 2009.

This commonsense bill would empower State and local governments and educational institutions to divest from those foreign companies supporting Iran's energy sector if they so choose. I support the efforts of our diplomats both to engage Iran and to work with Iran's key trading partners to impose meaningful, multilateral sanctions.

However, if Iran still refuses to take meaningful steps towards transparency in halting its nuclear ambitions and if China and Russia refuse to go along with multilateral sanctions, then I believe it is critical that the President be prepared to act, including imposing crippling sanctions.

This bill will provide the President with the authority he needs. (*Congressional Record*)

Rep. Ron Klein (D-FL)

December 15, 2009

Madam Speaker, I rise today to support the Iran Refined Petroleum Sanctions Act.

It is deeply disappointing that the Iranian government continues to choose to isolate itself. The Iranian government has chosen its clandestine nuclear program and its support for global terrorism over joining the community of nations in allowing its economy to thrive.

That is why I worked to include an important provision in today's legislation that requires companies applying for contracts with the United States Government to affirmatively certify that they do not conduct business with Iran.

The legislation gives companies a single choice: do business with the United States or do business with Iran. We cannot allow the U.S. Government to be a financial crutch of this rogue regime, not on our watch and not on our dime. And with the passage of this legislation,

Iranian businesses will have a choice as well: support a regime that chooses economic isolation or work to change the behavior of the Iranian government.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation. (*Congressional Record*)

October 13, 2009

Madam Speaker, I rise today to support H.R. 1327, the Iran Sanctions Enabling Act.

The United States has found itself at a crossroads when it comes to Iran. As we pursue an engagement strategy, we must also prepare for the worst. If Iran fails to comply with their commitments, we must have tools to compel them to change their behavior. This is what we're doing here today with this bill.

I would like to thank Congressman BARNEY FRANK for his continued and sustained leadership on this issue. The Iran Sanctions Enabling Act is one of many steps that Congress can and should take to isolate Iran, which we are working on.

I am proud that my home State of Florida was the first in the Nation to pass the law to divest from companies that conduct business in Iran. I would also like to acknowledge many of the activists and people in Florida that help pass this legislation. In particular, I note the accomplishment of my friend, State Senator Ted Deutch, the author of the Protecting Florida's Investments Act of 2007.

Iran must not get a nuclear weapon--not on our watch and certainly not on our dime. I would certainly urge the swift passage of this legislation. (*Congressional Record*)

July 9, 2009

I rise to support H.R. 3081, the State, Foreign Operations and Related Programs Appropriations Act of 2010.

This legislation addresses our most urgent national security needs, rebuilds our diplomatic infrastructure for the long term, and maintains our commitment to fiscally responsible government. The total for this bill comes in \$3.2 billion below the President's budget request, meaning that we cut spending tremendously but still managed to fund the most vital programs around the globe. I'd like to touch on some of these programs.

This legislation requires that the Administration report to Congress on the status and progress of diplomatic efforts to prevent Iran from acquiring nuclear weapons. I support the President's current efforts to stop Iran's dangerous nuclear weapons program; however, diplomacy should not be open-ended. This legislation makes it clear that Congress will exercise its oversight

authority over these negotiations to ensure that there is a plan to stop Iran from building a nuclear weapon.

Furthermore, the legislation prevents the U.S. Export-Import Bank from providing or guaranteeing credit to companies that provide Iran with significant amounts of refined petroleum. Iran imports about 40 percent of its refined petroleum. Then-Presidential candidate Barack Obama stated that restricting these imports could be a valuable lever in persuading Iran to cease its efforts to acquire nuclear weapons capabilities. We start that process today, and I am proud to support legislation that takes the first step in instituting crippling sanctions against the Iranian government.

Iran represents a great threat to the United States and our allies throughout the world. This legislation helps mitigate that threat to our allies by ensuring that countries that Iran would seek to destroy or destabilize receive support from the United States. U.S. aid to Israel represents a cornerstone in the strong relationship that our two countries share. I visited Israel right after the signing of the 10-year Memorandum of Understanding between the United States and Israel, and it was clear that this agreement would help cement our long-term friendship. This legislation fully funds our commitment under this accord and serves as an assurance to Israel that we will work together to ensure Israel's security during a time when Israel faces several powerful threats.

In addition, this legislation helps put us and our allies on a path to energy independence, funding clean energy initiatives that reduce our dependence on oil and make us more energy efficient. By partnering with other countries, we can share these important technologies and learn from others about new innovations.

Finally, I would like to briefly mention my support for the amendment by the gentleman from New York, Mr. Weiner. This amendment sends a strong statement to Saudi Arabia to cease its funding of terrorism and stop its incitement against Israel, Jews and America. While the bill prohibits aid to Saudi Arabia, it leaves the door open in case the President deems that aid is necessary. This amendment shuts that door. Common sense tells us that Saudi Arabia has enough American dollars from money that we waste on our dependence on oil.

In closing, this bill fulfills the American imperative to lead the world in commitment to democracy, human rights and security. I am proud to support this legislation. (*Congressional Record*)

June 19, 2009

Mr. Speaker, I rise to support H. Res. 560 and would like to thank our chairman Mr. Berman and my colleague Mr. Pence for bringing this bipartisan statement forward which supports our American view of the events in Iran.

The Iranian people deserve a democracy that counts every vote and treats its citizens with the utmost dignity. They deserve to trust their own government. However, these are not free and

fair elections by any stretch of the imagination, and it is our imperative to speak out whenever and wherever freedom is suppressed, whether by our allies or by our foes.

Frankly, we have honest differences with the Iranian government, no matter who is elected. Any Iranian government that seeks a nuclear weapon and spreads state-sponsored terrorism is a threat to the United States and our allies. That is why the United States has not taken either side in this conflict. It is for the Iranians to choose who leads them. Indeed, this struggle belongs to them.

However, the message we send today is the world is watching. I urge my colleagues to support this resolution. (*Congressional Record*)

Senator Amy Klobuchar (D-MN)

November 30, 2009

Mr. President, I come to the floor to call attention to the situation of three citizens of the United States--Shane Bauer, Sarah Shourd, and Josh Fattal--who have been detained by the Government of Iran for nearly 4 months. One of these individuals, Shane Bauer, comes from my home State of Minnesota, and so the safe return of these three young Americans is of particular importance to me.

On July 31 of this year, Shane, Sarah, and Josh--who shared a common passion for travel and discovery--were on a hiking trip in a peaceful region in northern Iraq, when they reportedly accidentally strayed across the poorly marked border between Iraq and Iran and were surrounded by Iranian border guards.

Since then, Shane, Sarah, and Josh have been held in near isolation in a Tehran prison and have been allowed no contact with their families in the United States.

Despite repeated requests by the Swiss Government, which represents U.S. interests in Iran, the three have been denied regular consular access required by the Vienna Convention. They have been denied repeated requests to be able to speak with their families via telephone, and they have been denied public information on any charges they may face.

In the 4 months they have been detained, the three have been allowed only two meetings with Swiss consular officials and have been denied due process and access to legal representation.

Even more alarming, Iranian officials have recently declared the three may be charged with espionage, a charge that is not only baseless but also completely at odds with who Shane, Sarah, and Josh are as individuals.

Shane, Sarah, and Josh made a simple mistake in accidentally crossing the border, and their continued detention is unwarranted and unreasonable.

Since the three were detained, I have gotten to know Shane's mother Cindy and other members of the hikers' families. During our conversations, I have learned what a remarkable person Shane is and how he is dedicated through his work to bringing the world closer together through photo journalism.

Shane grew up in Onamia, MN, a small town in the central part of our State, and he graduated from the University of California at Berkeley. Prior to being detained in Iran, Shane was living with Sarah in Damascus. He has traveled around the Middle East as a free-lance journalist, reporting from Syria, Iraq, Darfur, Yemen, and Ethiopia. His writing and award-winning photographs have been published in the United States, the United Kingdom, Canada, and throughout the Middle East.

His latest trip with Sarah and Josh brought him to the Kurdistan region of Iraq, which is known for its scenic hikes among mountainous waterfalls. This is hardly the background of someone who would deliberately enter Iran in hopes of committing espionage.

A few weeks ago, I met with Shane's mom Cindy and members of Sarah and Josh's families in my office in Washington. As a mother, I can only imagine how difficult this ordeal must be for all of them. They have had no contact with their sons or their daughter. Yet I have been overwhelmed by their resolve. They are pursuing every avenue they can find to demonstrate to the Iranian Government that their children made a simple mistake and clearly deserve to be released.

I came away from our meeting even more committed to seeing that Cindy and Shane, along with Sarah and Josh and their families, are united as soon as possible. As we all know, Iran is in the center of many pressing foreign policy challenges we currently face. I, along with my colleagues, will address those, but Shane, Sarah, and Josh have absolutely nothing to do with these international fights. They have nothing to do with what is going on in Iran or Iran's differences with other countries. This is strictly a humanitarian case. I urge Iranian officials not to politicize it or seek to use the three hikers as diplomatic pawns. There is no cause for their continued detention, and nothing will be gained by prolonging it any further. Iran's leaders should demonstrate the necessary compassion by immediately releasing Shane, Sarah, and Josh and allowing them to return home to their families. In the meantime, they should at the very least allow them to speak to their families in the United States over the telephone.

I thank my friend, the Ambassador to Switzerland, and Swiss officials for their work in this area. It has been 122 days since Shane, Sarah, and Josh were first detained; 122 days in captivity, apparently just for straying over a line on a map when they were on a hike. We will continue to work with the families, with the State Department, and Swiss officials to do everything we can to bring Shane home to Minnesota. (*Congressional Record*)

Senate Minority Whip Jon Kyl (R-AZ)

November 4, 2009

Mr. President, I rise today to note the 30th anniversary of a very sad day in American history. On this day 30 years ago, an angry mob of so-called students stormed the U.S. Embassy in Tehran and took 66 U.S. citizens hostage there. The original plan of the terrorists was to hold the Embassy for 3 days. In the end, they held 52 American hostages for 444 days.

The images of hostages blindfolded, with their hands tied behind their backs, should remain seared in our memories. The ABC News program "Nightline" essentially has its beginning in this crisis. The title of the news program at the time was "The Iran Crisis--America Held Hostage." Each night, as Americans went to bed, it would add a day to its count of how long Americans were held hostage. Walter Cronkite would similarly sign off his newscast.

I am sure many remember the chants of the hostage takers and those who supported them-- "Death to America," they would say. The Iranian regime would call us the "Great Satan." The thing is, although the hostages have long been released, not much else has changed. The government still leads its citizens in chants of "Death to America."

After Ayatollah Khamenei came to power, a Time magazine article in 1980 described him as the face showing "the ease with which terrorism can be adopted as government policy." Terrorism remains the policy of the Government of Iran today. Earlier this year, the State Department issued its annual report on terrorism, finding that "Iran remained the most active state sponsor of terrorism."

The Ayatollah Khamenei blessed this brazen terrorist act of holding Americans hostage. Upon his coming to power, Iran went from being an American ally in the region to our mortal enemy. The hostage crisis was, and remains, the defining symbol of this rupture.

In his inaugural address, in keeping with his campaign promises, President Obama stated to countries such as Iran, "We will extend a hand if you are willing to unclench your fist." On the nuclear weapons issue, the hand has been extended many times to Iran, but Iran has yet to unclench its fist.

Sadly, its resistance is nothing new. In October 2003, Iran concluded an agreement with France, Germany, and the United Kingdom known as the EU-3 in which Iran promised to suspend its uranium-enrichment activities. It did not live up to that promise. Iran arranged again, in November 2004, a suspension agreement with the EU-3, only to repudiate it again. This Iranian duplicity continues to this day.

In June 2006, the EU-3 was joined by Russia, China, and the United States to become the P5-plus-1. They called on Iran to suspend its uranium-enrichment activities in exchange for a variety of incentives. A revised version of this proposal was presented to Iran in the summer of 2008.

The International Atomic Energy Agency issued its most recent report on the matter in August 2009. In paragraph 27, it found that:

Iran has not suspended its uranium enrichment related activities or its work on heavy water related projects as required by the Security Council.

The most recent Congressional Research Service report on the matter says:

Iranian officials maintain that Iran will not suspend its enrichment program.

Yet another deal to bribe Iran to comply with its international obligations is before Iran today. Under this proposal, Iran would transfer stocks of its low-enriched uranium to Russia, Russia would enrich the uranium further and transfer that to France for France to fabricate into fuel assemblies, and then finally France would transfer this enriched uranium back to Iran. This deal came after the G-20 meeting in Pittsburgh in September, at which it was revealed that Iran had a covert enrichment facility in defiance of all of its international commitments and requirements.

French President Sarkozy said:

If by December there is not an in-depth change by the Iranian leaders, sanctions will have to be taken.

Prime Minister Brown stated:

I say on behalf of the United Kingdom today, we will not let this matter rest. And we are prepared to implement further and more stringent sanctions.

I hope President Obama will join in the Europeans' forceful and clear response to continued Iranian intransigence on the nuclear issue.

This current Iranian regime represents the same terrorists who took U.S. citizens hostage 30 years ago today and held them in humiliating captivity for 444 days. That seminal event is still celebrated in Iran. I do not believe it has ever been repudiated or condemned by the Iranian Government.

In his book "Guests of the Ayatollah," Mark Bowden describes how the U.S. Embassy has perversely become an anti-American museum to which students are bussed to commemorate the terrorist event. He further describes how "the takeover is remembered as one of the founding events of the Islamic `republic.'" "

Mr. Bowden also writes:

The Iran hostage crisis was for most Americans their first encounter with Islamo-fascism and, as such, can be seen as the first battle in that ongoing world conflict. [The hostages] were the first victims of the inaptly named `war on terror.'" "

Now Iran continues its nuclear activities in defiance of Security Council resolutions, and it remains the world's leading state sponsor of terrorism. This regime is not negotiating in good faith over its nuclear program, and during the time we have attempted to bring it into compliance with its international obligations, Iran has continued to defiantly develop its nuclear capabilities.

Thirty years ago today, Iran directly threatened and harmed the most vital and core U.S. interests. No one in this Chamber should be confused that 30 years later this regime still means to do us harm.

Mr. President, I wish to especially thank Michael Stransky for his research on this matter.

As a sign of remembrance and respect, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the *Record* the names of all of those taken hostage in Iran 30 years ago today, as well as the 8 service members who lost their lives in an attempt to free them. (*Congressional Record*)

October 19, 2009

Mr. President, in the coming weeks, the Senate will consider S. 908, the Iran Refined Petroleum Sanctions Act. Passing this bill should not be difficult 76 Members of this body are registered as cosponsors--but it is vital that we do.

I support strong sanctions to build pressure on Iran to end its illegal nuclear weapons program, which, in light of the recent disclosure of the Qom uranium enrichment facility, may be far more advanced than we realize.

However, China and Russia continue to thwart meaningful action in the United Nations Security Council. As Bob Robb, a columnist for the Arizona Republic notes, both nations have commercial ties to the Iranian regime and are unlikely to abandon their interests and assist the United States in building pressure on the Iran.

Mr. Robb also emphasizes that U.S. efforts to halt Iran's nuclear program have taken on a new urgency after the President cancelled the deployments of the ground-based interceptors to Poland and the Czech Republic.

Had the President managed to get support from Russia for more sanctions on Iran in exchange for sacrificing missile defense, things might look different. However, as shown by Secretary Clinton's recent visit to Moscow, Russia's position has not changed, and the U.S. has nothing to show for breaking its strategic commitments with two important allies.

Time is not on the administration's side. Every day the Iranians stockpile more uranium and get closer to having long-range missiles capable of delivering the world's most dangerous weapons against our allies, our deployed forces, and our homeland. The time to act is now.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the op-ed by Mr. Robb be printed in the *Record*.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Iran a Test of Obama's New Diplomacy

(By Robert Robb)

Iran is providing a premature and very high-risk test of President Barack Obama's new approach to American diplomacy.

Simplified, the thesis of the new Obama approach is that if the United States plays nicer with others, others will play nicer with us and be more willing to help do tough things.

I've never held out much hope for the Obama approach. I believe that nations generally act in their self-interest without regard to sentiments about other countries.

On the other hand, the Bush administration's blustery approach only made the rest of the world more hostile and resentful, which wasn't in our self-interest. So, it was worth giving the Obama approach a whirl.

The Obama approach, however, was intended to generate good will over time. The United States would cooperate more on international issues such as climate change and in international organizations such as the U.N. We would engage in direct diplomacy with troublesome regimes such as in Iran, North Korea, Syria, Venezuela and Cuba, all of which Obama said would receive presidential meetings in his first year in office.

After showing good will and willingness to engage in direct diplomacy, the rest of the world would be more willing to support the United States if tougher efforts to rein in dangerous rogue behavior nevertheless proved necessary, went the theory.

Iran has spoiled and short-circuited the rollout of the new Obama diplomacy. The disputed Iranian election made it difficult to engage in direct diplomacy with the current government without appearing to give the back of the hand to those risking their lives to protest its illegitimacy. Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad stepped up his attacks on Israel's right to exist. And Iran remains unflinching and deceitful about its rapidly-developing nuclear program.

So, the Obama administration is going to have to test its new diplomatic approach before laying all the prerequisites by trying to organize strong sanctions against Iran. It increased the stakes for such diplomacy greatly by abandoning the missile defense complex in Poland at least in part, it seems clear, to induce greater cooperation on Iran by Russia.

Sanctions would have to be crippling to have any hope of forcing Iran to abandon its nuclear ambitions. Only the equivalent of a non-military embargo on gasoline imports is thought to have sufficient effect to possibly get the job done.

To be effective, a ban on Iranian gasoline imports would require extraordinary international cooperation. Western powers might adopt them, and indeed Western suppliers have already

been cutting ties to Iran. But gasoline is transportable and tradable, so masking its origins is difficult but doable.

The national interest calculations would suggest that Russia and China are unlikely to go along with potentially effective sanctions against Iran, officially or unofficially. Iran is a client of Russia's on nuclear technology and military apparatus. China is a client for Iranian oil, which provides 15 percent of China's crude supplies.

They also have the interest Robert Kagan has cited that all autocratic regimes have in thwarting efforts to pressure and delegitimize other autocratic regimes.

The need to very quickly cobble together an effective sanctions regimen against Iran is an unfair test of Obama's new approach. But it's the test that has to be taken.

If the effort to impose effective sanctions fails, as it is likely to do, the Russian gambit will prove very costly.

If sanctions fail and Israel doesn't act, the world may have to live with an Iran capable of producing a nuclear weapon. In that world, the Poland missile defense complex would have been very valuable.

The Obama administration said that it was abandoning the Poland complex designed to shoot down long-range missiles because the intelligence suggested Iran has slowed down the development of its long-range capability. It's hard to credit that. Iran has successfully tested a two-stage rocket and put a satellite in space.

Theater missile defense, which the Obama administration says it will emphasize more, is important. But in a world with a nuclear-capable Iran, so is the European missile defense against long-range threats the Obama administration just abandoned. (*Congressional Record*)

July 30, 2009

Mr. President, I rise today to speak on my amendment to the fiscal year 2010 Energy and Water Appropriations bill.

This amendment prevents the Department of Energy from spending taxpayer dollars on companies that invest significant resources or do business in Iran's energy sector to fill the Strategic Petroleum Reserve.

Earlier this year, the Department signed contracts with energy giants Shell, Vitol, and Glencore to add almost 17 million barrels to the Strategic Petroleum Reserve. Open source material indicates that these three companies make up a majority of Iran's gasoline imports.

Companies that sell gasoline to Iran should not receive the support of the American taxpayers, and this body has now gone on record multiple times opposing government contracts with companies that have substantial investment in or do business with Iran's energy sector.

My amendment does not penalize the Department of Energy for this activity, but prevents this sort of thing from happening again. Ending taxpayer support for Iran's energy sector is a commonsense step and crucially important. Most major importers of gasoline to Iran have substantial ties to the U.S. Government, and unanimous adoption of my amendment sends a clear message to those involved in Iran's energy sector: You can do business with us, or you can do business with Iran --not both. (*Congressional Record*)

July 21, 2009

Mr. President, I will make some brief remarks here, and at the conclusion we will determine whether there is an agreement on the other side so I can go ahead and lay down an amendment. But first I want to discuss what that amendment will be. It is amendment No. 1628, and in a moment I will seek to offer it and get it pending. It is an amendment I introduced with Senator Lieberman, Senator Bayh, and Senator McCain.

Like other Members of this body, we have watched recent events unfold in Iran with great concern. This year began with talk of warming ties and potentially reestablishing contact with Iran; that we would no longer be afraid to talk to Iran and perhaps to even reach some kinds of agreements. In recent months, however, the Iranian regime has continued its support of terrorism, its illegal nuclear weapons program in defiance of its NPT obligations, and its engagement in violent and deadly repression of its own citizens.

While the administration has made clear its intention to continue to pursue high-level talks with Iran, an overture which the regime has not seen fit to even respond, the President has indicated that the window for Iran to negotiate and demonstrate progress toward complying with its international obligations is not open indefinitely.

I think President Obama was correct when he said:

Iran obtaining a nuclear weapon would not only be a threat to Israel and a threat to the United States, but would be profoundly destabilizing in the international community as a whole and could set off a nuclear arms race in the Middle East that would be extraordinarily dangerous for all concerned, including for Iran.

In May, the President indicated that Iran would have until December to show meaningful improvement. More recently, French President Nicolas Sarkozy said on behalf of the G8 nations that they will give Iran until September 2009 to agree to negotiations with respect to its nuclear activities or face tougher sanctions.

If negotiations do not prove fruitful, the United States must be ready to act quickly to increase pressure on Iran to end its support for terrorist groups and its illegal nuclear program.

The Kyl-Lieberman amendment expresses the sense of the Senate that the President should sanction the Iranian Central Bank if, by December, Iran has not verifiably halted its uranium enrichment activities, as well as come into full compliance with the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty and the Additional Protocol.

By sanctioning the Central Bank of Iran--Bank Markazi--our Nation would send the message that we will use all methods at our disposal to stop the spread of nuclear weapons and oppose sponsors of terror.

The case against the Iranian Central Bank is strong. It is knee-deep in the regime's illicit activities. Last year, Deputy Secretary of the Treasury Robert Kimmit revealed that between 2001 and 2006 the bank had moved \$50 million from banks in London to Hezbollah front organizations in Beirut. Hezbollah, of course, is a terrorist organization.

It also processes transactions for Iranian banks that already face U.S. sanctions. The Central Bank of Iran is instrumental in helping Iranian banks--the very ones this body voted overwhelmingly to sanction in 2007--to avoid sanctions. In March 2008, the Financial Crimes Enforcement Network of the Department of the Treasury warned financial institutions about the illicit behavior of the Central Bank of Iran. Here is what the advisory said:

The Central Bank of Iran and Iranian commercial banks have requested that their names be removed from global transactions in order to make it more difficult for intermediary financial institutions to determine the true parties in the transaction. They have also continued to provide financial services to Iranian entities designated by the U.N. Security Council in its Resolutions 1737 and 1747. The U.S. Department of Treasury is particularly concerned that the Central Bank of Iran may be facilitating transactions for sanctioned Iranian banks.

Under U.S. law, institutions that aid entities covered by financial sanctions are liable to penalties. The Central Bank's activities clearly warrant such action, and sanctioning the bank would increase the effectiveness of existing measures. I urge my colleagues to support our amendment at such time as we are able to get a vote on it. (*Congressional Record*)

June 4, 2009

Mr. President, I rise today to discuss recent events in North Korea. On April 5, the North Koreans tested a long-range Taepo Dong 2 missile, which traveled nearly 2,000 miles before falling into the Pacific Ocean. This test, which the North Koreans described as an attempt to launch a satellite into orbit, represented an improvement in the range of North Korea's missiles. In 2006, the Taepo Dong 2 only traveled 1,000 miles and did not successfully reach a second stage, as the most recent missile did.

U.N. Security Council Resolution 1718 prohibits the country's use of ballistic missile technology, and the United Nations Security Council issued a statement on April 13

condemning the recent launch and calling on member states to implement existing sanctions against North Korea.

In response, North Korea abandoned the six-party talks, promising to reactivate its nuclear program and never to return to the six-party negotiating table.

Less than 2 weeks later, North Korea conducted a nuclear test. Between the Taepo Dong 2 test and the nuclear test, North Korea also launched at least five shorter range missiles. Intelligence reports also indicate another long-range test is in the offing for later this month or early July.

So far, world response to this latest illicit behavior has been one dimensional, with leaders around the globe issuing condemnations of varying strength. President Obama issued a clear condemnation of North Korea's action, stating:

North Korea's ballistic missile programs pose a great threat to the peace and security of the world and I strongly condemn their reckless action.

Secretary Clinton echoed the President's remarks and emphasized, as the President did in his April speech in Prague that--and I am quoting--"there are consequences to such actions." The question is, it is unclear what consequences the administration has in mind. And Susan Rice, our Ambassador to the United Nations, has been reluctant to commit U.S. support for the inclusion of sanctions in the U.N. resolutions currently being drafted.

Despite North Korea's detonation of a nuclear device and test of long-range missiles designed to threaten us, the relationship between the United States and North Korea has not substantially changed. There are, however, several things that the United States could do to back up its condemnation of North Korea's reckless actions. Thankfully, we have a number of options available to us, and we are not faced with the "shoot first, ask questions later" approach that former Secretary of Defense William Perry advocated in a 2006 Washington Post editorial, when he argued that the United States had no other option than to destroy North Korea's missiles on their launching pads.

First, the United States could return North Korea to the state sponsor of terrorism list. North Korea was removed from this list when it agreed to a series of measures related to the disablement of its plutonium production at the Yongbyon reactor. Now that North Korea has renounced that agreement and restarted its nuclear program, there is no reason it should not return to that list.

President Obama indicated his support for this type of strategy on the campaign trail, saying:

If the North Koreans do not meet their obligations, we should move quickly to reimpose sanctions that have been waived, and consider new restrictions going forward.

Second, the United States could reimpose financial sanctions on high-level North Korean officials and banks affiliated with the North Korean Government. In March 2007, the U.S. Treasury ordered U.S. companies and financial institutions to terminate their relationships

with Banco Delta Asia over alleged links between the bank and the Government of North Korea and froze certain funds of high-ranking North Korean officials.

Third, the United States could expand defense and nonproliferation initiatives. President Clinton's Secretary of Defense William Cohen recently argued in the Washington Times for reversing President Obama's deep cuts to missile defense programs. I agree with Secretary Cohen that the President's \$1.4 billion of cuts do not send the right signals to those who seek to threaten us, especially those who tout ballistic missiles as the chief element of their threats.

President Obama, in direct support of U.N. Security Council Resolutions 1695 and 1718, could also expand interdiction and intelligence cooperation under the Proliferation Security Initiative with our new partner, South Korea.

As the President said in Prague:

Rules must be binding. Violations must be punished. Words must mean something.

These commonsense steps would send a clear message to the North Koreans and their partners in proliferation that the United States is serious when it repeatedly refers to consequences and is willing to employ all measures and its full leverage in order to influence North Korea and avoid conflict.

Of course, the United States should work with the international community to enlist its support for increasing pressure on the North Koreans, and the administration has signaled its support for a multilateral approach through its focus on working through the United Nations. But this approach is already limited by North Korea's history of disregarding U.N. action and by continued Russian and Chinese waffling. I am not convinced new U.N. resolutions would be treated any differently by North Korea than the ones it has already ignored. Its record has led some to question whether a regime so willing to wreak famine and destruction on its own people is not beyond the traditional application of "carrot and stick" diplomacy.

Moreover, our effort to work with other nations does not excuse us from the responsibility to act ourselves. If Russia or China will not sanction North Korea, is that any argument that the United States should not? Of course not. We can offer nations attractive terms for their support, such as help in dealing with increased flow of North Korean refugees, trade incentives, or enhanced military-to-military cooperation, such as revoking the misguided Obey amendment and allowing Japan to purchase an export variant of the F-22 fighter. However, if other nations conclude that holding North Korea accountable is not in their interest, then we must not let that prevent us from doing what is best in our interest.

The gravity of events in North Korea is only increased by the similar disagreement between the international community and Iran on the subject of its nuclear program. If strong words are followed by weak and ineffective action toward North Korea, why should Iran expect different treatment? Conversely, if we display resolve and fortitude in confronting a belligerent North Korea that uses nuclear explosions and ballistic missiles as foreign policy tools, we send a powerful message to the rest of the world of our sincere commitment to

nonproliferation and regional stability. This is doubly important considering the well-known cooperation between North Korea and Iran on a variety of illicit programs.

While some debate the proper U.S. response, I believe one thing is certain: Past negotiations have not been successful. North Korea has not been an honest negotiator, preferring to use, instead, “missile diplomacy” to spark international panic and extract a concession--typically fuel or grain shipments--from a worried international community. This process, in various permutations, happened in 1993, 1994, 1998, 2006, 2007, and it may repeat itself in 2009.

For those who would not repeat the blunders of the past, North Korea’s actions have forced an unwelcome choice on the world: either North Korea is a threat and we must take actions across all fronts to isolate the regime and defend our Nation and our allies against its considerable capabilities or these actions are the benign outbursts of a misunderstood regime.

The President has clearly said that North Korea poses a threat to world peace and security. It is now a question of matching action to rhetoric. (*Congressional Record*)

Rep. Barbara Lee (D-CA)

October 27, 2009

I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank him also for carrying this resolution.

Madam Speaker, I am in strong support of Senate Concurrent Resolution 45, which encourages the Government of Iran to allow the three American citizens detained in Iran to reunite with their families as soon as possible.

Since July 2009--I think it was July 31--Joshua Fattal, Shane Bauer, and Sarah Shourd have been detained by the Government of Iran after inadvertently, inadvertently, crossing the unmarked border with Iran while attempting to hike in the mountains in Iraqi Kurdistan. Now, Sarah is a constituent, but Joshua and Shane, they are all graduates of the University of California in Berkeley, which is located in my district.

I have had the opportunity to talk with family members of Sarah, and I know how difficult it is for them during these trying times and I know how they are doing everything they can do to seek their release.

Reports indicate that for 3 months, the families of these young American citizens have had no contact with the detained, whether in person or by telephone. The lack of information regarding the whereabouts and welfare of their loved ones, as well as any indication of a timeline for their release, is deeply troubling.

Under article 36 of the Vienna Convention, consular officers shall be provided access to an arrested, detained, or imprisoned national without delay. I was relieved to hear that on September 30, 2009, Swiss officials were finally granted consular access to the three detained American citizens. However, like my colleagues, like all of us, we are deeply concerned that

these officials and the three lack freedom of communication, which is also provided for by the Vienna Convention on Consular Relations.

This resolution importantly calls upon the Government of Iran to allow for Joshua, Shane, and Sarah to communicate by telephone with their families in the United States, who continue to passionately appeal to the Government of Iran for their timely and safe release. On September 22, President Ahmadinejad stated his intent to ask the Iranian judiciary to “expedite the process” of this case, as well as to “look at the case with maximum leniency.”

In accordance with this resolution, I hope that the Government of Iran will live up to its promise and act without delay to ensure that these young American citizens may be reunited with their families and loved ones.

I stand in support of this resolution today. I want to thank the State Department and all of our colleagues for doing so much to try to gain the release of these three young individuals as soon as possible.

I thank my colleagues for their support of this resolution. (*Congressional Record*)

Sen. Carl Levin (D-MI)

December 15, 2009

Mr. President, I want to take a few moments today to comment on recent events in Iran, the continuing protests against that nation's ruling regime, the brutal response of that regime to the legitimate protests of Iran's people, and one small step the United States can and should take to aid the people of Iran in exercising the basic human right to protest and hold their own government accountable.

As my colleagues know well, student protests in Tehran and other cities took place on Dec. 7, Student Day, the anniversary of the 1953 attacks by the shah's security services that left three student protesters dead. Just as those students sought to protest against an unjust and repressive government, so did today's students. And again, Iran's government responded with intimidation, violence and repression.

Iranian security forces, and paramilitary militias allied with government hard-liners, used teargas, batons and beatings to attack nonviolent protesters on the campus of Tehran University and at other universities. The government's chief prosecutor told the state-controlled news agency--apparently without irony--“So far we have shown restraint,” and threatened even harsher methods to end the protests.

Sadly, this is a recurring theme in Iran. Outraged by overwhelming evidence of fraud designed to keep President Ahmadinejad in power last June, students and other Iranians took to the streets. These nonviolent protests were met by the regime with escalating levels of brutality. According to a recent report from the human rights group Amnesty International, government-sponsored violence and repression in Iran since the election has reached the

highest level in 20 years. Hundreds of people have been rounded up and imprisoned, often under appalling conditions, without access to legal representation or indeed any contact with the outside world. Iranian citizens, according to the report, were charged with vague offenses unconnected to any recognizable criminal charge under Iranian law.

More than 100 were paraded before cameras in show trials, with visible signs of abuse. The Amnesty International report includes evidence that the pace of executions by the Iranian government has increased, a clear and chilling message to the regime's critics. And citizens released from detention made credible and horrific charges of abuse while in custody, including allegations of the widespread use of rape.

This deplorable record is why I and six colleagues introduced a resolution last month, approved by this body, expressing the sense of the Senate that the government of Iran has routinely violated the human rights of its citizens, and calling on the Iranian government to fulfill its obligations under international law and its own constitution to honor and protect the fundamental rights to which its citizens, and all human beings, are entitled. We recognized the need for a strong statement of condemnation of the regime's behavior, and of solidarity with those Iranians seeking to exercise their right to protest. The Iranian government must know that the world is watching.

Mr. President, there is more the United States can do. I draw my colleagues' attention to a notice from the State Department that the administration will waive certain provisions of the Iran-Iraq Arms Nonproliferation Act of 1992 with respect to the export of personal, Internet-based communications tools to Iran. This is an important response to the Iranian government's crackdown on its people. The regime has sharply curtailed the actions of foreign media representatives in Iran, making independent observations of the situation there difficult or impossible to report. Much of what we know about the regime's repression has come from first-hand accounts by Iranian citizens, distributed via Internet tools such as YouTube and Twitter. These media outlets have become vital, not only to those of us outside Iran seeking information about events within the country, but to Iranian citizens seeking to communicate with one another. And they are especially important given the near total absence of independent news media in Iran. The regime has undertaken, even before the June election, a systematic effort to eliminate newspapers or broadcasters that report critically on the government's activities. And Iran's Revolutionary Guards, closely connected to government hardliners, have sought to add media and communication companies to its growing commercial empire, tightening the regime's grip on communications within Iran.

The State Department recently notified Congress that it intends to waive provisions of our sanctions against Iran to allow Iranians to download free, mass-market software used in activities such as e-mail, instant messaging and social networking. According to the State Department, "U.S. sanctions on Iran are having an unintended chilling effect on the ability of companies such as Microsoft and Google to continue providing essential communications tools to ordinary Iranians. This waiver will authorize free downloads to Iran of certain nominally dual-use software (because of low-level encryption elements) classified as mass market software by the Department of Commerce and essential for the exchange of personal communications and/or sharing of information over the internet."

Granting of this waiver is an important step in ensuring that our actions here do not impede the attempts by Iranians to exercise their human rights. I applaud the administration for its decision, and hope the people of Iran will view this as one more sign of the solidarity between them and the people of the United States. I ask that a letter to me from Richard R. Verma, assistant secretary of state for legislative affairs, informing the Senate Armed Services Committee of this waiver decision, be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, DC, December 15, 2009.

Hon. Carl Levin,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The enclosed report is being provided consistent with Section 1606 of the Iran-Iraq Arms Non-Proliferation Act of 1992 (P.L. 102-484) (the "Act"). The Under Secretary of State has determined that the issuance of a license for a proposed export to Iran is "essential to the national interest of the United States." The attached report provides a specific and detailed rationale for this determination. The waiver authority under Section 1606 of the Act will not be exercised until at least 15 days after this report is transmitted to the Congress.

The Department of State is recommending that the Department of Treasury's Office of Foreign Assets Control (OFAC) issue a general license that would authorize downloads of free mass market software by companies such as Microsoft and Google to Iran necessary for the exchange of personal communications and/or sharing of information over the Internet such as instant messaging, chat and email, and social networking. This software is necessary to foster and support the free flow of information to individual Iranian citizens and is therefore essential to the national interest of the United States.

Please do not hesitate to contact us if we can be of further assistance.

Sincerely,

Richard R. Verma,
Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs.

Report under the Iran-Iraq Arms Non-Proliferation Act of 1992

This report is being provided consistent with Section 1606 of the Iran-Iraq Arms Non-Proliferation Act of 1992 (P.L. 102-484) (the "Act"). Section 1603 of the Act applies with respect to Iran certain sanctions specified in paragraphs (1) through (4) of Section 586G(a) of the Iraq Sanctions Act of 1990 (P.L. 101-513) (the "ISA"). This includes the requirement under Section 586G(a)(3) of the ISA to use the authorities of Section 6 of the Export Administration Act of 1979 ("EAA") to prohibit the export to Iran of any goods or

technology listed pursuant to Section 6 of the EAA or Section 5(c)(1) of the EAA on the control list provided for in Section 4(b) of the EAA, unless such export is pursuant to a contract in effect before the effective date of the Act (October 23, 1992).

Pursuant to Section 1606 of the Act, the President may waive the requirement to impose a sanction described in Section 1603 of the Act by determining that it is essential to the national interest of the United States to exercise such waiver authority. On September 27, 1994, the President delegated his authorities under the Act to the Secretary of State. Subsequently, on January 12, 2007, the Secretary of State delegated these authorities to the Under Secretary for Arms Control and International Security (DA 293-1).

Personal Internet-based communications are a vital tool for change in Iran as recent events have demonstrated. However, U.S. sanctions on Iran are having an unintended chilling effect on the ability of companies such as Microsoft and Google to continue providing essential communications tools to ordinary Iranians. This waiver will authorize free downloads to Iran of certain nominally dual-use software (because of low-level encryption elements) classified as mass market software by the Department of Commerce and essential for the exchange of personal communications and/or sharing of information over the Internet. The waiver will enable Treasury's Office of Foreign Assets Control to issue a broader general license covering these downloads and related services. This general license will be comparable to exemptions which already exist for the exchange of direct mail and phone calls. The new general license will specifically exclude from its authorization the direct or indirect exportation of services or software with knowledge or reason to know that such services or software are intended for the Government of Iran.

The Under Secretary has determined that it is essential to the national interest of the United States to exercise the authority of Section 1606 of the Act not to impose the sanction described in Section 1603 of the Act and Section 586(a)(3) of the ISA and to permit the issuance of a general license for this kind of software. (*Congressional Record*)

November 19, 2009

Mr. President, recent events have made abundantly clear that the Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran is failing, and failing badly, to live up to its own professed ideals and its international commitments to protect the human rights of its citizens and others. I urge my colleagues to join with me in supporting a resolution, S. Res. 355, submitted today, condemning Iran's deplorable human rights record, calling for an immediate release of those wrongfully imprisoned in violation of their rights, and urging the restoration of meaningful human rights to all of Iran's citizens.

Iran's 1979 constitution, the result of a revolution against years of political and human-rights abuses by the regime of the Shah, guarantees fundamental rights and freedoms. Moreover, Iran is a signatory to four major human rights treaties. And yet its shameful record of executions that contravene international standards; of repression of the rights of women and minorities, including religious minorities; of outrageous attacks on the rights of peaceful

assembly and protest; and of unwarranted arrest and detention of foreigners, including Americans, all make a mockery of these commitments.

Just last week, the Iranian Government again demonstrated its contempt for human rights and the rule of law when it announced it would pursue espionage charges against three young Americans who crossed Iran's border with Iraq. These allegations are just the latest telling example on a long list of abuses.

American Robert Levinson has been missing in Iran for more than two years, during which the Iranian regime has denied having any information on his whereabouts and has blocked international attempts to discover his fate. In January 2009, the Iranian Government jailed Iranian-American journalist Roxana Saberi and charged and convicted her of espionage after a one-hour show trial that mocked even the most basic standards of due process and law, and then sentenced her to eight years in prison before releasing her a few months later. Esha Momeni, a student at California State University, Northridge, was imprisoned last fall for her peaceful activities in support of women's rights in Iran. The regime's abuses have even touched Nobel peace prize winner Shrin Ebadi, whose Center for Defenders of Human Rights was forced to close by the government in December 2008.

None of these recent abuses, however, as deplorable as they are, have shocked the conscience of the world so severely as the Iranian Government's actions in response to this year's disputed presidential elections. Prompted by justifiable concern that their will had been thwarted in a rigged election, thousands of Iranian citizens took to the streets, firmly but peacefully exercising their rights and demanding the democracy their government purports to embody. The regime's response was to launch violent, heavy-handed attacks against these peaceful protestors, using government security forces and paramilitary militias under government control to repress the legitimate expression of a valid grievance. The United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights reports that this violence resulted in at least a dozen deaths, and hundreds of injuries.

In the aftermath, the Iranian Government imprisoned dozens of its citizens and conducted a mass trial of more 100 of them, many of whom bore clear signs of physical abuse. The government sentenced at least four of these prisoners to death on the basis of dubious confessions, likely produced under duress and abuse.

It is proper and appropriate for the Senate to make clear its determination that these acts violate international human rights standards, Iran's own professed commitments, and common decency. The resolution introduced today would record the Senate's condemnation of Iran's woeful human rights record; remind the Iranian government of its domestic and international commitments to human rights; call for the immediate release of all those held for their peaceful exercise of rights of free expression, assembly and association; and urge Iran to extend full legal rights to those imprisoned. It calls for the Iranian Government to guarantee humane treatment of those in detention; to halt immediately state-sanctioned violence against its own citizens; to allow unrestricted communication and access to information; and to respect the rights of the Iranian people to free speech, a free press, free expression of religion, freedom of association, and freedom of assembly.

It is a tragic irony that the government perpetrating these deplorable acts of violence and abuse came to power three decades ago because the Iranian people rejected the abuses and violence of a previous regime. Now following in the repressive footsteps of that previous regime, the current Iranian Government has been widely condemned by the community of nations. Passage of this resolution would add the U.S. Senate's loud and clear voice of condemnation to the many voices inside Iran, and out, calling for the restoration of basic human rights for the Iranian people. (*Congressional Record*)

Sen. Joseph Lieberman (I-CT)

July 23, 2009

I thank the Chair, and I thank the chairman of the committee.

