

The IAEA has also recently raised new concerns about the military nature of Iran's nuclear program. In February, the U.N. nuclear watchdog agency issued a report that said Iran may be working to develop a nuclear-armed missile, adding further evidence that Iran's nuclear work is not for peaceful purposes.

If Iran is successful in building a nuclear weapon and fitting it into a missile, the entire region will be at risk. Iran already has missiles with a range of more than 1,200 miles, which puts Israel, Iraq, Turkey, Afghanistan, Pakistan, Egypt, and the Ukraine and many other countries within striking distance.

Advancements in Iranian technology threaten nations further away from Iran as well. Iran has launched a satellite into space, demonstrating that it has the technical capability that may allow it to build ballistic missiles capable of hitting American cities.

While nuclear proliferation is dangerous in any context, there is greater reason to be gravely concerned about a nuclear-armed Iran. For years, Iran has fought American presence in the Middle East and has supported terrorist groups that have targeted and killed American troops. For example, American officials believe Iran supported the group behind the 1996 terrorist attack on a U.S. military residence in Saudi Arabia that killed 19 of our servicemen. A nuclear-armed Iran would surely put American troops serving in the Middle East today at even greater risk.

In addition, Iran's leaders frequently speak of a world without Israel. The Iranian President has called for Israel to be "wiped off the map." If Iran gets a nuclear weapon, its leader will have the capability to do these hateful, destructive things that they speak of.

Americans and Israelis around the world would also be at likely greater risk of a terrorist attack if Iran obtains the bomb. Iran is already the leading state sponsor of terrorism, funneling money, weapons, and training to terrorist groups, including Hezbollah, Hamas, and other terrorist organizations. These groups have goals and ideologies inconsistent with our American values. Emboldened by a nuclear-armed Iran, they may launch even more frequent and deadly attacks on innocent civilians.

□ 1830

Clearly, the consequences of a nuclear-armed Iran are intolerable. To stop Iran's drive to a nuclear weapon, we must act now and we must act decisively. The House of Representatives and the Senate have both passed legislation to impose strong and comprehensive sanctions on Iran. The Iran Refined Petroleum Sanctions Act and the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act target Iran's reliance on foreign suppliers to meet its fuel needs. Although Iran sits on top of a wealth of oil and nat-

ural gas, it lacks the ability to turn much of that oil into gasoline. Consequently, Iran imports 40 percent of its gasoline needs.

The Iran Refined Petroleum Sanctions Act and the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act offer the best prospect of compelling Iran to give up its pursuit of nuclear weapons. Congressional leaders must quickly resolve the differences between the House and Senate versions of these bills while keeping the teeth of the sanctions intact so the President can sign a final bill into law.

At the same time, the administration and like-minded allies should impose multilateral sanctions now while also pressing reluctant nations to agree to strong and comprehensive sanctions at the United Nations. The administration must also enforce current law and levy sanctions against companies that violate our laws.

Time is not on our side. The sooner strong and comprehensive sanctions are applied on Iran the greater chance we have of preventing a nuclear-armed Iran, saving the lives of many, and enhancing the security of our own and that of our allies in the region.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. KAPTUR addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

CREATING AMERICAN JOBS THROUGH TRADE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BOUSTANY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow Ambassador Kirk will meet behind closed doors with the House Ways and Means Committee. While I appreciate the meeting, why do congressional Democrats refuse to talk in the open about creating jobs through international trade? I am encouraged by the administration's newfound openness to promoting American goods and services overseas, but the current situation is bleak. Nearly one in 10 Americans who want work cannot find a job.

The recent economic downturn erased the certainty many families came to rely on, and now they turn to Washington for solutions. Unfortunately, a health care overhaul with new mandates, energy taxes that will drive up input costs, and a massive Tax Code full of quirks and loopholes add to

their doubts. To truly grow American jobs, entrepreneurs and businesses need new markets where they can compete to sell their products. We must restore American competitiveness to create new jobs and a prosperous future.

With 95 percent of the world's consumers living outside the United States, our ability to compete fairly and successfully in these markets is vital to our long-term economic growth and security. As the President said last week, "We need to compete for those customers because other nations are competing for them."

