Here is another statement from Arthur Mount, a retiree living in Stony Brook, New York.

''In 2003, I retired from this once great company after almost 38 years of continuous service. I started with United in June of 1965 as a ramp serviceman at JFK airport, and in April in 1967 became a pilot, finishing my career in April, 2003, as a captain. There are many things that I am concerned about regarding a loss of my pension, but my biggest apprehension is in regards to my wife. With the termination of my pension as proposed by the management of United Airlines, what sort of life can she expect? Who will take care of her? Where will the money be for the things she will need? Is she to end up as a financial burden to our children? It has been said that a true leader leads by example. Apparently the senior management of United Airlines does not hold to such a high standard. Their pensions are secure. Somehow or another I cannot help but believe that if the pensions of this company's senior management were to be treated exactly as they proposed mine to be, that another solution, other than termination, would have been proposed. Arthur Mounts, retiree, Stony Brook, New York.''

Mr. Speaker, I will also include in the RECORD a letter from Leola Robinson from the Bronx, New York and a letter from James P. Lattimer from Bronxville, New York.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to close by saying it is the business of the Congress to protect the American people from these kinds of legal swindles and legal thefts. This is suffering that should not take place in the United States of America in the year 2005. We can do better.

We have bills that are being proposed which will make certain that no future employees of other large corporations will have to suffer what the United Airline people have suffered. We urge you to participate if you have the opportunity to participate in any future e-hearings and that we have your participation fully.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MILLER: As a result of the termination of my pension with UAL I will be the only one, and the first in my family, to not have a pension. I have been in the airline industry for 32 years working for Saturn Airline in the 70's, then Trans America, enduring with Seaboard and finally with Capital (dollar sign on the tail). With each airline I've had to support my daughter and myself on a ''Flight Attendant salary'' which was never enough living in New York City. I have survived under great duress.

I finally came to UAL hoping to get some decent benefits and a retirement plan which is the very least an employee should expect after devoting time and giving loyalty to this company.

Needless to say I am extremely disappointed at recent events in which UAL sought to dissolve the defined pension benefits. Now my future looks bleak. At my encouragement, my daughter became a UAL Flight Attendant as well as her husband and they now cannot support their family of five and they have no hope of future benefits and retirement. How cruel.

Sincerely,

LEOLA ROBINSON,
Bronx, New York.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MILLER: I know you have been inundated by communications from UAL employees and retirees concerning the termination of our pension funds. I would like to add my voice to protest this termination of my pension. I flew for UAL for thirty two plus years (retiring at 60 in August of 2002). My loyalty, labor and perseverance could not be questioned. Now, in return for my labors, I find that the company is attempting to greatly diminish the pension that was promised by contracts and that I worked hard to obtain. Since there are alternatives (e.g. freezing the pension) to termination that would be a better solution, these avenues should be given time to explore.

Personally, should the plan be terminated, I could see a reduction of 60–75 percent in my retirement income, with no potential to replace this income. This would necessitate sale of our house and a drastic change in our lifestyle. I am also aware that thousands of my fellow employees and retirees would suffer similar situations, many of them very drastic changes. But I also see further beyond that and foresee a domino effect where other airlines (e.g. Delta, Northwest, American) could seek the same relief; along with some of the larger national companies (Ford, GM). This would put an undue burden on the PBGC, necessitating a government bailout, and a possible depression and recession. I don't feel this is a house of cards, but a real and viable outcome. I strongly feel that our burdens should not be passed along to our children and grandchildren.

I fully support you in your efforts and the efforts of Rep. Janice Schakowsky to sponsor HR 2327 and my appreciation of your actions cannot be measured.

Thank You.

JAMES P. LATTIMER,
Bronxville, New York.

IRAN STUDY GROUP

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MACK). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. KIRK. Mr. Speaker, there are key moments in the life of our country in the course of this Congress when the United States faces a path towards democracy or towards war. That choice may be approaching in the policies we face regarding Iran's development of nuclear weapons.

I, for one, choose diplomacy over conflict; and I believe that the United States and our allies can achieve our ends to the Iranian nuclear program without a shot being fired in anger. This should be our goal; and towards that end I join with my Democratic colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS), to form the bipartisan House Iran Study Group.

The mission of our group is to review the situation in Iran, to measure the potential threat, to examine our military options, but most importantly to find and promote diplomatic policies that advance our security interests without a resort to arms.

I could not have chosen a better partner for this effort than my colleague from New Jersey. He is, first and foremost, not a Republican or a Democrat. He is an American. We both agree with Senator Arthur Vandenberg's dictum, who said that partisanship should end at the water's edge. We are also dedicated to the ideal that, when acting abroad, Republicans and Democrats are joined together as Americans.