Mr. President, I rise to offer this amendment, along with the Senator from Alabama, Mr. Sessions, and a broad bipartisan group of cosponsors. This amendment concerns the deployment of missile defenses in Europe.

I am very pleased to say, as Chairman Levin suggested, that there has been a lot of work done on this issue by a lot of people, including Chairman Levin, Ranking Member McCain, their staff, and our staff.

I think we have reached a very important agreement here which holds up some standards of what is most important to our national security regarding the deployment of missile defenses to Europe.

If I may, the administration, as we know, is now evaluating alternatives to the planned European deployment of a Ground-based Midcourse Defense, or GMD, system to Poland and the Czech Republic. In the context of that policy review, this amendment states that any alternative to the GMD deployment to Poland and the Czech Republic must be as effective and affordable as the current plan. We think this is a reasonable standard by which to judge any alternative and I am hopeful and grateful my colleagues seem to agree.

Let me now go forward to explain why Senator Sessions and I and others think it is so important to set a standard for the alternatives that are now under consideration, and why the growing Iranian threat requires us to deploy an effective missile defense in Europe.

Last year the United States reached a pair of groundbreaking agreements with two of our closest European allies on the deployment of elements of a Ground-based Midcourse Defense, GMD, system to protect Europe and the United States from Iran's growing ballistic missile threat.

When I say "and the United States," they don't have the ability now, or the ballistic missile, to reach the United States, but they are clearly investing in a ballistic missile program whose range they hope will grow and grow to a point where they will be able to reach the United States.

Specifically, on July 8, 2008, the United States and the Czech Republic agreed on establishing an American ballistic missile defense radar site on Czech territory. Two months later, on August 20, the United States and the Government of Poland reached a similar agreement under which we would deploy 10 ground-based interceptors to Poland. Just less than a year after these agreements, at a June 16 hearing at our Senate Armed Services Committee, Deputy Secretary of Defense Bill Lynn told the members of the committee:

We think there are a number of ways to address [the Iranian] threat and one of the options is to deploy the missiles in Poland and the radar in the Czech Republic, and we are certainly evaluating that option as well as other possible options.

We heard other testimony before our committee, including from the Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, General Cartwright, along the same lines, that though the agreements were entered into with Poland and the Czech Republic, the administration is evaluating other options.

To help place the other options that are under consideration into perspective, and to explain why Senator Sessions and I and the others who have joined us as cosponsors introduce this amendment today, I want to go to a Congressional Budget Office study that was released earlier this year, in February. It is titled “Options for Deploying Missile Defenses in Europe.” This study was requested by then-Congresswoman Ellen Tauscher, in her capacity as Chair of the House Armed Services Strategic Forces Subcommittee. It examined the potential cost and defense capability of the European ground-based defense system in Poland and the Czech Republic, as well as alternatives to it.

What are the alternatives? These include deployment of sea-based interceptors on Navy ships around Europe, or using mobile land-based interceptors in Europe. The study also considered the possible benefits of closer cooperation on missile defense with the Russian Federation.

The findings of this report clearly demonstrate that the Ground-based Midcourse Deployment in Poland and the Czech Republic is the most effective and affordable option that is before us today. I am particularly struck by the report’s conclusion that the alternatives to the GMD system in Poland and the Czech Republic would significantly reduce America’s ability to provide a layered defense for our American homeland against the eventual threat of intercontinental ballistic missiles launched by Iran or anyone else in that region against the United States of America.

I want to be clear about this and what it means. Whereas the GMD deployment to Poland and the Czech Republic would provide, according to the report, a so-called shoot-look-shoot capability for the defense of the entire continental United States, the alternatives that the Congressional Budget Office considered would leave most of our country without such a layered defense.

Let me explain. Shoot-look-shoot is an operational concept that is actually the cornerstone of our increasingly successful missile defense program. It is the idea that we should be able to shoot at an incoming missile, assess whether that shot was successful, and then shoot again.

This shoot-look-shoot capability dramatically increases the effectiveness of our missile defense system.

You might say it is redundant. Most of our military systems are redundant because of what is on the line. I cannot think of a place where I would rather have redundancy than the situation we are dealing with, with an incoming ballistic missile, presumably containing a nuclear weapon, perhaps chemical or biological. I know people watching this debate may think this is far off and unrealistic, but these are the realities we do have to deal with in our world because we know a country such as Iran, whose leaders regularly lead tens of thousands of their citizens in shouting “death to America” is in fact investing in a growing intercontinental ballistic missile system.

What does shoot-look-shoot mean with regard to this amendment? If you have a GMD system in Europe and a missile that is fired from Iran, we have a first opportunity to take a shot at that missile. We then obviously have a chance to look and see whether we hit it. If we did not, we have a second opportunity utilizing the ground-based missile defense system that we have now installed in California and Alaska. That is an important redundancy in the God-awful circumstance that a rogue nation, an anti-American nation, is actually firing missiles at the United States.

I want to draw the attention of my colleagues to a pair of maps that I think indicate the differences as CBO found them between the planned GMD system in Poland and the Czech Republic and the proposed land-based SM-3 block IIA system that I think is a favored alternative--a possible alternative--I don't mean it is selected, but one looked at with great interest by the Defense Department.

Incidentally, these maps were prepared by the Congressional Budget Office and included in the study I just mentioned, which I would commend to my colleagues to read in full.

On the first map here we can see the planned GMD system in Poland and the Czech Republic would provide a layered defense for the entire continental United States. In other words, this is the area that would be defended. Most of Europe, if a missile were fired from Iran, and all of the United States would be covered. That means the concept of shoot-look-and-shoot would be in effect a defense for our entire population.

The second map shows the capabilities of a prospective land-based SM-3 IIA block system, which is quite different. You can see that this one, as the CBO estimated, only covers a portion of the United States. I note it does cover Connecticut, but there is a lot of the rest of the United States--even though there are those of us who love this small State--a lot of the rest of the United States we do not want to leave unprotected by this redundancy.

In fact, on a population basis, because there is a concentration of population, of course, on the east coast, almost 80 percent of the population would be left uncovered by this redundant defense. All States west of the Mississippi, for example, would not be defended by this system.

In terms of operational capability, it is also important to note that the components of the proposed GMD system for Europe are much farther along in their development and purchase closer to being proven to work than the proposed SM-3 Block IIA interceptor, which may not be available until close to 2020. So the consequences of pulling away from the Poland and Czech Republic system are serious in the near term.

As for the question of cost, the Congressional Budget Office in this study estimates that the two alternate systems would cost nearly the same to develop, deploy, and operate. In other words, if we opt for an alternative to ground missile defense, CBO will be telling us we will be paying the same amount of money but for a less capable defense and a dramatically less comprehensive coverage of the population and territory of the United States.

Another question under consideration, I know by the administration, is the possibility--and was with the last administration, too--the possibility of partnership between the United States and Russia through the joint use of two Russian radar stations, as well as the sharing of information and data. I support very much the exploration of this opportunity of cooperating with Russians on missile defense, but I believe we have to have a clear understanding of its potential benefits and limitations.

Let me begin with some of the benefits. Obviously, closer cooperation with Russia on missile defense could increase our early warning detection capability for missile launches from the Middle East, based on their radar. With this capability we could send a clear message to Iran that not just the United States but the world, including Russia, is opposed to its weapons of mass destruction and intercontinental or continental ballistic missile systems. So I support the objective of negotiating and discussing this with the Russians.

But I want to say there are also limitations that are in this proposal. The Russian radar stations that are most discussed as part of a joint United States-Russian ballistic missile system as a technical matter cannot be a substitute for a European-based GMD system. Although these radars would give us additional early warning capabilities, as I indicated, they would not provide any additional targeting capability which, of course, is a critical component to reducing threats. Radar helps to target, sends the message to the interceptors in Poland and to the other system, and that facilitates an accurate shoot-down.

As the CBO pointed out in its February report, the radars face south and any missiles facing south and any missiles targeted toward Europe and the United States would, according to the report, "tend to fly through and out of the Russian radar's field of regard very early in their trajectories." Though this system would provide us with early warning, it is also very important, really critical, to have targeting capability.

The amendment Senator Sessions and I and the others have proposed would not in any way prohibit the possibility of cooperation, or even deter the possibility of cooperation with the Russian Federation--certainly not with regard to sharing radar data, and I hope we can all agree we should not seek an agreement with Moscow that leaves the United States more vulnerable to the threat from Iran.

Very briefly, what about that threat? Some may ask, Why do we still need to be investing so much in missile defense? The answer, simply put, is because our most unpredictable and irresponsible adversaries, in particular rogue states such as Iran and North Korea, are investing very aggressively in ballistic missiles. That is why we need ballistic missile defense. The investments we make in missile defense will quite literally provide greater personal security to the coming generations of Americans, our children and their grandchildren and beyond. As LTG Mike Maples, then Director of the Defense Intelligence Agency, testified before our Senate Armed Services Committee earlier this year:

The threat posed by ballistic missile delivery systems is likely to increase over the next decade. Ballistic missile defenses with advanced liquid or solid propellant propulsion systems are becoming more mobile, survivable, reliable, accurate, and possess greater range.

That is the end of the quote from the former head of the Defense Intelligence Agency.

In the last few months we have seen graphic reminders of the progress our enemies are making toward fielding intercontinental ballistic missiles. In February, Iran launched its first satellite into orbit using the same technologies that Tehran can draw upon to develop the capacity to build an intercontinental ballistic missile that could strike the continental United States.

In May, Iran carried out its first successful test flight of a two-stage solid fuel ballistic missile, a development that the White House Coordinator for Arms Control and WMD Terrorism, Gary Samore warned was “a significant step forward in terms of Iran’s capability to develop weapons.”

Iran’s growing ballistic capabilities are made, of course, even more threatening when coupled with its nuclear weapons development program. Of course, we all hope the United States and the rest of the international community can persuade Iran , through diplomacy and economic sanctions, to abandon both its nuclear and ballistic ambitions and programs.

Missile defense is an important component of that effort on the premise that we may be able to convince Iran it is not worth spending those countless millions of dollars on perfecting these weapons if its leaders come to realize that we in the West are determined to stay one step ahead of them in neutralizing their strategic impact with a missile defense system.

As the Department of Defense now undertakes its review of the planned GMD deployment to Europe and possible alternatives, this amendment would express the Senate’s opinion of what we expect our missile defenses in Europe to deliver, generally.

It would state that the United States expects those missile defenses to be the most capable and affordable and give a defense in the short term, not just to our allies in Europe but to our fellow citizens throughout the United States of America. (*Congressional Record*)

July 21, 2009

Mr. President, I thank the Chair and I thank my friend from Arizona, Senator Kyl, for his very strong statement. I rise to speak in support of this bipartisan amendment which I have cosponsored along with Senator Kyl, Senator Bayh, and Senator McCain.

As you know, President Obama has made a historic offer to Iran's leaders, inviting them to engage in direct diplomacy to resolve the outstanding differences between our two countries. As the President has repeatedly said, the door is open for the Iranians to come in out of the cold, if they choose to do so. It is by suspending their illicit nuclear activities and ending their support for terrorism that the Iranians have a clear path to ending their international isolation and taking their rightful place in the community of nations.

Unfortunately, as Senator Kyl said, it has now been more than 3 1/2 months since the formal offer of engagement was made by President Obama, and there has been no reply from the Iranians. Meanwhile, Iran's illicit nuclear activities have continued to speed forward, in violation of multiple U.N. Security Council resolutions. Thousands of additional centrifuges are being installed, and more and more fissile material is being stockpiled.

At the same time, Iran's support for terrorist proxies in Iraq, in Lebanon, and in the Palestinian Authority areas has continued. And, of course, over the past month we and the rest of the world have watched with horror as the Iranian regime has engaged in a brutal crackdown against its own people, who have sought no more than basic human rights.

President Obama, together with our international allies, has been very clear that we will not wait indefinitely for the Iranians to respond to our offer of talks, nor will we enter into negotiations--if that is the willingness of the Iranians--that go on without end. Two weeks ago, at the annual G8 summit in Italy, the President joined with other world leaders to make clear to the Iranians that they have until the G20 summit in Pittsburgh, at the end of September, to return to the negotiating table or face the consequences.

The amendment Senators Kyl, Bayh, McCain, and I have put forward would place the full weight of the U.S. Senate behind the time frame that the President and the G8 have articulated. Our amendment expresses our strong hope that Iran seizes this historic opportunity for direct dialogue.

We also make clear that if the Iranians have failed to engage with us diplomatically by the time of that G20 summit 2 months from now, it is our preference that multilateral sanctions be imposed through the United Nations Security Council. However, the Iranian Government--the regime that controls the people of Iran--must also understand that the United States is itself prepared to put in place what Secretary of State Clinton a while ago referred to as crippling sanctions in the event that they in Tehran continue to flaunt the will of the international community.

Specifically, our amendment asks the President to impose sanctions on the Central Bank of Iran and other banks involved in proliferation and terrorist activities, in the event that the Iranians haven't entered into negotiations that are serious by the time of the Pittsburgh

summit or if they haven't suspended enrichment and reprocessing activities within 60 days of that summit.

The Central Bank of Iran is the financial lifeline of that regime. It is an entity that our own Treasury Department says has engaged in deceptive financial practices and facilitated the efforts of other Iranian banks that are involved in bankrolling proliferation and terrorist activities to avoid international sanctions, and that have themselves been sanctioned by the U.N. and our Treasury Department as a result.

I will say this. The idea of imposing sanctions on the Iranian Central Bank is not new. It has already been endorsed by a bipartisan majority in this Chamber. Last year, the Senate Banking Committee, under Chairman Dodd, adopted bipartisan legislation by a vote of 19 to 2 to urge the President to immediately impose sanctions against the Central Bank. Also last year, the House of Representatives passed such legislation that urged immediate sanctions.

More recently, the legislation that Senators Bayh, Kyl, and I introduced this spring--the Iran Refined Petroleum Sanctions Act, S. 908--in addition to the other steps it takes--also expresses the sense of the Senate that the President should impose sanctions against the Central Bank of Iran.

I am very grateful to report that S. 908, the Iran Refined Petroleum Sanctions Act, now has 67 Members of the Senate, a strong bipartisan group of 67, or two-thirds, as cosponsors of that legislation. These cosponsors range all across the ideological spectrum of Members of the Senate, and clearly make the point to Iran and to the rest of the world that whatever other differences we have, we stand together here as a strong majority and beyond the Senate in our concern about the nuclear proliferation and terror-sponsoring activities of the Iranian Government.

You might say, if you are one of the 67 cosponsors of S. 908--which does more than this amendment does but includes it--you have already spoken in favor of this amendment.

This amendment, I want to point out and make clear, in no way ties the President's hand in his diplomacy with Iran. That is not our intent. The amendment is about empowering the President, giving him additional leverage in his diplomacy, by endorsing the same timetable that came out of the G8 summit a short while ago. The effect is this, and I will repeat: The Iranians must appreciate that there will be consequences if they fail to respond to the international community's diplomatic initiatives; in other words, if they continue to speed their nuclear program forward.

I think this amendment will send an unmistakable message to the fanatical regime in Tehran, in support of the G8, in support of President Obama: Either you can engage with the United States and the world community and take steps to suspend your nuclear activities or you can continue on your current course, in which case you will face the crippling sanctions this sense-of-the-Senate resolution calls for.

I thank the Chair, and I yield the floor. (*Congressional Record*)

June 15, 2009

ANDREA MITCHELL: Let's turn to foreign policy, because the streets in Teheran have been filled with protesters. We've seen this extraordinary election, and people seem to feel, for one thing, that there was a bait-and-switch, that they were promised an open election and then the votes were counted within two hours.

At the same time, both sides now are claiming that there is something wrong. The White House and the State Department now saying that in fact it looks as though there are real problems with these election results.

As a result, what should the U.S. do? Should the U.S. and should President Obama back off on his promise for diplomacy?

SEN. JOSEPH LIEBERMAN: Well, first I'd say the evidence is mounting, and I'm -- I'm very glad that the White House and the State Department have -- have begun to acknowledge this today, that the election in Iran was a fraud, and a lot of facts point to that.

What should we do? I think the first thing we should do is to make clear that America stands with the Iranian people. I mean, this -- this -- these are people who 30 years ago rose up in a revolution for their freedom, and they ended up being dominated and in many ways repressed by a -- by a theocracy. They want a new way and they want to relate to the rest of the world. So we should stand with them.

Incidentally, one of the things I think specifically we should do as a response to what's happened is to increase our federal government support of Radio Farda, which is the Farsi language broadcast, like Radio Free Europe used to be to the Soviet Union -- former Soviet Union -- to tell the Iranian people that we're with them and to give them information that they might not otherwise have.

MITCHELL: Do you have any concerns that the administration might lean over too much to try to be conciliatory in the aftermath of all of this? Clearly, this is a very complicated result for an administration -- a new president who has promised diplomacy with no preconditions.

LIEBERMAN: Yes.

MITCHELL: What the vice president said on Meet the Press this weekend, he said, "Look, talks with Iran are not a reward for good behavior. They're only a consequence if the president makes the judgment it's in the best interest of the United States of America, our national security interests, to talk with the Iranian regime." And he then went on to say that they have clearly made that decision, with or without these election results.

Should they change their policy now?

LIEBERMAN: Yes. No, I think Vice President -- Vice President Biden had it exactly right with that last couple of clauses. The only reason to go forward with the president's intention to engage with the Iranians is if he continues to believe that it is in the national security interests of the United States.

But I -- -- and incidentally, we have a lot of...

MITCHELL: But would you have a problem with that if they decide that it is in their interests? It seems to be every signal that they do want to continue engaging with Iran.

LIEBERMAN: Yes, I -- wouldn't have a problem, but I -- would say what I have said about it. It's got to be done on a timeline. The Iranians can't feel that this can go on forever. We've got to test them and see whether they're sincere about the possibility of ending their nuclear weapons program which they've given no indication of. And if not, we have to slap them with economic and diplomatic sanctions.

I'll tell you one thing that the -- the fraudulent election in Iran does. It -- it raises the bar to what the Iranians would have to do in any negotiated agreement for us to trust it, because a -- a country, a regime that lies to its own people about the results of an election really can't be automatically trusted by any other nation in the world.

And if there was ever a -- if we ever get to a point where we have the potential for an agreement with the Iranians, this is -- this is the classic verify. It's got to be tightly verified.

I'm pessimistic about it, but if the president determines it's in the national security interests of the United States to talk to Iran about getting rid of its nuclear weapons program, he should do it, do it with eyes open, and do it on a timeline that doesn't let them delay while they can simply continue to get closer to having a nuclear weapon that would destabilize the Middle East and the whole world.

MITCHELL: Finally, Senator, Bibi Netanyahu's announcement yesterday, his speech on the Middle East, did not go far enough for many in this administration. They believe it is a first step, they've said, but according to Robert Gibbs on Air Force One just now, it's a first step in a number of steps that have to be taken, and there has been certainly a lot of criticism that his category -- his statement about a Palestinian state and two-state solution were too categorical, were too qualified.

Does he need to come farther?

LIEBERMAN: I -- I thought that Prime Minister Netanyahu's speech was a thoughtful speech. Remember, he is the duly elected, democratically elected leader of a very close ally of ours, of the United States. I thought it was very historically significant for him, that Prime Minister Netanyahu essentially acknowledged the -- the potential of the two-state solution and of Palestinian statehood.

And I think we should go forward from there. But I -- I must say that -- that -- that the big threat in the Middle East today is Iran. In fact, it is Iran's support of Hamas that is the

ultimate, the real obstacle to a peace between the Israelis and the Palestinians -- nothing else between them. (*MSNBC Interview with Andrea Mitchell*)

March 3 2009

Madam President, Secretary of State Hillary Clinton is in the Middle East this week on her first trip to the region as America's top diplomat. The Secretary traveled to Egypt earlier in the week to attend the international summit in Sharm El Sheikh, and she is now visiting Israel and the Palestinian Authority.

I rise to praise Secretary Clinton for the strong and principled diplomacy she has undertaken on America's behalf on this trip, that is as reflected in her comments, both prior to her departure from Washington and since arriving in the region.

Secretary Clinton is no stranger to the Middle East, having spent significant time there as First Lady and then as our colleague in the Senate. As a result, she brings a depth of familiarity with the Middle East's complexities and challenges, an appreciation for our friends and allies in the region, and a clear-eyed understanding of the interests and values that must guide American foreign policy there.

In particular, I believe Secretary Clinton deserves praise for her strong statements on this visit strengthening the forces of moderation in the Middle East and challenging the forces of extremism. Having recently returned from the region myself, I am convinced, with a clarity greater than ever before, that the true dividing line in the Middle East today is not between Arabs and Israelis or between Sunni Muslims and Shia Muslims. The true dividing line in the Middle East today is between moderates and extremists. In every case, it is important to note, the extremist camp is sponsored and supported, often trained and equipped, by the Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran in Tehran.

Secretary Clinton deserves praise for her promise to vigorously promote peace between Israelis and Palestinians, as well as her recognition that success in this crucial effort is inseparably linked with strengthening the moderate forces among the Palestinians, in particular, the Secretary was absolutely correct to make clear that aid to the Palestinians should be directed toward bolstering the leaders of the Palestinian Authority, President Abbas and Prime Minister Fayyad, rather than directly or indirectly rewarding or supporting the extremist terrorist leaders of Hamas.

I am also pleased Secretary Clinton has made clear that any reconciliation between Hamas and Fatah must be contingent on Hamas accepting the conditions of the so-called Quartet; namely, that Hamas must renounce violence, recognize Israel's right to exist, and honor the agreements made by previous Palestinian Governments. There should be no compromise or confusion on this point by anyone. If the leaders of Hamas refuse to accept these conditions, they are dooming themselves to further isolation from the international community, and they are standing in the way of the aid that the world wants to provide the Palestinian people who live in Gaza.

Secretary Clinton, I believe, also deserves commendation for her realistic and hardheaded comments about the danger posed by the Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran. Our friends in the Middle East want to know that the U.S. Government understands this threat, that we are committed to taking the tough actions necessary to address it, and that whatever strategy we adopt, we will do so in real and close partnership with them.

What our friends and allies in the Middle East are asking of us is reasonable and very much in America's national security interest.

I will say that based on my recent visits to Saudi Arabia, Egypt, Israel, and the Palestinian Authority, I can attest that there is great anxiety in the region about Iran and its intentions, its aggressiveness, its extremism, its expansionism. But there is also some uncertainty about the direction of American policy toward the Government in Tehran.

The hard truth is that Iranians are determined to acquire nuclear weapons. Everything we know about what they are up to tells us that and, therefore, we must be even more determined than they if we are to stop them from obtaining nuclear weapons.

Our friends and allies in the Middle East are looking to the United States now for leadership and strength. President Obama and Secretary Clinton have been very clear that they are committed to preventing Iran from going nuclear on their watch. We in Congress have a responsibility in turn to work together with the administration to achieve this result, which is so critical to our national security and to the world's security in the years ahead.

Again, I thank Secretary Clinton for her leadership, for her words, for her outreach, for her representation of America's best interests on this, her first trip to the Middle East.
(Congressional Record)

Rep. Dan Lipinski (D-IL)

December 15, 2009

Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 2194, the Iran Refined Petroleum Sanctions Act. I am proud to be a cosponsor of this important bill, and urge my colleagues in the House, as well as the Senate, to enact this legislation into law without delay.

Iran has for decades presented a serious threat to the security of the United States, our allies, the region, and the international community. Its support for terrorism and other belligerent activities has been a particular challenge to the security of Israel and the entire Middle East. Iran's more recent efforts to develop nuclear weapons elevate these security threats, and must be resisted by all the diplomatic and security institutions of the United States. Furthermore, the reports this week that Iran is pursuing technology specific to nuclear weapons should remove any doubts about Iran's intentions with regard to uranium enrichment, and make clear to me that we must contain this threat immediately.

The Iran Refined Petroleum Sanctions Act will provide the United States with a new lever against the Iranian regime in order to deter its dangerous behavior. Specifically, this bill would allow the President to impose sanctions on any business or individual that makes an investment that contributes to Iran's ability to develop its petroleum resources or to import petroleum goods. Iran relies on its oil exports to derive income, and must also import 30-40 percent of its gasoline to meet its needs. Sanctions on petroleum development and the fuel needs of Iran will further cripple its economic development--focused primarily on the elite class that is closest to the regime, and help to increase the costs of its threatening activities. These far-reaching sanctions, capturing all those who provide a range of associated support to Iran's petroleum needs, will send an important message to the regime that its nuclear weapons ambitions are unacceptable, and that they will be met with serious consequences.

It is very important that Congress pass this bill quickly in order to provide the President the necessary options and legal remedies to deter Iran. There is a point of no-return with nuclear weapons development, and we must engage all available options to prevent Iran from developing those capabilities. Furthermore, as we have learned with Iran's support for terrorist groups like Hezbollah, should Iran acquire nuclear weapon capabilities, it is all too likely that they will share their weapons and knowledge with any number of dangerous actors. Nuclear weapons proliferation, particularly to non-state actors and those who pose the greatest threats to the security of America, Israel, and other allies, must be stopped at all costs.

At the same time, it is vital that we seek the support of the international community to pressure Iran to stop its nuclear weapons pursuit. We must work with our allies in Europe, as well as with China, Russia, and others to address the threat that a nuclear-armed Iran presents to the world. But international efforts should not be an alternative to the United States pursuing the strongest sanctions options possible against Iran.

It will be very important in the upcoming year that we continue to proceed with both U.S. sanctions, and also international diplomatic efforts and sanctions to prevent Iran from proceeding with its dangerous and insular nuclear weapons ambitions. Iran must not be allowed to become a nuclear weapons state, and we must pursue all available options to prevent that from occurring. It is essential to that goal that we pass the Iran Refined Petroleum Sanctions Act. (*Congressional Record*)

Rep. Nita Lowey (D-NY)

December 15, 2009

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the bill's expansion of economic sanctions against Iran and businesses and the refined petroleum and energy sectors collaborating with the regime.

I strongly support this bill's expansion of economic sanctions against Iran and businesses in the refined petroleum and sectors collaborating with the regime.

Iran's relentless pursuit of nuclear weapons technology and defiance of international law are a great threat to world stability. This bill sends a critical message: the American people and this

Congress have little patience for Iran's foot-dragging, and there will be serious consequences for the Iranian government if its nuclear efforts are not halted.

The 2010 foreign aid bill includes a measure to curtail Ex-Im's cooperation with foreign companies that significantly contribute to Iran's refined petroleum industry.

And passage of H.R. 2194 will lay the groundwork for even tougher sanctions on Iran.

I thank the Gentleman from California for his efforts, and I urge my colleagues to vote in support of this bill. (*Congressional Record*)

Rep. Daniel Lungren (R-CA)

June 4, 2009

Mr. Speaker, I listened with interest to the President as he spoke in Egypt today. There are a lot of things to talk about, but in 1 minute you can't talk about most of them.

Let me just make one comment. It was interesting that the President made a very pointed statement that the country of Iran deserves to have the opportunity to use nuclear power in a peaceful way. I find it very interesting that the President thought that that was a part of energy that he ought to emphasize overseas.

My question is this: When will the President, when will his administration, when will this House understand that energy produced from nuclear power is appropriate not only for Iran and other countries around the world, but for the 50 States in the Union? When will the President understand that nuclear energy is a source that we ought to look at? And as the President gives us his various plans under the climate change rhetoric, why does he not realize the importance of nuclear energy for his own people? (*Congressional Record*)

Rep. Connie Mack (R-FL)

December 15, 2009

Madam Speaker, today I rise in strong support of the Iran Refined Petroleum Sanctions Act of 2009 (H.R. 2194). I would like to thank Chairman *Berman* and Ranking Member *Ros-Lehtinen* for their leadership and work to bring this legislation to the floor. I would especially like to thank them for working with me to ensure that language related to Venezuela and Iran was included.

Madam Speaker, Iran is not wasting any time in its pursuit of nuclear weapons, and this body must also not waste any time in making sure that this bill becomes law.

Today in the Western Hemisphere, Iran and its proxies, such as Hezbollah, are working hard to promote acts of terrorism.

Iran is also working diligently across the Western Hemisphere to acquire uranium. This would, of course, not be possible without the help of Venezuelan leader Hugo Chavez.

Madam Speaker, my subcommittee held a hearing in which we addressed Iran's rising influence in the Western Hemisphere. All experts point to Venezuela when it comes to Iran's threat in our region.

Hugo Chavez has not only facilitated Iran's influence, but is a co-conspirator with Iranian leader Mahmoud Ahmadinejad in both evading sanctions and procuring nuclear technology.

This bill targets Iran. And we should target Iran. But we must also be mindful of who is helping Iran avoid sanctions and who is helping Iran achieve its ultimate goals.

This bill rightfully adds the sale of gasoline to the list of sanctions for Iran. It should come as no surprise to this body that just a few months ago, Chavez and Ahmadinejad signed a deal that allows Venezuela to sell 20,000 barrels of gasoline each day to Iran.

Chavez's actions clearly undermine our efforts and bolster Ahmadinejad's ability to acquire a nuclear weapon. We in Congress must not stand for it. We must stem Ahmadinejad's growing influence in Latin America, and we can start by passing this important legislation.

I urge my colleagues to support the Iran Refined Petroleum Sanctions Act. (*Congressional Record*)

Rep. Carolyn Maloney (D-NY)

June 19, 2009

Mr. Speaker, today I stand with my colleagues in this Congress, I stand with President Obama and Vice President Biden, in support of the Iranian people, their right to express themselves, their right to have peaceful demonstrations, and I stand in support of this resolution.

I hope that the ayatollahs understand that these demonstrations are about the future of Iran and the right of their people to have a voice in their government. Young and old, liberal or conservative, all ages, all economic groups are part of these demonstrations.

As President Obama has said, the entire world is watching, and the world is inspired. We applaud your efforts to move your country toward a more democratic, peaceful country. (*Congressional Record*)

June 18, 2009

Mr. Speaker, I would like to echo what President Obama said the other day. Something is happening in Iran, and it is something remarkable and inspiring.

Thanks to Iranian citizen journalists and technological innovations and communications, the entire world has seen the pictures from Iran of those who are giving their lives in the cause of freedom and democracy. The pictures show hundreds of thousands of people, men in green, women in chadors, young and old, rich and poor, taking to the streets in unity in peaceful protest. They have used the universal human right to peacefully assemble and to seek redress of grievances in the full knowledge it may cost them their lives.

They go out today in mourning for the scores of victims of shameful acts of repression. Their determination and bravery have the whole world watching, waiting and inspired, and hoping that Iranian authorities, with the support of the ayatollahs, will do the right thing.
(*Congressional Record*)

June 16, 2009

Mr. Speaker, I rise to join with President Obama, with Vice President Biden and with all of those around the world who have been expressing their most profound concern about the events in Iran and, in particular, about the violence being used against those people who have been peacefully dissenting in the streets of Iran.

There are news reports that at least seven have been killed. Others have been beaten and have been badly injured. Both the protests and the violent suppression have been spreading. It has been reported that there are instances of live fire being used by police in the cities. The Iranian authorities have now indicated that they will do a limited recount of the election results. I hope they are sincere and earnest in this offer.

As President Obama has said to those who have used their right to dissent: The world is watching and the world is inspired. (*Congressional Record*)

Sen. John McCain (R-AZ)

November 4, 2009

Mr. President, today we mark a painful anniversary for our country--the day, 30 years ago, when America's Embassy in Iran was violently seized and an institution of diplomacy became a prison for dozens of peaceful servants of this Nation. For 444 days, the United States and the world watched and feared for the safety of our citizens. Eight brave Americans lost their lives trying to rescue our diplomats. And after so many days of dread, anguish, and heartbreak, we all felt a great weight lifted when our fellow citizens were returned home safely to their friends and families.

Today we express our deepest gratitude to those Americans taken hostage in Iran 30 years ago and to those who died to save them. They all gave more for our country than should be asked of any public servant, and we thank them for it.

Today, however, we are also mindful that the pain and suffering that began on November 4, 1979, did not end after only 444 days. For the people of Iran, that hardship continued for 30 more years, and it continues to this day.

Iran is a great nation, and the Iranian people are the stewards of a proud and accomplished civilization.

Throughout their nation's history, Iranians have made spectacular contributions to the arts and sciences, to literature and learning. These achievements have not only benefited Iran, they have added to the development and enrichment of all mankind. So it is with profound sadness that we think today of all the potential of the Iranian people that has been suppressed and squandered over the past 30 years by the rulers in Tehran.

I know that the Iranian Government is singing the praises of their revolution today. But Iranians are not fools. They know what the real legacy of the past 30 years is. Iranians know that the government in Tehran has ruined their nation's economy and kept them isolated from the promise of trading and engaging with the world.

Iranians are right to ask how much better off they would be if all of the money--the billions and billions of dollars--that Iran's rulers have spent sponsoring terrorist groups, tyrannizing their people, and building weapons to threaten the world were instead devoted to creating jobs, educating young people, and caring for the sick.

Iranians are right to wonder why a country so blessed with natural resources cannot meet the basic needs of so many of its own citizens. And yet corrupt members of the ruling elite are stuffing the wealth of their nation into their own pockets.

The rulers in Iran seized power 30 years ago, promising justice and better lives for all. But now they throw innocent Iranians in prison without proper trials. They mistreat and torture Iranians in jail. They beat and murder Iranians in the streets for trying to speak freely and exercise their basic human rights.

The world watched in horror as Iran's rulers inflicted all of this abuse and more upon peaceful Iranian protesters after the flawed elections last June. But the world also watched in awe as courageous Iranians risked everything for freedom and justice.

We Americans reflect with sympathy on Iran's continuing struggle for human dignity and human rights. Our country seeks a relationship of peace and prosperity with Iran, and it is incredibly unfortunate that the Iranian Government seems determined to keep the relationship between our two countries mired in the past by funding and arming violent groups that threaten our citizens and our allies, by building a nuclear weapons program in violation of Iran's own agreements and multiple U.N. Security Council resolutions, and by spurning repeated American efforts to reach out respectfully to resolve our differences in peace. The

United States of America has no eternal enemies. We can overcome even the most painful parts of our own history, as we are doing now with countries such as Vietnam.

So today, on this solemn anniversary of the hostage crisis in Iran, we honor our fellow Americans whose lives were forever altered by that tragic day. But we also look forward to a new day, a better day when the long nightmare of the Iranian people is over and when our two nations share a relationship of mutual security, mutual respect, and mutual advantage.
(*Congressional Record*)

July 23, 2009

Mr. President, I rise in support of the Lieberman amendment expressing the sense of the Senate that the U.S. Government should continue developing and planning for the proposed deployments of elements of a ground-based midcourse defense system. I thank the Senator from Connecticut for this amendment and his willingness to work with all parties, which will then allow us to voice vote this very important amendment.

Obviously, there are a lot of strong feelings on the issue of missile defense in Europe. I believe this amendment addresses and expresses our concerns and our goals, including a midcourse radar in the Czech Republic and ground-based interceptors in Poland, as well as the reservation of funds for the development and deployment of missile defense systems in Europe.

As rogue nations, including North Korea and Iran, push the nuclear envelope and work tirelessly to develop delivery vehicles capable of reaching America and its allies, we must aggressively develop the systems necessary to counter such belligerent efforts. Enhancing missile defense capabilities in Europe is an essential component to addressing rogue state and in-theater threats we face and expect to face in the future.

As Iran works to develop ballistic missile capabilities of all ranges, the United States must reaffirm its commitments to its allies and develop and deploy effective missile defense systems. The Iranian ballistic missile threat is real and growing. During the NATO summit in Bucharest in April of 2008, the allies cited the threat of ballistic missile proliferation as one of great concern to their forces, territory, and populations. Missile defense in Europe, according to NATO “forms part of a broader response to counter this threat [a] substantial contribution to the protection of Allies from long-range ballistic missiles to be provided by the planned deployment of European-based United States missile defense assets.”

Uncertainty about the future of missile defense in Europe, some stemming from perceptions, whether wanted or not, that Russia will have a say or veto power over the disposition of our missile defense architecture, has caused concerns both here in the Senate and among some of our closest European allies. I urge the administration to provide some clarity on how it plans to honor the commitments the United States has made to Poland and the Czech Republic.

The last administration recognized the importance and need for a European component to our missile defense system, reached out to the Governments of Poland and the Czech Republic,

and asked that they make what many at the time perceived as an unpopular agreement. Despite unwanted threats from Russia, both governments recognized the importance such a capability would provide to their citizens and to Europe as a whole and agreed to allow the United States to place ground-based interceptors in Poland and a midcourse radar site in the Czech Republic.

Given the perception, one that has been strengthened by the testimony of administration officials before the Armed Services Committee, that the United States is preparing to back away from its commitments to our Polish and Czech allies, this amendment comes at an important moment. It was only a year ago, after all, that the United States and the Czech Republic affirmed that:

Within the context of, and consistent with, both the North Atlantic Treaty and the Czech Republic..... the United States is committed to the security of the Czech Republic. [And that] the Czech Republic and the United States will work together to counter emerging military or non-military threats posed by third parties or to minimize the effects of such threats.

Similarly, on August 20, 2008, the United States signed an agreement with Poland stating that the:

United States is committed to the security of Poland and of any U.S. facilities located on the territory of the Republic of Poland.The United States and Poland intend to expand air and missile defense cooperation. In this regard, we have agreed on an important new area of such cooperation involving the deployment of a U.S. Army Patriot air and missile defense battery in Poland.

Our Polish friends are clearly uneasy and have been quite vocal. During a forum earlier this year in Brussels, Polish Foreign Minister Radoslaw Sikorski said:

We hope we don't regret our trust in the United States.

I urge the administration and my colleagues in the Senate to join me in reiterating our commitment to the security and freedom of these nations as well as deterring and defending them against any threats to their security.

With respect to Russia and the ongoing START negotiations, I urge the President to continue to reject any Russian attempt to link reductions in offensive strategic nuclear weapons with defensive capabilities such as missile defense. Russia, too, must recognize that the current Iranian path is unsettling to the global interests of all peace-seeking nations. Missile defense in Europe is not and should not be viewed in Moscow as some new form of post-Cold War aggression. It is, rather, a reasonable and prudent response to the very real threats the Iranian regime continues to pose to the United States, Europe, and the world.

Again, I thank my good friend from Connecticut for offering this amendment, and I urge my colleagues to support its adoption.

Mr. President, I yield the floor. (*Congressional Record*)

July 21, 2009

Mr. President, before my colleague Senator Lieberman leaves the floor, I wish to thank him for this amendment. We are working right now to see if we can get the amendment pending and possibly a voice vote, because it is clear it is a very important amendment and one where I think we need to express very strongly the sense of the Senate, given the situation as it exists in Iran.

I wish to thank Senator Lieberman, and right now it is my understanding that your side is checking to see if it is an agreeable amendment. Hopefully, we will get that decision and move forward with it right away on a voice vote, if that is agreeable to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. McCain. Mr. President, the amendment is straightforward and expresses the sense of the Senate that there should be a date certain--and soon--by which Iran is required to end its nuclear program or face severe sanctions. The amendment expresses that if the Iranian regime has not accepted the offer of the United States of direct diplomatic talks by the time of the G20 summit in late September or if it has not suspended all of its nuclear enrichment and reprocessing activities within 60 days after the summit, and if the U.N. Security Council does not adopt new and significant and meaningful sanctions on the regime, the President should sanction the Central Bank of Iran.

The situation with respect to Iran is nearing the crisis point, if it is not there already. We have all watched the brutal crackdown in the streets of Tehran and elsewhere as the Iranian regime imposed the results of a fraudulent election. We have been astonished by the courage and resolve of those Iranian citizens who have protested for their own inalienable rights in the face of repression. And we have known that, while these dramatic events have played themselves out, the Iranian regime has continued its enrichment of uranium, growing ever closer to the day on which it has a nuclear weapons capability.

The Iranian regime has gotten away with too much for too long. Its illicit nuclear activities, combined with its development of unconventional weapons and ballistic missiles, support for Hezbollah and other terrorist groups, and its repeated threats against Israel and the United States, represent a real and growing threat to the security of the United States and the Middle East. It is in the interest of the United States, and the world's other great powers, to achieve an end to the Iranian nuclear program.

The administration has held out an "open hand," making clear that it intends to open direct talks with Iran. Yet 3 1/2 months since the President's formal offer, the Iranian government has made no response, nor has it suspended its enrichment activities, as required by U.N. Security Council resolutions. Time is not on the side of those pushing the Iranians to cease these dangerous actions. Administration officials and others, including the French President, have stated that they will not wait interminably while the Iranian nuclear program proceeds.

At the G-8 summit 2 weeks ago, the assembled leaders agreed that the Iranians do not have forever, and that they should return to the negotiating table by the time of the G-20 summit in September. This amendment puts the Senate on record behind that timeframe, irrespective of any Senator's individual view about the likelihood of agreement soon.

Make no mistake: we must not wait interminably. According to the IAEA's latest report, Iran has increased its stockpile of low enriched uranium by some 60 percent in the previous 6 months, and has brought the number of active centrifuges above 7,000. The IAEA also reported that Iran denied inspectors access to the Arak heavy water reactor. As the threats--including to the State of Israel--continue.

As the Secretary of State has recently articulated, should Iran continue to defy the international community, it must face severe sanctions. Should the regime not take up the historic offer extended to it, this resolution advocates sanctions on the Iranian Central Bank, the country's major connection to the international financial system. The U.S. Treasury Department has stated that the central bank has engaged in deceptive financial practices and facilitated the movement of funds to those involved in proliferation and terrorist activities. This must end, and in fact 67 Senators have cosponsored legislation--the Iran Refined Petroleum Sanctions Act--that urges the President to sanction the central bank.

By adopting this resolution, we will send an unmistakable message to the government of Iran that its actions are unacceptable and will result in real and severe consequences if continued. The administration has offered to talk; the ball is in the Iranian court, and if that regime continues down its destructive path, we have no choice but to impose crippling sanctions for its continued defiance.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Let me point out again, this amendment is a sense-of-the-Senate amendment, an important sense of the Senate but certainly one that allows the administration the latitude it needs in its handling of its relations with Iran.