Today almost one in five U.S. jobs is supported by international trade. I welcome President Obama's lofty goal of doubling U.S. exports in the next 5 years through his National Export Initiative, and I look forward to discussing his plans with Ambassador Kirk.

As our economy continues to struggle, it is evident Americans will not be able to consume their way out of this recession, so we must focus on getting our products and services to emerging markets around the world. American ingenuity, creativity, and innovation can spur new jobs and new factories all right here at home.

According to the Obama administration, increasing trade by merely 1 percent would create 250,000 jobs, a significant start to helping Americans find work. Passing the Colombia, Panama, and South Korea Free Trade Agreements would accomplish just that, increasing our trade exports by 1 percent and creating an estimated 250,000 American jobs. These free trade agreements put American workers on a fair footing with workers in those countries instead of alienating our global trading partners through narrow-minded policies such as Buy American.

Now American-produced goods face substantial tariffs in Colombia, Panama, and South Korea, while many goods produced in those countries have no tariff at all when sold to the U.S. The President's goal is ambitious, so passing these three free trade agreements is an important first step to restoring American competitiveness in global markets.

The last time the U.S. doubled its exports, it took nearly 10 years: final implementation of the North American Free Trade Agreement, nine bilateral free trade agreements, and the successful conclusion of the Uruguay Round. Since 1994, Louisiana has increased its exports to NAFTA countries by 271 percent. As a result, thousands of Louisiana workers have job stability, but we can do much more.

Trade creates good-paying jobs for millions of Americans, and leveling the playing field abroad increases our opportunities. Truly supporting American workers and creating new jobs will not be accomplished by closing our doors to the rest of the world while they continue to strike new deals and expand their exports. Now is the time to reach and to work with our allies

and major trading partners. American leadership is in jeopardy, not because of a rising power but because of a shrinking level of American engagement. The world will not wait for us to wake up and realize the opportunities out there. That is why we need to act on expanding these trade agreements.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. FOXX addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

ISRAEL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, actually my main subject I want to cover tonight is Israel, but I didn't want today to pass again without making comments about the health care bill, because clearly that is the number one subject on the minds of the people in Indiana as well as the rest of the country.

One of the things that has happened here, without getting into what I believe are the demerits of the bill, the 17 percent of the American economy, and many companies in my district are threatened and their choices threatened, but I think one of the frustrations here is the arrogance of the process.

Initially, we were promised that it was going to be live on C-SPAN and we would see all the negotiations. We are all familiar with how that was abandoned. Then many Members refused to do town halls. They wouldn't answer phone calls. They still won't answer their phone calls or mail. Then we saw deals made in the Senate bill unprecedented in American history.

As I pointed out earlier today, Thomas Jefferson got all of 13 States as part of the first Louisiana Purchase in inflation-adjusted dollars of \$150 million. Buying one vote from Louisiana in the other body cost \$300 million.

Then when 17 percent of the American economy is at stake, not some annual budget process but 17 percent of the American economy, the Founding Fathers had set up a process in the Senate that is being abused to go down to where it is 50 plus the Vice President can pass the bill. Now we are going to apparently pass this in the House, if they have the votes, and it is going to be deemed passed. We are not even going to vote. No wonder so many American people are losing confidence in government. It wasn't that we were high before, but we have hit new lows. And it is going to be difficult to establish confidence with the American people if we continue at this pace.

But another part of the arrogance of this government is happening in Israel.

I would like to insert this article from the Jerusalem Post into the RECORD. It is an article that makes some nuanced points.

But first let me start and say Israel has an historic importance to the world and to ourselves not just because of its history before the Diaspora and the tremendous history of the Jewish people and the Nation of Israel, but also it was a returning homeland for those after the Holocaust from around the world where they could gather again to the land from which they had been evicted.

Then it is important because it is a democratic bastion in the Middle East, where there are not democratic bastions. We are trying to see if Iraq can form a democracy, and Turkey is kind of a democracy as well. But Israel has been from its founding such a democracy, since its refounding in 1948. Not only that, but they are our best and really only consistent ally in the Middle East. But it is also because Israel is going to be of importance in future world history as well in many ways. In fact, not only should all Americans be concerned about what is happening in Israel, but many people have special concerns about the future of Israel and how the United States responds to Israel.