We formed the Iran Study Group last year to carefully review the facts about Iran, to make sure the U.S. government is reviewing all of its policy options and to push diplomacy towards a successful conclusion. And I want to recognize my colleague from New Jersey.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate this opportunity tonight. I want to thank my friend from Illinois for his compliment. It is truly appreciated, and I know it is shared on my side that I very much appreciate, Mr. Speaker, my work with my colleague from Illinois. I also want to point out that he is one of the Members here who simply does not talk about his patriotism but he practices it.

He is active reservist. He serves his country in uniform on a regular basis, as do his brother and sister reservists. I think he honors this institution and this country by his service, and I thank him for it.

I appreciate the work we have done in our Iran Study Group. The emphasis is on the word ''study.'' We think the country faces a truly perilous situation with the prospect of the mullahs who run the Iranian government obtaining a nuclear weapon. We have devoted ourselves to analyzing how this problem came about and to carefully analyzing how we might solve it.

Our intention tonight is to have a discussion of those solutions that would be based on diplomacy, and I look forward to having my friend from Illinois lead that discussion, and I will join it so I can complement his points as to how we can solve this problem.

Mr. KIRK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

When we review the situation in Iran, we see a nation with a proud Persian language and a culture that now is under a religious regime that has a very weak hold on the voters of its nation.

Time and again old revolutionary leaders of Iran have lost elections to reformers, but they keep power through the religious Guardian Council, Revolutionary Guards and the Iranian Intelligence Service. These ruling extremists have kept Iran as a pariah nation, unable to build lasting ties to the West.

While nearly everyone under 40 in Iran favors good relations with the West and even the United States, Iran's current Guardian Council maintains her isolation.

Now, all U.S. Presidents, Republican and Democrat, since 1979 have certified

that Iran is a state sponsor of terrorism, that Hezbollah would collapse in the Middle East without the direct support of Iran's intelligence service, the MOIS. And under the Guardian Council, Iran took a clear turn towards nuclear weapons despite her status as a signatory to the nuclear non-proliferation treaty.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I want to explicate the nature of the regime of which he speaks. This Congress and our Presidents of both parties did not choose the terrorists label lightly.

This is a regime which has its antecedent roots in the holding of American diplomats hostage for 444 days, an image which we will not soon forget. It is a regime where people are imprisoned and tortured for dancing at wedding celebrations. It is a regime in which women who express their points of view are brutalized, assaulted and tortured in Iranian prisons. And perhaps the most striking piece of evidence as to the real nature of this regime is found in the run-up to the elections which are going to be held in Iran on the 17th of June, in 9 days.

1,014 people registered to be part of that election, to be on the ballot for this election, and the ruling council that the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) made reference to under the Iranian system has the right to chose who goes on the ballot and who does not.

I say this again. If you want to run for office, you file your nominating petitions, and then a ruling council decides whether or not you are worthy to be on the ballot. Of the 1,014 persons who filed to be on the ballot on the June 17 election in Iran, six of them were permitted to be on the ballot by the ruling council, six people out of 1,014 people.

□ 2145

This is not a regime that can have a nuclear weapon. We have to start this discussion from the proposition that it is unacceptable for a regime of this dark nature to have a nuclear weapon.

Mr. KIRK. Mr. Speaker, I would agree. Iran had grand ambitions under the Shah who planned to build 29 nuclear reactors. His plans and those of his successors are ironic given Iran's location atop one of the largest reserves of oil that emerged from the ground at less than a cost of $2 a barrel. With the fall of the Shah, Iran's nuclear ambitions were cut back but then revived with the help of Russia. Based at Bushehr, the Russian nuclear reactor project gives Iran a clear path to the production of plutonium despite Russia's assertions otherwise.

Until 2002, we had strong suspicions about Iran, but no clear allegations that she had violated her solemn commitment to the United Nations under the non-proliferation treaty; but then an exile group, the National Council For Resistance of Iran, exposed clear, undeclared nuclear activities, indicating uranium enrichment at that task; and the Arak heavy water production facility gives Iran a clear path towards the refinement of products which would become the center of a nuclear weapon.

This was just not according to the exile group. After 2 years of extensive inspections by the United Nations International Atomic Energy Agency, they reported that Iran had undeclared centrifuge atomic vapor, a laser isotope separation, a molecular laser isotope separation and plutonium separation activities, all in direct violation of Iran's formal obligations under the nuclear non-proliferation treaty and the safeguards agreement.

I yield to my colleague on these points.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I again thank my friend. It is important to note that we have nearly a quarter century of active deception from the Iranian regime on this point.

As recently as 4 years ago, 3 years ago, in international forums, the representatives of this government were actively denying that they were in pursuit of a nuclear weapon. For nearly a quarter century, we were told by the Iranian regime that activities which appear to be nuclear in nature were for a domestic energy program.