I yield the floor. (*Congressional Record*)

June 22, 2009

Mr. President, there is a news report from the Associated Press entitled "Iranian Police Use Force To Break Up Protest." The article reads as follows:

Tehran, Iran--Riot police attacked hundreds of demonstrators with tear gas and fired live bullets in the air to disperse a rally in central Tehran Monday, carrying out a threat by the country's most powerful security force to crush any further opposition protests over the disputed presidential election.... Witnesses said helicopters hovered overhead as about 200 protesters gathered at Haft-e-Tir Square. But hundreds of anti-riot police quickly put an end to the demonstration and prevented any gathering, even small

groups, at the scene.... Iran says at least 17 protesters have been killed in a week of unrest so far after the electoral council declared hard-line President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad winner of the June 12 election.

Severe restrictions on reporters have made it almost impossible to independently verify any reports on demonstrations, clashes, and casualties. Iran has ordered reporters for foreign news agencies to stay in their offices, barring them from any reporting on the streets.”

The story goes on. Demonstrations followed by repression, followed by murder in the streets. As these things seem to evolve, an event took place yesterday which may be the defining moment in the struggle of the Iranian people to be able to peacefully disagree with their government, in this case, because of a corrupt and fraudulent election, without being killed in the streets and beaten and imprisoned.

It has to do with a woman named Neda. I quote from an ABC news story dated June 22, 2009.

She sinks to the ground--and a few minutes later she is dead. A video that has been repeatedly posted on the Internet purports to show the last moments of Neda, a young Iranian woman shot in the heart by government sharpshooters. Overnight she has become a symbol of the opposition.

[Her] shaky blurred images: A young woman collapses onto the pavement, a dark pool of blood spreads beneath her body. Two men kneel next to the woman and press on her chest, screaming. The camera phone which is filming her zooms in on her face. Her pupils roll to the side. Blood streams out of her nose and mouth.

”Neda, don’t be afraid! Neda, stay with me. Neda, stay with me!” [cries one man.]

Another man beseeches someone to take her in a car. Then the footage stops.

The video footage appeared on the social networking sites Facebook and Twitter on Saturday evening. It immediately became a viral sensation, being forwarded repeatedly. User groups were determined to get around YouTube’s attempts to block the immensely graphic film. They posted the clip so often it became impossible for YouTube to remove it.

So we have seen, as we have in cases of other brutal repressions throughout history, a living example or the dying example of martyrdom. By Sunday morning, Neda became the fifth most common topic on Twitter. She had already become a kind of Joan of Arc.

“It took only one bullet to kill Neda, it will take only one Neda to stop Iranian tyranny” was one posting from Tehran on Twitter.

Neda died with open eyes. Shame on us who live with closed eyes.

”They killed Neda, but not her voice” was another.

During the day, thousands of people replaced their profile pictures with tributes to the young woman such as “I am Neda,” or “Neda forever.” Others posted images of a broken heart in green, the color of the opposition movement.

So a debate has been going on as to how much the United States of America, its President, the Congress, and the American people should speak out in favor and in support of these brave Iranians--the average age in Tehran is 33 years of age--and their quests for the fundamentals of freedom and democracy that we have enjoyed for more than a couple of centuries.

Today, I and all America, pay tribute to a brave young woman who was trying to exercise her fundamental human rights and was killed in the streets of Tehran. All Americans are with her, our thoughts and our prayers for her, her family, and her countrymen.

I ask unanimous consent to have two news articles that I quoted printed in the *Record*.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the *Record*, as follows:

[From abcnews.go.com June 22, 2009]

Neda, Is She Iran's Joan of Arc?

NEDA HAS BECOME A SYMBOL AND MARTYR FOR THE IRANIAN OPPOSITION

(By Ulrike Putz)

Beirut.--She sinks to the ground--and a few minutes later she is dead. A video that has been repeatedly posted on the Internet purports to show the last moments of Neda, a young Iranian woman shot in the heart by government sharpshooters. Overnight she has become a symbol of the opposition. They are shaky, blurred images: A young woman collapses onto the pavement, a dark pool of blood spreads beneath her body. Two men kneel next to the woman and press on her chest, screaming. The camera phone which is filming her zooms in on her face. Her pupils roll to the side, blood streams out of her nose and mouth. “Neda, don't be afraid! Neda, stay with me. Neda, stay with me!” cries one man. Another man beseeches someone to take her in a car. Then the footage stops.

It cannot be confirmed if the 40-second film, which was posted on the Internet on Saturday, really shows the death of a young Iranian demonstrator. Like almost all the video and photo material coming out of Iran these days, it is impossible to verify its authenticity. However, even if it may never be certain if these images really show the death of a young woman named Neda, she has still become an icon, a martyr for the opposition in Iran. Neda has given the regime's brutality a bloody face and a name. Overnight “I am Neda,” has become the slogan of the protest movement.

The video footage appeared on the social networking sites Facebook and Twitter on Saturday evening. It immediately became a viral sensation, being forwarded repeatedly. User groups were determined to get around YouTube's attempts to block the immensely graphic film. They posted the clip so often that it became impossible for YouTube to remove it. The first postings were furnished with a commentary. A supposed eyewitness described what was happening. He gave details, presumably in order to underscore the clip's veracity. The

incident occurred on the Karekar Avenue, at the corner of Khoravi Street and Salehi Street in Tehran at 7:05 p.m. local time, he reported.

COULD NEDA CHANGE THE COURSE OF IRAN'S HISTORY?

A young woman, watching the protests together with her father, the commentary said, was shot in the heart by a sharpshooter with the Basij, the government militia. "I am a doctor, so I rushed to try to save her," the man says. "But the impact of the gunshot was so fierce that the bullet blasted inside the victim's chest and she died in less than two minutes." "The film is shot by my friend who was standing beside me," he continues. "Please let the world know." Persian-speaking Internet users quickly supplied a translation. The screams, "Stay with me, Neda!" are said to have come from the young woman's father. By Sunday morning "Neda" was the fifth most commented topic on Twitter. She had already become a kind of Joan of Arc. "It took only one bullet to kill Neda. It will take only one Neda to stop Iranian tyranny," was one posting from Tehran on Twitter.

"Neda died with open eyes. Shame on us who live with closed eyes," was one entry. "They killed Neda, but not her voice," was another. During the day thousands of people replaced their profile pictures with tributes to the young woman, such as "I am Neda" or "Neda forever." Others posted images of a broken heart in green, the color of the opposition movement. Many blogs, including that of the New York Times, are now speculating if the footage could change the course of history. There are parallels being drawn to the images that became iconic during the Islamic Revolution. The film could become as much as a symbol as those now historic images from 1979 which showed the Shah's troops shooting on unarmed demonstrators.

Iranian Police Use Force To Break up Protest

(By Nasser Karimi and Jim Heintz)

TEHRAN.--Riot police attacked hundreds of demonstrators with tear gas and fired live bullets in the air to disperse a rally in central Tehran Monday, carrying out a threat by the country's most powerful security force to crush any further opposition protests over the disputed presidential election.

Britain, accused by Iran of fomenting post-election unrest, said it was evacuating the families of diplomats and other officials based in Iran--the first country to do so as Iran's worst internal conflict since the 1979 Islamic Revolution escalated.

Witnesses said helicopters hovered overhead as about 200 protesters gathered at Haft-e-Tir Square. But hundreds of anti-riot police quickly put an end to the demonstration and prevented any gathering, even small groups, at the scene.

At the subway station at Haft-e-Tir, the witnesses said police did not allow anyone to stand still, asking them to keep on walking and separating people who were walked together. The witnesses asked not to be identified for fear of government reprisals.

Just before the clashes, an Iranian woman who lives in Tehran said there was a heavy police and security presence in another square in central Tehran. She asked not to be identified because she was worried about government reprisals.

“There is a massive, massive, massive police presence,” she told The Associated Press in Cairo by telephone. “Their presence was really intimidating.”

Iran says at least 17 protesters have been killed in a week of unrest so far after the electoral council declared hard-line President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad winner of the June 12 election. His main challenger, Mir Hossein Mousavi, charged the election was a fraud and insists he is the true winner. His followers have been staging near-daily rallies, at least one of them drawing a massive crowds of hundreds of thousands.

Severe restrictions on reporters have made it almost impossible to independently verify any reports on demonstrations, clashes and casualties. Iran has ordered reporters for foreign news agencies to stay in their offices, barring them from any reporting on the streets.

The country’s highest electoral authority, the Guardian Council, acknowledged on Monday that there were voting irregularities in 50 electoral districts, the most serious official admission so far of problems in the election. But the council insisted the problems do not affect the outcome of the vote.

Earlier Monday, the elite Revolutionary Guard issued its sternest warning so far in the post-election crisis. It warned protesters to “be prepared for a resolution and revolutionary confrontation with the Guards, Basij and other security forces and disciplinary forces” if they continue their near-daily rallies.

The Basij, a plainclothes militia under the command of the Revolutionary Guard, have been used to quell street protests that erupted after the election result was announced.

The Guard statement ordered demonstrators to “end the sabotage and rioting activities” and said their resistance is a “conspiracy” against Iran. On Sunday, acting joint chief of the armed forces Gen. Gholam Ali Rashid issued a thinly veiled warning to Mousavi, saying “we are determined to confront plots by enemies aimed at creating a rift in the nation.

Mousavi vowed Sunday night to keep up the protests, in defiance of Supreme Leader Ayatollah Ali Khamenei, who holds ultimate power in Iran. In a sermon to tens of thousands on Friday, Khamenei said demonstrators must stop their street protests or face the consequences and he firmly backed Ahmadinejad’s victory.

“The country belongs to you,” Mousavi’s latest statement said. “Protesting lies and fraud is your right.”

Mousavi’s Web site called Monday for supporters to turn on their car lights in the late afternoon as a sign of protest.

Mousavi's latest statements posted on his Web site also warned supporters of danger ahead, and said he would stand by the protesters "at all times." But he said he would "never allow anybody's life to be endangered because of my actions" and called for pursuing fraud claims through an independent board.

The former prime minister, a longtime loyalist of the Islamic government, also called the Basij and military "our brothers" and "protectors of our revolution and regime." He may be trying to constrain his followers' demands before they pose a mortal threat to Iran's system of limited democracy constrained by Shiite clerics, who have ultimate authority.

Mousavi ally and former president Mohammad Khatami said in a statement that "protest in a civil manner and avoiding disturbances in the definite right of the people and all must respect that."

Britain's Foreign Office said it was pulling staffers' dependents out because "the families of our staff have been unable to carry out their lives as usual."

In Washington, President Barack Obama said he does not want to become a scapegoat for Iran's leadership as the postelection upheaval continues, but Republicans continued criticizing him for being overly cautious.

The Czech EU presidency summoned the Iranian charge d'affaires to reject claims by Iran that the 27-nation bloc has been interfering in its internal affairs.

Iran state media reported at least 10 people were killed in the fiercest clashes yet on Saturday and 100 were injured.

A graphic video that appears to show a young woman dying within minutes after she was shot during Saturday's demonstrations has become the iconic image seen by millions around the world on video-sharing sites such as YouTube.

Police said Monday that 457 people were arrested on Saturday alone, but did not say how many have been arrested throughout the week of turmoil.

The country's highest electoral authority agreed last week to investigate some opposition complaints of problems in the voting. The Guardian Council said Monday it found irregularities in 50 voting districts, but that this has no effect on election outcome. Council spokesman Abbas Ali Kadkhodaei was quoted on the state TV Web site as saying that its probe showed more votes were cast in these constituencies than there were registered voters.

But this "has no effect on the result of the elections," he said.

Mousavi has demanded that the election result be annulled and a new vote held.

Khatami said "taking complaints to bodies that are required to protect people's rights, but are themselves subject to criticism, is not a solution"--effectively accusing the Council of collusion in vote fraud.

The government has intensified a crackdown on independent media--expelling a BBC correspondent, suspending the Dubai-based network Al-Arabiya and detaining at least two local journalists for U.S. magazines.

English-language state television said an exile group known as the People's Mujahedeen had a hand in the street violence and broadcast what it said were confessions of British-controlled agents.

The exile group, also called the Mujahedeen-e-Khalq, is the military wing of the Paris-based National Council of Resistance of Iran. The council says it is dedicated to a democratic, secular government in Iran, but the military wing has been blacklisted by the United States and the European Union as a terrorist organization.

The Foreign Ministry lashed out at foreign media and Western governments, with ministry spokesman Hasan Qashqavi accusing them of "a racial mentality that Iranians belong to the Third World."

"Meddling by Western powers and international media is unacceptable," he said at a news conference shown on state TV, taking particular aim at French President Nicolas Sarkozy.

"How can a Western president, like the French president, ask for nullification of Iranian election results?" Qashqavi said. "I regret such comments." (*Congressional Record, June 22, 2009*)

June 19, 2009

Mr. President, the resolution I submitted, on behalf of myself, Senator Lieberman and others, is exactly the same as has been introduced by Congressmen Berman and Pence in the House of Representatives. It is the exact same resolution. It expresses support for all Iranian citizens who embrace the values of freedom, human rights, civil liberties, rule of law, and for other purposes.

The resolution expresses its support for all Iranian citizens who embrace the values of freedom, human rights, civil liberties, and the rule of law, and for other purposes. It condemns the ongoing violence against demonstrators by the Government of Iran and pro government militias as well as the ongoing government suppression of independent electronic communication through interference with the Internet and cell phones and affirms the universality of individual rights and the importance of democratic and fair elections.

Basically, what this is is a resolution that has been introduced in both Houses, which affirms America's fundamental respect and commitment to human rights, to people no matter where they reside in the world.

It is unfortunate, in a way, that this resolution is required since the administration does not want to “meddle,” and the President has refused to speak out in support of these brave Iranian citizens, most of them young, who are risking their very lives to protest what was clearly an unfair and corrupt election.

What we are seeing in Iran today is sort of a sequence of events that should worry all of us who have watched this before. The demonstrators, some beaten, some killed, the Ayatollah Ali Khamenei calls together the participants in the election and then says there should be no more demonstrations and strong action will be taken.

That is coupled with ejecting the world’s media from Iran--first restricting it and then forcing them out so as not to record events. Unfortunately for the Iranian mullahs, Twitter has become an incredible means of communication, as well as cameras in cell phones. The word is still coming out as to the degree of oppression that is being practiced by the Iranian Government.

There is a lot I wish to say today about what is going on in Iran; the fact that we, the United States of America, have a long history of speaking out on behalf of people who are oppressed, who are victims of a corrupt election. We stood tall, America did, for the workers in Gdansk, in solidarity with Lech Walesa. We stood tall for the people of Prague during the Prague Spring, and we were not afraid, as Ronald Reagan was not, to go to the Berlin Wall and say “Take down this wall,” and call an evil empire what it was, an evil empire.

One of the ironies of this situation that I wish to address very briefly is that President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad’s political adviser said Thursday that the United States will regret its interference in Iran’s disputed election. In other words, our President says he does not want to go meddle and at the same time, of course, they are accusing us of doing exactly that. He, the adviser, said: I hope in the case of the elections they realize their interference is a mistake and that they don’t repeat this mistake. They will certainly regret this. They will have problems reestablishing relations with Iran.

In the history of this country, since July 4, 1776, we affirmed the fundamental rights of all people throughout the world, and that is the inalienable rights granted by our Creator to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. That commitment to human rights was there then and it is there today. The United States of America must, and this body must, affirm our support for fundamental human rights of the Iranian people who are being beaten and killed in the streets of Tehran and other cities around Iran. We are with them.

It is not an accident that the signs “Where is my vote?” are in English. They are waiting for an expression of support from the Government and the people of the United States of America. I think this resolution is an important way to do so. (*Congressional Record*)

June 3, 2009

Mr. President, today we celebrate the unveiling in the Capitol of a statue of Ronald Reagan, one of our country’s great Presidents and a personal hero to me throughout my political life.

While there are many aspects of President Reagan's legacy we might reflect on today, I would like to take the opportunity to discuss one of them--his dream of a world free of nuclear weapons.

Speaking before the Japanese Diet on November 11, 1983, President Ronald Reagan said:

"The only value in possessing nuclear weapons is to make sure they can't ever be used. I know I speak for people everywhere when I say our dream is to see the day when nuclear weapons will be banished from the face of the earth."

That is my dream, too, and it is one shared by many of our most distinguished national security practitioners. In 2007, former Secretaries of State Henry Kissinger and George Shultz, along with former Secretary of Defense William Perry and Senator Sam Nunn, authored an article entitled "A World Free of Nuclear Weapons," in which they laid out their vision of the globe free of the most dangerous weapons ever known.

This is a distant and difficult goal. We must proceed toward it prudently and pragmatically and with a focused concern for our security and the security of allies that depend on us. But the Cold War ended almost 20 years ago, and the time has come to take further measures to reduce dramatically the number of nuclear weapons in the world's arsenals. In so doing, the United States can--and indeed must--show the kind of leadership the world expects from us, in the tradition of American Presidents who worked to reduce the nuclear threat to mankind.

Our highest priority must be to reduce the danger that nuclear weapons will ever be used. Such weapons, while still important to deter an attack with weapons of mass destruction against us and our allies, represent the most abhorrent and indiscriminate form of warfare known to man. We do, quite literally, possess the means to destroy all mankind. We must seek to do all we can to ensure that nuclear weapons will never again be used. As the administration renews its nuclear weapons posture, it should, I believe, seek to reduce the size of our nuclear arsenal to the lowest number possible, consistent with our security requirements and global commitments. This means a move, as rapidly as possible, to a significantly smaller force. As we take such steps, it will be crucial to continue to deploy a safe and reliable nuclear deterrent, robust missile defenses, and superior conventional forces capable of defending the United States and our allies.

Today, we find ourselves at a nuclear crossroads. As rogue nations, including North Korea and Iran, push the nuclear envelope, the perils of a world awash in nuclear weapons is clear. Yet we should also consider the more hopeful alternative--a world in which there are far fewer such weapons than there are today and in which proliferation, instability, and nuclear terrorism are far less likely.

In achieving this world, Ronald Reagan's dream will be more important than ever before. As Secretaries Kissinger and Shultz wrote with their colleagues in 2008:

Progress must be facilitated by a clear statement of our ultimate goal. Indeed, this is the only way to build the kind of international trust and broad cooperation that will be required to

effectively address today's threats. Without the vision of moving towards zero, we will not find the essential cooperation required to stop our downward spiral.

Make no mistake, we must arrest the downward spiral. North Korea's recent nuclear test is just the latest provocative demonstration of the troubling reality the world faces today. Together with Iran's ongoing commitment to nuclear development, we face real dangers in the proliferation of the world's most terrible weapons. The United States must lead the world not only in reducing the size of existing nuclear arsenals but also in reversing the course of nuclear proliferation. This requires a tough-minded approach to both Iran and North Korea, both of which have gotten away with too much for far too long.

We must also help ensure that other potential nuclear programs do not get off the ground. Last week, former National Security Adviser Brent Scowcroft joined two colleagues in calling on the President to promote the international ban on the spread of fissile materials that can be used in the production of nuclear weapons. I agree and urge the President to do so.

But we must also strengthen enforcement. We must insist that countries that receive the benefits of peaceful nuclear cooperation return or dismantle what they have received if, at any point, they violate or withdraw from the Non-Proliferation Treaty. Leading up to the 2010 Non-Proliferation Treaty Review conference, we should lay the groundwork for building an international consensus to ensure that the International Atomic Energy Agency has the tools to be a meaningful agent for achieving the dream of a nuclear weapon-free world. We should work with allies and partners to interdict the spread of nuclear weapons and materials--including any borne on vessels traveling to and from North Korea--under the Proliferation Security Initiative.

As a nation, we have a number of important decisions in the coming months, including those related to a follow-on to the Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty with Russia, the administration's planned resubmission of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty for ratification, and the need for a robust missile defense shield.

As we move ahead with these and other decisions, let us keep in mind the dream of a nuclear-free world, enunciated so eloquently by our 40th President. As Secretary Shultz has written, this was a dream President Reagan pursued with great patience and depth of conviction. We would be wise to follow his lead.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the *Record* two articles by George Shultz, William Perry, Henry Kissinger, and Sam Nunn, one of January 4, 2007, and the other of January 15, 2008. (*Congressional Record*)

Senate Minority Leader Mitch McConnell (R-KY)

September 25, 2009

The disclosure of the covert Iranian enrichment facility at Qom makes clear that the international community and the United States Senate should, at a minimum, enact the

strictest sanctions on the importation of refined petroleum products by Iran. The Iranian regime must allow inspectors to examine the covert facility, answer all questions of the International Atomic Energy Agency concerning its weapons program and freeze any further enrichment activity. They've relied on denial and deception for years while advancing their nuclear program. But the time for determined action has come and I hope the administration will make clear to the Iranians and our European allies that a nuclear weapon in the hands of Iranian leaders is unacceptable to the United States. (*Press Release*)

Rep. Patrick McHenry (R-NC)

May 21, 2009

“Madam Speaker, I rise today to call attention to the ticking time bomb in Tehran. The IAEA reports that Iran has enriched enough uranium to make a nuclear bomb. Once weaponized, Iran’s nuclear capabilities threaten the existence of Israel and our allies throughout the region.

President Obama’s open hand of soft diplomacy has been met with firmly clenched fists by Iran’s Supreme Leader, Ayatollah Khamenei. With the clock ticking, the President must heed the advice of Defense Secretary Gates and proceed with stricter economic sanctions on Iran.

The administration has threatened to drag its feet on Iran until Israel accepts its terms for a two-state solution. While peace between the Israelis and the Palestinians should be a priority, I urge the President to reconsider using this as a precondition for stopping the Iranian nuclear threat and nuclear weapon.” *(Congressional Record)*

Rep. Tom McClintock (R-CA)

December 15, 2009

Madam Speaker, I rise to applaud the passage today of H.R. 2194, the Iran Refined Petroleum Sanctions Act of 2009.

Iran's regime has consistently lied to the world over its nuclear ambitions. Yesterday's revelation that Iran has been working on nuclear bomb detonators should convince even the most naive officials within our government of Iran's ultimate intention.

I do not believe that petroleum sanctions alone will dissuade the Iranian regime from its obvious intention to acquire nuclear weapons, or from its stated goal of wiping Israel off the map, or from its unremitting hostility toward our own country; but I do believe that it will send a vital message of growing Western resolve at a critical moment in world history.

Iran should interpret the House action today as an overwhelming expression of American commitment that spans the wide spectrum of political views within our Nation.
(Congressional Record)

Thaddeus McCotter (R-MI)

July 30, 2009

Mr. Speaker, recently we have seen the end of Islam’s 40-day period of mourning for the martyrs of freedom that were killed on June 20, Neda Soltan, Taraneh Mousavi.

And what did the regime do in response? They prevented people from attending their grave sites. They removed people who wanted to lay flowers. And in the end, as reported by

msnbc.com, Brigadier General Abdollah Araghi warned against any further gatherings: “We are not joking. We will confront those who will fight against the clerical establishment.”

Yes, Mr. Speaker, they will fight against rape and murder, martyrs such as Neda and Taraneh. But the world will mourn these martyrs, and soon Iran and all the world will rejoice when these murderers are brought to justice and the Iranian people breathe free. (*Congressional Record*,)

July 20, 2009

Madam Speaker, the Iranian people’s peaceful struggle for freedom continues despite the tyrannical regime’s barbarous crackdown. In fact, in his Friday’s sermon, former President Rafsanjani called into question legitimacy of the present government and rebuked the regime for its crackdown on peaceful protesters and its cavalier rejection of the cries that the election was stolen.

Finally, former President Rafsanjani called upon the regime to free and fully account for all those peaceful freedom seekers who have been arrested in the repression. Then, on Sunday, former President Khatami called for a referendum on the legitimacy of the Iranian regime and asked that the results be tallied by an objective independent Iranian body to ensure its accuracy.

This led the current opposition, Presidential candidate Hossein Mousavi, to say, You are facing something new, an awakened nation, a nation that has been born again and is here to defend its achievements. Arrests won’t put an end to this problem. End this game as soon as possible and return to the nation its arrested sons.

While humanity agrees, Supreme Leader Khamenei disagrees. And to leaders who both tacitly and expressly support the freedom seekers in Iran, Khamenei issued this warning. The elite should be watchful since they have been faced with a big test. Failing the test will cause their collapse.

I’d ask Supreme Leader Khamenei to look at this picture. Her name is Taraneh Mousavi. She was arrested near Ghoba Mosque, where she was on her way to attend hairdressing college. After her arrest, she was raped, sodomized and tortured by her captors, taken to a hospital in a coma, and it was there that she died. Upon her death, her body was removed to the outskirts of Karaj Qasim where, to prevent an autopsy, it was burned.

She came from a religious family. Taraneh was only 19 and an only child. Her family has been threatened to keep quiet, and yet the resistance wants her story out. Why? Because here’s the truth denied by Khamenei and his misogynistic, murderous regime. Your referendum has been held and you have failed your test. Taraneh and Nadeh condemn you as the despicable killers of women. You have no legitimacy either in the eyes of the Iranian people or in the eyes of the civilized world. You are doomed by your own hands, and it is but

a matter of time until your regime collapses and the Iranian people breathe free.
(*Congressional Record*,)

June 26, 2009

Mr. Speaker, from the hellish streets where Iranians demand freedom, voices arise to pray for deliverance and liberty; but, elsewhere, safely ensconced in freedom, others argue for appeasement and “neutrality.” We must choose wisely between these competing voices and visions, lest we betray our allegiance to liberty.

Some voices allege America’s support of Iranian democracy demonstrators harms their cause, strengthens the regime, increases the repression, and, once the freedom seekers are slaughtered, precludes “good” relations with the murderous mullahs.

Their siren song is wrong. Despite pronouncements, America has not intervened, the mullahs publicly accuse us of it, their illegitimate puppet Ahmadinejad demands our prostration at the regime’s feet, and all the while, the regime butchers innocents.

On June 24, CNN recorded a call from a terrified Iranian girl, who told of democracy demonstrators being hacked with axes, shot or thrown from bridges. She pleaded: “You should stop this. You should help the people of Iran who demand freedom. You should help us. It’s time to act.” She was pleading to America. She was pleading to us.

Once, another generational chance for freedom was seized, as Soviet dissident and gulag prisoner Natan Sharansky attests, “We developed our own tapping language to communicate with each other between the crawls of our cells. We had to develop new communication methods to pass on this great, impossible news.

“Reagan dared to call of the great Soviet Union an evil empire. That moment made it impossible for anyone in the West to continue closing their eyes to the real nature of the Soviet Union.

“It was one of the most important, freedom-affirming declarations, and we all instantly knew it. For us, that was the moment that really marked the end for them, and the beginning for us. The beginning of a new revolution, a freedom revolution. Reagan’s revolution.”

As for voices clamoring for a “grand bargain” with Iran’s inhumane regime if it clings to power, Sharansky warns: “How a government treats its own people cannot be separated from how that government could be expected to treat other countries.” How did the regime treat the family of Neda Agha-Soltan, the student it shot in the streets? Her state executioners refused to tender Neda’s body to her family; buried her without a funeral; banned all signs of mourning; and forced her family to flee from their Tehran home.

To defeat such a regime, Sharansky offers Reagan's example: "Ronald Reagan had the moral clarity to understand the truth, and the courage both to speak the truth and to do what needed to be done to support it."

What concrete actions can we take today to aid the Iranian people's march to freedom?

We must increase funding for Radio Farda and other democracy building programs to provide the Iranian people with the free flow of information and communications in their struggle to be free.

The President must use his full authority under the Iranian Sanctions Act to deter companies from investing in Iran's energy sector.

We must place column 2 tariff rates on Iran's remaining exports to the United States. We must pass the Global Online Freedom Act to prevent American companies from assisting foreign governments, including Iran, from censoring and monitoring their people on the Internet. We must pass the Iran Refined Petroleum Sanctions Act and the Iran Threat Reduction Act to embargo the flow of refined fuel to and increase the pressure upon the regime.

The President must prohibit regime members from entering the United States of America.

We must seek a United Nations Security Council resolution denouncing the regime; demanding a new, internationally monitored election; and tightening the current U.N. sanctions against the regime until this election occurs and its outcome's integrity verified.

We must work with American labor organizations to establish a support fund for Iranian workers striking in protest of the regime.

Finally, we must link all of our relations with Iran, and with those nations abetting the regime's perpetuation in defiance of its people's freedom to human rights.

If we pale and fail to take these measures, we will be haunted by the cries of the oppressed Iranians abandoned to preserve our neutrality in this time of moral crisis.

But, when we act, we will expand freedom to the oppressed and enslaved; and ensure it for our children and ourselves. Only then will we have honorably performed our duty to liberty by guaranteeing generations of Americans and Iranians may proclaim, "We are free."
(*Congressional Record*)

June 23, 2009

Her name was Neda. In Farsi, it means "the voice." True to her name, she loved music, sought freedom, and she's dead, shot down in the streets by the Iranian regime's state-sanctioned murderers. She must not have died in vain.

Today, Iranians and Americans face a generational chance for freedom--one that ensures a rogue regime's implosion prevents a nuclear confrontation.

Regrettably, our President's "post-American" foreign policy presumes talk can thaw the murderous mullahs' hearts and attain a "grand bargain" for peace in our time; consequently, while Iranians demanded their freedom from a barbarous regime, the President vapidly opined: "It is up to Iranians to make decisions about who Iran's leaders will be. We respect Iranian sovereignty."

Then, as the crisis escalated, the President optimistically noted, "You've seen in Iran some initial reaction from the supreme leader that indicates he understands the Iranian people have deep concerns about the election. And my hope is that the Iranian people will make the right steps in order for them to be able to express their voices, to express their aspirations."

Tragically, the supreme leader's deep concern drove him to step on the throats of pro-democracy protestors, like Neda.

Next, on June 20, the President stated, "The universal rights to assembly and free speech must be respected, and the United States stands with all who seek to exercise those rights." It was painfully evident just how far behind them he stood. "The last thing that I want to do is to have the United States be a foil for those forces inside Iran who would love nothing better than make this an argument about the United States."

With these contradictory statements of support and appeasement, the President returned to square one. "The Iranian people will ultimately judge the actions of their own government. If the Iranian Government seeks the respect of the international community, it must respect the dignity of its own people and govern through consent, not coercion."

In truth, the Iranian people have already judged the regime and found it wanting. The supreme leader, his cleric cronies and their puppet government have never respected the dignity of the Iranian people or governed through consent. This is why the regime stole the election and shoots peaceful, pro-democracy demonstrators. Implying otherwise mocks the Iranians risking and losing their lives for liberty.

As for the claim that American "meddling" in support of the demonstrators plays into the mullahs' hands, the Iranian regime will claim this regardless, for as our President noted, "That's what they do."

Yet, what matters is not what the regime says about America, but what the demonstrators think about America. Presently, brave Iranians watch as our President still holds an open hand to the regime that opened fire on them, that opened fire on Neda.

This is the passive, disastrous policy of Jimmy Carter that led to the rise of this rogue regime, not the courageous policy of Ronald Reagan that led to the demise of an evil empire.

The surest, safest termination of Iran's nuclear weapons program and support of terrorism is to hasten this fanatical tyranny's collapse by supporting its people's liberty. Taking its rightful place amongst the community of free nations, a democratic Iran will necessarily realize and reverse the insanity of this terrorist regime's homicidal obsession with nuclear weapons. Thus, for their and our security, the United States and the world must do everything in our power to further the Iranian demonstrators' sacred claim to freedom. We know Neda did.

Further, in the grand strategy of our war for freedom over terrorism, how we aid pro-democracy Iranians will remind the world of who we are. We are Americans, the revolutionary children of freedom who have lived and died defending our liberty and extending it to the enslaved and oppressed. We will do no less today in support of our Iranian brothers and sisters.

Today Neda's voice calls to our consciences and warns that the fate of Iranians' liberty is entwined with the fate of America's security. We must not miss this generational chance for freedom; again, one that ensures a rogue regime's implosion, prevents a nuclear confrontation, and ensures that Neda and all of liberty's martyrs shall not have died in vain. As Americans, we must seize this moment and help Iranians seize their freedom. That's what we do. (*Congressional Record*)

Rep. Michael McMahon (D-NY)

December 15, 2009

Madam Speaker, the Iran Refined Petroleum Sanctions Act of 2009, an historic, bipartisan piece of legislation, smartly targets investment in Iran's hydrocarbon sector.

Outside of the oil and natural gas industry, Iran has practically no economy and any international company that chooses to invest and assist Iran in importing or producing refined petroleum, enables Iran to buy time as it masters the nuclear cycle. This perilous cat and mouse game, ultimately endangers the security of the U.S. Israel and the global community.

For those who question the effectiveness of stricter sanctions, I would point out the fact that already, due to U.S. pressure, at least 40 banks, including Deutsche Bank, UBS, Credit Suisse, and Commerzbank AK, have reduced business with Iran.

Yet, despite increased pressure from the international community and 5 UN Security Council Resolutions, Iran still refuses to suspend its enrichment program and has pledged to build even more enrichment facilities.

For this reason, H.R. 2194 is a necessary instrument in the tool box of international diplomacy that the United States can use to pressure Iran to engage in serious negotiations.

While I commend the Obama Administration for its willingness to engage with Iran and offer new solutions, I fear that their dialogue and discussion isn't being met with true partnership by the Iranian regime. The Iranian Government continues to drag their feet and refuse to commit to honest dialogue.

Madam Speaker, nuclear nonproliferation is a global responsibility.

Through my position on the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, I included a provision in this bill to the President to issue a timely report on the trade and sales of petroleum extraction equipment between Iran and members of the G20.

Sanctions by the United States alone will not put the pressure on the Iranian regime unless they are met with equal restrictions by our friends and allies.

I have devoted much of my efforts on the committee to promoting transatlantic relations and nonproliferation efforts, and I feel that there is no better way to engage with allies and foes-alike than to promote a nuclear nonproliferation regime and ending Iran's nuclear ambitions once and for all.

This reporting requirement will allow the U.S. to weigh the efforts of the G20 members in the fight against nuclear proliferation and will ultimately further secure the United States, Israel and the global community.

I am confident that this measure will undoubtedly give the Administration the leverage that it needs to negotiate with the Ahmadinejad regime, but the United States will need the support of the international leaders in trade and the energy sector to wean Iran off its nuclear ambitions. (*Congressional Record*)

November 6, 2009

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Concurrent Resolution 209, which recognizes the 30th anniversary of the seizure of the United States Embassy in Tehran on November 4, 1979.

In February 1979, shortly after the collapse of the Shah's regime, exiled religious leader Ayatollah Khomeini returned to Tehran and whipped popular discontent into rabid anti-Americanism. When the Shah came to America for cancer treatment in October, the Ayatollah incited Iranian militants to attack the United States. Shortly thereafter, on November 4, the American Embassy in Tehran was overrun and its employees taken captive. The hostage crisis had begun.

Sixty-six Americans were taken hostage by the Iranians. They were separated into small groups which were not allowed to communicate with one another. They were completely cut off from the outside world, even from their families. They were blindfolded whenever their captors took them outside their rooms. Meals were served irregularly and were often inadequate.

Particularly worrisome for the hostages was the lack of adequate medical care. Many of them were senior Embassy staff with serious health concerns. Above all, there was the psychological pressure of never knowing if they would be harmed or executed, if and when they would be released, or what, if anything, the American Government was doing to help them.

Mr. Speaker, our brave diplomats and servicemen were held for well over a year. The Iranians released a few of the hostages along the way, but 52 of the original 66 who were captured were held for the entire 444 days. All of the hostages made a heroic sacrifice for our Nation, and they deserve our eternal gratitude.

We also lost eight courageous soldiers when their helicopters crashed in the Iranian desert on April 25, 1980, in a failed attempt to rescue the hostages. We honor their bravery and we mourn their loss. Our thoughts and prayers continue to go out to their families, Mr. Speaker.

The Iranian regime's support for the holding of American hostages was a disgrace of the highest order, and it was far from the last time that the Iranian regime would show contempt for its international obligations, as we know. Iran continues to flout the will of the international community today with its nuclear weapons program and with its support for terrorism.

Annually--and outrageously--the Iranian regime continues to mark the anniversary of the Embassy takeover as a celebration rather than as the badge of shame they should acknowledge it to be. This year, thousands of Iranian demonstrators turned the tables on the regime, fittingly using the occasion to declare their contempt for the Iranian leadership.

Mr. Speaker, several of those who were taken hostage 30 years ago remain active in serving our Nation's interests today. One of them, Ambassador John W. Limbert, was a young political officer, already an accomplished Persian scholar, who was just finishing his third month at the Embassy when Iranian thugs took him and his colleagues hostage.

Today, 30 years later, he is starting an assignment as Deputy Assistant Secretary for Iranian Affairs at the State Department's Bureau of Near Eastern Affairs. For the past 3 years, he has been a professor at the United States Naval Academy in Annapolis, which has granted him leave so he can assume his critically important position. He is not only a scholar but a first-rate diplomat. We honor him today, wish him well on his new assignment, and look forward to working with him.

I commend my friend, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. *Fortenberry*), for introducing this important resolution, and I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting it. (*Congressional Record*)

October 13, 2009

Mr. Speaker, Iran's nuclear program has been an issue of serious concern for the international community since the Islamic Revolution of 1979.

Since that time, Iran has been steadily advancing towards the nuclear threshold necessary to develop nuclear weaponry.

Ahmadinejad already has 8,000 centrifuges that have produced enough uranium to build two nuclear weapons and the International Atomic Energy Agency, IAEA, has evidence of an Iranian uranium enrichment program coupled with explosives testing and development of devices to fire nuclear weapons.

Furthermore, every day Iran's nuclear stockpile grows by 4 1/2 pounds.

It would be an absolute disaster for the United States and its allies if Iran enriched uranium even further.

Israel, in particular, sees the face of Iran's blind aggression every day.

Iran has not only threatened the very existence of the one true democracy in the Middle East, but encourages other hostile governments to do the same through a complex network of nuclear and arms cooperation.

Given these facts and undoubtedly an immeasurable amount of undisclosed information, the United States finds itself at a crossroads.

Negotiations with the Iranians will conclude in Vienna on October 19.

But, recent revelations of a previously undisclosed nuclear facility, not to mention the increasingly atrocious treatment of opposition supporters, have illustrated that unfortunately, Iran has already failed the test and it is time for Plan B.

For this reason, I commend the House on the passage of the Iran Sanctions Act, H.R. 1327, a bill which I am a proud cosponsor of.

The future of nuclear nonproliferation, international security and the well-being of young Iranians lies in the administration's ability to steer Iran away from its dangerous ambitions.

Fortunately, H.R. 1327 opens the door to this diversion by uniquely complementing the administration's forward-thinking strategy of dialogue with strict credit sanctions.

Sans sanctions, engagement can be and historically has been manipulated by Iran as a mere tactic for delay.

Without the foreign capital investments to modernize its petroleum infrastructure, Ahmadinejad will soon have no choice but to change course.

I would like to conclude by noting that Iran's deficient refining capacity calls for targeted sanctions on refined petroleum and increased international cooperation to enforce these measures with our partners in the EU, Russia and China.

The threat from Iran demands an effective policy response--and our European allies are well-placed to formulate one.

Germany, for example, has already taken notable steps to reduce its business with Iran.

But despite a 90 percent decline between 2006 and 2008 in the German Government's issuance of export credit guarantees to Iran, exports to Iran have increased.

These sorts of disturbing trends coupled with Iran's thriving black market, underpin the premise that more must be done to curtail foreign investment and ultimately, Iran's nuclear weapons pursuit.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to working with both my colleagues in the House and the Foreign Affairs Committee to increase the administration's options when dealing with Iran.

Once again, the passage of the Iran Sanctions Act is a momentous step towards not only effectively dealing with Iran, but towards replacing a troubling network of nuclear cooperation with a newfound movement towards international cooperation for the sake of world peace. (*Congressional Record*)

Rep. Cathy McMorris Rodgers (R-WA)

December 15, 2009

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2194 and urge my colleagues to pass this important security bill.

As I have mentioned before, in August my husband and I visited Israel. The people of Israel want nothing more than to live in peace with their neighbors, many of whom have said repeatedly that they want Israel wiped off of the map.

But the Israelis are realistic about peace. They know it comes from strength, from clear military superiority, from letting your enemies know that they cannot defeat you. That is a hard, realistic peace. It's clear Iran wants to break that peace, to destabilize the whole region and make Israel live in fear.

After years of Iranian delays and deception, we must now back our words with action. Iran must be held accountable.

As Iran takes one step after another towards nuclear weapons, it edges towards war. A vote in favor of this bill is a vote in favor of continuing a hard peace in the Middle East and showing the rest of the world that a nuclear Iran is not an option.

When I left Israel, I pledged to do all I could to support their work to maintain and expand a difficult peace. I urge my colleagues to join me in this quest. A strong first step is passing H.R. 2194. (*Congressional Record*)

Sen. Robert Menendez (D-NJ)

June 16, 2009

Mr. President, last Wednesday, a few blocks down the street, a neo-Nazi opened fire at the Holocaust Museum. He murdered a security guard and terrorized the museum's visitors, including schoolchildren, who had come to learn, to express sympathy, and to pray. That evil act was the work of a killer who had made his hatred of other religions and ethnic groups well known. And it was a reminder that intolerance, ignorance, and anti-Semitism have not yet been defeated in our world.

This tragedy reminds us of the need of sound understanding of one of the darkest episodes in the history of the world. Far too many misrepresent the significance of the Holocaust, especially in regard to the State of Israel and her people. And far too many people deny it happened altogether, out of bigotry, hatred, and spite.

In the face of so much misunderstanding, I am compelled today to speak up about the role of the Holocaust in Israel's history and Israel's challenges in preventing anti-Semitic murder from continuing to happen.

The Holocaust was the most sinister possible reminder that the Jewish population in exile was in constant jeopardy. It was a definitive argument that anti-Semitism could appear anywhere, and its horrors galvanized international support for the State of Israel. But let us be very clear: While the Shoah has a central role in Israel's identity, it is not the reason behind its founding and it is not the main justification for its existence.

The extreme characterization of this mistaken view is the following: The Western powers established Israel in 1948 based on their own guilt, at the expense of the Arab peoples who lived there. Therefore, the current state is illegitimate and should be wiped off the face of the map. This flawed argument is not only in defiance of basic human dignity but in plain defiance of history. It is in defiance of ancient history as told in biblical texts and through archeological evidence. It ignores the history of the last several centuries. Because of what is at stake, it is well worth reviewing this history in detail, and let me make a modest attempt at a very broad overview.