Therefore, it is extremely disturbing to watch the arrogance of this administration to bully our best ally. This article in the Jerusalem Post says this is the worst that the United States has treated Israel since 1975. The American leadership is mistakenly painting Israel into a corner is the thrust of this article. In one of the more sophisticated statements in it by Mr. Avner, who has written on the '75 crisis, he said, "If the United States wishes to advance a peace process, it must never paint Israel into a corner." And he points out that what is needed is constructive ambiguity.

Now, that is an interesting term because most of us like to be very forthright. And I would say that most people in Israel would like to be forthright most of the time. But when dealing with historic conflicts that have gone back to how the divisions first occurred in what I believe when God gave Israel its land, and divisions that have occurred since then, straightforwardness does not bring peace. Constructive ambiguity brings peace.

So when the United States takes sides in calling Ramat Shlomo a settlement, they chose words that were from the other side. That sends a message that becomes then very difficult for Israel. The question is, have we switched our positions or are we not as fully behind Israel?

Now, anybody who has ever visited there, reads about it, follows Israel, realizes that its enemies on all sides at least claim they want to destroy it. And from time to time they have had wars with which to attempt to destroy it. You don't have to be kind of really informed on international issues to re-

alize that Iran is trying to develop a nuclear bomb. Why are they trying to develop a nuclear bomb? They want to destroy Israel from the face of the earth. It is their stated goal.

Now, the people in Israel may be divided on a lot of things and they have a lot of opinions in their country, but they are a tad worried about Iran. And they believe that the United States and the rest of the world don't seem to be taking it as seriously as they do. Maybe because, for example, you can get a bomber over Jerusalem from Amman, Jordan, in a minute and a half. So they tend to be a little uncertain when there is some doubt. And so they have a deep concern. In this case they have a concern that we are all going to talk, talk, talk while they are going to be in danger because of a nuclear weapon. If we are going to address this, we need to stop giving the signals that we do not stand behind Israel, and we need to stand directly behind Israel and let the world know that is what our U.S. position is and do a little bit of constructive ambiguity.

OBAMA REPEATING 1975 MISTAKES

(By Gil Hoffman)

EX-RABIN ADVISER SAYS US GOVERNMENT'S STANCE RECALLS US-ISRAEL SINAI CRISIS.

The American leadership is mistakenly "painting Israel into a corner," as it did during a 1975 confrontation between the two countries, Yehuda Avner, who was an adviser to then-prime minister Yitzhak Rabin at the time of the crisis, said Monday.

Ambassador to the US Michael Oren was quoted as telling Israeli consuls general on a conference call Saturday night that the current crisis with the US was the worst since the 1975 confrontation between then US Secretary of State Henry Kissinger and Rabin over an American demand for a partial withdrawal from the Sinai Peninsula.

Avner said he did not have enough inside information about the current crisis to compare the two. But he compared the language of Kissinger 35 years ago to that of current US Secretary of State Hillary Clinton, who he said spoke in a manner that was more emotional than diplomatic.

"The US must never create a situation in which Israel sees itself as being abandoned, because it encourages belligerence on the other side and inflexibility on the Israeli side," Avner said. "If the US wishes to advance a peace process, it must never paint Israel into a corner as it did by calling Ramat Shlomo a settlement. What's needed now on all sides is constructive ambiguity."

Avner, who worked under four Israeli prime ministers, recalled the details of the 1975 crisis, which he recounts in his new book *The Prime Ministers*.

He said the March 1975 incident erupted when Kissinger demanded that Israel give up the Jidda and Mitla passes in the Sinai, and Rabin refused. Because of his refusal, Kissinger left a meeting with Rabin in anger and accused Israel of "shattering the cause of peace."

At the height of the confrontation between the two men, Kissinger told Rabin: "You will be responsible for the destruction of the third Jewish commonwealth," and Rabin replied, "You will be judged not by American history but by Jewish history." Avner said he hoped the current crisis would be resolved as successfully.

Then American president Gerald Ford wrote Rabin a fiercely worded letter that