Now, one must find it curious that a nation that is sitting on one of the largest supplies of crude oil in the world, that is an exporter to the States, whose main export is crude, would find the need for a nuclear energy program. That alone is a rather curious proposition; but putting that aside, we had a quarter century of deception until, as the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) says, in 2002 resistance leaders blew the whistle about the facilities at Arak and Natanz.

I want to be very clear, Mr. Speaker, that there has been controversy in this Chamber about the existence of weapons of mass destruction and ideological views coloring that discussion. There is no ideological dispute here. There is factual understanding by the French, by the Germans, by the British, by the EU, by the U.N., by every objective party in this case. It is not in factual dispute that there is a nuclear program going on in Iran.

Since the disclosures that became public in December of 2002, as the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) just said, we had a 2-year process of inspections under the jurisdiction of the IAEA of the United Nations, and they confirmed the existence of plutonium, or rather of uranium, enrichment facilities. They confirmed the equipment and the infrastructure necessary to make the other parts of a reactor, including a centrifuge, that would lead up to the construction of a nuclear weapon.

So we want to be very clear tonight that what is in controversy is what will happen next with respect to development of this Iranian program. What is in controversy is what we ought to do about it. What is not in controversy is that the Iranians actively pursued a nuclear weapons program and that they actively deceived the rest of the world about that pursuit for a quarter of a century.

Mr. KIRK. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend and I want to emphasize his point that the violations we are talking about were not based on faulty intelligence from the U.S. CIA. These violations that we are talking about are documented in formal, open reports by the United Nations international staff under Dr. Mohamed ElBaradei of the IAEA. Inspections through June of 2003 showed many reporting failures by Iran; and by mid-year, Iran admitted to enriching uranium, purification, reprocessing and later admitted to the United Nations of losing nuclear material that had been covered by her U.N. safeguards agreement.

Iran built a centrifuge enrichment plant at Natanz with 1,000 rotors and started construction at another facility with 50,000 rotors. Iran first claimed that it had not enriched uranium at all, and the IAEA reported then that it had found contaminations of enriched uranium at the Kalaye Electric Company, at one place, of 36 percent enriched uranium; at another, 54 percent on imported components; and at another, 70 percent enriched uranium inside its workshop. Until these discoveries by the U.N., Iran had only admitted to enriching uranium once to a level of 7 percent.

After the A.Q. Khan network was exposed in Libya, Iran also admitted to using advanced rotors of Pakistani design to enrich uranium. It also admitted in May 2004 that it had separated plutonium in much larger amounts than previously reported.

All of these actions point to a continuing effort by Iran to develop nuclear materials beyond an enrichment level ever needed for civilian power, giving us and the United Nations clear and convincing evidence that it is dedicated to the production of a nuclear weapon in violation of its commitment under the non-proliferation treaty at the U.N.

Now, Iran also has backed up its public statements with policy and announced just last month enacting legislation requiring the Iranian Government to develop nuclear technology, including enrichment of uranium, but this is not just the only part of the threat.

Iran not only has a nuclear program; it also has an aggressive missile development program, based on a North Korean missile, the No Dong, which the Iranians call the Shahab 3.

Iran's missile program brings many key U.S. facilities and friends into range, especially Israel. This is a picture of the latest Shahab 3 missile, almost 98 percent North Korean; and when you look at the range of these systems, you see that U.S. facilities like the Fifth Fleet, or our allies in Israel, come clearly into range.

When we look at this, we have a real danger now, nuclear weapons and missiles to promptly deliver them that represent a long-term threat to the Jewish State.

I yield to my colleague from New Jersey.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

This is truly a toxic combination of a dishonest regime that has actively deceived the rest of the world for a quarter century, the most lethal and deadly weapons known to man, and the ability to use those weapons both in a conventional and unconventional sense.

As the gentleman from Illinois' (Mr. KIRK) map shows very clearly, Iran tonight has the ballistic capability, has the ability to fire a missile that could cause nuclear havoc to U.S. troops in Iraq, in Kuwait, could cause the destruction of America's great friend in Israel. This is a real and present danger, but beyond the conventional danger is the asymmetric unconventional danger of the unconventional use of a nuclear weapon in an unconventional way: in a suitcase, in a rental truck, on a container being shipped into a port of the United States.

The risk that we are discussing tonight is not only the risk that one of the missiles that the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) just described would rain down on U.S. troops in the Middle East or on our friends in Israel or in a friendly Arab state; the risk is that this risk could manifest itself in Times Square or in the Nation's capitol through the use of a nuclear weapon in an unconventional way. A toxic combination of a Jihadist regime, a 25-year record of deception, and the possession of this lethal technology is something we simply cannot countenance.