There has been a continuity of Jewish presence in the Holy Land for thousands of years. Jewish kings and governments were established in that area that is now Israel several millennia ago. After untold years of Jewish sovereignty, based in Jerusalem, the land of the Jewish people fell repeatedly to invaders--Assyrians, Persians, Greeks, Romans, and many others. Jews were repeatedly massacred and expelled, and the departure of so many from the land they had always called home developed into an unparalleled diaspora.

From the 16th century until the earliest 20th century, the land that is now Israel was under the control of a distant Ottoman caliphate based in Istanbul, and during this time, as earlier, many Jews returned to their ancestral homeland. The Ottoman Empire collapsed after World War I, and the treaty granted Great Britain a mandate over the area then known as Palestine.

The League of Nations endorsed and clarified this mandate in 1922, requiring Britain to reconstitute a Jewish national home within the territory they controlled, in accordance with the declaration made by British Foreign Secretary Balfour in 1917, making the restoration of Jewish communities in that area a matter of international law.

By the time World War II had ended, there were more than 600,000 Jews living in the British Mandate of Palestine. In 1947, the United Nations approved a plan to partition the territory into Arab and Jewish states. The Jewish Agency accepted the plan. The Arabs did not. On May 14, 1948, the State of Israel declared its independence. On May 15, five Arab nations declared war. Despite being surrounded on all sides, Israel prevailed and expanded its borders, providing a small additional measure of security against attacks which were certain to come--and did.

So to be clear, the more than 700,000 Palestinians who left Israel were refugees of a war instigated by Arab governments, bent on seizing more land for themselves. But the Arabs who left Israel after its modern founding weren't the only displaced population in the Middle East. In addition to the hundreds of thousands of Jews who left Europe during and after the Holocaust in the 20th century, more than three-quarters of a million Jews fled or were expelled from their homes in Arab and Middle Eastern nations--in cities that many of their

families had lived in for nearly a millennium. Their possessions were taken, their livelihoods were destroyed, victims of nationalism and hatred of Israel.

Several thousand years of history lead to an undeniable conclusion: The reestablishment of the State of Israel in modern times is a political reality with roots going back to the time of Abraham. And so the way to consider the immeasurable impact of the Holocaust in Israel is not to ask whether the State would exist otherwise. It is, at least in one sense, to imagine how even more vibrant Israel would be if millions upon millions had not been denied a chance to know it.

The attacks on Israel have barely stopped since 1948--not just attacks by armies but attacks by individuals, attacks by tanks and terrorists, attacks that have come in the form of stones and they have come in the form of speeches. Its enemies have attempted to assassinate its people with rockets and assassinate its national character with hateful rhetoric. Today it is still surrounded by hostility; its back is still to the sea. It is surrounded by hostility from Hezbollah in Lebanon and Hamas in the Gaza strip.

In looking at the threat Israel faces on its southwestern border, one fact must be absolutely, indisputably, unequivocally clear: There is no moral equivalency between Israel and Hamas. Israel is a sovereign democratic state of 7.5 million people--Jews, Muslims, and Christians. Hamas is a terrorist organization. It won control of Gaza after men in ski masks waged gun battles with another branch of Palestinian leadership. It used that control to launch rockets at sleeping children in the nearby Israeli cities of Ashkelon and Sterot. This is the thanks Israel got for withdrawing from Gaza.

Hamas does not recognize agreements that Palestinian leaders have reached with Israel in the past, it does not recognize Israel's right to exist at all, and in fact it is ideologically committed to Israel's annihilation. Gaza's people thirst for freedom and opportunity but are held hostage to Hamas's thirst for destruction. And even today, after the consequences of menacing Israel became clear in a disastrous war, weapons are flowing freely through tunnels into Gaza, Hamas has rearmed and is readying itself for the day when it is going to take on Israel again.

Hamas and Hezbollah may be the head of the snake when it comes to terrorism, but the tail extends much further. The weapons terrorists use were sent from Iran. Money they received was sent from Iran. Propaganda supporting Hamas's campaign of terror and calling for Israel's destruction was conceived in, produced by, and broadcast from Iran.

The fundamentalist regime in Teheran isn't just an emerging threat. It doesn't just have the potential to be a threat to Israel's existence. It is a threat to Israel's existence. Under no circumstances whatsoever can we allow that conventional threat to become a nuclear one. Especially in light of the threat of Iran, and in light of the threat extremists pose to so many innocent civilians around the globe, the importance of Israel as a strategic ally and friend to the United States could not be clearer. It is hard to overstate the value of having such a stalwart democratic ally in such a critical part of the world--an ally in terms of intelligence gathering, economics, politics, and culture. Israel arose in a desert rampant with repression, a force of moderation against fundamentalism and extremism. It is an ally we can constantly

depend on and count on to be with us in international fora and on the key decisions that affect the safety and security of Americans around the world.

For more than six decades, it has been a key U.S. trading partner and a scientific innovator. We have Israeli engineers to thank for everything from advances in solar power to cell phone technology to AOL Instant Messenger. Equipment we are using in Iraq to fight terrorism and keep American troops safe was developed in Israel. Medical treatments we are using in U.S. hospitals to fight cancer, heart disease, and chronic pain were developed in Israel. Israeli-born actors are stars of Hollywood, and an Israeli astronaut has accompanied Americans into space.

So it is not only in the interest of Israel to have its full history recognized, it is in the national interest and the national security interests of the United States. It is in our interests to fully remember the unbreakable bond that has made us both stronger over the last 61 years and to make it unmistakable that our commitment is as strong as ever.

The argument for Israel's legitimacy does not depend on what we say in speeches. It has been made by history. It has been made by the men and women who have made the desert green, by Nobel prizes earned, by groundbreaking innovations and enviable institutions, by lives saved, democracy defended, peace made, and battles won. There can be no denying the Jewish people's legitimate right to live in peace and security on a homeland to which they have had a connection for thousands of years.

We can and must move forward in the peace process, and look for ways to reach agreement between all sides. But we cannot erase the moral distinctions between tyranny and freedom, and we must not edit history. If we stay true to history and follow our moral compass, I am optimistic that talks can lead to understanding and resolution of the very sensitive, detailed, and tough issues we face.

The next pages of Middle Eastern history are not doomed to be stained by an endless, senseless fight to the death. It doesn't have to be that way. Different peoples of vastly different backgrounds have peacefully thrived in the Middle East for generations upon generations, and this coexistence can happen once more.

Let us remember the words of Egyptian President Anwar al-Sadat in 1978, when he accepted the Nobel Prize for peace--words that not long before would have seemed incredibly unlikely. He said:

Let us put an end to wars, let us reshape life on the solid basis of equity and truth. And it is this call.....of the great majority of the Arab and Israeli peoples, and indeed of millions of men, women, and children around the world that you are today honoring. And these hundreds of millions will judge to what extent every responsible leader in the Middle East has responded to the hopes of mankind.

I have been to Israel. I have shaken the hands of its citizens and visited its holy places. I know that in the heart of Israelis there is a strong desire for peace.

We can never lose sight of why peace is so important. After the unspeakable horrors of the Holocaust, the Jewish people would forever be mindful that no one knows what turns history will take and every day we are mindful that anti-Semitism has not gone away, whether in the form of a firebombing of a French synagogue, defamatory comments of a government official in South Africa, or a senseless murder in Washington DC.

Israel is the one place in the world, the one place where anti-Semitism can be structurally impossible. It is a field of hope on which fear can be vanquished, an island of refuge that can stand firm no matter how stormy the sea of history turns. That is why we must always keep it safe and always keep it free.

The United States is not simply allied with a government, it is an ally of Israel's people. It is an ally of Israel's democratic ideals. It is an ally of its history, of its aspirations for peace and prosperity, its can-do spirit, and amazing resilience in the face of threats from all sides. In that sense, we are not just Israel's allies, we are admirers, we are partners, and we are friends.

I plan to do everything I can to see that we support this friendship this year, next year, and every year thereafter.

Let me close by saying Martin Luther King said:

The arc of the moral universe is long, but it bends towards justice.

We know that in Israel's quest for security, there will be trials along the way, there will be setbacks, and there will be dangers too tremendous for words. But if we continue the work we do and continue to stay true to the values that drive our journey, then the long arc will eventually rest in place in the land of Israel and it is a just and lasting peace that will be at hand. (*Congressional Record*,)

Sen. Jeff Merkley (D-OR)

July 29, 2009

Mr. President, I rise today to address one of the defining challenges of our time--the restructuring of our Nation's energy supply. Reforming our energy policy is critical for multiple reasons: to improve our national security, to create jobs and rebuild our economy, and to protect our children and our communities from the damaging effects of carbon pollution. Today I want to focus on just the first of these--improving our national security.

It has been said before and it will be said again, but it deserves repeating until we in Congress act to change it: Our Nation is addicted to foreign oil. This dependence makes us vulnerable to the whims of nations that do not have our best interests at heart.

This afternoon, I will examine this problem in some detail and consider the implications for a national energy policy that will strengthen our national security and end our addiction to imported oil. I emphasize that there is a cure. If we as a nation focus on smarter, wiser use of

energy and aggressive development of homegrown renewable energy sources, we can indeed greatly reduce or eliminate dependence on imported oil, improve our national security, and strengthen our national economy, all at the same time.

Well, let's talk about dependence on foreign oil. Our dependence on foreign oil comes from two intertwined factors: First, our economy depends upon oil for transportation. Cars, trucks, trains, planes, boats that we use to move ourselves and our goods around the country are entirely dependent on oil. Indeed, 95 percent of the energy used in our transportation sector comes from oil. Second, our oil addiction relies on foreign imports: 58 percent of the oil we consume is imported. Thus, access to foreign oil is essential to the vitality of our economy. The result is that maintaining access to this oil becomes a very high priority for our national security.

Exactly whom do we depend on? The good news is, nearly 30 percent of our imported oil comes from our democratic neighbors to the north and south in North America. But that is where the good news ends. Take a look at this chart. Seventy percent of our imported oil comes from outside North America, and this chart shows the top four nations outside North America from which we import oil.

All four of these countries represent security challenges for the United States. Saudi Arabia is No. 1 on the list. It is the source of one in nine barrels of imported oil. Before addressing the fact that it presents national security challenges, it should be noted Saudi Arabia has often been a significant ally to the United States in our interests, in a relationship going back decades. Nevertheless, the dependency on their oil creates two national security issues:

First, the oil infrastructure and delivery systems of Saudi Arabia are vulnerable to terrorist attack or to manipulation by governments in the region. Consider the Strait of Hormuz. The Strait of Hormuz is a vulnerability for all Persian Gulf oil, 90 percent of which moves through the Strait. The Strait is 21 miles wide, with a narrow shipping channel. So, geographically, it is vulnerable to disruption, and Iran has explicitly threatened to put pressure on traffic going through the Strait or attempt to control it outright.

Second, the wealth we send to Saudi Arabia in exchange for petroleum has not always served us well. Former CIA Director James Woolsey testified in the Senate a few years ago that over the last three decades the Saudis have spent between \$70 billion and \$100 billion to support conservative institutions that often promulgate viewpoints and actions hostile to the United States. The wealth dispensed in this manner has, in some cases, migrated into terrorist organizations such as al-Qaida to recruit and build institutional capacity. This has led former CIA Director Woolsey to say of our current military conflicts: This is the first time since the Civil War that we have financed both sides of a conflict.

Venezuela is No. 2 on the list. It is, of course, led by President Hugo Chavez, a vocal critic of our country who has expressly threatened to cut off U.S. oil supplies. He told an Argentine newspaper that Venezuela has:

A strong oil card to play on the geopolitical stage..... a card that we are going to play with toughness against the toughest country in the world, the United States.

The third nation on this list is Nigeria. Nigeria has had a series of disruptions just this year due to civil unrest. In February, oil companies reported to Reuters that 17 percent of the country's oil capacity was cut off from export because of attacks and sabotage by militants. According to testimony given to our Senate Foreign Relations Committee by the National Defense Council Foundation in 2006, Nigeria loses 135,000 barrels per day to theft.

Iraq, No. 4 on our list, has gone through enormous upheavals. Saddam Hussein's forces destroyed much of the nation's oil infrastructure when President Bush launched the Iraq war in 2003. That infrastructure has been subject to ongoing sabotage over the last 6 years. A significant share of Iraqi oil, similar to its neighbors, moves through the Strait of Hormuz, an additional point of vulnerability. Moreover, Iraq has not succeeded yet in passing a national law to share oil wealth among the ethnic groups in the nation, and the friction that comes from this continues to allow the possibility of factional conflict and disruptions in supply.

Iran isn't on this list. We have an embargo against Iran. We don't import oil from there, but it is still worth mentioning. Many of our allies get oil from Iran and their oil supplies are large enough to affect the world markets and thereby the stability and cost of our own supply. Again, turning to former CIA Director Woolsey testifying in the Senate, he noted that Iran derives 40 percent of its government budget from oil exports. According to the RAND Corporation, higher oil revenues have not just emboldened the Iranian Government to defy the United Nations regarding their nuclear program but also helped Iran to finance the activities of Hezbollah and Hamas.

Our dependence on foreign oil makes us vulnerable to a disrupted energy supply, and the risk is heightened because most of the world's proven reserves are controlled by just a few governments. State control means countries can and do manipulate energy supply. We had a case this last year when Russia manipulated gas markets to dominate new democracies in Eastern Europe.

The Energy Modeling Forum at Stanford University brought together a group of leading experts to assess the chances of a major oil supply disruption. They identified major areas of the globe where oil disruptions are most likely due to geopolitical, military or terrorist threats. Those areas include Saudi Arabia, the rest of the Persian Gulf, Russia, the Caspian states, and a group of nations in Africa and South America--which account for 60 percent of world oil production.

So the threat of disrupted supply is a serious one for our economy, as we found out during the oil shocks of the 1970s, which cost our economy about \$2.5 trillion. If repeated today, such a crisis would cost our American economy about \$8 trillion. We were reminded of the threat of supply disruption again when Hurricanes Katrina and Rita disrupted supplies and caused price spikes here in our Nation.

These don't supply the United States, but they do supply our allies, and in a global oil market these supplies are interdependent. A disruption of European oil supplies would have effects on our economy.

We also expend extraordinary resources to maintain our access to foreign oil because it is so important. It is important to the success of our economy. While estimates vary, according to a study produced by the National Defense Council Foundation, the indirect security and military costs relating to securing our access to oil amount to about \$825 billion. That equates to more than \$5 a gallon, on top of the price we pay at the pump. So we cannot allow our Nation's security and the health of the American economy to rely on the whims of unstable, unreliable, even hostile governments.

If we refuse to address our single greatest point of vulnerability, we fail in our most fundamental duty to protect this Nation. It is clear we need to end this addiction. We need to be energy self-sufficient. But how are we going to get there? One answer, which we heard chanted in rallies across America last year, was: Drill, baby, drill.

It is true we could increase production from American reserves in the short term with an aggressive drilling strategy. In fact, I support changing leases on hundreds of thousands of acres already approved for petroleum drilling and converting those into "use it or lose it" leases because major oil companies have secured those leases, and they are sitting on them without doing a thing.

Nevertheless, drilling is not, and cannot be, a long-term strategy for the security of our Nation for one simple reason: America uses a lot of oil but has, globally speaking, limited reserves. In fact, the United States has just 2 percent of the world's oil reserves, as this chart shows right here. Here we are, down here at the small end, with Mexico and Europe. Then, we see Eurasia, with 7 percent; Africa, with 9 percent; Central and South America, with a little bit more; then Canada; and then the whopper, the Middle East, which makes my point about security for our supplies. (*Congressional Record*,)

Rep. Candice Miller (R-MI)

December 15, 2009

Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 2194--Iran Refined Petroleum Sanctions Act.

This bill requires the President to impose sanctions on any entity that provides Iran with refined petroleum resources, or engages in activity that could contribute to Iran's ability to import such resources.

Because Iran lacks sufficient domestic petroleum refining capability, a restriction of gasoline deliveries to Iran will become a painful sanction designed to bring Iran's leaders into compliance with their commitments under the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty.

The government of Iran must verifiably suspend, and dismantle its weapons-applicable nuclear program and stop all uranium enrichment activities.

There can be no doubt that Iran poses a significant threat to the United States and our allies in the Middle East and elsewhere. Iran is proceeding with an aggressive nuclear weapons program, despite its claim that the Iranian nuclear program is for peaceful uses.

Preventing Iran from acquiring nuclear weapons and ending its support for international terrorism are vital United States national security interests.

We know that Iran has engaged in stonewalling, deception and deceit when it comes to its nuclear program. Several weeks ago, a secret uranium enrichment facility near the city of Qom was revealed--a facility the Iranians failed to disclose to the International Atomic Energy Agency.

Yesterday, British intelligence revealed that it has discovered documents which indicate that Iran has been testing nuclear bomb triggers since at least 2007.

This Administration is engaged in some wishful thinking if they believe that the threat posed by Iran's nuclear weapons program can be negotiated away through engagement and concessions.

Mohammad El-Baradei, the former head of the IAEA said, ``Investigations into military aspects of Iran's nuclear program had reached a ``dead end."

We have tried negotiations and inspections to convince the Iranian regime to end its weapons program and we are getting no results.

So, the time has come to take decisive, concrete action and nothing less than overwhelming and crippling sanctions will compel Iran to end the pursuit of nuclear weapons.

This bill provides a powerful stick to force the Iranians to end its illicit nuclear weapons program.

I urge my colleges to support this bill. (*Congressional Record*)

June 19, 2009

Madam Speaker, I come to the floor today to show support for those in Iran who are standing up for their rights and for those who seek freedom across the globe.

Tyrants who use violence and fear to suppress the voices of their citizens who seek freedom lose their legitimacy to govern.

Those who seek freedom and liberty across this globe must know that the American people stand with you.

We stand with you because we have a supreme desire to live up to the belief espoused in the founding document of our nation--

We hold these truths to be self evident--that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

And to secure these rights governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed.

That is why we stand consistently with nations who conduct free, fair, and open elections.

That is why we stand with citizens of nations who are brave enough to stand up and demand their freedom.

America does not seek to impose any individual on the Iranian government or the Iranian people.

But America will always stand with those who peacefully demand their voices are heard.
(*Congressional Record*)

Rep. Jerry Moran (R-KS)

December 15, 2009

Madam Speaker, over the past several years, I have worked hard to remind my colleagues in Congress and the Americans that they represent of a real threat of a nuclear Iran. The Obama administration has been engaged in discussions with Iran during the last several months.

As many of us expected, the President's open hand to Tehran was met with a clinched fist. Despite international efforts to negotiate with Iran, Iranian leaders continue to be devious and defiant. Enough; now is the time for Congress to act. Fortunately today the House of Representatives did.

Iran already possesses enough nuclear fuel to build two nuclear weapons. Even while negotiations were taking place, Iran continued to enrich uranium in defiance of five United Nations Security Council resolutions, increasing its supply of uranium and becoming more and more dangerous each and every day.

While there are many domestic issues that demand the attention of us in Congress, we must not forget an Iranian call for a world without a United States or an Israel. A nuclear-armed Iran threatens the safety of American troops in the region. It is a threat to Israel's existence, emboldens terrorist groups Hamas and Hezbollah and leads to a perilous nuclear arms race in the Middle East.

These are all things we cannot accept and must not tolerate.

Passage of the Iran Refined Petroleum Sanctions Act takes an important step to counter the Iranian threat to our national security and to that of our strong democratic ally Israel.
(*Congressional Record*)

October 13, 2009

Mr. Speaker, it is none too soon that the House is considering what I hope will be the first of several pieces of legislation to sanction Iran for its illegal nuclear program.

Despite Iran's agreement on October 1 to allow IAEA inspectors to visit its newly disclosed nuclear site near Qom, the regime continues to enrich uranium. Iran grows more and more dangerous each day enrichment is allowed to continue. A nuclear-armed Iran is an existential threat to Israel; would threaten the safety of American troops in the region; would likely embolden terrorist groups Hamas and Hezbollah; and could lead to a dangerous nuclear arms race in the Middle East. We must not allow this to happen.

I strongly support the legislation before us today. H.R. 1327, the Iran Sanctions Enabling Act, would allow state and local governments to divest the assets of their pension funds and any other funds under their control from companies investing \$20 million or more in Iran's energy sector. By allowing states and local governments to withdraw their investments in companies doing business in Iran, we can increase pressure on the Iranian regime to change course and abandon its pursuit of nuclear weapons. Only when Iran feels pressured, is it likely to make concessions.

Unfortunately, the leaders of Iran seem to feel fairly secure despite all the talk of tough sanctions. On Friday, October 9, Ayatollah Ahmad Khatami, a member of Iran's Assembly of Experts, said the October 1 talks between Iran, the U.S. and other world powers were a "great victory" for Iran, suggesting Iran had been successful in putting off any sanctions.

By passing this legislation today, though, Congress can send Iran a clear and powerful message. While the President and other world leaders gauge whether Iran is truly serious about complying with its obligations, Congress will back the negotiations with sanctions to show Iran that it must act in good faith and not delay as it usually does.

Passage of this legislation is important, but it is only the beginning of what needs to be done to address the Iranian nuclear threat. Congress must pass additional legislation, including H.R. 2194, the Iran Refined Petroleum Sanctions Act, to put sufficient pressure on Iran to fully suspend all enrichment and work on its nuclear program.

No government that calls for the complete destruction of another should be allowed to have nuclear weapons. The Iran Sanctions Enabling Act is a first step to take in order to prevent Iran's leaders from acquiring the means to do what they say they will. (*Congressional Record*,)

September 16, 2009

Madam Speaker, we are just days away from President Obama's deadline to Iran that it accept his offer of meaningful talks about that country's nuclear program. Although the U.S. and other world powers will meet in Iran on October 1, Iran has said discussions of its nuclear program are finished. Any discussion that does not include Iran's nuclear program significantly dilutes any benefits of such talks.

For 8 months, Iran has had the opportunity to discuss its nuclear program. Now, moments before the deadline, it proposes talks but remains unwilling to engage on the most important issue.

The President needs to rally international support through the U.N. and G-20 summit this month for sanctions against Iran to ensure that they have great impact. At the same time, Congress should move forward with legislation that has been introduced to put pressure on Iran. Specifically, we should pass H.R. 2194, the Iran Refined Petroleum Sanctions Act.

The longer we wait to address Iran's pursuit of nuclear weapons, the more difficult it becomes to deal with Iran, and the world becomes a more dangerous place. Hoping that Iran changes course is not a strategy we can live with. (*Congressional Record*)

June 10, 2009

This week we are experiencing Iran's presidential election. While the election is noteworthy, it will probably not have an impact on Iran's illegal nuclear program. Unlike in the United States, the President of Iran has minimal influence over the country's national security policies. Those decisions are controlled by Supreme Leader Ayatollah Ali Khomeini, the unelected head of Iran's theocratic regime.

The supreme leader has vowed to continue Iran's nuclear program, and unfortunately we see evidence of this. Just last Friday, the International Atomic Energy Agency reported that Iran has sped up production of nuclear fuel and installed more centrifuges in advance of the election. Nuclear weapons experts say Iran now has enough centrifuge capacity to fuel up to two nuclear weapons a year.

Iran is determined to acquire nuclear weapons regardless of who is president. It would be a mistake for the Obama administration and this Congress to wait and see what direction Iran takes if a new president is elected because the course appears to be already determined. If we are going to engage Iran, we must do so right away, immediately, and back engagement with tougher actions. (*Congressional Record*)

April 29, 2009

Madam Speaker, a few weeks ago, I came to this House floor to address my colleagues and bring to their attention the danger that Iran poses to Israel. I shared with my colleagues some of the things that the Iranian leader had said about Israel to illustrate the seriousness of the threat.

Madam Speaker, the Iranian President, Mahmoud Ahmadinejad, has again spoken. Last week, at the opening day of the United Nations Anti-Racism Conference, the Iranian President was given a platform on which to spread racist and hateful views. In his address to the conference, he called Israel “the most cruel and racist regime,” said that Zionism “is a paragon of racism,” and said the creation of Israel was founded on “the pretext of Jewish sufferings and the ambiguous and dubious question of the Holocaust.”

While the Iranian leader’s comments are disturbing in any context, it is even more troublesome that he would question the Holocaust on the day before we celebrated the Holocaust Remembrance.

It is hard to understand how the United Nations and so many other countries fail to take the Iranian threat seriously. It is more than ironic that the U.N. would give one who has denied the Holocaust and advocated for the destruction of Israel the opportunity to speak at a conference convened to combat hatred and racism.

Although the United States and a few countries had the sense to boycott the summit and thereby refuse to lend credibility to the conference and speakers like Ahmadinejad, too many nations continue to act with complacency.

Last Thursday, our Nation’s leaders gathered in our Rotunda here in the Capitol for the National Commemoration of the Day of Remembrance to remember the 6 million Jews who were murdered in the Holocaust. The theme of this year’s events was, “Never Again: What You Do Matters.” That theme is a message for all of us to take very seriously.

When we say “never again,” we need to think about the current threats to peace and security and take appropriate action to prevent senseless violence. Iran’s pursuit of nuclear weapons is an existential threat to the people of Israel and a grave danger to the rest of the world.

Madam Speaker, the things we do do matter. It is time for us to join together and confront this Iranian threat.

Today, Israel celebrates its 61st anniversary of its independence; again, a day in which we ought to remember the threat that still remains. Congress can take action to address this threat by approving H.R. 1327, the Iran Sanctions Enabling Act, and H.R. 1985, the Iran Diplomatic Enhancement Act.

The Iran Sanctions Enabling Act gives States and local governments the authority to divest their assets from any company that invests \$20 million or more in Iran’s energy sector. The

other piece of legislation, H.R. 1985, would sanction any entity engaged in activities that contribute to Iran's ability to import gasoline or fine petroleum.

I am a sponsor of these bills, and I believe that sanctions will increase pressure on the Iranian regime to change course and abandon its pursuit of nuclear weapons.

The Days of Remembrance call us to soberly evaluate the changes to peace we face and take swift action as best we can to address them.

Madam Speaker, I ask the House of Representatives to quickly approve the Iran Sanctions Enabling Act and the Iran Diplomatic Enhancement Act. "Never again: What we do does matter." (*Congressional Record*)

March 16, 2009

Mr. Speaker, while much of the attention here in Congress is focused on the difficulties here at home, as we have heard in speeches this evening, rising unemployment rates, home mortgage foreclosures, increasing health care costs, stock market decline, I rise tonight to remind us that we cannot forget about the pressing challenges to global stability and our national security interest posed by Iran.

One of the best ways to understand the seriousness of the Iranian threat is to listen to the words of its leaders. Iran's President has called the Holocaust a lie, has said that Israel "must be wiped off the map" and frequently speaks about a future world in which "Israelis will be eradicated" and Israel no longer exists. Iran's supreme leader joined in this hateful refrain recently when he called Israel a cancerous tumor.

The hatred of Iran's leaders is not just directed at Israel. Ahmadinejad has called American objectives and influence "Satanic" and has spoken before crowds that chant "death to America." Such aggressive and intolerable words are not just simply rhetoric. They represent the policies of a government committed to terror and destruction.

Iran is the world's leading state sponsor of terrorism and is pursuing a nuclear program in defiance of three United Nations Security Council resolutions. Iran's support for terrorist groups Hezbollah and Hamas have enabled these organizations to carry out attacks on Israel and kill innocent civilians. With training and other assistance from Iran, Hamas increased the range of its rockets so now 1 million Israelis are within the scope of attack.

Iran's pursuit of nuclear weapons threatens Israel, other nations in the region and our U.S. national security. No government that calls for the complete destruction of another nation should be allowed to have nuclear weapons. Yet Iran continues to move closer and closer to being capable of constructing such a weapon.

Although Iran reportedly does not currently have a sufficient amount of highly-enriched uranium to build a nuclear weapon, Iran does possess enough low-enriched uranium that can

be converted into material needed to create an atomic bomb. Using existing centrifuges, Iran could enrich its low-level uranium to that of weapons grade in several months.

Time is not on our side. The Obama administration must back engagement with tougher sanctions and guard against Iranian diversions and delays. Appropriate economic, political, and diplomatic means are the best tools we have to prevent Iran from developing nuclear weapons.

Last year I cosponsored legislation that declared it was in the national interests of the U.S. to prevent Iran from acquiring nuclear weapons and urged the President to impose tough sanctions on Iran, specifically its banks engaged in proliferation activities and companies doing business with Iran's Islamic Revolutionary Guard.

I also voted in favor of legislation that expanded the types of entities in Iran that are subject to sanction and allowed state and local governments and individuals to divest in any company that invests in Iran's energy sectors.

America's efforts must go further. I support sanctioning Iran's Central bank and foreign banks that conduct transactions with sanctioned Iranian entities. Efforts to prohibit the export to Iran of refined petroleum products should be pursued.

Israel is one of America's closest allies and plays a central role in the peace and security of the most volatile region of the world. We must continue to demonstrate our support for our Israeli friends in the face of continued defiance and threats.

A nuclear-armed Iran is unacceptable. I urge my colleagues in Congress and the Obama administration to act with the urgency this situation demands and devote the necessary attention to this serious threat. While there are problems at home that require our attention, we must not waiver in our efforts to prevent Iran from acquiring nuclear weapons.”

(Congressional Record)

Rep. Jim Moran (D-VA)

December 15, 2009

Madam Speaker, I rise today in reluctant support of the Iran Refined Petroleum Sanctions Act, IRPSA.

President Obama has extended a hand to the Iranian government, offering a mutually beneficial deal that would severely limit Iran's ability to develop a nuclear weapon. This confidence building measure is intended to give us the space and time to reach a more comprehensive agreement that would seek to integrate Iran back into the international community as a responsible actor and to impose strong, verifiable safeguards to ensure that Iran cannot build a nuclear weapon. After agreeing in principle to an initial agreement to send Iran's enriched uranium to Russia, Iran has since backed away from it and even refused to provide the International Atomic Energy Agency a formal response to the proposal.

Because of the seriousness of the challenges we face, I reluctantly support the IRSPA. It sends the clear message that Iran can either work cooperatively and beneficially with the international community or it can choose further international isolation.

However, for sanctions to succeed, they must impose a cost on Iran's ruling regime. I am concerned that it is the Iranian people--rather than the Iranian regime--that will suffer the most under IRPSA. If we are able to limit Iran's ability to import refined petroleum, the Iranian government will simply deflect this cost onto the Iranian people, by eliminating petroleum subsidies and blaming the United States for the hardship such actions will cause the general public.

A democratic uprising against the Iranian regime is currently under way. I believe we need to stand with the Iranian people as they fight for their freedoms. The Iranian government by contrast has brutally oppressed peaceful demonstrators. For that reason, Congress and the Obama administration should work to craft sanctions that affect the leaders of Iran and the IRGC. Only sanctions that hurt these decision makers will influence Iran's decision-making process.

While we must make the Iranian regime aware of our displeasure with their rejection of our positive advances, we must also provide a helping hand to Iranian citizens. That is why it is important for Congress, in addition to these punitive sanctions, to also provide assistance to the democracy movement in Iran by aiding their access to the internet, in order to provide the Iranian people unfettered access to information, free of government censorship. Congress should also take steps to increase the ability of non-governmental organizations in the U.S. to work with their counterparts in Iran, so that the Iranian people can benefit from better health services, educational opportunities, the promotion of equal rights, and the facilitation of people to people exchanges.

The Iranian people are among the most pro-American people in the Middle East. With passage of today's sanctions legislation, it is all the more important to reach out to, and around the Iranian government, to this pro-American society. This is the time to redouble our efforts to support the Iranian people and their courageous fight for democracy by increasing their access to information and communication both in country and internationally.

December 14, 2009

Madam Speaker, I rise today to introduce the Iranian Digital Empowerment Act.

In the aftermath of Iran's disputed 2009 presidential elections, millions of Iranians flooded the streets to stand-up to their government and make their voices heard. Empowered by communication services like Twitter and Facebook, Iranians were able to organize and communicate freely outside of the watchful eye of their government in what has become the first popular democratic uprising of the social media age.

The Iranian people are among the most pro-Western people in the Middle East, and despite suffering under a totalitarian regime, their struggle to create a freer and democratic Iran continues to this day. This weekend marked the 6-month anniversary of fraudulent presidential elections. Once again, the Iranian people took to the streets in non-violent protest. The government of Iran has sought to counter the peaceful efforts of the Iranian people, launching unprecedented efforts to block access to Internet technology, infiltrate electronic social networks, and restrict Iranians from communicating freely. Unfortunately, due to outdated language in provisions regarding information services, U.S. sanctions have had the unintended consequence of denying the Iranian people the tools necessary to communicate freely and circumvent government monitors online.

In an effort to assist the Iranian people fighting for a change in leadership, I am introducing the Iranian Digital Empowerment Act. This legislation will clarify that U.S. laws are not intended to prohibit the export of software that would enable the Iranian people to communicate freely by circumventing their government's censorship efforts. U.S. sanctions intended to change the behavior of the Iranian government must not have the effect of stamping out the voice of the Iranian people. (*Congressional Record*)

Sen. Bill Nelson (D-FL)

February 5, 2009

Mr. President, since we have a moment, I will tell you about S. Con. Res. 4. Two years ago, an American went to Kish Island, which is part of Iran. The Iranian island is in the Persian Gulf and a visa is not required to get there. We have the records that Bob Levinson, a retired FBI agent, checked out of his hotel, which subsequently has been confirmed by the taxi driver who drove him to the airport and deposited him. At that point, Bob Levinson disappeared and has left a wife and seven children. They happen to reside in the State of Florida. But it doesn't make any difference where the State is. We have a number of Senators who have joined with me on this resolution to keep up the pressure.

I want you to know that under the reasonable man test, all of the evidence we have suggests that Bob Levinson is in Iran and is being held against his will. First, there was an Iranian press story about 6 weeks after Levinson's disappearance that indicated he would be released, that he was in custody. This report comes from PRESS TV, which is an Iranian Government press operation.

In addition, there was a fellow he met with on Kish Island named Belfield, who is a fugitive from American justice. Belfield now resides in Iran and has stated publicly that he met with Bob Levinson. The meeting was suddenly interrupted by people who arrested Belfield. This fellow, Belfield, has said that Levinson is being held in Iran. We have also had the statement by the President of Iran, Ahmadinejad, who says he doesn't know anything about Levinson's location in Iran, but that the Government of Iran would do everything to cooperate.

Thus far, in innumerable contacts from this Senator and Mrs. Levinson including during her visit a year ago to Tehran and to Kish Island, the Government of Iran has not been forthcoming or willing to cooperate.

The reasonable man test says he is held in Iran. I can tell you that this Senator believes he is being held and he is being held in a secret prison. We do know that, from time to time, in several diplomatic sessions, whenever this has been brought up to an Iranian official, first, he says, "We don't know anything about Levinson," and then they immediately change the subject to talk about the Iranians who were picked up by the U.S. Government in Erbil, Iraq. Whether they are suggesting an exchange, we simply don't know. But I can tell you that the Government of the United States, now under the new administration, specifically with the Secretary of State, who has been briefed on details in the Bob Levinson case, is pressing forward.

In conclusion, if there is a new chapter in the relationship between the United States and Iran, what better way for that new chapter to open than for Iran to make a humanitarian gesture by returning this father, this husband, to his family, his wife and seven children. (*Congressional Record*)

Rep. Pete Olson (R-TX)

December 15, 2009

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Iran Refined Petroleum Sanctions Act.

The threat from Iran is real. Just last month, the IAEA censured Iran for its secret nuclear facility. In response, Iran vowed to no longer cooperate with the IAEA and, soon after, announced their plans for 10 additional nuclear enrichment sites. Iran is also the leading state sponsor of terrorism and is supporting extremist organizations in the Middle East and beyond.

It is time for this Congress to say "enough is enough." This legislation sends a clear message: foreign entities selling petroleum to Iran will pay a price and will not enjoy the benefits of having the United States as a customer.

I commend Mr. *Berman* for this fine piece of legislation and urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2194. (*Congressional Record*)

March 25, 2009

Madam Speaker, the threat from Iran is real. It endangers Israel, our greatest ally in the Middle East, many of our NATO allies in Europe, and indeed, the United States of America herself.

The President has said that Iran with nuclear weapons would be a “game changer,” and last week he sent a video message to the people of Iran. What was contained in the message was not as striking as what was left out.

The President did not call on the Iranian Government to give up uranium enrichment. He did not insist that the Iranian Government stop arming Hezbollah in Lebanon and Hamas in Gaza. He did not insist that the Iranian Government stop threatening Israel.

What he did do was call for a “new beginning,” without saying much more. Israeli President Shimon Peres also appealed to the people of Iran before making clear that the country would be run by religious fanatics.

I urge the President to rely more on our friends in the Middle East, who deal with Iran on a daily basis, and less on Youtube and sports metaphors.

The United States must make clear that we support Israel, their President, and their new prime minister in their continuing struggle with Iran and its misguided leaders. (*Congressional Record*)

Rep. Erik Paulsen (R-MN)

December 15, 2009

Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 2194, the Iran Refined Petroleum Sanctions Act.

A few months ago, a second nuclear enrichment site was discovered in Iran. The Iranian regime had withheld the disclosure of this facility from the International Atomic Energy Agency for quite some time--yet another violation of Iran's obligations under the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty. Furthermore, this second facility will allow Iran to produce more enriched uranium and at an even faster rate.

There is no doubt that a nuclear Iran poses a dangerous threat to the United States and its allies throughout the Middle East and across the entire globe. We cannot allow the Iranian regime to continue threatening its neighbors and thumbing its nose at the world. And we certainly cannot let a regime that has threatened to wipe Israel off the map even come close to obtaining a nuclear weapon.

Madam Speaker, the Iran problem is getting worse, not better. It is time we take action.

Currently, Iran relies on foreign suppliers for 40 percent of its refined petroleum. The legislation before us would sanction foreign companies that sell refined petroleum to Iran, or help Iran with its own domestic refining capacity, by depriving those companies of access to the U.S. market. This will help put needed pressure on Iran to suspend its program and allow for verification of that action.

Time and time again, Iran has been given the opportunity to prove they are not pursuing nuclear weapons and each time they have failed to do so. It is time for the U.S. to take action and send a message that the world will not sit idly by as tyrants in Iran buy time to enrich uranium and ultimately amass a nuclear weapon.

Madam Speaker, I would be remiss if I did not mention the brave Iranian people who are peacefully going to the streets to protest the actions of the current regime. It is not only for our own security but also for these people--the students and dissidents who desire a better future for their nation--that this legislation should be passed.

The status quo when it comes to Iran is no longer a viable option. This bill offers a peaceful, significant course of action that will set the world on a safer course when it comes to Iran. I urge adoption of this important legislation. (*Congressional Record*)

October 13, 2009

Mr. Speaker, I also rise today in strong support for H.R. 1327, the Iran Sanctions Enabling Act of 2009. The author of this legislation, Chairman Frank, deserves a great deal of credit for helping shepherd this legislation through committee in a very strong bipartisan basis and for his tenacious work in bringing it to the House floor today in a bipartisan manner. I also want to commend my colleague from Illinois, who I know could not be here today, Mr. Kirk, who also has been a champion of this legislation in the past.

Mr. Speaker, with the recent disclosure of a second site for enriching uranium in Iran, our relations with that country continue to be at the forefront of U.S. foreign policy. The Iranian regime has made no secret of its ambitions to acquire nuclear technology while it continues to engage in human rights violations and suppressing dissent.

The U.S. can and should demand that Iran take specific actions, concrete actions, in the near term. This legislation today is going to help in that effort. The Iranian government will be more responsive if the United States can isolate the regime and apply some distinct pressure that will help force Tehran to deliver on its commitments and not merely to do what it has done in the past, and that is use negotiations to merely run out the clock.

This legislation increases the economic pressure that is placed on Iran by permitting State governments, local governments and educational institutions to divest from investments related to Iran's energy sector.

In addition, the legislation would extend to private actors the ability to consider U.S.-Iran relationships in their investment calculus. This means that registered investment advisors are provided a safe harbor, allowing them to divest from or elect not to invest in securities of companies that invest in Iran's energy sector.

Many States, as the chairman had noted, including my own State of Minnesota, have already moved in that direction. But today we have the opportunity to push this important initiative a

step closer at the Federal level, and in doing so we can help leverage and we can help slow down Iran's nuclear program and move one step closer to helping diminish this major security threat to the Middle East and the rest of the world.

With the recent revelation of the second enrichment site, passage of this legislation is imperative, and it is even more important than it has been in the past.

So I would urge immediate passage of H.R. 1327, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, at the end of last month, Iran finally got around to notifying the United Nations International Atomic Energy Agency of a previously undisclosed nuclear enrichment facility located on a military base. This additional enrichment facility will allow Iran to make more enriched uranium and make it faster.

Now, what this means is that previous estimates on when Iran could potentially achieve a nuclear weapons breakout are now inaccurate and unreliable. What is especially disconcerting to many of us in Congress is that this is supposed to be a civilian facility but it's located on a military base. This raises quite a few red flags, and we must make sure and not allow the Iranian regime to buy even more time.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, this is another violation of Iran's obligation under the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty, which requires all members to declare all nuclear facilities and allow inspection.

Mr. Speaker, it is high time we begin to act on the threat of a nuclear Iran by demanding action, and the Iran Sanctions Enabling Act is one more tool in the toolbox, an important step in moving that direction forward. I ask for its passage, and I commend the leadership again of the chairman for moving this bill in a bipartisan manner forward. (*Congressional Record*)

Speaker Nancy Pelosi (D-CA)

December 15, 2009

I rise in strong support of the Refined Petroleum Sanctions Act. I would like to acknowledge the great leadership of our chairman, Chairman *Berman*, and the ranking member, Congresswoman *Ros-Lehtinen*, for their efforts and leadership to bring this legislation to the floor.

All Members of Congress, regardless of party, agree a nuclear Iran is simply unacceptable; it is a threat to the region, to the United States, and to the world. The American people have great hopes for our friendship with the people of Iran. We look forward to a day when Iran is a much more productive member of the community of nations. Until that day, though, we must ensure that Iran is prevented from obtaining nuclear weapons that would threaten the security of the world.