Now there have been efforts, intense efforts over the last 18 months or so to address this problem. I know that the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) is going to outline them, and we are going to talk about how we support the intent of those efforts, how we are working through our working group to try to buttress the efforts, but how we believe that our country must be prepared both in the eventuality of the success of the negotiations or the failure of the negotiations in order to protect ourselves.

Mr. KIRK. Mr. Speaker, I point out the record of Iran is already clear in the late 1980s and early 1990s when she used chemical weapons and fired several hundred missiles in her war with Iraq.

Now, the U.S. and Israel, they are already spending hundreds of millions of dollars building a defense system against incoming Iranian missiles. If Iran's nuclear and missile programs go further, then the United States and Israel will have to commit hundreds of millions of more dollars to make sure that our allies in the Jewish State are able to resist incoming Iranian weapons. I will note that a missile fired from Iran, aimed, for example, at Tel-Aviv would arrive just 11 minutes after lift off, putting the Middle East on a hair trigger.

Given all of this, the United Nations' reports of violations, Iran's record of terror, nuclear and missile developments, all reported not by the CIA or MI6, but by the United Nations, what should we do?

Some say that we should let Iran have nuclear weapons, that we cannot stop technology, that we should not be able to classify the laws of physics, and so Iran will get nuclear weapons; but if we acquiesce to this, then this policy would commit us to a vast and expensive course of building missile defenses to protect our allies. While the Middle East would descend into a tense hair trigger peace, one irrational leader, one miscalculation and millions could die in a nuclear Jihad.

It would also put nuclear weapons in the hands of the Guardian Council, the same council that Presidents Carter and Reagan and Bush and Clinton and Bush all certified were the number one supporters of state terror, the men and women who funded operations like the gentleman said who would put a suitcase or a car bomb in a Western city.

I think we can do better. Some might say if this is so bad, then let Israel remove this threat by military means. In fact, in 1981 Israel destroyed Iraq's path to plutonium when it bombed the Osiraq reactor; but when we look at Israel and a potential attack on Iran, we see a vastly complicated operation of great cost and a chance of failure. At best, such an operation could set back Iran for a few years. At worst, it would enrage an enemy who would then use all of the means at her disposal to attack the Jewish homeland.

An attack by Israel on Iran would also destroy what is our greatest long-term asset in Iran, her young people, her young people who overwhelmingly report that they support better relations with America.

I think we can do better. We can stand between appeasement under an Iranian nuclear trigger or an attack against Iran. What could America do?

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my colleague from New Jersey.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding.

I certainly share the view that the Israelis did peace-loving people around the world a huge favor in 1981 when they took out Saddam Hussein's nuclear reactor program. The first Gulf War in 1991 and the recent hostilities which endure to today would have looked very different and much worse had Saddam been able to proceed with that program.

It is tempting to exercise the so-called Israeli option this time, to condone an action by the Israelis that would solve this problem. It is tempting, but it is illusory because the nature of this program is literally subterranean. Much of the developmental activity of the Iranian nuclear program is underneath the Earth.

□ 2200

They are not easily penetrated or perhaps not penetrable at all by an air assault. As the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) has pointed out, in addition to the dubious prospects of success as a military proposition, there would be the unbelievable fallout of probably unifying the Iranian population against us and our Israeli allies and forfeiting what I believe is the best hope for a peaceful solution to this problem which would be voluntary, indigenous change led by progressive young Iranians who want to live in a country where they can speak and worship and vote and live as they choose. Running the risk of offending and alienating that block of forward-looking young Iranians would be a risk I do not believe we should bear.

As the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) suggests, we need to resist the temptation of saying that the Israelis can once again take care of this problem as they did in 1981, because I do not think the record shows that. What we need to do is devise a robust, effective plan to sanction and leverage the Iranians toward a path of peace, rather than a path of development of nuclear weapons.

There is a sincere attempt led by the British and the Germans and the French to reach such a result. Most recently, that attempt has resulted in an agreement in November of 2004 which calls for the suspension of the Iranian enrichment program by the Iranians, an active inspection program by the United Nations, and then the extension of economic incentives so the Iranian economy may grow and prosper as a result of that proposition. There is hope that that will succeed. I hope it will succeed. I know the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) does as well.

But the record must also show that since November of 2004 there have been at least three very serious problems reported with respect to compliance with the agreement. According to the IAEA, that is the United Nations arms inspection regime, Iran has limited IAEA access to two secret Iranian military sites, including a large complex at Parchin where suspected nuclear access may be taking place. Only two. The IAEA inspectors visited the site in January of 2005, but Iran has not allowed visits subsequently. So they have already begun to shut down the inspections.

Secondly, Iran is also alleged to have withheld information and conducted maintenance and other work on centrifuge equipment and uranium conversion activities. So there is centrifuge work continuing even though the official posture of the Iranian government is they have suspended nuclear weapons activities.

Finally, Iran is also beginning construction of a heavy water research reactor which could well be suited to plutonium production, and I would note for the record that discussions between our European allies and the Iranians do

not cover plutonium development of a weapon, they cover uranium enrichment. There are two major pathways to achieve a nuclear weapon. One is based on uranium, and one is based on plutonium. Even in its best day, this agreement is not addressing plutonium.

So to answer the gentleman's question directly, what should we do, we should anticipate what would happen if this agreement does not succeed, and we would define success as the abandonment of the nuclear weapons development program by the Iranians followed by a transparent inspection regime so the rest of the world could verify that it has not yet been restarted.

In order to do that, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) and I believe, and I think Democrats and Republicans can come together and believe, that a robust and effective program of economic sanctions is what we need. I know the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) has worked on one particular idea which I think has very strong merit and ask the gentleman to outline that.

Mr. KIRK. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS) and I support diplomacy with teeth. Over the last 18 months, the Iran Study Group has met with our allies, the U.K., Germany and France, and they have formed the EU–3 group to bring Iran back from the brink of an unstable and expensive nuclear arms race.

The essence of the EU–3 offer is to provide Iran with a set of carrots, spare parts for civilian aircraft, membership in the WTO, access to loans, all if Iran provides international guarantees and inspections to end the development of nuclear weapons. The EU–3's goal is not quite as idealistic as it may sound. South Africa, Argentina, Brazil and Ukraine all gave up nuclear weapons programs, and recently so did Libya. Iran can, too, if we can find the right mix of diplomatic incentives and disincentives for them.

I find the current U.S. policy debate on Iran is too simplistic. It is just two-dimensional: Either let Iran have the bomb, putting the Middle East under a nuclear hair trigger, or let Israel do it and have another war.

President Kennedy faced a similar dilemma looking at Cuba, but he broke out of the intellectual box that some would have him in to either let the Cubans have nuclear weapons or invade. He thought of a new policy, a quarantine, which allowed us to resolve the Cuban missile crisis without a shot being fired.

Are there policies which we can employ which will help the European Union succeed? I think there are. We all know this matter could be referred to the United Nations Security Council. We know, using its broad powers under Chapter 7 of the U.N. charter, the Security Council could impose sanctions, putting enormous pressure on Iran and isolate her completely.

What could those sanctions look like? We could do small things like outlaw Iran's participation in the Football Soccer World Cup. We could also ban airline flights in and out of Iran. We could block travel of anyone in the Iranian government outside her borders. We could impose comprehensive sanctions that would shrink Iran's economy. All of these means have been authorized by the U.N. Security Council against other countries and could be authorized by the United Nations against Iran if she says no to the European Union.

But what if one member of the Security Council vetoes action against Iran? Russia could veto action against Iran. She is, in fact, building a reactor in Iran. China also has extensive and growing relations with Iran. They could also veto action.

Some have talked about an oil quarantine against Iran. In fact, 20 percent of Iran's income is dependent on oil sales. An oil quarantine would implode Iran's economy, but it would also hurt our economy. The mullahs have threatened, if their sales were stopped, oil on the world market could hit $100 a barrel. That would hurt us. It would also hurt our allies in Japan and in Europe.

Are there other options available? In our bipartisan work in the Congressional Iran Study Group, we found that Iran has a unique vulnerability, one that opens a new window of diplomacy that could help us achieve all of our objectives without a shot being fired, and here is the vulnerability she has. Despite being a leading member of OPEC and one of the largest oil producers in the world, Iran is heavily dependent on foreign gasoline for her economic progress. In fact, one-third of all Iranian gasoline must be imported from overseas.

Iran's director of planning at the National Iranian Oil Derivative Distribution Company reported that Iran uses 67 million liters of gasoline. Only 39 million liters can be produced in Iran. Policies to expand oil refining capacity in Iran could in no way meet the demand; and in fact in Tehran they regularly debate rationing gasoline, ironically in a country that is a leading OPEC nation.

So we have this lever, a potential gasoline quarantine on Iran, a quarantine which would not affect international oil markets but would heavily affect just Iran alone. And if this policy was discussed, it could give a huge impetus to the European Union effort which my colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS), and I both think offers the best chance for working our way out of this threat without anyone being hurt.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, gasoline is the Achilles' heel of the Iranian autocrats. They have presided over such a dysfunctional country that they are in a situation where they sell crude oil in huge amounts to the rest of the world but import gasoline. Think about that. A country that is literally awash in the basic stuff that gasoline is made of cannot produce its own gasoline. Estimates go as high as 40 percent of the gasoline consumed by Iranian consumers is imported from other countries.