Iran must take the necessary steps to demonstrate its willingness to live as a peaceful partner in the international community. And we must use all of the tools at our disposal, from diplomacy to sanctions, to stop Iran's march toward nuclear capability.

Today, with this legislation, we give the President a new option, a new tool, the power to impose sanctions against companies that supply Iran with or support its domestic production of gasoline and other refined petroleum products. By targeting Iran's ongoing dependence on largely imported refined petroleum, we reduce the chance that Iran will acquire the capacity to produce nuclear weapons.

A pillar, Mr. Speaker, of our national security is diplomacy; and in the case of Iran, we must use it. We must exhaust every diplomatic remedy. I commend President Obama for standing with other U.N. Security Council leaders earlier this year to condemn Iran and to work toward an agreeable diplomatic solution to end Iran's proliferation of weapons of mass destruction.

However, as we have seen, Iran has refused to accept a reasonable offer that was put on the table a couple of months ago. Instead, it has reiterated its resolve to continue its uranium enrichment program, the cornerstone of its nuclear program. The international community must, therefore, consider stronger options. We have that opportunity today to give the President the option with a waiver to use in the best possible way.

Now, I have heard mention of the State of Israel in some of the debate here today, and Israel certainly has proximity to Iran. Iran is increasing its capability both to develop a weapon of mass destruction and the delivery system to deliver that bad news. But this isn't about Israel. Israel, again, is close, and this development of a weapon of mass destruction is a threat to the region. But the development of a weapon of mass destruction anyplace in the world is a threat to the entire world, and it is not in the national security interest of the United States. So while Israel may bear the brunt or be the closest target--or target of words, if, hopefully, not anything else--they have carried this fight, but it's not just their fight. The fight is all of ours.

I mentioned diplomacy as a pillar of our national security. Another pillar of our foreign policy and of our national security is stopping the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. Imagine what the reaction would be if Iran had a nuclear weapon, what that would evoke in the Arab world in terms of their interest in having weapons of mass destruction. It simply cannot happen. With this legislation today, we strengthen the President's hand to use or to withhold this particular sanction, but to have the capability to use diplomacy in a stronger way.

I urge all of my colleagues to support the Iran Refined Petroleum Sanctions Act.
(*Congressional Record*)

September 25, 2009

Iran's effort to conceal a major nuclear facility sends a clear signal that the regime has not worked in good faith to eliminate the threat of nuclear weapons in the Middle East and around the world.

One of the strongest pillars of America's national security is non-proliferation, and I commend President Obama for standing with fellow leaders to condemn this development and call on Iran to cooperate in our pursuit of a world free of weapons of mass destruction.

An Iran with nuclear weapons is simply unacceptable. It is a threat to the region, to the United States, and to our allies across the globe. Iran must take the necessary steps to demonstrate its willingness to live as a peaceful partner in the international community. And we must use the tools at our disposal – from diplomacy to sanctions – to stop Iran's march toward nuclear capability. (*Press Release*)

Rep. Mike Pence (R-IN)

December 15, 2009

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2194, the Iran Refined Petroleum Sanctions Act, and I commend the chairman and ranking member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee for their leadership in bringing this legislation to the floor.

In June of this year, it was a great privilege for me to partner with Chairman *Berman* in bringing a bipartisan resolution to the floor of the House that expressed the American people's solidarity with dissidents in Iran and condemned the violence taking place there. That resolution was met with overwhelming support. So should this Iran sanctions legislation.

Iran has deceived the world community time and again, and any assurance that their nuclear program is peaceful should be seen for what it is, just another lie. Iran's support for terrorism and pursuit of weapons of mass destruction have long threatened global peace and security. It

is time to impose meaningful sanctions on the Iranian government, and send a strong signal that these dangerous acts will not stand.

President Obama promised during his campaign that he would extend an open hand to Iran and has expended precious time and resources towards that goal. However, the international community and this country have talked long enough about Iran's nuclear ambitions; it is time for deeds.

I urge my colleagues to come together in a bipartisan way to support this important legislation. (*Congressional Record*)

December 15, 2009

I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of H.R. 3714, the Daniel Pearl Freedom of the Press Act. I do so with a profound sense of privilege and gratitude to those who have gone before me on the floor today.

To Chairman *Berman* of California, to the ranking member, Ms. *Ros-Lehtinen* of Florida, your partnership on behalf of a free and independent press on the world stage should be an inspiration to every American looking on these proceedings.

I especially want to express my appreciation for the visionary leadership of Congressman *Adam Schiff*, who brought this legislation and who invited us to partner in his vision for expanding awareness of the people of the United States and the people of the world of the repression of the free press. Congressman *Schiff* and I were elected in the same year. We have undoubtedly followed different paths and usually voted differently on things. We occasionally disagree, but we always agree on freedom and a free and independent press, and I commend the gentleman from California for his singular leadership on this issue and the privilege of working with him.

It is altogether fitting, as the gentlewoman referred earlier, though, that I should do so not only during this debate but also in anticipation of the debate on the next legislation, a bipartisan measure known as the Iran Refined Petroleum Sanctions Act, to specifically point out the abuses of the regime in Iran and express my strong support for H.R. 2194 as well in the midst of this debate.

The reason why the Iran Refined Petroleum Sanctions Act has broad bipartisan support, and that will be reflected on the floor this day, is, among other reasons, the support for terrorism by Iran, the pursuit of weapons of mass destruction, the deception to the world community again and again. But to the point of this debate, it is also imperative that the people of the United States of America send a message to Iran that the aggressive repression of a free press in Iran will not be tolerated in the form of normal relations with the United States of America either diplomatically or economically.

At this point, the Committee to Protect Journalists reports there are some 23 journalists in prison in Iran. Last week, we received word that another opposition newspaper was closed in Iran. And, of course, the world watched in horror in the aftermath of the blatantly fraudulent elections of this past June in Iran, as not only did the secret police stream into the streets to silence, oftentimes by billy club and violence, the dissidents, but we also watched in horror as the Internet was silenced, as YouTube videos were cut off, as access to the free flow of information was stymied by the brutality of the regime in Iran. So I endorse the legislation that will be brought up, but I see a nexus here between the two and can't help but reference it.

The legislation that Congressman *Schiff* and I have brought to the floor will serve two purposes:

Number one, it will remember the extraordinary sacrifice and courage of one Daniel Pearl, kidnapped and murdered by terrorists in Karachi, Pakistan just 4 months after the attacks of September the 11th, 2001. He was serving as a South Asia Bureau Chief for The Wall Street Journal that, at the time, was based in Mumbai, India. He went to Pakistan as part of an investigation into the alleged links between Richard Reid, the convicted would-be shoe bomber of American Airlines flight 63, and al Qaeda and Pakistan's Inter-Services Intelligence Agency. Tragically, Mr. Pearl was brutally executed by his captors. The legislation today is named in his memory, and I hope his family may well be looking on today and know that his memory, his courage, and his example of what it means to advance the practice of journalism on the world stage will never be forgotten in this body.

But the legislation today is not simply a tribute. The Daniel Pearl Freedom of the Press Act also will result in an effort to highlight and promote freedom of the press by including such reports in the State Department's annual Country Reports on Human Rights Practices information.

As we consider this legislation, we remember Daniel Pearl's legacy, and we think of the stories of so many others on the front lines of freedom.

Gustavo Azocar is a political talk show host, newspaper correspondent and blogger in Venezuela, and he is a vocal critic of Hugo Chavez. Azocar was jailed in 2009 after posting information about his court case online. Amnesty International's 2009 "Report on Human Rights in Venezuela" noted the physical attacks and imprisonment of journalists by this corrupt and despotic regime.

As a conservative who believes in limited government, I believe the only check on government power in real-time is a free and independent press. I don't believe our Founders put the First Amendment, freedom of the press, in our Bill of Rights because they got good press. I believe it's because they believed in limited government and believed in the need to constrain consolidations of power.

A free and independent press ensures the free flow of information to the public. It serves as a vital check on such abuses during a time when the role of government in our lives and in our enterprises here at home seems to grow every day. Yet taking a stand today for the principle

of a free press, not only home but in making the means available to hold the lamp of liberty high and to shine it deep into the crevices of this world to expose abuses of the freedom of the press, is a noble task, indeed. So I rise today in support of this legislation.

I commend Chairman *Berman* and Ranking Member *Ros-Lehtinen* for their bipartisan leadership. I commend the gentleman from California, Congressman *Adam Schiff*, for his visionary leadership in bringing this legislation to the floor.

More importantly than that, I salute the bravery of reporters like Daniel Pearl and Gustavo Azocar and of press outlets around the world which, day in and day out, stand in the gap, oftentimes risking their liberty and, in the case of Daniel Pearl, in fact, risking his life to do the work of a free and independent press in the world.

I urge those in that service to stand firm, to take heart and to know that those of us in public life, that those of us in public service, also understand that those who serve in the world of journalism are also in the business of public service.

I urge this Congress to stand in solidarity with those on the front lines of the worldwide fight for the freedom of the press, and I urge support for the Daniel Pearl Freedom of the Press Act and for the legislation that will follow. (*Congressional Record*)

June 19, 2009

I rise with a great sense of humility and a great sense of moment before this body but also a great sense of gratitude to the ranking member for her extraordinary leadership in bringing this resolution to the floor, a resolution which, as the chairman of the committee just stated quite eloquently, will give the American people, through their elected representatives, a clear opportunity on this day, after a week of violence and tumult in the nation of Iran, to express the American people's support for all Iranian citizens who embrace the values of freedom, human rights, civil liberties and the rule of law.

I am especially grateful for the leadership and the spirit brought to this legislation by Chairman Howard Berman, with whom I don't agree on very much; but I am grateful that he demonstrates today a public mindedness that I think is in keeping with the best traditions of this institution.

Ronald Reagan would say in 1964, "You and I are told increasingly that we have to choose between a left or right, but I would like to suggest that there is no such thing as a left or right. There is only an up or down: up to a man's age-old dream, the ultimate in individual freedom consistent with law and order or down to the ant heap of totalitarianism."

Today the leadership of Chairman Howard Berman demonstrates that on the issue of speaking a word of encouragement to those who would stand with extraordinary valor for their own liberty, there is no left or right in this body. It has been, as has been stated before, an extraordinary week in the life of the nation of Iran. On 12 June, just one week ago, from the

very moment that the presidential election results were announced, the international community and the international press called the results into question. Chief among the reasons for that was that even before the extraordinary demonstrations had begun, millions of paper ballots had apparently been tallied and counted within a matter of hours. The official government results of the election were met with public consternation among the people of Iran; and while the defeated candidate launched a legal appeal, as the western media has reported, what has ensued on the streets of Iran has been the biggest demonstration in the Islamic Republic's 30-year history. And most sad, following that election day, the actions by the government and militias that support the government have turned to violence. Pro-government forces have attacked demonstrators over the past week, causing fatalities, resulting in the arrest of dissidents. We have heard of foreign reporters prevented from making their way into the public. We've heard of the jamming of electronic communications. For all the world, we may well be witnessing a Tiananmen in Teheran.

It seems to me that in this moment, the people of the United States of America long to be heard; and by dint of House Resolution 560 today through their elected representatives, the American people will have had that opportunity. This resolution simply states that it is resolved that the House of Representatives expresses its support for all Iranian citizens who embrace the values of freedom, human rights, civil liberties and rule of law. It also condemns the ongoing violence against demonstrators by the Government of Iran and pro-government militias, as well as the ongoing suppression of independent electronic communication through interference with the Internet and cell phones. And lastly, it affirms the universality of individual rights and the importance of democratic and fair elections.

I have said many times this week, and it has been echoed by my colleagues, like the Republican Whip Eric Cantor, that the cause of America is freedom; and in this cause, the American people will not be silent. There is no intention here to pick sides in the Iranian election. There is an intention here, in a true spirit of bipartisanship, to allow the American people to be on the side of liberty and to be on the side of freedom. I urge my colleagues to join us in supporting this legislation because the voice of the American people has before and, I believe in my heart of hearts, will again make a difference in the advancement of human liberty in the world. I urge its support.

...

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentle lady for yielding, and again reiterate my gratitude for her expeditious work in bringing this important resolution to the floor on a timely basis, and commend again Chairman Howard Berman for the spirit and thoughtfulness with which he brought this resolution to the floor.

Today, in the wake of a week of extraordinary public demonstrations, violence, and tumult across the nation of Iran, the American people through this Congress will condemn that violence and the suppression of the free and independent press in Iran, and, as the American people have done throughout our history, we will proclaim liberty by supporting all Iranian citizens who embrace the values of freedom, human rights, civil liberties, and the rule of law in this measure.

I urge my colleagues to support this measure and join us, and, if reports are correct, our colleagues in the Senate who may well come together and give voice on the world stage of the character and compassion and commitment to freedom that is at the heart of every American.

Now, some observers say that America should remain silent in the wake of this violence and the suppression of free speech and the intimidation and suppression of a free and independent press in Iran. But let me say from my heart, the American cause is freedom, and in that cause we must never be silent.

The Iranian regime would do well to note the words of President Ronald Reagan from his first inaugural address 20 January, 1981, where he said, No arsenal or no weapon in the arsenals of the world is so formidable as the will and moral courage of free men and women.

Today this Congress, in a true spirit of bipartisanship, will come together on behalf of the moral courage of the men and women of Iran who have tasted freedom and have been willing to risk their liberty and their lives to advance it.

It is my hope and it is my prayer that this word of encouragement from the American people to the Iranian people will be to good effect for that nation and for freedom in the world. I urge support of this resolution. (*Congressional Record*)

June 17, 2009

Madam Speaker, for the fifth day in a row, hundreds of thousands of Iranian citizens have taken to the streets on behalf of free elections and democracy. Sadly, the response by the Iranian government has been more oppression and violence against its own people, deaths confirmed, hundreds of citizens beaten, and foreign journalists intimidated and banned from the streets. We are witnessing a Tiananmen in Tehran.

While I respect the fact the President of the United States has denounced the violence, that he has said the protestors had a right to be "heard and respected," this administration has not yet expressed the unqualified support of the American people for those who are courageously taking to the streets on behalf of self-government and free elections in Iran.

Yesterday, I introduced House Resolution 549, a resolution that would give voice to countless Americans who want our Nation to support the dissidents in Iran who are struggling for their own freedom.

The American cause is freedom. In this cause, America must never be silent. I urge my colleagues to cosponsor this important resolution and bring it to the floor this week. (*Congressional Record*)

June 17, 2009

WOLF BLITZER: As we have reported, Iran's state-run media is insisting that -- is insisting that the U.S. is meddling, meddling in what it calls Iran's affairs and says that is intolerable. The Obama administration strongly denies that. Let's bring in Republican Congressman Mike Pence of Indiana. He's the chairman of the House Republican Conference, a key member of the Foreign Affairs Committee. You have introduced a resolution in Congress to support the dissidents, what you called the dissidents in Iran. Would that be seen as meddling, congressman, in Iranian affairs?

REP. MIKE PENCE: Well, I'm not really worried about how it would be seen by the tyrants in Tehran. What I'm interested in doing is what Americans have done throughout our history and that is to stand with those and to give encouragement to those that are courageously standing for free elections, free expression, for Democracy and it's hard to look at these past five days and the images that have been so well covered here on CNN and across the Internet and not be deeply moved by the courage of people that are at least risking their liberties and probably risking their lives for free and fair elections and democracy.

BLITZER: So specifically, congressman, what do you want the president to say and do?

PENCE: Look, I appreciate the fact that the president said that the protesters have a right to be heard and respected and I appreciate the fact that he said he is troubled but I respectfully disagree with the administration's decision to -- to essentially draw the line at not meddling and not interfering.

Look, the cause of America is freedom. And in that cause, we must never be silent. And if the president wants to draw the line and say that we are not going to stand with those brave citizens of Iran who are taking to the streets the last five days on behalf of democracy, on behalf of the freedom of speech and free elections, then I think the Congress behind me ought to take up a resolution that very simply expresses the support of the American people through their elected representatives for the people of Iran who are taking a stand for freedom.

Wolf, I really believe we may have an opportunity for a fresh start here, not with the tyrants in Tehran, not with Ahmadinejad, who even looks at what this administration is doing and accuses them of meddling but rather with the good and decent and courageous people of Iran who are stepping forward and risking their liberty and their lives for principles that we as Americans cherish.

BLITZER: The president was on CNBC in an interview and he said the differences between Ahmadinejad and Mousavi may not necessarily be as significant as a lot of folks on the outside are hoping they are. I'm going to play a little clip for you

BLITZER: Is he right, congressman?

PENCE: Well, look, I don't think we should be in the business of endorsing the opposition candidate. What I want the Congress of the United States to do, and frankly what I would like to see the president of the United States of America do is speak a word of support to the people of Iran.

Those demonstrations, those soccer players playing in South Korea, at least for half of the game, are wearing, you know, the green arm bands. They are walking out onto the streets of Tehran in their own country and they're taking a stand. I would suggest not so much for a person as for a principle. It is the principle of free and fair elections. It is the principle of a free and independent press, the freedom of association.

We ought to affirm the fact that hundreds of thousands if not millions of Iranians are risking their liberty and even perhaps their lives to take a stand for the values upon which we have really founded this nation.

But again, the president can draw the line where he wants. I'm working with Republicans and Democrats here on Capitol Hill to give the opportunity for the American people to be heard through their elected representatives. I think Congress ought to pass a resolution that says to the people of Iran who are standing for freedom and free elections, that we support you. And that's message that Americans have sent around the globe for generations. (*Interview on CNN's The Situation Room*)

June 16, 2009

Madam Speaker, I come to this floor at a time of extraordinary moment on the global stage. According to the Islamic Republic News Agency, the official news agency of Iran, President Mahmud Ahmadinejad, supposedly won the election over his primary opponent on 12 June 2009.

But from the very moment that that election result was announced, the international community and the international press called it into question, and the bases for that, even before the extraordinary demonstrations had begun to take place, is the fact that these were paper ballots, but the official government results of the election were announced literally within hours of the polls being closed.

Various media outlets around the world have questioned the authenticity of the results. Mr. Mousavi, the defeated candidate, has launched a legal appeal against the election results. On the day of the election, mobile phone communications were interrupted. Western media has reported "heavy electronic jamming" disturbing broadcasts. News Web sites were reportedly blocked by Iranian authorities, and the Iranian Government has allegedly arrested opposition political figures and journalists.

The Iranian Government has outlawed any protests following 2 days of extraordinary unrest. The BBC recently reported that recent rallies in the streets of Tehran were the biggest demonstrations in the Islamic Republic's 30-year history. The protests, according to news reports, became violent, and according to media reports, pro-government forces attacked demonstrators in the last 24 hours, causing at least one fatality.

We are witnessing a Tiananmen in Tehran, and the United States of America must stand in the gap on behalf of those brave Iranian citizens who are standing for free and fair elections, democracy, and basic rights. Freedom, in fact, may be flowering in Iran, as hundreds of thousands rally for democracy and free elections.

And while I appreciate President Obama's comments yesterday at the White House that he was "troubled by the violence," and his belief that the voices of the Iranian people should be "heard and respected," it seems by my likes that this administration has yet to express the unqualified support of the American people for those who are courageously taking to the streets for free elections and for democracy in Iran.

Let me say from my heart, the American cause is freedom, and in this cause, the American people will not be silent, here or abroad. If the President of the United States won't express the unqualified support of our Nation for the dissidents in the streets of Tehran, this Congress must.

Today, I am introducing a resolution that will do just that. It will express its concern regarding the reported irregularities of the presidential elections of 12 June 2009; condemn the violence against demonstrators by pro-government militias in Tehran in the wake of the election; it will affirm our belief in the universality of individual rights and the importance of democratic and fair elections; and lastly and most importantly, Madam Speaker, it will express the support of the American people for all Iranian citizens who struggle for freedom, civil liberties, and the protection of the rule of law.

Believe it or not, in my small town of Columbus, Indiana, I grew up next door to a Hungarian immigrant who fled Hungary in the wake of the Soviet repression of the Hungarian Revolution in 1956. I sat often with Julius Perr, now passed away, and heard of the way the Hungarian people, inspired by our calls for freedom, stood up for their own freedom. And as Bret Stephens recounts in today's Wall Street Journal, We stood by idly, we didn't want to interfere, and the Soviet tanks rolled.

We cannot stand idly by, speak of Iran sovereignty, speak of their own right to choose their own leadership at a time when hundreds of thousands of Iranians are risking their liberty, and even their lives, to stand for free elections and democracy.

Ronald Reagan said, "There is no arsenal or no weapon in the arsenals of the world so formidable as the will and moral courage of free men and women." All of us desire a fresh start with Iran, and it seems from news reports and the extraordinary images coming from the streets of Iran that millions of Iranians long for a new start in their government. There is a reformist movement afoot in Iran.

Today, I will introduce a resolution. I urge all of my colleagues in both parties to join me in expressing support for these brave and courageous men and women. (*Congressional Record*)

May 4, 2009

On this day, we remember reporters like Roxana Saberi. Miss Saberi is a 31-year-old American journalist who was arrested in February 2009, and is being held in Iran on charges of espionage, which her lawyer and the U.S. Department of State call baseless. Saberi is a freelance journalist who moved to Iran 6 years ago and reports for NPR, the BBC, and other news organizations. A true representative of this melting pot that is America, she grew up in Fargo, North Dakota, the daughter of Reza Saberi, who was born in Iran , and Akiko Saberi, who is from Japan.

As we learn of cases like Miss Saberi, we understand the stakes that are at risk here. We understand why oppressive regimes like that of Iran want so desperately to muzzle the unfiltered reporting of journalists like Saberi. And we understand why it is so important to cherish and protect freedom of the press as a vital check on abuses of power. Today, we call on the government of Iran to free Miss Saberi, hospitalized in her desperate attempt to win her freedom with a hunger strike that might appeal to the conscience of her oppressor where her valid legal arguments did not. (*Congressional Record*)

Rep. Gary Peters (D-MI)

December 15, 2009

Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the Iran Refined Petroleum Sanctions Act, legislation that I co-sponsored because of my concerns about the Iranian nuclear threat. We in Congress must act swiftly to make sure a nuclear Iran is never a reality.

I know how destabilizing a nuclear Iran would be to the region. While serving on duty with the U.S. Navy reserve in the United Arab Emirates, I could look out each day over the Straights of Hormuz. I could see the line of oil tankers waiting to transit the straights and I saw what a choke point that was for the world's economy. This year, I traveled to Israel, a trip which reinforced just how critical and grave the threat from Iran is to Israel's security and America's interests in the region.

Despite being a leading producer of crude oil, Iran cannot adequately meet its own needs for refined petroleum products. Enacting sanctions to restrict the imports of those products into Iran is important leverage we must have to ensure the security of the United States, Israel, and our allies around the world.

Passing tough sanctions today will show Iran, and the global community, that the United States will not stand idle as Iran attempts to amass a nuclear arsenal.

Madam Speaker, the threat is real and the time to act is now. I strongly urge passage.
(*Congressional Record*)

Rep. Joseph Pitts (R-PA)

October 28, 2009

Mr. Speaker, last week the Iranian Government handed down death sentences to three activists who protested this year's stolen election in Iran. There are at least 140 other demonstrators who will be subject to these sham trials, and unfortunately, there may be more executions as the regime seeks to restore their iron rule.

The charges were phony, the trials were held in secret, the outcome rigged, and now the Iranian Government is only identifying condemned men by their initials. The Iranian Government is clearly on shaky footing; and according to some reports, they imported Hezbollah and Hamas radicals who wore face masks and who couldn't speak Farsi to harass and beat the demonstrators.

Unfortunately, we continue to negotiate with this brutal regime, legitimizing their autocratic rule, even though they are so weak they must resort to hiring brutal thugs from other nations.

The President should act swiftly, without regard to Russian objections to institute international sanctions that will support freedom for the Iranian people and undermine the vicious rulers who persecute them. (*Congressional Record*)

Rep. Ted Poe (R-TX)

December 15, 2009

I appreciate the gentlewoman for yielding. I totally support this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, the First Amendment to our Constitution is first for a reason. The items stated in the First Amendment--the right of freedom of religion, the right of freedom of speech and of a free press and the right to peaceably assemble--are in the First Amendment because they are the most important. Without those four, the rest of the amendments that follow are meaningless, especially the two which deal with freedom of speech and with the freedom of press.

You will notice the amendment to our Constitution guarantees a free press. It does not guarantee a fair press, as "fair" is always in the eyes of the beholder; but it guarantees the right that a press may exist and communicate, first, through the written word about what is taking place in a free society, in a democracy, in a republic. Iran is a perfect example of a nation that does not believe in a free press or in a press of any kind. It does not want to have its illegitimate regime exposed to the world in order to let the world know what is taking place in that country.

We have all seen the students who protested last summer and, more recently, in the last week and a half. We have all seen how the regime in Iran blocked Internet access and blocked cell phone usage so that photographs of what took place could not be transmitted somewhere else. We have seen that journalists were hauled off to jail and were tried before the star chamber in

secret and that some of them were sentenced to the penitentiary. Speech is silenced in Iran, both that of the oral word and the written word. A free press is the enemy of a dictator.

President Ahmadinejad is in defiance of world peace. He is determined to build nuclear weapons, and he is determined to build missiles that are capable of delivering those nuclear weapons. Of course, he has made those plans of his clear to destroy Israel and to be a constant threat to the West, especially to Europe and to the United States. He oppresses his own people. That is why those people, those young people, including journalists and reform clergy members, are opposing his legitimacy to be ruler over them.

My own opinion is that, in that nation, the more the world hears about what takes place there, the more the world will support the people of Iran and a regime change. I hope that we stand by the people of Iran, who desire to have self-determination and to rule their country in spite of their rogue dictator.

Of course, now before us today is another bill regarding sanctions of Iran. I, personally, am not a big fan of sanctions. Historically, they haven't worked. Some countries have always figured out a way to get around it. To me, sanctions usually mean that we kick the problem on down the road with the intention of maybe dealing with it later. However, preventing refined gasoline from getting to Iran is a good idea, and that is what this sanction that we will talk about later and vote on is all about. It may have the result of helping the people of Iran change their illegitimate government.

Mr. Speaker, dictators hate a free press, but a free press is essential to a free people whether those free people are in the United States or whether those free people are in the nation of Iran.

And that's just the way it is. (*Congressional Record*)

December 14, 2009

Madam Speaker, on December 10, 2009 the Iraqi government announced that it is going to forcibly displace thousands of Iranian dissidents living in Camp Ashraf to a remote prison in the Iraqi desert. The Iraqi government knows the world recognizes Camp Ashraf as a refuge for those who stand tall for freedom and democracy, so it is demolishing their homes they have lived in for over 20 years and moving them to southern Iraq, where the Iraqi government thinks it can do whatever it wants to them and the world won't notice.

The families in Camp Ashraf's biggest crime is that they love freedom and oppose the oppressive Iranian regime. Tehran has for months now pressured the Iraqi government to hand over Camp Ashraf residents so it can imprison and torture them just like they do to all who dare speak out against the regime. This is no secret: Iranian Parliament Speaker Ali Larijani explicitly asked Iraqi lawmakers in early November to expel these dissidents from Iraqi soil.

Iraqi Prime Minister Nouri Al-Maliki, wanting to better relations with Iran, sent Iraqi government forces to brutally attack Camp Ashraf residents in July. It was a humanitarian catastrophe leaving 11 unarmed residents dead, 500 wounded, and 36 abducted.

We cannot ignore any perpetrator, whether friend or foe, who seeks to violently and brutally oppress innocent people. America cannot forget the people of Camp Ashraf.

Prime Minister Al-Maliki should stand by repeated and written assurances he has given to the United States and the United Nations to respect the fundamental rights of the residents of Ashraf. These are ``protected persons" under the Fourth Geneva Convention. President Obama should honor the U.S. government's repeated promises to protect these people.

The President and Secretary Clinton should undertake whatever steps necessary to ensure the safety and well-being of the residents of Camp Ashraf. The increasingly vulnerable regime in Tehran must not be allowed to extend its repressive tentacles beyond Iran's border and crack down on its principal opposition. Someone must stand up for those who cannot stand up for themselves.

It's bad enough that Iran brutalizes Iranian dissidents in Iran; the world cannot ignore Iran's intent to brutalize its own people in Camp Ashraf in the foreign country of Iraq as well.

And that's just the way it is. (*Congressional Record*)

December 14, 2009

Madam Speaker, the whole world has been watching what has taken place in Copenhagen, Denmark last week and this week. All the talk is about climate change and how man is affecting the climate, but what we need in this world is a climate change in Iran. That's right. We need to change the atmosphere in Iran with what has taken place with the little man from the desert, Ahmadinejad.

Last week and even this week, thousands of students--and here is a photograph of some of them--have taken to the streets to protest the regime of Ahmadinejad and how oppressive it is. They are complaining in this peaceful protest against the tyranny against the people of Iran. Not only Ahmadinejad, but they are protesting the radical mullahs and the Iranian military.

You see, these young people want what everybody throughout the world wants--freedom. Somewhere down in the way that we are made there is this spark; there is this flame of freedom. The people in Iran don't have that, so the young people have taken to the streets--the sons of Iran, the daughters of democracy--and they are protesting the oppressive government. They are protesting the fraudulent elections that got Ahmadinejad elected last summer. They are protesting the fact that they have no freedom in their own country. They have suffered the consequences for these protests. They have been beaten. They have been teargassed. They have been hauled off to jail.

The press has been oppressed as well. In fact, what has occurred is that the Internet has been closed, and cell phones have been blocked--all in the name of preventing young people and others from protesting this oppressive regime.

We all remember this past summer how numerous students were murdered in the streets just because they complained to their government about what was taking place. Already 80 of those protesters, political prisoners, have been tried by the star chamber--in secret, away from anybody in a public trial--and 80 of them have received sentences in an Iranian prison of 15 years or more, and 5 of them have received a sentence of the death penalty.

Why? What is their crime?

Their crime is objecting to the oppression of their own government, and for that, they are punished. Of course, others have been shot in the streets just because they have taken to the streets to protest their government.

You know, the students aren't the only ones who have been arrested. Journalists have been arrested. Clerics, who call themselves ``reform clerics," and other people--all for the same reason--objecting to their government. They object to what has taken place.

By blocking the cell phones and Internet access, the government had hoped to keep the word from getting out to the rest of the world about this pollution, about this horrible climate in Iran, but the word has gotten out--photographs such as this one here. Here is another one of a young Iranian student having been beaten for taking to the streets to protest his government last week. This one also escaped the controlled press of the Iranian Government.

You know, Iran violates its own constitution by not allowing its people to protest and to lawfully assemble. They are standing for basic human rights. That's right--the right to peaceably assemble and to object to your government and what it's doing to you. It's the right of free speech--a basic human right. It's the right of a free press, which is a right we take for granted in this country.

So we need a regime change in Iran. The way to do that is to help these young people and the people who want to change their regime. We must support them. This country should support them in any way that we can.

Yes, President Ahmadinejad is the pollution of the world, and we need a change of climate in Iran. The students are sending a message to Iran's rogue government that you can beat us, you can arrest us, you can imprison us, but you will not stop us, and you will not intimidate us because we are not going away.

Good for them. We should be proud of those students. We should support them. We should have a climate change in Iran.

And that's just the way it is. (*Congressional Record*)

November 18, 2009

Mr. Speaker, yesterday the United Nations had an update on the government of the tiny tyrant in the desert of Iran. The U.N. nuclear watchdog agency, the International Atomic Energy Agency, or the IAEA, has released their new report on Iran's nuclear site. This facility, called Fordo, is being built inside a mountain near the religious city Qom. The IAEA concluded the facility had no relevance to any alleged civilian power program.

Western analysts say Fordo's small size will only allow enrichment of small amounts of uranium enough to make a nuclear bomb, but not enough to fuel a nuclear power station. Are we surprised with this finding.

The IAEA said in its report that Iran was not able to convince them that they weren't hiding other nuclear sites. Well, imagine that.

The Government of Iran sponsors acts of terrorism all over the world. Now this thuggish government seeks to threaten the world with nuclear holocaust. For 30 years, Iran has used terrorism, assassination squads, and hostages as their foreign policy.

And, Mr. Speaker, just look at the way this government treats its own people. The people of Iran live in fear of their own government and their own President. Iranian state television yesterday reported that five Iranian citizens were sentenced to death for peaceably protesting the fraudulent Presidential elections in June. That's right. They got the death penalty for exercising the human right to peaceably assemble. And in this Third World country, the death penalty rules the day.

Further, Mr. Speaker, the world witnessed earlier this year how the government even murdered its own people in the streets who peacefully protested the Presidential elections that were rigged by Ahmadinejad.

The cries of the murdered are from the blood of the Iranian freedom patriots who want freedom in their own country. More than 100 prominent opposition leaders in Iran are now being tried for peacefully protesting. Brave men and women of Iran who refuse to be trampled by the tiny tyrant, Ahmadinejad.

The United States should stand with the people of Iran that oppose this illegitimate reign of terror by their government and by their president. The government of Iran is the threat to world peace, especially peace in the Middle East. The sanctions that have been imposed by the U.N. and other Nations on Iran have failed to get the attention of the desert rat, Ahmadinejad. He continues to build his nuclear weapons. He continues to build intercontinental ballistic missiles so that he can fire those nuclear weapons. He continues to finance terrorist groups like Hezbollah and Hamas. He continues to meddle in the lawful affairs of Iraq, including supporting assaults and assassinations against the Iranian people that are in Camp Ashraf.

He sends aid and comfort to al Qaeda and to the Taliban in Afghanistan that war against American troops and NATO troops. The key to world peace and peace in Iran is a regime change sponsored by the freedom-loving citizens of Iran. Those noble citizens who have now

become the enemy of their own government deserve our support and our encouragement here in America.

Mr. Speaker, deep down in the soul of every person who ever has been or ever will be born is the spark for freedom. The sons of liberty and the daughters of democracy in Iran have in their hearts that spark for liberty, and they will not be quenched by the tiny tyrant of Iran.

It is imperative that the United States recognize the true threat to world peace, Ahmadinejad, and that we as a Nation and that we as a people stand shoulder to shoulder with the good folks of Iran, the citizens of Iran that want a change in their government.

And that's just the way it is. (*Congressional Record*)

October 21, 2009

Madam Speaker, for over 60 years, Israel has had to fight for its mere existence. No other nation has suffered more discrimination and outright threats from the United Nations itself. There have been more U.N. resolutions condemning Israel than any other nation, more than 20 a year.

Approximately 80 percent of country censures issued by the United Nations Human Rights Council are aimed at the nation of Israel, and last week they did it again, issuing another report self-righteously condemning Israel.

But let's just take a look at who some of the members of this so-called "human rights" council are. It's really a rogue's gallery of dictators and tyrants.

The Communist countries of Cuba and China have a seat at the U.N. human rights table. These two stellar threats to their own people are self-righteously condemning Israel. The whole world saw China's disrespect for human rights on display in Tiananmen Square. Religious persecutions, the one-child policy, forced abortions for people who already have one child, persecutions of political dissidents are rampant, and speech against the government is brutally suppressed. China is, yes, a truly shining example of human rights. Yeah, right.

And then there is the tiny Communist country of Cuba, you know, the Mario brothers, Fidel and Raul. They have over 250 prisons in that nation. Political dissidents are beaten and tortured in this island paradise of persecution. Some have died in prison from this abuse. Cuba is a nation that denies human rights to its own people.

And then there is Iran. Iran also sits on the United Nations Human Rights Council. Now, what a surprise that is. What legitimate human rights organization would want Iran as a member? Run by the mullahs and the little fella from the desert, Ahmadinejad, Iran systematically violates human rights. Unarmed men and women are still in jail today for peacefully protesting this summer's rigged presidential election. You know, Madam Speaker, the election where the government murdered unarmed students who wanted freedom. The ones who survived were beaten and tortured, they are denied medical care in jail, and some are

sexually assaulted by the jailers as retribution. Some Iranian human rights activists simply disappear, never to be seen again.

Amnesty International says that right now they know of eight women at risk of being stoned to death in Iran for adultery. Of course, if a woman is raped in Iran, that sometimes is considered adultery, too. And the male perpetrator, well, he's released.

In 2004, a 13-year-old girl, Zhila Izadi, was sentenced to death by stoning for being raped and impregnated by her 15-year-old brother. One news report says that the international outrage forced a reduction from death to 55 lashes. After Zhila gave birth to the baby, the government stole her child.

The people of Iran and Iranian Americans continue to cry out against their own government's crimes against the Iranian citizens and their violations of human rights.

Iran is also sending money and equipment to worldwide terrorist groups. To make matters worse, the tiny tyrant of Iran, Ahmadinejad, says he wants to wipe all of Israel off the map. He is making nuclear weapons and building intercontinental ballistic missiles. Now, who do you think these missiles are aimed at? And Iran sits on the United Nations Human Rights Council. This rogue's gallery of misfits has no moral basis to sit in judgment of Israel or anyone else for that matter.

Israel has been fighting for its existence ever since it came into being a nation.

In 1967, it was attacked by its neighbors. It gained territory in that defensive war, including in the West Bank, in Gaza and in the Sinai Peninsula. International law requires that land won in a defensive war must be returned when there is a negotiated peace.

Time and again, Israel has placed itself in jeopardy, has given back land and has traded that land for an empty promise of peace, and Israel is still committed to peace.

Israel and the Palestinians need to problem-solve their issues and need to establish a permanent peace for Israel and for the Palestinian community. There must be a mutual respect for Jews and Muslims. Solutions will occur when respect and honesty are present on both sides. What Israel asks in return is that her enemies merely stop trying to kill her people.

Yet the U.N. Human Rights Council continues to bash Israel. Some members of the council are themselves overwhelmingly guilty of human rights violations and of violent crimes against their own people. These hypocrites have no place at the judgment seat, deciding human rights violations for Israel or for any other nation.

And that's just the way it is. (*Congressional Record*)

September 30, 2009

Mr. Speaker, Iran's rogue regime is getting closer and closer to going nuclear. And if we want to get their attention, we have to do something real: sanction Iran's gasoline imports. That's where Ahmadinejad is vulnerable. The tiny tyrant doesn't have enough oil refineries, and Iran imports 40 percent of its gasoline. We must make it pretty painful to be Iran's gasoline supplier. If we're waiting on the United Nations, that's not going to happen. Russia and Iran are just too cozy, and Russia will probably veto any sanctions. Also, Ahmadinejad's twin terrorist tyrant Moammar Qaddafi and the Libyans have a temporary seat on the Security Council. Libya will never vote to sanction their terrorist buddies. U.N. sanctions are a hapless illusion.

While the world talks, Iran test-fires missiles that could hit Israel, and they soon will have missiles that could hit Europe and the United States. Iran is the number one supplier of terrorism worldwide. A nuclear Iran is not an option. Peace-loving nations should sanction Iran's gasoline imports and encourage the Iranian people to change their reckless regime.

And that's just the way it is. (*Congressional Record*)

September 24, 2009

Mr. Speaker, the circus parade hit the United Nations yesterday. Libya's Omar Qaddafi treated everyone to a 100-minute rambling rant. It seems he thinks President Kennedy's assassin, Lee Harvey Oswald, was a spy and working for Israel. He says capitalism is the cause of all the world's problems and the U.N. was founded by terrorist nations like the United States.

The little fella from the desert of Iran, Ahmadinejad, gave a speech that cleared the room. The United States and other diplomats walked out. The tiny tyrant accused Israel of genocide and denies the Holocaust. The dictator praised his own glorious election this summer. You know, that's the one when his government murdered Iranian protestors.

These twin tyrants rant about death, destruction and doom to America and Israel. They preach hate and murder in the name of religion. These two twin threats to world peace cannot be brushed aside as laughable clowns.

The United States must take their hate speech and intimidation seriously. Our Nation must be prepared to defend America from their arrogant, aggressive threats.

And that's just the way it is. (*Congressional Record*)

September 23, 2009

Mr. Speaker, the tiny tyrant from Iran, President Ahmadinejad, is speaking at the United Nations today, continuing to spread his hate against Israel and the United States. He's

taunting the world with his nuclear program--by intimidation. He wants a nuclear bomb. And recent leaked reports say he's got all the elements to build a nuclear weapon.

The administration has abandoned the American missile defense shield based in Poland that was to protect us from Iranian missiles. Just a few days ago, one popular Polish newspaper had the front page headline that said, "Betrayed! The United States has sold us to the Russians and stabbed us in the back." We have left our allies vulnerable--like Poland--who stand with us fighting terrorism in Afghanistan.

The little fella in the desert has challenged the United States of America. He's called us out, and we backed off. We have succumbed to the Desert Rat's demands.

Truman, Kennedy, Reagan. None of these historical giants ever backed down from a gunslinger's threats. They knew that it was their responsibility to protect this Nation. To stand with our allies. When they were called out by tyrants, they stood their ground and did not flinch.

Has America lost its nerve? We shall see.

And that's just the way it is. (*Congressional Record*)

September 22, 2009

Madam Speaker, the little fellow in the desert has been at it again. Iran's usurper President Ahmadinejad that calls the Holocaust a myth has made it clear he wants nuclear weapons and intercontinental ballistic missiles to destroy Israel and the United States. And now the tiny tyrant is in New York City spreading hate at the U.N.

A leaked document says that Iran has all the elements they need to build a nuclear weapon. They have been working with North Korea on missiles, missiles with more distance and more accuracy.

The unstable situation demands that we put a complete missile defense system in place. We are leaving ourselves and our allies vulnerable, but the administration last week scrapped our missile defense system that's based in Poland, and they also cut our radar systems in the Czech Republic. Believe it or not, this country cannot stop a missile fired at us. One would think that would be a priority.

Why are the American people left vulnerable to any tin pot totalitarian with an itchy trigger finger? The government's main job is to defend the American people, even from gun-toting little thugs who are determined to have an international shoot-out with the United States.

And that's just the way it is. (*Congressional Record*)

July 27, 2009

Mr. Speaker, the women of Iran are inspiring people around the world leading in the cause and fight for freedom. They have taken to the streets by the thousands because of the fraudulent government elections and repressive government subjugation. They are giving even men courage to protest. The New York Times ran an eyewitness report saying, "For days now, I've seen women urging less courageous men on. I've seen them get beaten and return to the fray." Women shout at the men to "Get up. Get up. Speak out against government oppression."