Now another measure of the importance of what the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) is saying is this. Today when a citizen of Tehran fills up his or her tank of gas, they pay 40 cents a gallon. I wish I could go home and tell my constituents they were going to fill up their gas tanks for 40 cents a gallon. Obviously, it costs a lot more to produce gasoline than 40 cents a gallon in Iran, but this is such a sensitive issue for the population of the country that the Iranian parliament has voted, and as a matter of fact in January of this year the Iranian parliament voted to freeze domestic prices for gasoline and other fuels at 2003 levels.

Why did they do that? They did it because it would be so disruptive to the society and the economy to have a price shock that would reflect the true cost of a gallon of gasoline. If such a disruption occurred, it would shake the control, the iron grip the autocrats have over this country. They have identified their own weakness by freezing the price of domestic gasoline.

What the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) is suggesting is a surgical sanction. We are going to be I believe going to the U.N. Security Council in this calendar year. That is my prediction. The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) may not share that, but as I see things unfolding. On June 6, Monday, the Iranians once again said they would voluntarily suspend their uranium enrichment program until more talks ensued with the Europeans.

The election I made reference to earlier, the one where 98 percent of the candidates or more were expelled from the ballot, if we can call that an election, will take place on June 17. The talks will resume at some point in Geneva shortly after June 17.

I truly believe, given the track record we have seen thus far, that a referral to the U.N. Security Council is very near. We have seen after a dozen years of frustration with Iraqi sanctions that the U.N. Security Council taking a vote does not do a lot in and of itself. They took a lot of votes against Saddam Hussein over the course of a dozen years, but people still suffered and died and nothing really changed.

The key question if, and I think when, we reach the point of the U.N. Security Council, is what are we going to be asking for? Simply passing a resolution that condemns the Iranians for deceiving the rest of the world, violating their responsibilities under the nonproliferation treaty and continuing with the development of a nuclear weapon is not going to do it. It is going to take a meaningful sanction.

The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) has laid out a very meaningful

sanction. He has wisely avoided the stick-your-head-in-the-sand approach of saying, if they have a few weapons, so what, they are a small country. I fear we would find out the ''so what'' would be very soon.

He has also avoided the risk to rush headlong into a military solution to this problem. Military action should never be taken off the table, never, but they should never be the first instinct or the first option. I believe what the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) has outlined makes eminent sense, given the internal politics of Iran.

□ 2215

If Iran could only consume the gasoline that she produces domestically, one of two things would happen and they are both very disruptive to the regime. The first is that they would have to heavily subsidize the production that they already have internally; they would have to ration what people can use to hold the price down; and they would have to give up something else. Either food prices would rise, housing prices would rise, other energy prices would rise and the standard of living of the average Iranian would drop rather precipitously.

The other option would be to let the price of gasoline rise to meet the market curve of supply and demand, which I believe would cause chaos in that society. I believe that the hundreds and thousands of young Iranians who have taken to the streets in recent years want a change, and if the grip that their rulers have is weakened by the plan that has been set forth here, so be it.

The gentleman from Illinois said a few minutes ago about optimism, and he talked about Ukraine and about Libya and other countries giving up nuclear weapons. Another source of optimism I would daresay is this: If one went back and researched speeches made on this floor in 1985, if Members had stood and said, you know, within 6 years, millions of people in the Warsaw Pact countries are going to rise up and make changes within their countries without a violent revolution by simply demanding that change occur, they would have been hooted off this floor as being hopelessly naive and unaware of the way things really were.

I am not suggesting that Iran is like the Eastern European countries. I know the religion is different, the history is different, the culture is different. But I truly believe that human nature is not different. And I think that our 25-year-old students that we hear from in Tehran want the same thing that our constituents want and the same thing those brave Poles and Czechs and Germans and Ukrainians and Russians wanted, which is to live freely. And if we send a message that we will stand by them, I believe that they will be emboldened to try. And I think that the gentleman from Illinois' idea is not only an effective sanction but it is that powerful message.

Mr. KIRK. When we look at Iran, we have got an election coming up, not only just six candidates, they just added two more, but there is a key choice for the Iranian nation and the government to make, whether to pursue this nuclear weapons program, against the wishes of France, against the wishes of the United Kingdom, against the wishes of Germany and the United Nations, the IAEA and the formal commitments of Iran under the nuclear nonproliferation path, or to join the community of nations and build a growing economy in Central Asia, at peace with her neighbors, offering economic opportunity to her families.

But if she chooses the path of nuclear weapons and confrontation with the European Union, we do not have to resort, in my judgment, to any military means. We could impose a gasoline quarantine on Iran that would quickly implode her economy. This gasoline quarantine on Iran could be imposed by a coalition of the willing naval powers. But when you look at the position of anyone trying to import gasoline into Iran under an order of quarantine, you would find quickly that it would make no economic sense to try to run that quarantine. In fact, in my judgment, working with our British allies, Lloyd's of London likely would pull the insurance contracts for nearly all of the tankers attempting to service the Iranian market.

And working with our allies in the gulf who largely supply Iran's need for gasoline, they could by bilateral action simply abrogate contracts with Iran, making this quarantine fairly simple to operate and administer. The effect of this would be heavily on Iran, would put a number of people out of work, and with those thousands unemployed, then asking their government, why are we embracing a policy of confrontation, violating treaty commitments of our government and throwing me and my family out of work instead of going the direction that most people under the age of 40 would like to go in Iran, and that is embracing the West and having positive direction.

I think this is diplomacy with teeth. This is a way to break out of the intellectual box of either surrendering to an Iranian nuclear program run by a government who has the most extensive terror connections in the world or having some sort of war break out in the Middle East between our Israeli allies and Iran. I for one think that we should embrace a creative diplomatic posture that supports the European Union, that increases their likelihood of success and makes the Iranian government want to embrace a verifiable inspection regime that follows the path of Ukraine, that follows the path of Libya, that follows the path of Brazil and Argentina and South Africa and embraces a non-nuclear future.

For us, this is tense times ahead. My colleague talked about reference to the U.N. Security Council and any further action. We think that Iran is quickly moving towards a nuclear capability and, if the Guardian Council gets their way, could bring about a Middle East on a nuclear hair trigger. I think we can do much better. I think pitting our strength against their weakness, we can resolve this in a way that everyone is much more secure.

I thank my colleague. I also want to conclude by saying this, before I hand it over to him. We have had this debate on this floor as two colleagues from different parties working together in a bipartisan fashion. We have worked through the problem. We have met with ambassadors, with officials from the State Department, with our Israeli allies and reviewed carefully all of the options. I think on a bipartisan level when you work through all of these options and you listen to our allies and you listen to the experts, you will come to about where we are, a chance for a peaceful resolution of this that enhances security on a bipartisan basis. I think that represents the best traditions of this House, especially in our foreign policy where we set partisan differences aside.

I yield to conclude to my colleague from New Jersey.

Mr. ANDREWS. I thank my friend. It is characteristic of the gentleman from Illinois that he is a creative thinker and someone who wants to problem-solve rather than score political points. Working with him has been a terrific experience and one that I look forward to continuing on this and other ventures.

I think there is broad consensus in this House and in this country between the two parties on two points. The first is that there is a real and present threat to our survival in the form of Islamic jihadist terror. September 11 is the most dramatic example, but there are others. I think there are scarcely any people who believe that is not a very serious threat.

Mr. KIRK. Did you lose constituents on September 11?

Mr. ANDREWS. Of course I did. And lost people I knew personally. I think virtually everyone in New Jersey did in some way.

The second point of consensus is that America should always first use its economic and diplomatic and spiritual creativity to work with our friends and solve problems. No one here wants to rush to military conflict. And when we do get in military conflict, that is when it can be divisive and, frankly, should be, that we should have vigorous debate. What I like so much about the gentleman from Illinois' idea is that it fully employs the diplomatic and economic creativity of our country, and I think it does rise to a spiritual level of what our relationship will be with our friends in Iran for years to come. This is a surgical sanction that uses the might of our private sector.

The gentleman from Illinois made reference to the insurance sector. It is very true that the insurance industry

is very unlikely to insure vessels that would run afoul of a quarantine of gasoline. And if the insurers will not insure the cargo, the cargo does not flow. If the cargo does not flow, you do not need a naval quarantine. Frankly, the economics work in that advantage.

Secondly, this is a recognition that we want to share in the success of our European friends. They deserve credit for bringing us to a point where the Iranians are at least taking the position that they want to suspend this program. They deserve credit for saying they are ready to go to the Security Council, our British and French and German friends, should that need become evident. So this is an extension of a friendship with our allies in Western Europe, and it is a way to build on the success that they have had without resorting to armed conflict but by using the creative, economic and diplomatic tools at our disposal.

Finally, I would say spiritually, I do not doubt that someday, my daughters are 12 and 10, Jackie and Josie, and I think someday they will go to Iran. I want them to go to Iran as exchange students or as performers or as athletes or as people to visit friends that they have met in college or graduate school. I do not want them to go there as soldiers. We cannot ignore the reality that a jihadist despotic regime is trying to get a nuclear weapon, and we cannot ignore the high probability they will use it in ways that will terrify the world. But understanding of that threat does not imply a rush to military action. Instead, it implies a thoughtful, constructive plan such as the gentleman from Illinois has laid out.

It is our intention to introduce a resolution that lays out the ideas behind the gentleman from Illinois' discussion tonight. We want to persuade both Democratic and Republican colleagues and the administration to be supportive of this idea. We want to show that it is a reflection of our partnership with our Western European allies. And we want it to succeed. It is my hope that it is never necessary, that the mere fact that this is being discussed will embolden progressive, freedom-loving Iranians to take matters into their own hands. But I think it is going to take more than that. And I think that the idea the gentleman from Illinois has sketched out is one that will work. It is pragmatic, it represents our best tools and values, and I look forward to supporting it.