Untold numbers of Iranian women have been arrested. Shadi Sadr is a journalist, lawyer, and a human rights activist. She was last seen Friday, July 17, on her way to prayer. She was seen struggling with government henchmen as they beat her and dragged her into a car.

Shadi managed to break away for a few moments, but she was chased down, beaten with batons and taken to prison in Tehran to keep her voice silent. She is jailed this very night as we assemble here in this cradle of liberty. What's the charge? What's her crime? Seeking freedom and respect seem to be her crimes. And by any means necessary, the black-booted government thugs want to silence those who exercise the first human right of freedom--and that being the freedom to speak out against oppression.

As a lawyer, Shadi represents Iranian activists and journalists. She has won cases for several women sentenced to be executed for violations of religious laws, and those convictions have been overturned. She is also involved in Women's Field, a group defending women's rights in Iran, including the "Stop Stoning Forever" campaign.

Mr. Speaker, women are tragically stoned to death for religious violations in Iran, for acts that aren't even crimes in civilized countries. They are buried up to their waist with their hands tied behind their backs, then a mob throws stones at them until they're dead. And sometimes it takes more than an hour to die. These violent, barbaric acts are to be condemned by those who value life and liberty.

For the first time in a Presidential campaign in Iran, women made their oppression an issue in the election. Women courageously confronted their oppressors demanding freedom.

One Iranian woman said, "When the elections were stolen, women felt betrayed. They took to the streets. Images of security forces beating up unarmed, innocent women were shocking and fueled their anger. At times, the number of women exceeded those of men in the protest."

One protester told reporters, "We don't sit in the corner and wait for the men to make change. We do it. We are the mothers of Iran."

You see, Mr. Speaker, women in Iran have been fighting for dignity and respect for over 30 years. Mr. Speaker, these mothers of Iran have true courage, the kind of courage that comes from standing for truth over government lies. The kind of courage that comes from fighting for freedom against tyranny.

It's been said "Tyranny is when the people fear the government. Freedom is when the government fears the people." And now, the government of Iran has begun to fear these ladies of liberty.

The women of Iran have shown their courage to the world. They speak with one bold voice saying "NO MORE". They will not be silenced because truthful, righteous words cannot long be silenced by the stones of oppression and the rocks of brutality.

The Ladies of Liberty are writing their own glorious page in history. They have been unjustly trampled, dragged, beaten, shot, and killed by a government that has declared war on its own people.

They have earned their honored place among those who have shed blood for freedom. But their fight is not for their native Iran alone. It is a fight for all freedom-seeking women and men worldwide that are being persecuted by their own government. Shadi Sadr and the wonder women have earned the respect of the free world.

Mr. Speaker, it is only a matter of time before the women of Iran win their freedom. They are throwing off the yolk of tyranny. With every step they take, they move closer to the day that liberty will be theirs. When they are successful in liberating their country from tyranny, Iran and the world will be safer. Their cause is righteous and their actions are just.

And that's just the way it is. (*Congressional Record*)

July 21, 2009

Mr. Speaker, the women of Iran are standing shoulder to shoulder in the streets protesting against the rigged, corrupt Iranian elections. At least that's how it began. Now these legions of women, mostly wearing black, full-length Islamic dress, stand in defiance of their government's treatment of women. These women have shed their blood, suffered the same beatings and imprisonment as men. Some have sacrificed their very lives.

In America our hearts ache as we watched the video of Neda Agha Soltan. She was shot by her own government henchmen as she walked through the streets. She bled to death in that street, a martyr for democracy in Iran. Neda was only 26 years old, but her voice still cries from the grave: "that the people of Iran demand human rights, equality and freedom from tyranny."

Young women like a girl named Parsia told reporters, and I quote, "This regime is against all humanity, more specifically, against all women." She continues, "Lots of girls and women in these demonstrations. They're all angry, ready to explode, scream out and let the world hear their voices. I want the world to know that as a woman in this country, I have no freedom."

The women of Iran have a rich history of fighting for freedom. In the early 1900s, in Persia, later called Iran, Britain and Russia tried to rule Persia through a puppet government.

In 1906, the Persian people fought the shah, and became a constitutional republic. They had a Congress called the Majlis to make their laws.

American economic expert Morgan Shuster was appointed to that democratic government in 1911 to organize Persia's finances. At that time, members of the Majlis were threatened or were bribed by Russia, with support from Great Britain, to disband that constitutional government. Shuster wrote in his memoirs about Persian women who armed themselves and who marched on the Congress.

He writes about those bold, brave women, "Out from their walled courtyards and harems marched 300 women with the flush of undying determination in their cheeks. They were clad in their plain black robes with the white nets of their veils drooped over their faces. Many held pistols under their skirts or in the folds of their sleeves. Straight to the Congress they went."

These "Persian mothers, wives and daughters" dropped their veils and waved their pistols, saying they had decided to "kill their own husbands and sons and leave behind their own dead bodies" if the Congress "wavered in their duty to uphold the liberty and dignity of the Persian people and nation."

Because of these courageous women 100 years ago, the Persian Congress stood firm in their struggle for liberty and freedom for the people. However, Russian Cossacks marched into Tehran a week later, disbanding the government by force and executing every constitutionalist they could find.

History speaks to the courage and bravery of Iranian women, which goes back for centuries. It is no surprise they are again at the forefront of the struggle for human rights and dignity in Iran. The women of Iran are not the property of the government, and should not be punished because they demand equality with men. These women present a great challenge for the hard-line government. They are a force to be reckoned with, and the government knows it.

My grandmother used to tell me that there's nothing more powerful than a woman who has made up her mind. Let me tell you something, Mr. Speaker: The women of Iran have made up their minds. They are not going to take it anymore. Like their sisters in freedom 100 years ago, they are not going to give into the black-booted thugs who are trying to steal freedom and human dignity from them. Iran is their country. These women are no longer going to be treated as second-class people. Woe be to those who try to stop them. The daughters of Iran have inspired the world with their bravery. Their cause is righteous. Their actions are just. May the almighty who rules the universe make them strong and courageous.

And that's just the way it is. (*Congressional Record*)

June 23, 2009

Mr. Speaker, the turmoil continues in Iran with the little man from the desert, President Mahmud Ahmadinejad, claiming victory in the apparent fraudulent presidential elections.

Leave it to the students of Iran to continue to protest, in spite of the government's shooting of students and others who risk their lives for the human right to peaceably assemble and freedom of speech.

Backed by the government-controlled press and the religious leaders, Ahmadinejad is trying to quell the hundreds of thousands who say his claim to the imperial throne of the presidency is a fraud.

The sons of liberty and the daughters of democracy in Iran who wish to exercise the right of free speech and freedom to assemble should resolve this drama peaceably in order to ensure their human rights. And I hope our American policy would be morally and verbally supportive, as stated by President Kennedy years ago when he said, "Let every Nation know, whether it wishes us well or ill, that we will pay any price, bear any burden, meet any hardship, support any friend, oppose any foe, in order to ensure the survival and the success of liberty." (*Congressional Record*)

June 25, 2009

Mr. Speaker, we have all seen the bold and brave students defy the imperial regime of President Ahmadinejad of Iran as they struggle for freedom.

The people of Iran are being shot, assaulted and arrested by their repressive government. This is the same government that supplies arms and money to insurgents that are at war with our military in Iraq and Afghanistan.

The Iranian Revolutionary Guard, a state sponsor of terror, or more appropriately called the "Demons of Democracy", are killing their own people, mostly students, whose only crime is speaking out in public against these tough tyrants.

As the Fourth of July nears, the most sacred of all days of liberty, how about we invite the sons of freedom and the daughters of democracy of Iran for a bit of "Hot Dog Diplomacy?" The youth of Iran have shown more tenacity and love of freedom than the world has seen in years.

There would be no better way to honor the Fourth of July, our Founders and our heritage, than to celebrate this glorious day by opening our embassies not to the Iranian Government, but to these students who desire freedom and liberty.

And that's just the way it is. (*Congressional Record*)

Rep. Tom Price (R-GA)

September 25, 2009

“We cannot continue to ignore the need to halt Iran’s drive toward nuclear weapons,” said Chairman Price. “The public revelation of this nuclear facility’s existence illustrates yet again that the current Iranian regime cannot be trusted. The most stunning news, however, is that President Obama was aware of this facility’s existence, understood that it appears non-peaceful, yet still decided to weaken our missile defense capabilities. This administration’s nonchalant attitude about the threat of a missile-borne nuclear attack from Iran is absolutely reckless. Missile defense systems are vital measures that will both deter and defend against the threat of missile-borne attacks. Yet, the Obama administration has scrapped plans for a defensive site in Eastern Europe and has cut \$1.2 billion in missile defense funding.

“The lies and secrecy from Iran show a clear desire for more than nuclear powered electricity. At the same time, Iran continues to develop its missile program. A missile-delivered nuclear weapon from Iran will one day soon become a very real, very dangerous threat to America and our allies. The Iranian government has a long history of negotiating in bad faith. It should be clear to all but the most naïve that diplomacy alone will not prevent Iran from obtaining nuclear weapons.” *(Press Release)*

Rep. Mike Quigley (D-IL)

December 15, 2009

Mr. Speaker, despite its claims of pursuing only a peaceful nuclear program, Iran's actions clearly show that it's developing a nuclear bomb. You only need three elements to create a bomb: material, a delivery system, and a warhead. Iran has or almost has all three of these elements.

According to the International Atomic Energy Agency, Tehran has developed 1 3/4 tons of low-enriched uranium, enough to make two bombs. As for a delivery system, we know Iran has missiles and in May, tested a new long-range missile that can reach Israel, our other allies, and our troops in the region.

Regarding a warhead, the IAEA has evidence that Iran is working on fitting a bomb inside a missile cone. And this week it was reported that Iran has a plan to test a neutron initiator, a component that is used only to trigger a nuclear bomb and has no possible civilian applications.

As we stand here debating, Iran is making a nuclear bomb. The Iran Refined Petroleum Sanctions Act will send a signal to Tehran that we will not stand by silently while they develop a nuclear weapon and threaten the entire region. *(Congressional Record)*

November 17, 2009

Mr. Speaker, today the International Atomic Energy Agency released disturbing new information about Iran. The U.N. watchdog said Iran could be constructing several more covert nuclear installations. The report also said that Iran lied about the facility we do know about, saying construction began in 2007 when satellite photos prove it was started in 2002.

Most disturbing of all, the report indicates that Tehran has now produced 1 3/4 tons of low-enriched uranium. That is enough for two bombs if enriched further. Four weeks ago, Iran was offered a deal to ship its uranium overseas for processing, but instead of accepting, it gave us more delays. Today's report makes it clear that we can't afford to offer any more deals or accept any more delays.

This House took full action when it passed the Iran Sanctions Enabling Act and must now pass the Iran Refined Petroleum Sanctions Act. The time for action is now. (*Congressional Record*)

October 22, 2009

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H. Res. 175 and I thank the gentleman from Illinois, Representative MARK KIRK, for bringing this to the floor. This legislation makes it clear that the Congress of the United States of America will continue to stand strong against the religious persecution by the Government of Iran of the Baha'i community.

The ruthless persecution of those of the Baha'i faith by the Iranian Ministry of Information in Shiraz has led to jailing of Iranian citizens targeted solely on the basis of their religion. This persecution includes the jailing of Ms. Raha Sabet, 33; Mr. Sasan Taqva, 32; and Ms. Haleh Roohi, 29; who are currently serving four-year prison terms for educating underprivileged children.

In accordance with prior Congressional action, the Department of State has since released a statement urging the Iranian Regime to release these victims along with others imprisoned on the basis of religious discrimination.

The combined effort of the United States Congress and the Department of State is only furthered by today's legislation. Today we reach out to the international community to immediately condemn Iran's continued violation of human rights and to demand the immediate release of prisoners held solely on account of their religion. I strongly believe that the United States and the world should stand together against this continued and blatant violation of the International Covenant on Human Rights. (*Congressional Record*)

October 13, 2009

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the Iran Sanction Act. On September 25, we learned that Iran has been operating a secret uranium-enrichment plant in the city of Qom, capable of producing enriched uranium for bombs. The work at Qom has gone on for years in secret and despite five UN Security Council resolutions calling for Iran to cease all work on uranium.

The Iranians continue to claim that their nuclear intentions are peaceful, but the recently discovered plant's "size and configuration" are "inconsistent" with peaceful purposes. If we had any doubt that Iran was pursuing nuclear weapons, the discovery at Qom dashed that doubt.

Now the U.S. must do its part to stop Iran from obtaining nuclear weapons. The first step toward crippling Iran's progress toward a nuclear weapon is to impose the sanctions proposed in the bill before us today.

The Iran Sanctions Act calls on state and local governments to cease investing public funds in companies that support Iran's oil and gas sector. A nuclear armed Iran is a threat to the entire region, particularly our friends in Israel, and could incite nuclear proliferation in the Middle East and around the world.

We must do everything in our power to keep weapons of mass destruction out of the hands of the Iranians, and those efforts start today with this bill and these sanctions. (*Congressional Record*)

May 21, 2009

Madam Speaker, earlier this week, Iran tested a new long-range missile. This missile has a range of up to 1,200 miles and can reach our troops in the region, as well as many of our allies, including Israel.

This was not done in the name of peace. Rather, this launch was a grab at power, an attempt to threaten Israel and our other allies in the region. Now, more than ever, we must stand by our friends.

Iran, on the other hand, can only rejoin the society of nations with an olive branch, not a ballistic missile. We must not allow our allies in Israel and across the Middle East to fall under the threat of a nuclear Iran, nor can we allow Iran to achieve a dominant position in the region through intimidation.

The safety and security of millions of people depend on a strong and determined stance by the American people and all of the community of nations. (*Congressional Record*)

Rep. Dave Reichert (R-WA)

June 16, 2009

Mr. Speaker, halfway across the world today people are rioting in the streets. Violence, gunshots and even death have overtaken Iran's streets as its citizens protest the results of their recent election.

Iran's security affects the entire Middle East, and the riots there show how fragile their government really is. Recently, Iran successfully tested a long-range missile, and their intentions with their nuclear program are still unknown.

The United States must utilize every diplomatic, economic, and political tool at our disposal, including the further use of sanctions. Ultimately, our goal is peace for Iran, peace now and in the future. That's why I encourage Members of this body to join me in the support of the Iran Petroleum Sanctions Act. This legislation would use sanctions on refined petroleum to Iran in order to convince the government to give up its nuclear ambitions.

Our desire, all of us across the world, is to see a secure and peaceful future for the people of Iran, the greater Middle East and the world, but this cannot happen without some changes in Iran's policies, regardless of the outcome of their election. (*Congressional Record*)

Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid (D-NV)

December 24, 2009

I want to speak today about S.2799, the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2009. This important piece of legislation, which combines legislation written by Senator Dodd with legislation introduced by Senator Bayh, Lieberman and Kyl, was passed by the Banking Committee earlier this month. It would impose new sanctions on Iran's refined petroleum sector and tighten existing US sanctions in an effort to create new pressure on the Iranian regime and help stop Iran from acquiring a nuclear weapon.

I know that Senator Kerry, the Chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, has been working hard, along with other colleagues, to get a UC agreement so we can get this legislation passed. I understand that we are making good progress towards reaching that goal.

As we move forward with these negotiations, I want everyone to know that I am committed to getting this legislation to the floor sometime after we return in January. (*Colloquy on Senate Floor*)

June 16, 2009

I have a problem with what has gone on in Iran. I have a problem for basic human rights, freedom of the press, and fair elections. I think it would be wrong for the United States to start

judging who is a rightful elected leader in Iran, but I think we have every right to comment on what we see, and we're doing that. The president has done that.

It's up to the people of Iran to pick their leader. It's not up to the United States to pick their leader. We have a situation in Iran that is one where the world is focusing on what's going on in Iran. The world knows that almost 50 percent of the people living in Iran are under age 21.

They know how to use the Internet. It's no longer a locked, blocked society. So we're all watching Iran very closely. I think it was a step forward when the supreme leader, yesterday, said that he was going to take a look at recounting some of those votes. And we'll have to see what he meant by that. So we're watching this closely. That is my comment on Iran. (*Media availability following closed policy luncheon*)

Rep. Dana Rohrabacher (R-CA)

June 19, 2009

Today, I rise in strong support of this resolution which ratchets up, to a degree, America's willingness to express its heartfelt support for the Iranian people and their struggle against the mullah dictatorship that oppresses them.

Now, it has been said that you cannot champion the oppressed unless you are willing to take on the oppressor. America should not intervene in every struggle taking place, but we should be unapologetically on the side of those who are in desperate battle for their own freedom.

Tempered rhetoric can be interpreted by tyrants as weakness. We need to send a strong message to those tyrants and a strong message to the people who are willing to risk their lives on the streets of Tehran that we are on the side of the people and the side of democracy and freedom. Any other message would be a betrayal of our fundamental principles, the principles of liberty and democracy that so many Americans have sacrificed to give us and to pass on to other generations.

Yes, we should not intervene, but it is up to us to make sure those people struggling throughout the world know we are on their side. We must be bold in our words of support.

I was honored to be one of five speech writers serving Ronald Reagan. He too was told to tone down his rhetoric. He too was told that strong words would be interpreted as belligerence. But with his strong words, he ended the Cold War, without the conflagration that hung over our heads for decades. He made it a better, a more peaceful and a freer world with a strong message and no apologies.

We should follow the lead of Ronald Reagan. It will make this a better world if we side with the people in Tehran who oppose their mullah dictatorship. (*Congressional Record*)

Rep. Tom Rooney (R-FL)

December 15, 2009

Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 2194, the Iran Petroleum Sanctions Act. Not only has Iran repeatedly refused to engage in international diplomatic efforts to halt their ongoing nuclear program, it is resolute in its plans to expand it. Just today, Israel's Military Intelligence Chief Major General Amos Yadlin stated that Iran has enough nuclear material for a warhead and is close to being able to build one. This announcement reinforces the urgency of strengthening the United States economic sanctions against Iran.

The United States must defend the security of Israel and the Middle East, as well as our citizens here at home from Iran's dangerous threats. This bill sends a clear message that the United States takes Iran's actions and threats seriously and that we will not sit idly by. I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this critical legislation and I am thankful it has finally been brought before the House for consideration. (*Congressional Record*)

Rep. Peter Roskam (R-IL)

June 2, 2009

Congressman Peter Roskam (R-IL) today issued the following statement after President Obama suggested that Iran could have a right to nuclear energy:

“President Obama’s recent comment in support of Iranian nuclear power is both shocking and reckless. Supporting Iran’s “legitimate [nuclear] aspirations” ignores all recent history and smacks of the same naive and misguided approach that allowed for North Korea to gain nuclear power – and now possess nuclear weapons. In a bow to our worst enemies, the President is showing a striking ability to imitate former President Jimmy Carter.

“In just recent memory, Iran has funded terrorist activities against U.S. troops and our allies, called for the destruction of both the U.S. and our strong ally Israel, and sought to systematically destabilize the Middle East and world. Does the President believe Iran wants nuclear power to do their part in combating climate change? Iran has made it abundantly clear what sinister plans they have with nuclear power – and both the U.S. and our allies have great reason to worry.

“There are few scenarios worse than Iran gaining nuclear power – and subsequently nuclear weapons – to threaten and potentially attack the U.S. and our closest allies. The President should immediately recant his support for Iranian nuclear power and consider better options to protect our nation, not endanger it.” (*Press Release*)

Rep. Ileana Ros-Lehtinen (R-FL)

December 15, 2009

Since its secret nuclear weapons program was publicly exposed in 2002, Iran has manipulated nations, world leaders and the United Nations on its march toward possessing the capacity to unleash nuclear havoc on the world. Current and past regime leaders have made their intentions quite clear--the destruction of the State of Israel, the extinction of the Jewish people, a world without the United States.

Iran has already produced over 1,400 kilograms of low-enriched uranium, which can easily be used for a so-called "dirty bomb." New Iranian documents have been revealed reportedly detailing a program to produce and test the trigger for an actual nuclear weapon.

Nuclear experts note that there is no other possible use for such nuclear technology, except for a nuclear bomb. And in September of this year, media quoted international inspectors saying, they "believe that Tehran has the ability to make a nuclear bomb and is working to develop a missile system that can carry an atomic warhead." And U.S. officials have calculated that Iran already has stockpiled enough uranium to produce one nuclear weapon, even as it expands its enrichment capabilities.

We have arrived at the precipice, and we are staring into darkness. In February of 2006 the Congress adopted a concurrent resolution citing the Iranian regime's repeated violations of its nonproliferation obligations, underscoring that as a result of these violations Iran no longer had the right to develop any aspect of a nuclear fuel cycle and urging responsible nations to impose economic sanctions to deny Iran the resources and the ability to develop nuclear capabilities. Three years later, the idea that we could rely on the so-called international community to handle this problem has been shown to be a mirage.

But we, too, have failed to act quickly and decisively, failing to fully implement the range of U.N. sanctions that are already on the books. Now we must use the limited time remaining to impose sanctions so painful that they should threaten the Iranian regime's survival. Only when faced with the loss of power will the regime be compelled to abandon its destructive policies.

The bill we are considering today, Mr. Speaker, the Iran Refined Petroleum Sanctions Act, which I joined Chairman *Berman* in introducing, ratchets up the pressure on the regime by targeting a key vulnerability, Iran's inability to produce sufficient gasoline and other refined petroleum products.

In recent years, Iran has estimated to have imported gasoline directly or indirectly from at least 16 countries, including China, India, the Netherlands, France, and the UAE, as well as global oil companies such as TOTAL and Shell. To stop this trade, the sanctions we're considering today must also be adopted by our allies, who continue to talk about the need to act but hide behind the claim that the U.N. Security Council must act first. But the U.N. Security Council, due in part to Russian and Chinese opposition, has demonstrated that it will never impose meaningful costs on the Iranian regime.

There is no shortage of measures available. What is lacking is the will. Beyond this bill today, Mr. Speaker, the broader question is whether we will be bystanders, complicit in our own destruction. As Churchill warned, "If you will not fight for the right when you can easily win without bloodshed, if you will not fight when your victory will be sure, you may come to the

moment when you will have to fight with all the odds against you and only a precarious chance for survival." For our survival, and for that of our friend and ally, Israel, render your full support to this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time. (*Congressional Record*)

Madam Speaker, I rise to address what could develop into a humanitarian catastrophe in Iraq. Residents of Camp Ashraf, opponents of the Iranian regime who found a home in Iraq, appear to have been abandoned by the United States and other nations as they are subjected to unlawful seizure and detainment by Iraqi forces.

The Iraqi government must be called upon to respect the human rights of Ashraf residents and to honor its written commitment that it will treat all Ashraf residents humanely. The U.S. Government must ensure that the new democracy that we have helped prop up in Iraq does not forcibly return Ashraf residents to Iran, where they will face certain persecution, torture, and possibly even death. They must not be relocated to any country where they will be persecuted based upon their beliefs.

On a day when we have demonstrated here on the floor our support for the people and pro-democracy forces inside of Iran, let us not forget those in Camp Ashraf, Iraq. (*Congressional Record*)

November 6, 2009

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the resolution put forward by my good friend, the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. Speaker, September 11, 2001, will be forever engrained in our collective consciousness as one of the most vicious attacks against our Nation. However, we have been targeted by a global, violent, Islamic extremist network since November 4, 1979.

On this day, Iranian militants overran the United States Embassy in Tehran, and took innocent American hostages, with 52 of these brave Americans held for 444 days. U.S. diplomats, Embassy staff, and military personnel were bound and blindfolded, humiliated, and paraded in front of news cameras by their captors.

They endured unspeakable suffering and abuse for nearly 15 months in captivity. Since the capture of the United States embassy in Tehran 30 years ago and the ensuing hostage crisis, Iran has increasingly viewed terrorism as a tool to achieve its ideological and strategic aims.

These aims include exporting the revolution, supporting and arming militant Islamist extremist organizations and other groups worldwide, especially in the Middle East, attacking Israel, and destabilizing the governments of the more pragmatic and reformist Arab countries.

One of the chief instruments for the implementation of these policies has been the jihadist organization, Hezbollah, which, since its inception, has been trained, financed and supported by the Iranian Revolutionary Guard Corps. In return, Hezbollah has helped advance Iranian interests through a sustained campaign against the United States and our allies in the Middle East, including but not limited to the 1983 attacks on the United States marine barracks and embassy in Lebanon; the bombing of the United States embassy annex in Beirut in 1984; the 1985 hijacking of TWA Flight 847; the taking of American and other hostages in Beirut throughout the 1980's; the June 1996 truck bombing of the Khobar Towers United States military housing complex in Saudi Arabia.

Testifying at a subcommittee hearing that I chaired in February 2005, William Daugherty, a CIA veteran and one of the 52 Americans held hostage in Iran for 444 days 30 years ago, emphasized, "The undeniable truth is that the United States Government has utterly failed to hold Iran accountable in any sustained and effective manner for its role in the cumulative deaths of over 275 American citizens and the wounding of well over 600 more."

Mr. Daugherty continued, "Moreover, the United States Government has failed to undertake any action with the force or impact sufficient to deter the Iranian government from conducting terrorism against our interests.

"The absence of any credible response has served only to encourage the continuation of Iranian-sponsored terrorism, nor have those of us who are victims of Iranian terrorism received any justice from those acts."

Since Dr. Daugherty's testimony almost 5 years ago, Iran has been proactively involved in undermining United States and coalition interests in Iraq and Afghanistan, by providing material support and all types of weapons to extremists in both countries, so that they can kill and wound Americans. The number of U.S. victims of Iranian-sponsored or Iranian-supported attacks continues to increase.

The threat to our ally Israel has grown incredibly as well, with Iran increasing its involvement in the West Bank and Gaza in support of such Islamist extremist organizations as Hamas, the Palestinian Islamic Jihad and Lebanon through its proxy, Hezbollah. Yet successive U.S. administrations have failed to properly recognize and confront the totality of the Iranian threat, from its history of supporting violent Islamic extremists, to its nuclear weapons program, unconventional weapons and ballistic missile development.

In response, the United States must impose a cost so high on Tehran that it threatens the Iranian regime's survival unless it changes course. This approach will require applying immediate, comprehensive tough economic sanctions. Again, former hostage Dr. William Daugherty said it best, "It is time for Iran to be called to account, not by pronouncements, but by clear, sustained and overwhelming action for its past, as well as for any future violations of international law.

“And it is time for American victims of Iranian terrorism, like those of us who were held hostage by the Iranian government, to receive the justice that is decades delayed. The Congress can see that this happens.”

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to strongly support this resolution. (*Congressional Record*)

October 27, 2009

Madam Speaker, on July 31 of this year, the Iranian regime detained three U.S. citizens-- Joshua Fattal, Shane Bauer and Sarah Shourd--who were hiking in northern Iraq and who allegedly strayed across the border by accident. Almost 3 full months later, Iran still holds them captive. This case should alert us once again to the true nature of the Iranian regime.

Almost 30 years ago, on November 4, 1979, this regime took 53 American hostages at the U.S. Embassy in Tehran, and it held them for 444 days. Three decades later, this is a regime that continues to hold American citizens hostage. This is a regime that remains the largest state sponsor of terrorism in the world--from Beirut to Buenos Aires. This is a regime that continues to support Iraqi and Afghan violent Islamist groups, which are responsible for the deaths of Americans. This is a regime that openly seeks to wipe out our ally, the democratic, Jewish State of Israel, off the map, and it acts accordingly. This is a regime that continues to relentlessly pursue unconventional weapons and the missiles to carry them.

Using conventional means, Iran has inflicted considerable damage on U.S. citizens, on our interests and on our allies during its 30-year war against America.

I strongly support Senate Concurrent Resolution 45, which draws attention to the fact that Iran continues to hold U.S. citizens hostage. The regime must release these young Americans immediately and unconditionally, and the United States and other responsible nations must fully recognize the nature of the regime, and they need to apply every form of economic and political pressure in our arsenal--now, not later--to compel the regime to abandon its dangerous course. (*Congressional Record*)

October 26, 2009

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, on Wednesday, the House Committee on Foreign Affairs will hold a long-overdue markup of the Iran Refined Petroleum Sanctions Act. Some of our colleagues are focusing exclusively on Iran's nuclear ambition, as it was the nuclear program in itself that was the catalyst for the concern.

But if Iran were comprised of a responsible, democratic government, would we be as apprehensive about their nuclear activities? Of course not. But we are talking about an Iranian regime which just this year conducted two missile tests and continues to work on the range of

its missiles and on enabling them to carry a nuclear payload. We are talking about a regime whose leaders throughout the years have made it abundantly clear that they will stop at nothing to destroy the Jewish State of Israel. We are talking about an Iran which for nearly three decades has been designated by our U.S. Department of State as the world's leading state sponsor of global terrorism. The clerical regime is fomenting bloodshed and promoting chaos in the West Bank and Gaza and Lebanon and the Persian Gulf, as well as in Iraq, where it is actively assisting in the murder of our U.S. soldiers.

On the battlefields of Afghanistan, Iran is also playing a deadly subversive role. As early as 2002, allegations emerged that Iran was supporting insurgent groups in Afghanistan, including its former archenemy, the Taliban. However, the first significant report of Iranian weapons in Afghanistan came in April of 2007. Then-chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Peter Pace, announced: "We have intercepted weapons in Afghanistan headed for the Taliban that were made in Iran."

Since 2007, several large shipments have been seized near the Iranian border. U.S. officials say that Iranian-made weapons have been found in Afghanistan and used by Taliban-led insurgents. These weapons have included Tehran's signature roadside bomb, the explosively formed penetrator, EFP, AK-47s, as well as C-4 plastic explosives and mortars.

On August 29 of this year, just a few days before General McChrystal submitted his request to this administration, Afghan and NATO forces uncovered a weapons collection in Herat with EFPs, Iranian-made rockets and dozens of blocks of Iranian C-4 plastic explosives.

In the August 2009 declassified, leaked version of his assessment, General Stanley McChrystal stated that: "Iran plays an ambiguous role in Afghanistan, providing developmental assistance and political support to the Afghan government while the Iranian Qods force is reportedly training fighters for certain Taliban groups and providing other forms of military assistance to insurgents."

We cannot allow Iran to undermine U.S. efforts and kill our soldiers in Afghanistan. We cannot allow Iran to return Afghanistan to the status of a failed state and pave the way for attacks against the West using Afghanistan as its launching pad. We cannot allow Iran to develop nuclear weapons capabilities which threaten the United States and our allies.

If we are to be vigilant in protecting the lives of our men and women--military and civilian--in Afghanistan, we must increase the pressure on the Iranian regime and impose immediate sanctions on Iran. This should be our first option.

We don't have the luxury of time, to wait for an eventual Iranian response to U.S. diplomatic overtures. We cannot wait for the U.N. Security Council to come around. We cannot wait for our European and other allies to decide to do the right thing. The United States must lead by example. It is time to cut off the Iranian regime's economic lifeline. As such, we should not stop at this week's Foreign Affairs Committee markup.

I urge the majority to bring the strongest possible form of the Iran Refined Petroleum Sanctions Act to the floor next week for a vote, followed by quick Senate action so that it gets

to the President's desk before the end of the year. We must do this now. (*Congressional Record*)

September 25, 2009

“The revelation that Iran is building a second secret uranium-enrichment plant is the strongest evidence yet that the radical regime in Tehran is racing toward a nuclear weapon.

“For more than a decade, Iran has deceived international inspectors in a game of cat-and-mouse while it built its nuclear infrastructure without ever breaking stride.

“Yet, just yesterday, it was announced that the G-8 wants to give Iran until the end of the year before considering new sanctions.

“What else are we waiting for? Iran's detonation of its first nuclear device?

“The U.S. and other countries must immediately impose crippling sanctions on the Iranian regime, including cutting off Iran's imports of gasoline.

“The world cannot stand by and watch the nightmare of a nuclear-armed Iran become reality.”
(*Press Release*)

September 22, 2009

Madam Speaker, Ambassador Susan Rice, our Permanent Representative to the United Nations, has emphasized that the U.S. is “taking a new approach” to the U.N. as part of its broader “new era of engagement.” Instead of protecting the investment of our tax dollars, instead of conditioning our contributions on real reform, the U.S. has adopted a strategy of “money now, maybe reform later.”

At the U.N. General Assembly as it begins its new session this week, there is perhaps no better time to evaluate the effectiveness thus far of this so-called “new approach.”

Well, let's see what has resulted. In March, the U.S. sent an observer to participate in the U.N.'s so-called Human Rights Council, which is dominated by dictatorships like China, Cuba and Saudi Arabia, and is notoriously anti-Israel.

Despite U.S. engagement, the Council stayed true to form. What did they do? Overwhelmingly passed five separate resolutions condemning Israel, passing no resolutions condemning human rights violations by the regimes in Iran and Syria, Sudan, Cuba, Zimbabwe or many other dictatorships.

True to form, the Council-appointed panel recently released a report accusing Israel of “war crimes” and “possibly, crimes against humanity” for defending its citizens against rocket and mortar fire from Islamic militants in Gaza.

When it comes to the Council’s biases and backwardness, there is no end in sight. There is no change in sight. Yet, the U.S. silently nods and sends millions of our taxpayer dollars, with no questions asked.

There is also UNRWA, the United Nations Relief Works Agency, the U.N.’s discredited, biased agency for Palestinian refugees. This year alone, we have given UNRWA a record of \$260 million. In return, UNRWA continues to compromise its strictly humanitarian mandate by engaging in propaganda against Israel and in favor of Hamas. In fact, UNRWA’s head says she doesn’t even consider Hamas to be a Foreign Terrorist Organization, and her predecessor even admitted that members of Hamas were on the payroll of UNRWA, saying “I don’t see that as a crime.”

Deputy Secretary of State Jacob Lew testified before our Foreign Affairs Committee in May, and he said UNRWA’s activities received “the highest level of scrutiny” by the State Department. But we don’t even require UNRWA to vet its employees and aid recipients through the U.S. watch lists.

Turning to the U.N. General Assembly, Madam Speaker, it remains silent in the face of intense repression and violent attacks by the Iranian regime against peaceful demonstrators. Yet, in late June, it moved swiftly to condemn and isolate the constitutional democratic government of Honduras for acting in accordance with and in protection of the rule of law.

As for the leadership of the new session of the General Assembly, it’s a “who’s who” of the world’s worst regimes. The President? The former foreign minister of Libya. One of the vice-presidents? From Sudan. A vice chair of the legal committee? Iran. But the U.S. has said nothing as such rogue regimes were selected for leadership positions at the U.N.

Administration officials have said, “The U.N. is essential to our efforts to galvanize concerted actions that make Americans safer and more secure.” Libya, Sudan, Iran? Are you feeling secure now?

One of the greatest threats to the security of our Nation and an existential threat to our ally Israel comes from the Iranian regime and its nuclear program. This week, for the first time, a President of the United States will chair a meeting of the U.N. Security Council and will have a golden opportunity to raise the threat of Iran on the world stage. The Council will even be holding a special summit on the general issue of nuclear nonproliferation.

Yet the actions of specific countries such as Iran will be ignored. The U.S. will not use its presidency of the Council this month to push for increased sanctions on Iran or any other regime that pursues nuclear capabilities or sponsors violent extremist groups.

The International Atomic Energy Agency continues to provide nuclear technical assistance to Iran and Syria, and the U.S. remains silent.

The U.N. Development Program is accused of misusing funds in Zimbabwe, in Afghanistan and in North Korea, to name a few, and the U.S. continues to provide them with hundreds of millions of dollars every year in funding. No strings attached.

Madam Speaker, enough is enough. Let's put U.S. taxpayer dollars to work for the American people, and not for the U.N., where the inmates run the asylum. (*Congressional Record*.)

September 14, 2009

Mr. Speaker, last week we commemorated a sad anniversary of the September 11th attacks on our Nation. On that fateful day 8 years ago, we realized that protecting our homeland and defeating our enemies would require innovative approaches and an unconventional view of the threats that we face. However, when looking at the Iranian nuclear threat, it would appear that some have forgotten the lessons of 9/11.

Many believe that because Iran has not yet mastered all of the elements needed for an operational nuclear weapon, we have the luxury of time. Mr. Speaker, that is not so. Iran has already produced 1,400 kilograms of low-enriched uranium, which can easily be used for a "dirty nuke."

As former President Clinton noted in the year 2005, if you have basically a cookie's worth of fissile material and you put it into a traditional bomb, you can amplify the destruction power by hundreds-fold or more.

So the nuclear threat from Iran already exists in a radiological form. Yet, the U.S. and the U.N. Security Council have actually lowered the requirements imposed on the Iranian regime with respect to its nuclear activities. The initial U.S. position with respect to Iran's nuclear program was to demand its complete, verifiable, irreversible dismantlement. Then it went down to a mere temporary suspension of uranium enrichment. And now, reportedly, only a commitment from the Iranian regime that they will not use growing supplies of enriched uranium to make nuclear weapons.

This, as a U.S. government official was quoted as saying just last week, "Iran is now either very near or in possession already of sufficient low-enriched uranium to produce one nuclear weapon" and is closer "to a dangerous and destabilizing possible breakout capacity." And this means a breakout capacity for producing not a dirty nuke but a conventional nuclear weapon.

Iran is pouring enormous resources into its nuclear program. Its missiles can already strike U.S. forces, can strike Israel and our allies in the Middle East and Europe, and it is only a matter of time until it has the capability to hit us here at home.

Inexcusably, one administration after another has not fully implemented the range of sanctions that are called for in current U.S. law, nor have we leveraged our resources to secure cooperation from our allies, particularly those on the U.N. Security Council. And this year we

have filed another bill for another range of sanctions on Iran, and we have yet to get that bill out of committee, in spite of over 300 sponsors for that bill.

Next week at the United Nations in New York, for the first time a President of the United States will chair a meeting of the U.N. Security Council. The Council will be holding a special summit on the general issue of nuclear nonproliferation, but will ignore the actions of specific countries such as Iran.

The U.S. will also not use its presidency on the Security Council this month to pursue further sanctions targeting the Iranian regime. In fact, rather than using our platform at the U.N. to urge immediate action against the regime, the U.S. has again succumbed to Iranian manipulation.

Joined by France, Germany, Britain, Russia, and China, we will meet with the regime in Brussels on October 1 to resolve the disputes over Tehran's nuclear program.

Let's get this straight. As the threat posed by the Iranian regime increases, as the Iranian regime inches closer to weaponizing its nuclear program, the response from the so-called international community is to schedule more talks--legitimizing the regime by engaging them directly.

By its own statements, the regime is committed to the destruction of Israel and the U.S. as well. Ahmadinejad has repeatedly denied the existence of the Holocaust, called for Israel be wiped off the map, spoken of achieving "a world without America and Zionism."

Iran is also the world's leading state sponsor of terrorism, assisted the attacks on our soldiers and continues to this day in Iraq and Afghanistan, and poses a growing threat to the Persian Gulf, a major source of the world's oil. This threat is becoming global, as Tehran expands its presence and influence throughout the Middle East and South and Central Asia and right here in Latin America as well as Africa. But right here in our own hemisphere, one need look no further than the 1994 bombing of the Jewish community center in Argentina, Buenos Aires, to demonstrate Iran's willingness and ability to attack targets half a world away.

In July, Secretary of State Hillary Clinton called for even stricter sanctions on Iran to try to change the behavior of the regime. I couldn't agree more, but we need them now. Let's act now. (*Congressional Record*)

June 19, 2009

Mr. Speaker, I would like to start out thanking our esteemed and distinguished chairman of our Foreign Affairs Committee, Mr. Berman, for working with us in a bipartisan manner, reaching out to our side to bring this timely resolution to the floor. I especially want to thank our Republican Conference Chair and a great member of our Foreign Affairs Committee, Mr. Pence, who authored this legislation.

I rise in strong support of the fundamental, universal human rights and civil liberties to which the Iranian people are entitled. For 30 years, these rights and freedoms have been denied again and again by an oppressive Iranian regime which uses a sham process with candidates handpicked by the ruling apparatus to create the illusion of political participation.

There was no election in Iran this year. There has been no election, no democracy in Iran for decades. The candidates and the winners were again picked in advance by the regime. Real reform, real democracy were never an option. This repressive regime relies on so-called elections to provide a veneer of legitimacy, but that facade has been shattered by the protests taking place in Iran this week. The brutal nature of the Iranian regime is well-documented.

On Tuesday, I had the honor of attending, with Secretary of State Hillary Clinton, the release of the State Department's annual Trafficking in Persons Report, which again cited Iran as a Tier 3 country, among the worst, as the regime that does little, if anything, to prevent men, women, and children from being trafficked for sexual exploitation and involuntary servitude, slavery. Likewise, as the State Department's human rights report for 2008 noted: "Iran's poor human rights record worsened and it continued to commit numerous serious abuses. The government severely limited citizens' right to change their government peacefully through free and fair elections. Authorities held political prisoners and intensified a crackdown against women's rights reformers, ethnic minority rights activists, student activists, and religious minorities."

It is a pattern for decades. So we must look beyond the past week, which was only the most recent demonstration of the regime's brutality and authoritarianism.

But the Iranian regime is not just a threat to its own people. We cannot afford to lose sight of the threat that it presents to our own national security interests and, indeed, to global peace and security. Iran draws even closer to crossing that nuclear point of no return. Admiral Mike Mullen, the Chairman of our Joint Chiefs of Staff, has stated that Iran has likely enriched enough uranium to make an atomic bomb. International inspectors also report that Iran has enough low-enriched uranium to achieve nuclear weapons breakout capabilities and that issues about possible military dimensions to Iran's nuclear program remain unresolved. Yet Iran is allowed to continue its nuclear pursuit virtually unchallenged.

Additionally, Iran continues to develop chemical and biological weapons and ballistic missiles while arming and bankrolling violent Islamic extremists worldwide. We must bear this in mind when we determine what is the appropriate response to the Iranian regime's policies and actions.

But today, Mr. Speaker, we must focus on the hopes of the individual Iranians who have been robbed of a better future for almost 30 years by a regime which only promises nothing but misery and malaise. Now is the time for all responsible nations to stand foursquare with the people of Iran as they seek freedom, as they seek true self-governance at home, as well as to live at peace with the world.

We must send a clear signal today to the Iranian regime and all of its proxies and affiliates that free nations will not tolerate further efforts to silence the voice of the Iranian people through violence and coercion. (*Congressional Record*)

May 5, 2009

Mr. Speaker, yesterday this House voted to commemorate the 61st anniversary of Israel's independence. However, even as we recognize this historic occasion, we must not ignore the continuing threats to Israel's very survival, the greatest dangers presented by the radical regime in Tehran whose leader, Mr. Ahmadinejad, has repeatedly denied the Holocaust, as all of us know, and has called for Israel to be wiped off the map.

More recently, at last month's Durban II hate-fest in Geneva, Ahmadinejad reminded us of his regime's goals when he savagely attacked Israel, stating that "world Zionism personifies racism," and called Israel the "most racist" regime.

These are not mere idle words, Mr. Speaker. Ahmadinejad and his fellow thugs have long sought to make good on their call for Israel's elimination by sponsoring violent Islamic extremist groups and pursuing nuclear, chemical, biological and missile capabilities. In the face of such a menace to our strong, democratic ally, Israel, and to our vital interest in the Middle East, the U.S. and other responsible nations must not stand idly by. We cannot accept the prospect of an emboldened nuclear Iranian regime.

We must close loopholes in U.S. and international sanctions so as to deny the regime all remaining lifelines for their economy and compel it to abandon its destructive policies.

Further, we should realize that the existential threats to Israel, and the obstacles to peace, begin with Iran; but, sadly, they do not end there.

We must learn history's lesson that we will not achieve peace by engaging with these Islamic militant groups like the Iranian proxy, Hamas, or by recognizing a Palestinian Authority government that includes Hamas.

In standing with the Jewish state against those who seek to destroy it, we should above all do no harm. Unfortunately, proposed funding for the Palestinian Authority, the West Bank and Gaza is included in the emergency supplemental, which would be before this floor in a matter of days; and it does not meet that standard of do no harm.

It would provide, in fact, hundreds of millions of dollars of assistance in Gaza, thereby essentially providing a bailout for Hamas, enabling Hamas to divert its funds from reconstruction and put it, instead, to the purchase of arms. It would reward and bankroll a Palestinian Authority that has proven itself unwilling or unable to fulfill its responsibilities.

When considering assistance to the Palestinian Authority, Mr. Speaker, we need to judge their leaders by their words, and by their acts as well. Just last week Palestinian Authority leader

Abu Mazen reiterated his refusal to recognize Israel as a Jewish state. He said the same thing last year and the year before that, and there is no reason to think that more U.S. assistance will cause him to have a change of heart in the future.

Indeed, Abu Mazen and other senior Palestinian Authority officials have repeatedly emphasized that they do not expect Hamas or other violent Islamic groups to recognize Israel at all.

Instead, Abu Mazen bragged last year about his many years of leading and supporting violence against Israel, claiming that "I have the honor to be the one to fire the first bullet in 1965."

But this should come as no surprise, Mr. Speaker. In 2005, when campaigning for the leadership of the PA, he echoed Arafat and Hamas by referring to Israel as the Zionist enemy. A Palestinian transparency organization reported last month that many forms of favoritism, nepotism, misappropriation of public money and abuse of public position continued to impact many sectors of the Palestinian society.

If Palestinian leaders will not uphold their commitments to uproot violent extremism, to stop corruption, to recognize Israel's right to exist as a Jewish democratic state, they should not receive 1 cent of U.S. taxpayer dollars. The proposed supplemental, however, would provide \$200 million in direct cash transfers to the P.A. Let's stop this bill, Mr. Speaker. It does not do justice to the U.S. nor to Israel. (*Congressional Record*)

Rep. Ed Royce (R-CA)

December 15, 2009

Madam Speaker, time is not on our side. Today's Washington Post reports that Iran has learned how to make virtually every bolt and switch in a nuclear weapon. It is mastering the technology to enrich uranium which would fuel that weapon. A secret nuclear facility located on an Iranian military base was recently revealed. For years, Iran has been slapping away all of our diplomatic overtures. "Our outreach has produced very little." Secretary Clinton's words, not mine.

Today, the world's top terrorist state has its tentacles throughout the region. Its tentacles are Yemen, Iraq, Lebanon, Gaza, Afghanistan, Syria, Sudan. Its agents and proxies are practically everywhere in its aspiration for regional dominance, not to mention our own backyard. Tomorrow's nuclear Iran would have a compounding effect with severe consequences for regional security and for U.S. security. The time for action is long past. This bill would help address this threat, targeting the regime's Achilles' heel.

But we need a broad-based Iran policy that focuses not just on Iran's nuclear program, but one that aims to protect the U.S. and our allies from the Iranian missile threat and speaks out against its human rights abuses and bolsters its democracy supporters.

Disturbingly, this administration has backed away from missile defense in Europe and the democratic movement inside Iran. The administration must realize that promoting democracy in Iran and improving our national security go hand-in-hand.

I would just mention that sanctions helped bring down apartheid in South Africa and ended the South African program to develop nuclear weapons.

As ranking member of the Subcommittee on Terrorism, Nonproliferation, and Trade, I strongly support the passage of this legislation, of which I am an original cosponsor.
(Congressional Record)

Rep. Loretta Sanchez (D-CA)

December 15, 2009

Madam Speaker, I am a strong supporter of H.R. 2194, the Iran Refined Petroleum Sanction Act. I believe Iran remains the number one national security concern for the international community. Iran's continued pursuit of nuclear capabilities is extremely concerning and remains a serious threat to the United States of America and the entire world. Iran's refusal to respond to the United States' diplomatic engagement is especially disconcerting. I'd like to thank Chairman BERMAN for his willingness to add language to this legislation at my request, highlighting Iran's unwillingness to cooperate with the international community and the government's insistence on rejecting the United States' efforts at engagement.

When Iran's secret nuclear facility was revealed in September, my colleagues and I demanded that the Government of Iran immediately disclose the existence of any additional nuclear-related facilities, and provide open-access to its Qom enrichment facility. The Obama Administration set a deadline for Iran to open the facility for inspection. However, Iran did not meet this deadline. Iran was also required to ship its low-enriched uranium stockpile to Russia and France for conversion. Yet again, Iran refused to accept this deal. Iran has systematically refused to live up to any of its promises of transparency and cooperation with the international community. Instead, Iran decided to act against our efforts at engagement by announcing that it would enrich its own uranium to 20 percent, and that it would build 10 new enrichment plants for purportedly civilian purposes.

These actions are unacceptable and the U.S. House of Representatives must ensure that our country is not investing in companies and institutions that enhance Iran's petroleum resources, which may be used to fund their nuclear ambitions and terrorist groups. However, I also believe the international community must come together to help neutralize the threat Iran poses to the rest of the world. All states must take responsibility for maintaining peace and security in the region through multi-lateral sanctions and efforts to force Iran to denuclearize. In order to be successful, I believe these efforts must be international in scope.

The passage of H.R. 2194 is an important step towards continuing to show Iran that we will not stand by idly while they continue to threaten the peace and security of the rest of the world. I regret that I am unavoidably detained in California. However, as a cosponsor and

strong supporter of H.R. 2194, I would have voted ``aye" on this critical legislation.
(*Congressional Record*)

Rep. Adam Schiff (D-CA)

December 15, 2009

I thank the gentleman. I will be very brief.

Mr. Speaker, I wanted to add to the comments that my colleagues have made in their segue to the bill that follows the Daniel Pearl Freedom of the Press Act, which is the Iran Refined Petroleum Sanctions Act.

I am a strong supporter of this legislation. I commend my colleagues, Chairman *Berman* and Ranking Member *Ros-Lehtinen*, for their leadership on this issue.

One of the most serious threats facing our country is the prospect of a nuclear-armed Iran. This is an oppressive regime, one that has threatened to wipe one of its neighbors off the map. The possession of a nuclear bomb by Iran is enormously dangerous in its own regard, but it is all the more destabilizing in its potential of starting a nuclear arms race in the Middle East.

The President has offered carrots and the international community has offered carrots to Iran to step back from its pursuit of nuclear weapons. The Congress today takes an important step to make sure that there are sticks which are offered as well if Iran refuses the very generous offer by the international community to reprocess uranium--to provide it for peaceful energy purposes, to have Iran send its uranium out of the country so that it can be put in a form where it cannot be used for nuclear weapons.

This legislation, which will potentially crack down on Iran's ability to refine its petroleum, will put the most severe pressure on the Iranian regime to back away from a program that time and again we have seen it pursue, as much as it has declared to the contrary. So this legislation, I think more so than any other, will put teeth in a regime of sanctions, will put pressure on Iran to back away from its nuclear bomb-making efforts, and in so doing, will inure to the safety of our own country, to the safety of Israel and to the entire region.

So I thank the chairman for his leadership on this. I urge my colleagues to support the Iran Refined Petroleum Sanctions Act. (*Congressional Record*)

April 21, 2009

Madam Speaker, at ten o'clock this morning, the nation of Israel observed two minutes of silence in observance of Yom Hashoah, Holocaust Remembrance Day. For those two minutes, all activity in the country ceased to honor of the six million Jews who were murdered by the Nazis during the madness of the Final Solution. For Israelis, the Holocaust remains the

crucible that produced their state and its impact is felt daily across Israeli society--from politics to the arts.

Here in the United States, the Holocaust is more remote. The GIs who helped to liberate the Nazi death camps more than six decades ago are fading into history and the grainy black and white footage of the victims' images that stunned the world in the 1940s--now seem distant to many Americans.

For Israelis, though, the Holocaust serves as an omnipresent reminder of the historical insecurity of the Jewish people for whom persecution and exile have characterized two millennia of wandering from their ancient homeland. Coupled with Israel's mainly hostile and fundamentally unstable neighbors, the memory of Hitler's attempt to exterminate European Jewry has served to make Israelis extraordinarily vigilant in the face of constant security threats.

Israeli security analysts have focused their concern in recent years on Iran, which they see as the most critical existential threat to the Jewish state.

Through its support for Hezbollah in Lebanon and Hamas in Gaza and the West Bank, Tehran has taken up positions along Israel's borders and its proxies have repaid their Iranian masters handsomely by provoking large-scale military actions by Israel in 2006 and December of last year.

Through its relentless pursuit of the nuclear fuel cycle, Iran's radical regime seeks to dominate the region and to erect a permanent threat to Israel's security and the Israeli people.

Through its statements and the virulence of state-controlled media, Iranian leaders, particularly President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad are clearly fixated on the demonization and destruction of Israel. Just yesterday, the Iranian president sparked a walkout at a United Nations racism conference in Geneva when he launched into a rambling rant against Israel and Jews. The prospect of Ahmadinejad with nuclear weapons is one that keeps many Israelis up at night and should be keeping many of us awake as well.

Given the potential consequences, the United States must make the prevention of Iran developing the bomb a cornerstone of both its strategy for the Middle East and its nonproliferation agenda. To do otherwise would place Israel in Iran's nuclear crosshairs and likely spur a regional arms race as Saudi Arabia, Egypt and the United Arab Emirates could seek to match any Iranian nuclear weapons capability.

I support President Obama's decision to reach out to Tehran and I believe that tough, concerted diplomacy can be effective in getting the Iranian government to reassess its nuclear policy. But to be effective, that diplomacy must include a wide range of both inducements and disincentives. And it must take into account the character and nature of the current Iranian regime. And, finally, those charged with executing the policy must be willing to consider other alternatives should diplomacy fail.

Tehran's current declared enrichment activities at its Natanz facility are subject to regular inspections by the International Atomic Energy Agency, which should be able to spot diversion or any attempt to produce weapons grade material before it can be turned into a weapon. As long as the IAEA can maintain its surveillance of the Natanz facility, any Iranian intention to produce weapons-grade material there is likely to be frustrated.

What concerns many senior officials in Israel, here in the United States and in Europe, is the possibility that Iran, which continues to withhold a lot of information about its nuclear program, may have a parallel, secret nuclear program that is beyond the reach of the IAEA and western intelligence monitoring. As David Albright, the President of the Institute for Science and International Security, told the Financial Times last week, aside from Natanz "we don't know anything about what they are doing, how many centrifuges they have made, or whether they are ready to go with a duplicate facility that would allow them to produce fissile material."

The juxtaposition of renewed diplomatic overtures and the unease over the extent of what we do not know about Iran's capabilities or its intentions, may strengthen our hand with the other permanent members of the UN Security Council plus Germany, who are working to produce a collective response to the Iranian nuclear challenge. If our international partners perceive a new American willingness to explore seriously the prospect for a negotiated resolution to the Iran problem, they may also be ready to consider the more robust coercive measures that may become necessary if Iran is shown to be pursuing a nuclear weapons capability.

International cohesion will be absolutely vital if we are to resolve this standoff without resorting to force. Tehran has been adroit at exploiting differences between the United States and its international partners, some of whom have been unwilling to consider the possibility that President Ahmadinejad's vitriol is not merely intended for domestic consumption but is a real reflection of his murderous intentions. This could prove a tragic mistake.

Seventy-five years ago, Europeans, Americans and even many German Jews dismissed Hitler's threats against the Jews as political posturing. How could Germany, a nation with a rich and distinguished culture, whose cities embodied the best of cosmopolitan Europe, follow a depraved Austrian corporal into the depths of hatred? Humanity paid an enormous price for its passivity and the world pledged "never again."

We may now be faced with a similar threat from another society with a rich culture going back thousands of years and a sophisticated citizenry. Do we dismiss Mahmoud Ahmadinejad as a hate-filled demagogue, or do we take his threats seriously? All of us--Americans, Israelis, Europeans and Russians--would be well advised to remember the past, even as we work towards what we hope will be a safer tomorrow." (*Congressional Record*)

Rep. Aaron Schock (R-IL)

September 29, 2009

We come together tonight to talk about a very important issue and a very important relationship that we enjoy with our only true democratic ally in the Middle East, the State of Israel.

We've seen in the last week this issue come to light with the instability in that region, with the new facility that was just discovered and made public on Friday by the United States, Great Britain and her allies. This just reinforces in the minds of many of us in Congress the importance of us remaining steadfast in making sure that the State of Iran, that country, does not receive a nuclear weapon and that we do all that we can to support our ally, the State of Israel, and peace in that region.

I was fortunate to be a part of a delegation that traveled to Israel. In fact, there were 25 Members who traveled the first week of August to Israel on a fact-finding trip; 25 Republicans, which was the largest delegation of Republicans ever to visit the State of Israel at once. The Republican delegation was led by our whip, Eric Cantor. The following week the Democrats were led by Majority Leader Steny Hoyer, and my understanding was there were over 30 Democrat Members who went on that trip, which is the largest number of Democratic Members to travel to Israel all at one time.

If you do the math, that's over 50 Members, which is well over 10 percent of the Congress traveling to that region within a 2-week period and I think underscores the importance that this Congress believes that relationship is and the need for us to press for peace and the need for us to support our allies.

I want to take some time to reflect on my views of what I learned on that trip and some reflections of what I learned on that trip. Also here tonight, I have one of my good friends and allies who has joined me to share his experiences as well...

Well, thank you for your insights, and obviously I share those observations and would like to take the opportunity to share some of my own. First, let me say that I thought the trip to Israel reinforced what I had already known and that was that the Israeli citizens want peace. I saw this message on the faces of young soldiers. I've heard a passionate thoughtful cry for peace in Prime Minister Netanyahu's words, and I even prayed for peace with Israelis as they ended their prayers on Shabbat.

Furthermore, I found that like every nation in this world, Israel is a nation of contrasts. Specifically, it is a land hemmed by unambiguous borders, yet filled with lines that have been blurred beyond recognition. New and old, the archeological and the militarily strategic, the political and the religious were all indistinguishably bundled together until each lost its own identity and had become part of the same interwoven fabric.

Each day's itinerary was packed with life-changing events; the oppressive heat that hit me every time I stepped off the bus also seemed to also challenge all of my preconceived ideas about Israel. And while I found our agenda to be filled with the study of distorted lines, there were always those stark borders which clearly separated Israel from her neighbors and delineated fact from fiction.

I found this truth as we toured the Western Wall. As I watched old rabbis press their heads against the blocks of Herod's Temple, I found no ambiguous lines. I was clearly standing at the foundation of modern Israel. Conversely, I did not hear Israel's genesis in the echo of my footsteps through the solemn corridors of Yad Vashem. True, I heard an irrefutable argument against the unforgettable atrocities that happened when the world's Jewry does not have a land to call its own. While important, Yad Vashem's lesson does not speak to Israel's birthright. Plainly, Israel does not exist because of the Holocaust.

Unfortunately, I believe President Obama crossed this unmistakable border in his Cairo speech, linking the history of Israel not to the Western Wall or Masada but to the actions of a mad man. President Obama implied that Israel was thrown together to ease the guilt of a post-World War II Europe. I find this absurd. One can easily trace the tenacity of Masada straight through 2,000 years of history to the weary resolution on the faces of David Rubinger's famous photo "Paratroopers at the Western Wall."

Israel does not date to the instability caused by Adolf Hitler, but to the stability engendered by Abraham. Additionally, the President spoke of mutual respect but failed to show the Israelis the same respect he displayed to Palestinians. He spoke of the daily humiliations endured by Palestinians, but did not mention the daily fears endured by the residents of Sderot as they go about their lives tethered to bomb shelters.

The President also crossed the border between fact and fiction when he put settlement construction on a pedestal as the principal bargaining chip for peace, thereby providing cover for Palestinian leaders to harden their opposition to all construction in the settlements. This misstep was completely unnecessary. It is well known that Israel has no intention of building new settlements. However, the nation also has no intention of stopping normal life in the settlements; and, unfortunately, the President inadvertently called for the latter.

Admittedly, this is a difficult topic for us to understand, and it was only on my trip that I realized the line between Israeli parents and grown children is much more blurred than it is here in the United States. I love my mother dearly, yet I do not wish to have her live right next door to me. However, many Israelis want exactly that. They want to walk to their father's house for Shabbat and employ their mother as a readily available and reliable baby sitter.

Settlements need what is referred to as natural growth, but this term is a misnomer. The settlements have no intention of growing the geographic size of their settlements. Instead, they want a natural filling in of the existing land. They want their son to be able to build a house on the vacant lot next to their home. To deprive settlers of this ability is to deprive them of living the Israeli lifestyle. I wish President Obama had toured the Alfei Menashe settlement with us so he could have learned this lesson himself. The President also needs to learn that the world cannot preach from on high to Israel.

When the President tours U.S. cities, he does not encounter bus stops that double as bomb shelters. When he sees groups of crowded students around the White House, he does not see assault rifles slung over the chaperone's shoulders. He does not live in fear. And due to these facts, the President does not have the capability to lecture Israel on what she must do to keep peace or to make her citizens safe.

Finally, I turn my attention to the largest topic facing Israel, the Iranian threat. Using more than 7,000 centrifuges, Tehran has amassed enough uranium to produce a nuclear device. At their current pace, Iran would be able to produce two more atomic weapons each year, provided they find ways to further enrich this fuel. Never before--not India, not Pakistan, not even North Korea--has a group of criminals so defiant of international law had such destructive capability; and as the people of Iran have become more vocal in their pleas for responsible leadership, the ayatollahs have become more erratic and unpredictable.

As such, we must quickly and decisively act to end this danger. Without a doubt, the United States has failed to do enough to stop Iran from becoming a proud owner of the bomb. It is true, Congress has taken a multitude of votes on this issue. However, the majority of these were simply press releases disguised as legislation. To right this wrong, I have added my name in support of multiple bills this year to strengthen sanctions against Iran.

By no means are these pieces of legislation sufficient. The United States must use every unilateral and multilateral tool it has at its disposal to cut off Iran economically, diplomatically, and politically until this shadow of a state abandons its diabolical goals.

These actions can only help Iran make the decisions sooner. Iran must see it can stand with peace, prosperity, and the international community, or it can continue to live in squalor and obscurity, relegated to the trash heap of the international community with the other juntas, regimes, and cabals.

When I think about the threat of Iran, I am reminded of the saying that those who do not study history are destined to repeat it. I'm reminded of my tour of Yad Vashem. I recall an eerily similar declaration to annihilate Jews. I remember a leader who perverted a religion to justify his actions. And I am reminded of the famous British Parliamentarian Edmund Burke, who once said, "The only thing necessary for the triumph of evil is for good men to do nothing," which is exactly what too many Christian leaders did in that day: nothing.

This eerie similarity exists today, not with a leader who quotes the Bible but with one who quotes the Koran. His comments echo those of Hitler's; his stated goal is the same.

So what is necessary for peace? I would contend that there will be no peace until leaders around the world regardless of faiths denounce such comments, until leaders within the Muslim community reject this rhetoric, and until leaders of the Islamic states shun such hate speak within their borders. Whether someone builds a second garage or a second home within a defined community is not what stands between war and peace. A community of citizens who pervert a religion to justify hate and murder are what stand in the way of peace. This is precisely what we should all fear. It was radical Islamic terrorists who attacked the United States on September the 11th, who blew up subways in the UK. This ideology is the true barrier to peace.

I am reminded of a note that was left by the terrorists in Spain during the Madrid bombings. They said, "We will win and you will lose. Because you love life, and we seek death."

Therein lies the real problem with Iran. Unlike the threat of mutual destruction during the Cold War with Russia and the U.S., both knowing that if one attacked, the other would retaliate, we are now dealing with a regime that is not a socialist state like Russia but a religious state, whose leader espouses no fear of death but rather a clearly defined goal to destroy the state of Israel. This threat must be at the center of our President's and Congress's attention for the sake of Israel's security but also for the sake of our own.

Settlements, the West Bank, and a President who seems more interested in giving dictation rather than providing assistance--when spoken aloud, these problems seem rather insurmountable. I believe they are not. There is a path to peace which is as clear as the border formed by the security barrier. We only need to have the courage to take the first step on this path by ensuring Israel has our undeniable support.

Fortunately, we are not alone. The vast majority of Americans support Israel. We recognize that Israel stands as a lone beachhead of democracy in the Middle East. We know that we take our security for granted and do not judge those who are not afforded this luxury. In short, regardless of the muted lines within Israel, we know where the stark borders between our supporters and detractors are in the Middle East.

During our meeting with Shimon Peres, he said, "Israel and her neighbors seem to be able to live in peace. We just have a problem writing it down."

Focusing on the real threats to peace and democracy around the world, requiring leadership on the part of the Arab states to root out terrorists within their borders, and continuing to support and stand by our ally in the region, as, Mr. Netanyahu definitively stated, "With God's help, we will know no more war. We will know peace." (*Congressional Record*)

Sen. Charles Schumer (D-NY)

March 3, 2009

Mr. President, I rise today in support of President Obama's critical recognition that Russia must be a major player in blocking Iran's development of dangerous weapons. Yesterday, it was reported that the President wrote to Russia's President Dmitri Medvedev signaling an openness to re-examining the contested missile defense system in Eastern Europe, while urging Russia to help us stop Iran from developing nuclear warheads and long-range weapons.

This overture by President Obama is Reaganesque in its boldness. It has the potential to represent the most cooperative approach to a global threat by our two countries since President Reagan and Gorbachev signed the missile treaty 20 years ago.

It signals the ushering in of a new era of tough and smart thinking about foreign policy that has been desperately lacking in the White House. Rather than alienating potential allies, President Obama and his team are demonstrating that they will abandon the Bush unilateral

approach to nuclear nonproliferation in favor of galvanizing international support to meet the challenge posed by these deadly weapons.

I am not an after-the-fact supporter of this strategy. I have long thought that the key to defanging Iran's nuclear threat lies in Russia's cooperation in imposing tough economic sanctions on Iran. In fact, in an opinion piece published by the Wall Street Journal last summer, I urged President Bush to offer to Russia a deal: in exchange for walking back the missile defense system that Russia so opposes, the U.S. should get Russia to back the United States' economic sanctions on Iran that are our best stick for making sure that their nuclear threat does not become a reality.

I also made this suggestion in person at the White House last year. I was literally told by Vice President Cheney "We can't do that." Well, there's new leadership in Washington and President Obama says "Yes we can."

Today, there should be no lingering doubt that Iran represents a profound threat to our global security. The latest International Atomic Energy Agency report confirms that Iran remains in hot pursuit of a nuclear program. The report told us that Iran now possesses 1,010 kilograms, 2,222 pounds, of low-enriched uranium, which raises concerns that it now has sufficient uranium and the means to enrich it to produce nuclear warheads.

Whether President Ahmadinejad actually intends to make good on his threat remains to be seen. But what we do know is that the administration needs to use every diplomatic tool in our arsenal to halt Iran's progress in the development of deadly nuclear weapons.

In the recent past, we have made some progress in ratcheting up economic pressure on Iran by sanctioning four of Iran's major state-owned banks. This move has dramatically limited Iran's ability to conduct international business, as a growing number of foreign banks are unwilling to risk reputational harm or loss of access to U.S. financial markets. More economic pressure can and must be applied.

These sanctions are effective against Iran for several reasons. Despite the fact that the leadership and government of Iran is a theocracy, the Iranian people are largely secular and look westward for their cultural bearings. It's a common sight to see satellite dishes hidden in air-conditioning ducts, so Iranians can stay abreast of Western culture. Its growing youthful population also has strong ties to the west. MTV is a popular TV channel among the young in the country, not al-Jazeera. Iran is also wealthier than most neighbors in its region, and its inhabitants have enjoyed a higher standard of living than most people living in the Middle East.

However, Russia is blunting the impact of the sanctions. Economic self-interest motivates Russia's arguments that there is no evidence that Iran has a secret nuclear weapons program and that sanctions would undermine the International Atomic Energy Agency's efforts. Russia makes money from business with Iran, since Russia currently supplies over 75 percent of Iran's arms imports. Russia continues to supply Iran with nuclear fuel and to train Iran's nuclear engineers.

More ominously, Prime Minister Putin's nationalist rhetoric, designed to remake Russia into a global power and restore nationalist pride to the Russians, has led Russia into an even tighter embrace with Iran, an embrace that must be untangled if we are ever to truly eliminate the Iranian nuclear threat.

It is also not a secret that little has raised Russia's anger and fueled its nationalist impulses more than the Bush administration's missile shield plan. Putin argued that such a plan would both reignite the arms race of the 1980s and damage Russia's relations with the United States, Poland, and the Czech Republic. He also said that the shield would prompt Russia to increase its own defenses and abrogate its commitments to demilitarize under the Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe.

Despite Russia's loud complaints over this missile shield, the Bush administration plowed ahead, securing reluctant agreement from our allies at the NATO summit earlier last summer to move forward with its implementation.

Let me be clear. The United States is committed to both protecting against the threat of a nuclear Iran and protecting a free and prosperous Eastern Europe. But the Bush administration's plan to deploy the missile defense system in Poland and the Czech Republic has never made much sense. The technology has never been proven to work, it has not been determined to be cost-effective, and it will do nothing to tackle the ultimate source of this threat, Iran's stubborn refusal to abandon its nuclear program. At the same time, it does very little to preserve the necessary and very important independence of Eastern Europe.

In this context, it seems clear that the U.S. and Russia each have something to gain from each other. President Obama appears to recognize this dynamic. In exchange for joining the West in imposing economic sanctions on Iran until they stop their pursuit of nuclear weapons, I encourage the administration to roll back its predecessor's plans for a missile shield. It makes sense. With Russia on board, economic sanctions will have much greater success, and countries like China will certainly think twice before engaging with the Iranian regime. Russian participation will give multilateral sanctions against Iran real teeth, and we can halt Iran's nuclear program before it is too late.

The President's gesture to Russia is the kind of smart, targeted diplomacy our dangerous world needs. Given that a nuclear Iran is such a profound threat, this strategy makes eminent sense. The United States could give up a non-vital missile program in Eastern Europe in exchange for vitally needed Russian cooperation to prevent Iran from going nuclear. President Obama and President Medvedev do not need to look into each other's soul. They just need to be able to trust each other's handshake." (*Congressional Record*)

Rep. Allyson Schwartz (D-PA)

October 27, 2009

I appreciate the opportunity to speak on this resolution.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of three young American citizens who have been detained by the Government of Iran for nearly 3 months now.

On July 31, 2009, Joshua Fattal, Shane Bauer and Sarah Shourd were taken into custody after purportedly crossing into the Iranian territory while hiking in Iraqi Kurdistan. It is a peaceful region of northern Iraq which has become increasingly popular as a hiking destination for many Westerners. During the hike, it seems they accidentally crossed over an unmarked border into Iran.

As a result, these three young Americans, all graduates of the University of California-Berkley, have since been detained in Iran. While Swiss diplomats were finally permitted access to Josh, Sarah and Shane on September 29, the three have still not been allowed to have any contact with their families.

In response to this action, I have sponsored in the House--and Senator *Arlen Specter* has spearheaded in the Senate--Senate Concurrent Resolution 45, which encourages the Government of Iran to allow Josh, Shane and Sarah to communicate by telephone with their families in the United States. More importantly, it also encourages the Government of Iran to allow them to reunite with their families here in the United States as soon as possible.

This resolution was unanimously passed by the Senate on October 6.

Josh, whose family is from Montgomery County, Pennsylvania, which I represent; Sarah; and Shane did not commit any malicious acts. They were three young Americans who have traveled extensively throughout the world seeking to learn about different societies and different cultures. Unfortunately, they made a single mistake: They got lost. For that they have been held for nearly 3 months with almost no contact with the outside world.

As a mother, I can well imagine the pain and frustration the families of the three young adults feel as they wait, hoping, doing all that they can but with little power to compel action by Iran to free their children. I know, especially through my conversations with Mrs. Fattal, how important this resolution is to them and their families.

I urge the Government of Iran to reunite Josh, Sarah, and Shane with their families, and I ask my colleagues to support this concurrent resolution and the strong but compassionate plea for action that it contains. (*Congressional Record*)

Rep. David Scott (D-GA)

June 19, 2009

This is a time of great thought and deliberation and concern of what the United States must do and say. Our words have got to be carefully calculated to make sure that they are seen as not meddling, as not trying to tell the Iranian people what to do, because, quite honestly, Mr. Speaker, the Iranian people have already spoken. They have decided, and I believe that is our responsibility, if we hold true to the principles of our Founding Fathers.

As I was coming over on the floor, I was thinking what I could say, and the words of one of our great founders and patriots beams very deep in my heart as I think and I watch the news reports of what is happening in the streets of Tehran, when that great patriot said, Give me liberty or give me death. That is why the United States of America cannot be silent. It is our foundation.

I was reminded of the words of Thomas Jefferson when he wrote that, All men are created equal, and are endowed by their creator with certain inalienable rights, and among those life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

That is what we stand for. So it is important that we put this resolution forward, and it is important that the world understand that America is indeed that shining light of liberty and of freedom that Patrick Henry and Thomas Jefferson spoke so eloquently about.

We are proud to support the Iranian people, and we condemn the violence. (*Congressional Record*)

April 28, 2009

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this very important resolution, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, last month, President Obama delivered a very important video message to the Iranian people and to Iran's leaders, coinciding with Iran's Festival of Nowruz, a 12-day holiday marking the new year.

Mr. Speaker, I support President Obama's spirit of engagement, and I share his view that the United States and the international community should try to persuade Iran, through both diplomacy and economic sanctions, to comply with its legal obligations under the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty and under numerous United Nations Security Council resolutions.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Robert Levinson, a retired agent with the Federal Bureau of Investigation, disappeared in Iran over 2 years ago. There is no better time than now, in the spirit of engagement with Iran, for the Government of Iran to share the results of its investigation into Mr. Levinson's disappearance with the FBI. Indeed, the Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad, in an interview with NBC on July 28, 2008, stated that the Iranian Government was willing to cooperate with the FBI in the search for Mr. Robert Levinson. Iranian officials also promised their continued assistance to his relatives during the Levinson family's visit to Iran in December of 2007.

This resolution under consideration urges President Obama and our allies to raise the case of Mr. Levinson with the Iranians at every opportunity. Indeed, this process has already begun. During a March 31 conference in The Hague, Ambassador Richard Holbrook handed an Iranian diplomat a diplomatic letter asking Tehran to ensure the quick and safe return of Mr.

Levinson, as well as freelance journalist Roxana Saberi and student Esha Momeni, both of whom are being held in Iran. The resolution also urges the Government of Iran to fulfill its pledge to cooperate with the FBI. Both of these requests are more than fully appropriate.

Mr. Speaker, our hearts go out to the Levinson family. And we remain deeply committed to learning Mr. Levinson's fate in Iran and, if possible, hopefully returning him home safe and sound. I strongly support this resolution, and I urge all my colleagues to do likewise. And I want to thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. Wexler) for introducing this resolution.
(Congressional Record)

Sen. Jeff Sessions (R-AL)

July 23, 2009

Mr. President, I wish to join my colleague, Senator Lieberman, in introducing amendment No. 1744, concerning the deployment of missile defenses in Europe, and also thank him for his leadership on this issue over many years. He is clearly one of the most effective spokesmen for clear and strategic thinking and has helped us for many years to establish good defense policy for our Nation.

As Senator Lieberman has explained, this amendment would state it is the sense of the Congress that the administration should continue to develop the planned missile defense deployment through Poland and the Czech Republic, even as it considers other alternatives.

Further, it would state that any alternative to the current plan must be as effective and affordable, and, most important, must be able to defend the United States as well as Europe against long-range ballistic missiles.

This amendment is important at this time because the administration is now considering alternatives to the plan long pursued by the Bush administration to station ground-based interceptors in Poland, a missile-tracking radar system in the Czech Republic. Both Poland and the Czech Republic have signed agreements to host these missile defense assets after being told by the United States that we believed the plan is important to protect Europe and the United States from rogue states, more specifically, Iran's developing missile capability.

After much effort and political capital has been expended, both in the United States and by our Polish and Czech Republic allies and friends, now the project has been put in somewhat of a limbo, I am afraid.

Russia and the domestic left opposed this plan from the beginning. They lobbied the people and members of Congress in Poland and the Czech Republic to not do it. But they have gone forward with it today. If the objections of the United States to this system arise from Czech reasons, then I would refer my colleagues to a February 2009 CBO study Senator Lieberman cited, "Options for Deploying Missile Defense in Europe," which came to the conclusion that a ground-based interceptor deployment in Poland and the Czech Republic is the most effective and affordable option available for the foreseeable future.

The CBO concluded: “This is the most effective and affordable option for the foreseeable future.”

Other options apparently now under consideration include the deployment of a land- or sea-based version of the Standard Missile 3, SM-3 which is now deployed on Aegis ships of the United States.

The CBO found that this option, the SM-3, will not be available until late in the next decade, is no less expensive than the GBI option and does not provide protection for the United States against long-range Iranian missiles. In other words, while the deployment of a land- or sea-based version of SM-3 may be suitable to protect Europe against medium- and intermediate-range missile threats, it would not contribute to the defense of the United States which could occur from the launch of an ICBM, an intercontinental ballistic missile, which would travel at a much higher altitude.

Likewise, Admiral Stavridis, the new commander of the U.S. European Command, testified before the Senate Armed Services Committee during a hearing last month:

Sea-based and transportable land-based assets are integral components of a comprehensive ballistic missile defense system but cannot defeat the entire range of threats by themselves. Sophisticated sensors are required for early acquisition and target determination, and ground-based interceptors are needed to defeat longer-range missiles.

The missile Iran seeks to develop, and is moving forward to develop, would be capable of hitting the United States. Now they are seeking to develop ICBMs, and they are actively pursuing nuclear weapons, as we all know.

Why, I would ask my colleagues, would we want to consider alternatives to the proposed GBI deployment in Europe that would not save any money and would not provide additional protection for the United States?

I would recall the comments former Secretary of State Henry Kissinger made a few years ago about missile defense and whether we should deploy. His comment was: I have never heard of a nation whose policy it is to keep itself vulnerable to attack.

Well, we do not need to be kept vulnerable to attack. We have the capability to defend ourselves and protect against incoming missiles. Some have suggested that such additional protection is not needed, that current ground-based interceptors deployed at our missile defense site in Fort Greely, AK, can provide complete protection for the United States against Iranian threats.

But that argument does not tell the complete story. The truth is, deploying GBIs in Europe would provide an early opportunity to intercept Iranian missiles headed to the east coast, which could then be followed by an intercept attempt by Alaska, providing the United States an extra layer of protection. Just 10 missiles could provide a great additional protection for the

United States. That is what is needed, an integrated, layered, ballistic missile defense shield that effectively protects America and her allies from rogue attack.

Most Americans think we are adequately protected. I do remember a townhall meeting I held, and I asked the people there: What would happen if a missile was launched at the United States? They said: We would shoot it down. Well, that was before our system was up and running in Alaska, and it was not accurate. People think we do have a fully operational system, but we only have a few of those missiles up in Alaska, and we need this additional shield in Europe.

Without the site in Poland, the United States would have only one opportunity to engage Iranian missiles headed for certain portions of our country. Why should we take that risk?

Although the search for alternatives may please the Russians, it would perversely send the wrong message to our NATO allies and, in particular, to our friends in Poland and the Czech Republic who, despite pressure and threats from Russia, have agreed and stood firm and expressed their willingness to host these missile defense assets on their territory.

I would remind my colleague that NATO, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, the most successful defense treaty in the history of the world, endorsed the current plan at the April 2008 Bucharest Summit and noted in their declaration:

We therefore recognize the substantial contribution to the protection of Allies from long-range ballistic missiles to be provided by the planned deployment of European-based United States missile defense assets.

I also understand the Polish and Czech Parliaments have yet to ratify the agreements, and the ambivalence presented by the Obama Administration now regarding what was a firm policy of the United States, means, frankly, it is unlikely they will do so until our administration completes its consideration of alternatives. This has placed our situation in limbo. I am not happy with that. I think it was a mistake.

After all, why should those parliaments take up an agreement that the United States may pull off the table? This unfortunate event was obvious from the beginning when we backed away from our plan and started showing uncertainty. It is obvious the political support in Central Europe may erode.

I am left to conclude that the reason the administration is pursuing alternatives in this current plan is its hopes it will address Russian objections about the proposed deployment as part of a grand strategy to reset relations with Russia and conclude a follow-on to the START nuclear reduction agreement. I am not confident in this effort. In fact, it seems to, instead of moving our relations forward, have moved them backward.

Let me make note of some recent events. Just days after the United States and Russia reached a broader agreement on arms reductions and missile defense cooperation at the July 6 Moscow summit, Reuters News Agency reported, on July 10, 4 days later, that Russian President Medvedev threatened the United States that if it did not reach agreement with

Russia on our joint NATO/Polish/Czech plans for missile defense systems, Moscow would deploy rockets in an enclave near Poland.

Typical Russian bluster, threat. Likewise, Russian Foreign Minister Sergey Lavrov has threatened to end arms control talks with the United States if we pursue cooperation with our allies on missile defense, a system that in no way threatens Russia's massive nuclear capability, and they know it.

Ten interceptors of the United States in Europe are going to somehow have a capability to stop the thousands of Russian missiles and nuclear weapons that they have? Russia knows that our defenses would be no match.

As reported by the Associated Press, just 1 day after the summit, Lavrov stated:

If our partners make a decision to create an American missile defense system with global reach, then that will doubtless place a big question mark over the prospects for further reduction in strategic offensive weapons.

Again, this is, unfortunately, a regressive approach by Russia on issues that I do not think is justified. It seems we are falling back into a darker approach to world affairs with threats instead of working together to build a more peaceful and prosperous, harmonious world.

If, in fact, there were technical arguments in favor of alternative deployments, which there are not, Russian belligerence would now indeed be an argument for proceeding, nevertheless.

The former Prime Minister of the Czech Republic, Mirek Topolánek, put the issue in its proper perspective when he stated:

The moral challenge is clear and simple: If we are not willing to accept in the interests of the defense of the Euro-Atlantic area such a trifle as the elements of a missile defense system, then how shall we be able to face more difficult challenges that may come?

That is an important statement. Are we losing confidence in ourselves? He is not alone in that view. Just last week, 22 prominent Eastern European political figures of important historic importance, including Poland's Lech Walesa and the Czech Republic's Vaclav Havel, published an open letter to President Obama expressing their uneasiness over U.S. maneuvers with Russia. This letter was sent to address their concerns in light of what appears to them to be Russia's attempt to reassert its influence over Russia's former Eastern European satellites. These are independent nations. They have been freed from Soviet domination. It is not their desire to kowtow to Russia and to have to seek Russia's permission over whether to put a radar site in their country. They are sovereign nations.

These leaders noted in their letter that America's planned missile defense installations in Poland and the Czech Republic have become "a symbol of America's credibility and commitment in the region." They further warned that:

The Alliance should not allow the issue to be determined by unfounded Russian opposition. Abandoning the program entirely or involving Russia too deeply in it without consulting Poland or the Czech Republic can undermine the credibility of the United States across the whole region.

I don't think that is no small matter. These are historic figures in Eastern Europe who suffered under the Communist boot. They do not want to go back. They are sending us a message. They are great American allies. They believe in freedom and democracy. This is not an academic matter to them, it is very real.

On March 5, Secretary of State Hillary Clinton "applaud[ed] the decision by the people of the Czech Republic and their government--as well as the people and Government of Poland--for proceeding with missile defense on their soil." That was just in March of this year. The United States should honor this commitment by proceeding with the missile defense deployment as planned and not be affected by Russia's unfounded objections. I remain baffled by their objections, other than, perhaps, this is a way they think they can extract concessions from the United States as a bargaining chip.

As the CBO study referenced above makes clear:

Only the Polish and Czech deployments can protect the United States and Europe. Any other option costs more and defends the U.S. less, if at all.

I ask my colleagues to support this message. It will be good for our country to be clear on this question and for Congress to speak up.

I express a concern about what has happened in this budget to national missile defense. It represents a major reduction in spending for missile defense. We intend to deploy 44 missiles in Alaska. The budget proposes, I believe, now just 30. It was proposed and part of the agenda for the last number of years to place a multikill vehicle on top of these interceptors so it could take out dummies and decoys and multiple missiles. That was zeroed out, ended in this budget. For a number of years, we have been funding research and development of the kinetic energy interceptor. That is a high-speed system that can take out missiles in the launch phase, which is the best phase to do so. That was zeroed out. There was the airborne laser which has the capability of shooting down missiles in their launch phase when they have so much heat coming out of them. It is funded for 1 more year, and it will be ended, apparently. Of course, now the 10 interceptors in Europe are in question.