Mr. KIRK. I thank the gentleman and look forward to working with him and advancing this. We will be introducing our resolution next week.

ANNOUNCING INTRODUCTION OF THE NEW APOLLO ENERGY PROJECT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MACK). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE) is recognized for half of the remaining time until midnight.

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor tonight both to talk about a serious challenge of our country and some very optimistic news in that challenge. The challenge is to adopt an energy policy that will really be up to the problems we today face; and the optimistic news is that tomorrow with 15 of my colleagues, I will introduce the New Apollo Energy Project. The New Apollo Energy Project is a project that will really create a vision for this country's energy future that is up to the technological prowess of this country, that recognizes our can-do spirit, that recognizes the three challenges that I will talk about tonight, and will step up to the plate and solve those challenges. And it is about time for the New Apollo Energy Project because, indeed, we have challenges.

The New Apollo Energy Project of the bill we will introduce tomorrow will face three distinct challenges that we have in this country. It will face them head-on, and it will solve them. The first challenge that we face is somewhat related to the problems in the Mideast, the oil-producing region of the world that my colleagues were just talking about for the last hour. We know on a bipartisan basis that it is unhealthy for our personal national security; it is unhealthy for our ability to advance the cause of democracy, to be addicted to oil from the Mideast. It is unhealthy for any party who is in control of the White House. It is unhealthy for us across this country to have to make judgments about our foreign policy based on the politics, for instance, of the Saudi royal house.

Our addiction to Middle Eastern oil has cost this country dearly, and we must break that addiction. As I will talk about later, there is one way to do it and that is to adopt new technological fixes to wean ourselves off of oil so that this country can experience a new burst of democracy and spread it around the world, not afflicted and shackled to this pernicious addiction to Middle Eastern oil. The New Apollo Energy Project, I am happy to say, we will introduce it tomorrow, and it will take, I believe, the strongest, boldest, most ambitious step that this Congress has seen to try to deal with that problem.

The second problem: we are losing manufacturing jobs in this country by the thousands. We had a 14 percent reduction in manufacturing just in the last several years, since this last President took office. That is unconscionable. We need to adopt a new high-tech, new energy vision in this country that will make sure that the jobs associated with the efficient use of energy and the new production of energy are grown here in the United States. It is a sad commentary that the most fuel-efficient cars now are being built in Japan. The jobs of the future, building fuel-efficient cars, need to be in the United States of America. Those jobs need to be here.

□ 2230

Why are the jobs associated with the production of wind turbine technology which is actually the fastest-growing energy source in the United States, why are those jobs going to Denmark? Those jobs ought to be here. Why are the jobs associated with the solar cell industry going to Germany? Those jobs need to be in the United States.

The New Apollo Energy Project will seize on the basic can-do spirit of America to grow our homegrown technologies to bring those high-tech jobs and manufacturing jobs and construction jobs. We need to lay a lot of steel and copper to wire this country for the new sources of technologies that we need. Those jobs need to be in the United States of America. As I will talk about in a little more detail, the New Apollo Energy project will address that problem by growing over 3 million jobs in the next 6 years in this country associated with these new energy resources and efficiency systems.

So, first, we have a security concern. Second, we have a jobs concern. And the third concern is a global one, and that is the challenge of global warming. As we know from the National Academy of Sciences today, which came out with another report, another nail in the coffin of those who urged to take no action based on global warming, it is a fact. Arguing it would be like arguing gravity at this point. There are uncertainties of how significant it will be, but we need to step up to the plate and address global warming, and the New Apollo Energy Project is the most ambitious bill that has ever been introduced in this House to deal with that issue in ways that we will address.

So this New Apollo Energy Project will address three problems: A security problem associated with our addiction to Middle Eastern oil; a jobs problem associated with the loss of jobs going overseas due to other countries being advanced and getting ahead of us in this game; and, third, the need for our Nation to stop global warming. Rarely do we have a trifecta in one bill that will address three separate issues. But this needs to be done.

The reason we define our bill as the New Apollo Energy Project is it draws some inspiration from John Kennedy, who stood behind me here May 9, 1961, and said that America was going to put a man on the Moon in 10 years and bring him back safely. When he challenged America to do that, it was a very audacious, bold challenge. We had not even invented Tang yet. Rockets were blowing up on the launch pad. Many thought Kennedy had really engaged in a hallucinatory plan. But Kennedy recognized something that we should now recognize, which is that Americans, when they are challenged to invent new responses to problems we have, Americans come through.

In my district, we understand the power of innovation. Boeing Company, I represent the area north of Seattle,