We need to be sure we understand how seriously we are impacting the long-term strategy of the United States. We have spent \$20 billion to develop a system that will actually work at incredible rates of speed, with hit-to-kill technology to knock down an incoming missile. After all of these investments and all these years, for \$1 billion we could complete the program. We are saving about \$150, \$200 million this year that would have kept us on track. Maybe we can keep the system going forward. I hope so with this resolution and some other things.

But the American people need to know that we are not talking about a minor retrenchment of national missile defense in the budget that has come forward out of our committee. It represents the biggest reduction of missile defense funding during my time in the Senate, over 12 years.

I hope that as the months go along we will be able to reevaluate what we are doing and make sure we don't abandon the progress we have made and take full advantage of decades of research and development that has produced a system that will work to protect us.

I yield the floor. (*Congressional Record*)

Rep. Pete Sessions (R-TX)

June 10, 2009

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of my amendment to the Foreign Relations Authorization Act. My amendment would affirm the United States' complete support for Israel's absolute right to defend itself from an imminent military or nuclear threat from Iran, from terrorist organizations or from nations that harbor them.

Israel is currently being threatened on three fronts--by Hamas in the south, by Hezbollah in the north and by Iran. Iran provides financial and material support to both of these terrorist organizations. This threat culminated on May 20 when Iran successfully tested a surface-to-surface missile with a range of 1,500 miles. Iranian leaders continue to express their hatred for Israel, and they refuse to acknowledge its right to exist. Their incendiary words and actions are an existential threat to Israel and to the entire region.

No nation should be subjected to these continued threats. Israel has demonstrated tremendous restraint in the face of these dangers despite being continually questioned by some in the global community regarding its approach to dealing with these threats and terrorist attacks on its citizens.

Israel has been and remains one of the United States of America's strongest allies. Israel seeks only peace with its neighbors and a homeland secure for its people; but if an attack from Iran or from a terrorist organization becomes imminent, this Congress should declare that Israel, like the United States, should reserve for itself the inalienable right to defend itself and to protect its people.

I encourage my colleagues to demonstrate their strong support for Israel by supporting this amendment. (*Congressional Record*)

Rep. Brad Sherman (D-CA)

December 15, 2009

As one of the six original cosponsors of this legislation, I rise in support.

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. *Paul*) attacks the whole concept of the use of sanctions saying that American sanctions against Japan led to our involvement in World War II. If you think that America should have remained neutral in World War II, you should vote with the gentleman from Texas (Mr. *Paul*).

Iran has been found to have violated the nonproliferation treaty and its commitments under that treaty by the United Nations Security Council with the votes of Russia and China, who also voted to impose some limited sanctions against Iran.

My district contains, I believe, more Iranian Americans than any other in the country, and let me tell you that those who support the students and the effort for democracy in their homeland support the idea of sanctions. This bill is but one step that we need to take in ratcheting the economic power on the regime in Tehran. This bill amends the Iran Sanctions Act. It is important that that act be enforced both before and after we adopt these amendments. (*Congressional Record*)

October 22, 2009

For thirteen years in Congress, I've been focused on Iran. When Madeleine Albright opened our markets to Iranian goods in 2000 --- not to oil, but only the stuff that we don't need and they couldn't sell anywhere else --- I went down to the House floor and said "there's blood in the caviar."

Well, my fellow panelist pointed out those Iranian goods still have access to the American markets. If the nation wants to protect its national security, it must prioritize. The number one priority in American foreign policy should be to prevent Iran from developing a nuclear weapon. An Iranian nuclear bomb means the end of the worldwide nonproliferation regime. Iran is the number one state sponsor of terror; now imagine Iranian worldwide terror with impunity.

A nuclear Iran can interfere with the straits of Hormuz or engage any other provocative action and that provocation will involve us going eyeball-to-eyeball with a hostile nuclear state, not one led by Khrushchev, but led by someone far less sane. And finally, if the Tehran regime thinks its going to be overthrown, inshallah, they could use their nuclear weapons against Israel in an effort to regain popularity, or against the United States, figuring they might as well go out with a bang.

And do not let your neighbors tell you not to worry and feel safe behind a missile-defense shield in the United States, because it is easier to smuggle a nuclear weapon than it is to smuggle a person across our border, and you do not have to be a rocket scientist to smuggle a nuclear weapon inside a bale of marijuana.

Let me speak briefly about the military option. We are all aware that Israel acted militarily to stop the nuclear program of Saddam Hussein and then Syria. The nuclear sites in Iran are harder and better hidden. Now, I have strongly opposed any declaration by the US Congress – and we’ve fought these off on the floor, successfully – that the US would not use military force against Iran to stop its nuclear program. I regard such a declaration as Ambien for Ahmadinejad – it would just help him sleep better.

There are two other reasons why we should at least leave the military option on the table. One is to strengthen the argument of those Iranian forces that are saying “maybe we ought to give up our nuclear program, in return for the very generous terms offered by the West; it may get blown up before it yields any fruit, anyway.” Second, we need to convince Europe that we are serious, that they should go along with tough economic measures against Iran. If they block economic pressure on Iran, the Europeans are simply increasing the likelihood of more lethal pressure.

Israel could take military action. It would be highly problematic, however, and it could take either of two forms. One is the most talked about, which is a one to two week air campaign against Iran’s nuclear sites. The second version would then add Israeli action or the threat of Israeli action against the strategic and energy sites in Iran. Israel could threaten such action if Iran did not verifiably and permanently renounce nuclear programs and nuclear research.

But, as I said, this military approach is extremely problematic and we ought to focus instead on how we can force the Iranian regime to give up its nuclear program. We owe a special debt of gratitude to the mullahs in Tehran because their mismanagement, corruption and oppression have made Iran vulnerable to economic pressure. Vulnerable to what I call economic diplomacy. Let us look at that economic vulnerability.

Iran has a large and growing population with twenty percent unemployment. Their budget is based on a minimum price of seventy-five dollars a barrel but they are only getting fifty. They are dependent on a large quantity of imports which they are having a difficult time financing – they especially need parts for systems that they already own. For example, they’ve got a lot of Boeing jets that they bought prior to the imposition of the U.S. embargo. Those aging jets were going to be grounded in 2005 except for the fact that the Bush Administration allowed our companies to sell replacement parts to the Iranians, thus demonstrating that our aircraft manufactures are reliable suppliers, even to a country that is creating nuclear weapons in order to annihilate Israel. I’m not sure it was the right decision.

Europe has far more opportunities to say “we won’t provide this or that or replacement part or technologies that Iran needs.” Iran is in no way self sufficient; the sophisticated electric generation facilities, the sophisticated computer facilities, sophisticated aircraft systems, telephone systems, these are all coming in from abroad.

Iran’s oil fields need technology and capital because the infrastructure is getting old and production is petering out. Iran has to import thirty percent of its refined petroleum, the gasoline needed for its cars and diesel for trucks. The Iranians need capital, especially in a fifty dollar a barrel world. So, they have significant vulnerability.

We've got broadcasting resources, and nothing would please me more than to go on Radio Farda to tell the Iranian people and the Iranian elites they will face economic and diplomatic strangulation unless they abandon this nuclear program. The problem is that I can't lie this well in Farsi. Iran does not yet face economic and diplomatic isolation. The good news is that we have a lot of tools in the toolbox, tools that would be sufficient for the job. The bad news is that all of those tools are still in the toolbox, and after thirteen years of this I'm getting a little frustrated. Let's review some of those tools.

First, we need to implement existing law. We should enforce the Iran Sanctions Act, formerly known as the Iran-Libya Sanctions Act. We used the sanctions effectively against Libya, Qaddafi changed his behavior, and we dropped Libya from the statute. The law says that if an oil company invests \$20 million in oil production facilities in Iran, the State Department must name and shame this company, and then the President must either impose sanctions or waive them and explain to the American people why its in our national interest to do so.

What has the State Department done? They've cancelled their subscription to the Wall Street Journal so they can plausibly say they're not aware of all the stories in the Wall Street Journal about international companies making investments of \$20 million or more in the Iranian oil fields. This approach was adopted in 1998 in the Clinton Administration, continued for eight years by the Bush Administration, and I have not seen a change in the Obama Administration, but it's only been a hundred days.

So we start by enforcing the Iran Sanctions Act. But what about the new legislation? First, the Iran Sanctions Enabling Act. This bill is designed to further the efforts of states such as Florida and California that have enacted divestment measures against Iran. The argument that you run into with state governments and local governments, pension plans, municipal governments and with mutual fund managers is they say "Oh, if I don't invest for the best possible return, I'll get sued." Now some are genuinely afraid of lawsuits, some are just making an excuse. Either way, this bill says they can't be sued. We've passed legislation saying the same thing for divestment efforts aimed at Sudan for the Darfur Genocide. We've passed this same Iran bill through the House in 2007 and again in 2008, we could not pass this through the Senate even though Senator Obama was the Senate sponsor of the legislation. We've got to pass it now.

Next, the Iran Diplomatic Enhancement Act says that the Iran Sanctions Act, which focuses on investments in the oil and gas fields of Iran, should also apply to selling gasoline to Iran or selling refining equipment to Iran. Next, the Enable Divestment from Sudan and Iran Act. You've got some individual investors who want to divest, but a few of them realize that if they sell the stock at a profit, they are going to owe the cap gains tax. So what do we do? We say if you sell stock in a bad company and invest in a good company, you do not owe any taxes until you sell the stock in the good company some future time down the road. You'll pay the full tax at that time. We hope to have the support of the Darfur divestment community and I hope you'll mention this to those Members of Congress that are particularly interested in Darfur.

Next, the Iran Revolutionary Guard Corps Designation Implementation Act. The IRGC has already been designated a terrorist organization. We need to designate all its front groups as

terrorist organizations, but we can go beyond that. It's called secondary sanctions. Here's where Europeans come in. It's one thing to say we need to prevent Americans from doing business with the IRGC. Now, if the IRGC want to buy trucks, they buy from Mercedes through one of their front businesses. The question on secondary sanctions is, if Mercedes is selling trucks to a terrorist organization, can they still sell them to you? This bill would say no. Needless to say, this bill will be hard to pass, and we need your help.

Next is the International Uranium Extraction Control Act, which says: do not sell anything of relevance to uranium mining and milling to Iran, North Korea or Syria.

Next, the Overseas Private Investment Corporation Reauthorization Act, which is a longtime agency of the federal government which supports U.S. exports and business activities overseas that assist with development projects. Its charter expires this year. Its jurisdiction is in my subcommittee. This bill will say to OPIC that you cannot help a corporation that is doing bad things in Iran. Under this bill, OPIC will look at your entire enterprise, so don't play games with your subsidiaries and other affiliates. If one of the entities in a corporate family is doing bad things, your entire corporate family is disqualified from receiving OPIC assistance.

Finally, the Iran Counter-Proliferation Act. This was Tom Lantos' bill, *alav ha-shalom*, and I will reintroduce it in the coming weeks. It bans all Iranian imports into the U.S., prohibits U.S. companies from doing business with Iran through their foreign-incorporated subsidiaries, and bans the sale of spare aircraft parts to Iran.

In addition what can we do without actually passing legislation? Sometimes we're able to push on administrative agencies. Two partial successes. First, Vitol, a major Swiss oil trading company, sells gasoline to Iran. It also has a major contract with the Department of Energy. We got a decision out of the Department of Energy recently which says, in effect, no more contracts with Vitol. This company pled guilty to paying Saddam kickbacks in the Oil-for-Food scandal. Next is Reliance, the energy giant in India. This firm was getting help from the Export-Import bank. In response to Congressional pressure, they suspended gasoline shipments to Iran for several months; unfortunately, now it looks like they're resuming those shipments.

Next, multilateral organizations. The World Bank approved \$1.4 billion in concessionary loans to Iran from 2000-2005. We, in effect, acquiesced to this; we could have stopped it, but that would have made the Europeans upset, so we did not. \$500 million from these loans still has not been disbursed. We could stop the final disbursement. That would make the Europeans upset, so we have no plans to do that. AIPAC at its very core advocates US foreign aid, so please don't tell anybody back home that one of the major recipients of foreign aid is also aiding terror. Just don't tell anyone.

Now, the much bigger issue is the International Monetary Fund, the IMF, it's going to get roughly \$100 billion from the United States, similar amounts from Europe, a big check from Japan. Why? To allow it to bail out countries during this worldwide economic crisis, to make the IMF more bailout ready. My view is we should not make the IMF bailout ready as long as Iran is bailout eligible. Even if the IMF never provides loans to Iran, it enhances Iran's

international credit; the world would know that if everything melts down, Iran may get an IMF bailout. We've got to make the IMF choose between the United States and our \$100 billion and the potential relationship with Iran.

More important than the IMF and the World Bank is the United Nations, where we have to deal with Russia and China. Nothing could be more powerful in this effort than strong UN sanctions against Iran. Real sanctions, not the joke of a regime we have now. We could be successful in this effort, obviously, if we could get Putin to sound like Sherman.

Unfortunately, we have never offered Russia or China anything in return for them cooperating with us on Iran at the U.N. In fact, we've told Russia that their votes on Iran will not affect our policies towards Chechnya, South Ossetia, Abkhazia, Moldova – or anything else Russia cares about. Likewise, we've never pointed out to China how we pressured Taiwan to drop plans to develop nuclear weapons, and that our policy may be affected by whether or not they help block Iran from developing nuclear weapons. And, by the way, we have never suggested that the next shipment of tennis shoes will be stopped at the port if China continues to be unhelpful on Iran at the United Nations.

If we made it clear to Russia or China that things they care about are dependent on their support of our efforts against Iran at the United Nations, I think you would see improved cooperation from those two countries.

And if we have the Russians and Chinese --- not even their support but just their acquiescence at the UN --- we could get a worldwide binding resolution prohibiting the export to Iran of refined oil products that would put Iran in big trouble within a few weeks. We have that opportunity. We have to overcome the political power of the oil companies, the intransigence of the State Department bureaucracy, the ideological power in the argument that corporations should be allowed to do whatever they want without governmental interference, and we have to remember that the centrifuges are turning right now.

Preventing Iran from developing nuclear weapons should be the number one foreign policy objective of the United States. We have the powerful economic and diplomatic tools, and we better start using them right away. *(Press Release)*

Rep. Ike Skelton (D-MO)

September 25, 2009

“I remain deeply concerned about Iran’s nuclear intentions. The disclosure that the Iranians have built a covert nuclear facility confirms our suspicions that Iran could be concealing nuclear weapons-related uranium enrichment activities.

“The fact that Iran concealed this site is not consistent with its claims that the facility will be used only for peaceful purposes. Iran has a responsibility to fulfill its commitments to the international community by giving the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) full access to inspect this newly disclosed facility. I commend President Obama, U.K. Prime

Minister Brown, and President Sarkozy of France for making a joint statement today to insist that Iran cooperate fully with the IAEA.” (*Press Release*)

Rep. Christopher Smith (R-NJ)

December 15, 2009

Mr. Speaker, Chairman *Berman's* Iran Refined Petroleum Sanctions Act, cosponsored by the ranking member, Ms. *Ros-Lehtinen*, significantly ratchets up strong bipartisan pressure on Iran to end their nefarious quest for nuclear weapons.

Given Ahmadinejad's extreme hostility toward Israel, his outrageous threats to annihilate Israel from the face of the Earth, and his obsessive hatred of Jews worldwide, this bill strengthens penalties on those who not only sell, lease, or provide to Iran any goods, services, technology, information, or support that would allow Iran to maintain or expand its domestic production of refined petroleum resources, it has other sanctions as well.

Mr. Speaker, any serious effort to peacefully stop Iran from acquiring weapons of mass destruction, which I believe they will use if they acquire them, requires the strongest political and economic pressure that we can muster. H.R. 2194 is a step, the right step in that direction. (*Congressional Record*)

October 6, 2009

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2194, the Iran Refined Petroleum Sanctions Act of 2009, which my good friend and colleague Chairman *Berman* introduced on April 30, and of which I am a co-sponsor.

Madam Speaker, this bill amends the Iran Sanctions Act of 1996 to impose sanctions on persons who sell to or service, or otherwise commercially or financially support, Iran's petroleum industry. The bill responds to Iran's lack of refining capabilities--Iran imports 40 percent of its gasoline and relies on foreign companies to develop its energy industry. Limiting Iran's access to refined petroleum could have a major effect on the Iranian economy--and on Ahmadinejad's policies.

Even as President Obama opens diplomatic talks with Iran, we know, from all our experience with Iran and so many other dictatorships, that a serious effort to peacefully stop Iran's development of nuclear weapons will require the strongest political and economic pressure our country can muster.

Madam Speaker, it will not only be worth the effort, but it's absolutely necessary that we make this effort. In this regard, I want to point out that we have repeatedly seen the correspondence between the way a government treats its own people and the way it behaves

internationally. It seems to be almost a law of international relations: massive human rights violators behave deceitfully and aggressively, and the more massive the violations, the greater the deceit and aggression.

The law has certainly held in the case of the Ahmadinejad government, whose deceit in hiding a previously secret uranium enrichment facility was revealed several weeks ago, and whose support of Hezbollah and other terrorists and declarations of genocidal intent toward Israel are notorious. When we read the State Department's Country Reports on Human Rights Practices--I will attach the Iran summary as an addendum--we should keep in mind that all these outrages and atrocities Ahmadinejad and his cronies commit on their own citizens are more evidence of the aggression Ahmadinejad and his cronies are fully prepared and preparing to commit on Israel, toward whom they don't even pretend to have anything other than the most malevolent intent.

As former Senators Coats and Robb and General Wald wrote in the Washington Post on September 21: "By ratcheting up pressure on Iran before we sit down, Western negotiators would gain both sticks (additional measures) and carrots (repealing sanctions) with which to induce Iranian cooperation."

This is exactly right: the time to move this bill is now, before the administration opens its talks with the Ahmadinejad government. This House is ready to send a clear signal to the Iranian regime--that, though our President is negotiating, this country has not weakened one bit its fundamental commitment to defend Israel, that we will not tolerate nuclear threats to Israel, and we will not permit the Ahmadinejad government to obtain nuclear weapons.

Madam Speaker, I urge you and Chairman BERMAN to move this bill, which now has over 325 co-sponsors, to the floor for passage by the full House as soon as possible. The bill is right, and the time is right. (*Congressional Record*)

Sen. Arlen Specter (D-PA)

December 17, 2009

Mr. President, there has been wide publicity given to three young Americans who were taken into custody by Iran and the recent reports that they are going to be tried in an Iranian court. Senator Casey and I, in the Senate, introduced a resolution urging the Iranians to release those three young Americans--Congresswoman ALLYSON SCHWARTZ, on the House side, did so in the past--and it is my hope Iran will change its view.

I was talking to the Syrian Ambassador yesterday, who advised me that when the five British citizens were taken into custody by Iran, the Government of Great Britain made a request of the Syrian Government to use their good offices to secure the release of the five British citizens. That request was made via Syria, and they were released.

I have written to and contacted the State Department since that meeting yesterday afternoon to find out what is the status of U.S. activity because if we have not asked the Syrians for help,

my view is that we should. It would be my hope that with the very difficult problems facing the United States in Iran , that Iran would relinquish the custody of those three young Americans and release them to their family and friends, especially at this time of the year.

I have been an advocate of dialog with Iran for years. I have tried to go to Iran since 1989, when the Iran -Iraq war ended. Senator Shelby and I got to Iraq and met Saddam Hussein, but as yet we have not had an interparliamentary exchange, which I have sought for a long time with the Iranians.

It would be my hope that Iran , for humanitarian reasons, would release these people and that we would exercise our best efforts--the U.S. Government working through Syria or whatever other channel we can find--to secure their release. (*Congressional Record*)

September 22, 2009

Mr. President, I seek recognition to discuss legislation I have introduced encouraging the Government of Iran to grant consular access to and promptly release three young Americans who have been detained in Iran for the past 8 weeks after they reportedly crossed into Iran while on a hike in Iraqi Kurdistan.

On July 31, 2009, University of California, Berkeley graduates Joshua Fattal, 27, Shane Bauer, 27, and Sarah Shourd, 30, went “on a hike near the border of Iraqi Kurdistan and Iran in an area known for beautiful views and a waterfall, along an unmarked section of the border that zigzags.” The three inadvertently crossed into Iranian territory and were detained by Iranian officials.

While the Government of Iran has confirmed it is holding Joshua, Shane and Sarah, it has yet to grant the Embassy of the Government of Switzerland, in its formal capacity as the representative of the interests of the United States in Iran, consular access to the three in accordance with the Vienna Convention on Consular Relations. Nor has the Government of Iran allowed Joshua, Shane and Sarah to telephone their families in the United States to let them know they are well.

Based on news accounts I have read, I have every confidence that the three entered Iranian territory accidentally, perhaps due to, as I understand it, the absence of clear border markers in the region near Ahmed Awa. On August 8, an Iraqi government official was quoted as saying the three young Americans crossed the border “unintentionally and mistakenly.”

The legislation which I have introduced encourages the Government of Iran to: Grant consular access by the Embassy of the Government of Switzerland to the three United States citizens in accordance with the Vienna Convention on Consular Relations; Allow Joshua, Shane and Sarah to communicate by telephone with their families in the U.S.; and Allow Joshua, Shane and Sarah to reunite with their families in the U.S. at the soonest possible opportunity.

It is clear to me that Joshua, Shane and Sarah made a careless navigational mistake which they will not soon repeat. It is my sincere hope that the Government of Iran quickly comes to this conclusion and releases them so they can be reunited with their families in the U.S. at the earliest opportunity, as all have anguished too much already. (*Congressional Record*)

Rep. Jackie Speier (D-CA)

June 16, 2009

Mr. Speaker, while we are often focused on the things that make us different from other cultures, the recent news in Iran illustrates that there are far more things that bind us than that divide us. Freedom of speech, democracy and respect for basic fairness are not uniquely American or Western values. They are hardwired into all of us and are as elemental to the human experience as is the need for food, water or love.

We will likely have political differences with the Government of Iran for years to come. Despite this, let us all remember that the Iranian people want many of the same things that Americans do. They want their voices to be heard just like us. They want their government to be just, open and accessible just like us. They want their economy to be strong and for their country to work towards greater peace and understanding around the world just like us. (*Congressional Record*)

Rep. Cliff Stearns (R-FL)

June 24, 2009

My colleagues, it is vital that the elected officials in the United States express their solidarity with those who peacefully advocate for freedom in Iran.

It is clear that the votes in the Iranian elections were manipulated. An analysis by the London-based Chatham House, a British think tank, found that the turnout in two provinces exceeded 100 percent, along with other fraudulent activities. How could they count 40 million votes in 4 hours, many of them paper votes?

Let's see a list of registered voters and voter turnout by province and how these elections compare with earlier Iranian elections. These are crucial questions and considerations in determining the validity of these elections.

I agree with the President that the disputed elections are a matter for the Iranians to resolve themselves. However, as a leader of the Free World, the President should have stepped up earlier in support of the pro-democracy demonstrators and in condemning the attacks on them. And he should ask, Where is the proof? Where is the proof in the Iranian elections? (*Congressional Record*)

Rep. Glenn Thompson (R-PA)

September 29, 2009

I thank my good friend from Illinois for yielding and thank him for coordinating this time tonight when we truly do talk about our most important ally, a friend that we have and a good democratic friend in a very dangerous part of the world in the Jewish State of Israel.

It was a privilege to be able to visit the country of Israel and to go with other colleagues, to go there with an open mind and to be able to sit down and to visit and talk face to face with the President of Israel, with the Prime Minister of Israel, to meet with the military, to go into the West Bank and sit down with the Prime Minister of the Palestinian Authority and to look at the defense issues that Israel lives with each day and has since the beginning of that democratic nation; to visit all the borders on all sides of Israel and to look out into, whether it was Jordan or Syria or Lebanon, places where, at one time or different times during their short history where missiles rained from and mortars came down on men, women and children in that State of Israel. It's a country that is very familiar and lives every day where defense is on their mind, and a strong defense.

In particular, it was striking to me when we were in the southern part of Israel, and we were overlooking the Gaza Strip. All the borders are being relatively peaceful right now, but at the Gaza Strip and just outside of this small farming community of Sderot where we looked and the leaders of Israel chose, in a goodwill, good-faith offer of peace, gave up what I thought looked like a pretty good piece of real estate that sat along the Mediterranean Sea, and that was the Gaza Strip.

They moved the citizens of Israel out of there, and relocated them into other parts of Israel in the hopes of obtaining a lasting peace and long peace with the Palestinians; and in exchange, what they received is about 3,000 missiles and mortars that came raining down on them.

I think the most striking conversation I had--and I know my good friend was there--was with a young mom of a 9-year-old, and she had grown up in that farming community. Her grandparents lived there. Her parents lived there. She lived her entire life there, and she lived through that time when those missiles rained. She talked about how--and we saw as we were driving in to Sderot bus stations that looked a little unusual but that was because they were designed also as bomb shelters. We saw the playground, which had a great piece of equipment sitting in it. My kids are grown now, but my boys would have loved it. It looked like a giant caterpillar and kind of weaved around. But to look closer, it actually was a bomb shelter for children that they would run to whenever a missile was launched and would soon be landing.

Now from the time the siren sounds in Israel, they have about 20 seconds until that missile lands and explodes. That young mom I think put it so striking for me. Her words I hear over and over again in my mind, Imagine yourself, you are a parent, and you are driving down the road. That siren sounds, and you've got 20 seconds to get to safety. You've got two children. They're both strapped in car seats in the back seat. Which one do you pick?

I think we take for granted our safety and security in this country. We certainly have had our attacks here. We've been relatively safe since 2001 because of the measures that were taken by President Bush and by the Congress at that point, and we have not experienced another attack on our soil in those 8 years. But we certainly have issues that I look forward to talking about further tonight in terms of future threats to not just our country but to the country of Israel. And I thank my good friend for yielding. (*Congressional Record*)

Rep. Chris Van Hollen (D-MD)

October 13, 2009

Mr. Speaker, earlier this month, Iran admitted the existence of a secret enrichment facility in the holy city of Qom. This development has set in motion a renewed commitment on the part of the international community to pursue more aggressive penalties against Iran for its nuclear enrichment activities. Today, as Secretary of State Hilary Clinton arrives in Moscow to solicit Russian support for more stringent sanctions against Iran, the U.S. House of Representatives considers legislation that will enable ordinary Americans to express their opposition to Iran's illegal nuclear activities.

The Iran Sanctions Enabling Act of 2009 helps to weaken Iran's vital petroleum industry by cutting off its access to global investment. The legislation enables State and local governments to divest from entities that invest more than \$20 million in Iran's energy sector. Though Iran possesses large oil reserves, it has little refining capacity and the lack of refined petroleum products has often been a source of tension between its government and its people.

It is clear that arresting Iran's illegal nuclear enrichment program will require a comprehensive approach that targets Iran's important energy sector, truncates its access to the global financial system and engages its people. This legislation can help to achieve these goals. I encourage my colleagues to join me in support of this bill. (*Congressional Record*)

Rep. Debbie Wasserman Schultz (D-FL)

June 10, 2009

Mr. Chair, I rise in support of this essential amendment, recognizing Israel's right to defend itself from an imminent nuclear or military threat from Iran and other countries and organizations.

As Iran forges ahead with its quest for a nuclear weapons capability, it is vital for Congress to recognize Israel's urgent need to deal with the looming threat of a nuclear-armed Iran.

Like all sovereign nations, Israel has not only a right, but moreover, an obligation, to ensure the safety and security of her citizens.

An imminent nuclear or military threat from Iran would certainly endanger her citizens, and that is why, in the strongest of terms, I support my colleague's vital amendment.

According to the U.N.'s nuclear watchdog, Iran has sped up its production of nuclear fuel and has increased its number of installed centrifuges to 7,200--more than enough to make fuel for two nuclear bombs per year.

If Iran possessed nuclear weapons, it could share this technology with terrorist groups to carry out attacks against both Israel and the United States.

Let me be very clear. A nuclear-armed Iran would certainly constitute an existential threat to Israel, but would not only threaten Israel. As the leading state sponsor of international terrorism, a nuclear-armed Iran would pose unacceptable threats to global security.

This rogue nation's possession of a nuclear weapon would likely lead to nuclear proliferation elsewhere in the region and around the globe, while fundamentally altering the strategic balance of the Middle East, and endangering U.S. national security interests.

Undoubtedly, now is the time for us all to stand together in support of Israel and global peace and security. I urge my colleagues to support this critical amendment, and pray that Iran suspends its nuclear program, and starts working towards peace instead of terror.

(Congressional Record)

October 13, 2009

I rise today, Mr. Speaker, in support of H.R. 1327, the Iran Sanctions Enabling Act of 2009, which aims to put a stop to Iran's pursuit of nuclear weapons. It cannot be overstated. A nuclear armed Iran is an urgent and deadly threat to peace and stability in the Middle East and at home.

The anti-Western rhetoric of Iranian President Ahmadinejad has only intensified in recent years. His regime supports terrorism in all its forms, a travesty worsened by the fact that Iran continues to pursue nuclear weapons against the will of the international community. If Iran continues its plans for nuclear buildup, we can expect that nuclear proliferation will increase throughout the region and around the globe. That is why it is critical for Congress to pass the Iran Sanctions Enabling Act.

This legislation would authorize State and local governments to divest from companies investing in Iran's petroleum and natural gas sector. With Tehran importing nearly 40 percent

of its gas and diesel needs, this legislation would have a dramatic effect on Iran's economy and is an important step forward in convincing Iran to suspend its nuclear program. It strikes a careful balance between the administration's diplomatic outreach and the need for us to make sure that we can tighten the noose around Iran's neck in the event that those diplomatic efforts are not successful. (*Congressional Record*)

Rep. Diane Watson (D-CA)

October 21, 2009

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution, and I would like to thank my good friend, the gentleman from Illinois, Congressman MARK KIRK, for his leadership in introducing this important resolution.

H. Res. 175 condemns the Government of Iran for its state-sponsored persecution of its Baha'i minority and of its continued violation of the international covenants on human rights.

Mr. Speaker, resolutions in support of the much persecuted Baha'i communities in the Middle East have a long and proud tradition in the House of Representatives and in the other body. While past resolutions have chronicled the abuse and harassment Baha'is have experienced in several Middle Eastern countries, nowhere is the situation as dire or does it require more urgent action than in Iran, where Baha'is are routinely arrested and face the death penalty.

Iran's Baha'i community forms that country's largest religious minority. It is difficult to know the exact number because Iran has banned communal Baha'i institutions since 1983, but it is estimated that they number over 300,000.

Since 1979, some 200 Baha'is have been executed, and thousands have been imprisoned. They have been systematically denied jobs, pensions, access to higher education, and the right to inherit property. All Baha'i cemeteries, holy places and other community properties were seized soon after the 1979 revolution. Many sites of the greatest historical significance to the Baha'is have been destroyed, and the graves of Baha'is have been desecrated throughout the country.

In the spring of 2008, seven individuals who had been serving as leaders of the Baha'i community on an ad hoc basis were arrested and were put in Tehran's notorious Evin prison. Their trial date has been repeatedly postponed, and it is still unclear if and when they will face trial.

Official Iranian news agencies have reported that they are charged with espionage for Israel, insulting Islam and with propaganda against the Islamic republic. Family members have been informed of a fourth charge, that of spreading corruption on Earth. Some of these charges could carry the death penalty. The circumstances of this possible trial are particularly worrying because the Government of Iran has arrested and executed the Baha'i leadership on three previous occasions.

In addition to the seven Baha'i leaders, some 25 other Baha'is also remain in prison, including three young people in Shiraz who were arrested in 2006 for indirectly teaching the Baha'i faith and for engaging in antigovernment propaganda while merely carrying out a literacy program for underprivileged youth. These young people are currently serving 4-year sentences under very harsh conditions.

As the United States and the international community seek to engage Iran on the crucial issues of nonproliferation, we must not forget about the basic human rights of the Iranian people. International attention to the persecution of the Baha'is in Iran has been critical to preventing an even worse deterioration of their situation.

As large sections of the Iranian population are now being increasingly repressed and denied the opportunity to have a voice in their own country, it is crucial that others in the international community speak out on their behalf and support them. I urge all of my colleagues to support this important resolution. (*Congressional Record*)

Rep. Henry Waxman (D-CA)

December 15, 2009

Madam Speaker, each week brings more disturbing evidence of Iran's nuclear advances, its defiance of UN Security Council demands and its refusal to comply with the requirements of the International Atomic Energy Agency.

The latest news, since the revelation earlier this year of an undisclosed nuclear enrichment site in Qom, is Iran's work on technology to set off a nuclear bomb. The regime is already believed to have enough low-enriched uranium available to, with further enrichment create at least one nuclear bomb. Together with its ongoing work on ballistic missiles to deliver a nuclear warhead, Iran could have a nuclear weapon within months.

In an attempt to stop the Iranian program from moving ahead, President Obama has made a concerted effort to engage Iran in direct talks. Together with the permanent members of the UN Security Council and Germany, the United States has offered a clear path for Iran to end its status as a pariah state.

So far, Iran remains intransigent. If international concern over the Iranian nuclear program is to be resolved diplomatically, we must increase pressure on Iran to come to the table. The bill before us does exactly that by establishing stringent sanctions to limit Iran's ability to import refined petroleum. It also provides waiver authority that preserves the Obama Administration's flexibility as it moves forward in its diplomatic efforts. Iran imports up to 40 percent of its refined petroleum supplies to power cars, planes, factories and other key economic infrastructure. With a disruption in supply, the Iranian government will be forced to grapple with the serious cost of its reckless choices. I regret that the Iranian people, already victims of a tyrannical government, could also face economic repercussions as the result of these sanctions. But I believe it is imperative to do everything possible to bring about a successful diplomatic resolution of this crisis and avert the need for military action.

The danger of a nuclear-armed Iran is only underscored by President Ahmadinejad's unstable regime, its belligerence toward the United States, its calls for the destruction of Israel, its robust support for terror groups like Hamas and Hezbollah and its blatant disregard for its own citizens.

I urge my colleagues to vote yes and take serious action to pressure Iran to change course.
(*Congressional Record*)

Rep. Robert Wexler (D-FL)

April 28, 2009

Mr. Speaker, I introduced House Concurrent Resolution 36 earlier this year to shed light on my constituent from Coral Springs, Florida, Robert Levinson, who disappeared from Iran's Kish Island on March 9, 2007. More than two years later, there are disturbingly few known details about his whereabouts.

What we do know, however, is that Mr. Levinson, a former FBI agent, was last heard from on March 8, 2007 by his wife Christine, while he was working in Dubai as a private investigator. According to his family, he checked into a hotel on Kish Island and checked out the following morning to fly back to the United States. Unfortunately, Mr. Levinson never arrived at the airport for his flight, and there is no accounting for what happened to him after he left the hotel.

In December 2007, the Levinson family, with assistance from Swiss officials in Tehran, traveled to the hotel where Mr. Levinson was last seen and passed out flyers in Farsi with his photo. They also met with local Iranian authorities to seek their assistance in gaining information about Mr. Levinson's disappearance. The authorities in Iran pledged to assist the Levinson family in their efforts to determine Robert's whereabouts and to investigate the circumstances surrounding his disappearance. Despite its pledge, the government of Iran has not followed through on its promises to the Levinson family. In fact, the Iranian government has stonewalled any effort to gain pertinent information--claiming they have zero knowledge about Mr. Levinson's whereabouts.

I want to praise the decision of the Obama Administration to raise Mr. Levinson's case directly with the Iranian government. During last week's hearing in the House Foreign Affairs Committee, I raised Mr. Levinson's disappearance with Secretary of State Clinton, and she confirmed that Mr. Levinson was mentioned in a letter delivered by Ambassador Holbrooke to Iranian officials at The Hague and reiterated her unwavering commitment to press this issue at every opportunity.

While I am certain that Secretary Clinton and the Obama Administration will make every attempt to bring Mr. Levinson's home, it is critical that Congress express its unequivocal support for her efforts and send a clear statement that the Administration must employ every diplomatic tool at its disposal to locate Mr. Levinson and return him to the United States.

House Concurrent Resolution 36 calls on President Obama and allies of the United States around the world to engage with officials of the Government of Iran to raise the case of Robert Levinson at every opportunity. It also urges officials of the Government of Iran to fulfill their promises of assistance to the family of Robert Levinson, and calls upon Iran to share the results of its investigation into his disappearance with the FBI. Passage of this resolution sends a clear signal that the Congress stands with the Levinson family and believes all efforts should be exhausted to ensure Robert Levinson is found and brought home safely.

I want to once again express my unwavering solidarity and backing for the Levinson family and offer all of my support in their efforts to return Robert Levinson home. I urge all of my colleagues to support the passage of this resolution. (*Congressional Record*)

Rep. Frank Wolf (R-VA)

July 9, 2009

Madam Speaker, May 14 marked the one-year anniversary of the imprisonment of the seven-member national committee of the Iranian Baha'is. They have been unjustly held for over a year without formal charges or access to their attorneys.

According to The New York Times, the seven Baha'is are scheduled to face trial this Saturday, July 11.

They will reportedly be charged with "espionage for Israel," a crime which is punishable by death.

The United States Commission on International Religious Freedom recently released their 2009 report which recommends that the State Department designate Iran a country of particular concern due to its gross violations of religious freedom.

Such violations include the execution of over 200 Baha'i leaders since 1979, the desecration of Baha'i cemeteries and places of worship and the violent arrest and harassment of members of the Baha'i faith.

As the administration seeks diplomatic engagement with Iran, I urge them to make human rights and religious freedom, including the persecuted Baha'is, an integral part of the dialogue.

Human dignity and freedom must not be relegated to the sidelines. (*Congressional Record*)

February 11, 2009

Madam Speaker, I would like to bring to my colleagues' attention some deeply disturbing news coming out of Tehran. Tehran's deputy prosecutor recently announced that the revolutionary court will hear the cases of seven members of the Baha'i faith accused of spying for Israel. The continued systematic persecution of the Baha'is by the tyrannical government of President Mahmud Ahmadinejad is unacceptable and must stop. I ask that a report from the Agence France Press be inserted into the *Record*, as well.

IRAN TO TRY BAHAIS FOR SPYING FOR ISRAEL

TEHRAN (AFP)--Iran will soon try seven members of the banned Bahai religion on charges including "espionage for Israel," the ISNA news agency reported on Wednesday.

"The charges against seven defendants in the case of the illegal Bahai group were examined . . . and the case will be sent to the revolutionary court next week," deputy Tehran prosecutor Hassan Haddad was quoted as saying.

Haddad said the charges included "espionage for Israel, insulting religious sanctities and propaganda against the Islamic republic."

Iran and Israel are arch-enemies, and Iranian President Mahmud Ahmadinejad has repeatedly called for the Jewish state to be wiped off the map.

In late January, judiciary spokesman Ali Reza Jamshidi said Iran had arrested six adherents of the Bahai faith on the same charges.

Earlier last month, the Fars news agency said the ex-secretary of Nobel laureate Shirin Ebadi's office was detained for links with an organisation of the Bahai faith, adding that the ex-staffer was a Bahai herself.

Haddad did not say if the seven being charged were the same as those arrested in January.

Followers of the Bahai faith, founded in Iran in 1863, are regarded as infidels and have suffered persecution both before and after the 1979 Islamic revolution.

Bahai teachings emphasise the underlying unity of major religions, with history having produced a succession of divine messengers, each of which founded a religion suitable for the times.

Bahais consider Bahauallah, born in 1817, to be the last prophet sent by God. This is in direct conflict with Islam, the religion of the vast majority of Iranians, which considers Mohammed to be the last prophet.

In late 2008, Iran reported the hanging of a Bahai man for rape and adultery. The European Union has expressed “serious concern about the continuing systematic discrimination and harassment of the Iranian Bahais on the grounds of their religion.” (*Congressional Record*,)

Rep. Lynn Woolsey (D-CA)

June 2, 2009

Mr. Speaker, when the Cold War ended, the people of the world hoped that the threat of nuclear war would end also, but that hasn't happened. Today, more nations than ever have nuclear weapons. North Korea's powerful underground nuclear explosion last week reminded us that testing continues. And there are great fears that terrorists could get nuclear weapons through the black market. Tragically, the United States has not done enough to stop the threat.

The previous administration turned its back on arms control. It practically laughed at America's obligations under the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty. It refused to push for Senate ratification of the comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, and it proceeded with plans for the United States to develop new nuclear weapons, which undermined our ability to deal with North Korea and Iran.

Mr. Speaker, we must do better. The United States must lead. We must lead a new global effort to make the world nuclear free. It's the moral thing to do, and it's also smart politics. If we are seen as leading the fight for nonproliferation and disarmament, we will be in a much better position to convince the world community to put peaceful pressure on North Korea and Iran to give up their nuclear ambitions.

President Obama is already moving the right direction. In his speech in Prague on April 5, he promised to reduce the role of nuclear weapons in our national security strategy. He announced the new diplomatic effort with Russia to reduce warheads. He promised to work for ratification of the Test Ban Treaty, and he said he would seek a new treaty to end the production of fissile materials for use in nuclear weapons. I welcome all of these policies.

In fact, 3 days before the press speech in Prague, I introduced Resolution 333, which is called No Nukes. It calls upon the United States to take a number of important actions to end the nuclear threat. It calls upon the United States to pursue multilateral negotiations to produce verifiable steps that every country should take to eliminate their nuclear weapons. It calls for the United States and Russia to work together to end the deployment of nuclear weapons that are currently operational and can be launched on short notice. It urges the President to declare that so long as the United States has nuclear weapons, we will not--and I say we will not--use them first. It calls for ending the previous administration's policy of preventative warfare and ending our development of new weapons of mass destruction, and it calls for a ban on weapons in outer space.

I've also introduced House Resolution 363, which describes my Smart Security Platform for the 21st Century, which includes several initiatives to stop the spread of weapons of mass destruction. It calls for beefing up inspections and regional security arrangements to stop

proliferation. And it advocates more funding for the programs designed to keep Russian weapons and materials from falling into the wrong hands.

I urge my colleagues, please examine both of these resolutions and support them. There is no time to waste. The world is getting more dangerous every single minute. And if there is a nuclear attack, we won't be able to save our lives by ducking under our desks like we were taught in grade school.

Mr. Speaker, America must move aggressively to end the nuclear menace. It's the most important thing we can do for our country, and it is the most important thing we can do for our children and our grandchildren. (*Congressional Record*)