A couple of weeks ago,

there was a resolution introduced in

the Congress, H. Con. Res. 362, that

quickly got 220 cosponsors. I want to

talk a little bit more about that resolution

because there are some Members

of Congress now having second

thoughts about invoking a blockade on

Iran.

Take, for instance, here’s a quote

from Congressman ROBERT WEXLER of

Florida. He says, ‘‘Given my growing

concerns regarding this resolution, including

its failure to advocate for direct

American engagement with

Tehran and open language that could

lead to a U.S. blockade of Iran, I will

lead an effort to make changes to this

resolution before it comes to the Foreign

Affairs Committee for a vote.’’

The chairman of the Financial Services

Committee, BARNEY FRANK, had

this to say: ‘‘I am all for stricter sanctions

against Iran, but the blockade

part goes too far. I am going to call the

sponsors and tell them I am changing

my vote.’’

I would like all Members of Congress

to reconsider, because this I consider a

very dangerous sense of congress resolution

and that it is going to lead to

trouble.

There is a new pro-Israeli lobby established

called J Street, and they had

some comments about this legislation

as well. Their comments are this: ‘‘We

as a group oppose preemptive military

action by either the United States or

Israel and we support stronger U.S. diplomacy.

To us, it is common sense

that saber rattling and constant

threats are counterproductive. What

better way to unite Iran behind its

most hawkish leaders than threatening

to attack? What better way to empower

the Iranian hardliners’ case for

nuclear weapons development than to

talk of a military attack?’’

Today, I had three young Iranians in

my office, and they verified that next

year there will be an election and

Ahmadinejad, who is in political trouble

over there, is being enhanced by

our militant conversation we have

here, threatening of blockades, and

with this plan or possible plan to actually

bomb Iran. But the other side argues,

well, no it is all the Iranians’

fault. They are testing missiles.

The testing of missiles came after

there were war games by Israel testing

whether or not they had the manpower

and the airplanes to travel that particular

distance. So the saber rattling

is not one-sided, and we cannot say

that it is all the Iranians’ fault.

This H. Con. Res. 362, the authors

claim it is not a blockade. But what it

does, it demands inspection of all imports

of petroleum products, vehicles,

ships, planes, trains and cargo. They

use word ‘‘prohibit’’ and impose stringent

inspection on all of these items.

Now, the question I would like to

pose here for our Members is this: How

would we as Americans and how would

we as a government react if a strong

government came and did that to us?

What if another government came and

said we are going to restrict the importation

of petroleum products and we

are going to inspect all vehicles, ships,

planes, trains and cargo? We wouldn’t

know what that would mean. How

could they do that without an embargo?

This is militant language, it is just

looking for trouble, and it will not help

solve the situation.

There is nothing wrong with talking

to people. We talked to the Soviets in

the midst of the Cold War. They had

40,000 nuclear weapons. Now they are

talking about, well, maybe the Iranians

might get a weapon later on.

Quite frankly, this talk about this

violation, the Iranians were asked by

IAEA not to resume enrichment. They

had voluntarily stopped enrichment for

peaceful purposes. They have every

right under the Nonproliferation Treaty

to enrich for peaceful purposes. In

the last year, there have been nine unannounced

inspections of the Iranian

nuclear sites. They have never once

been found in violation.

This does not make them angels.

This does not make them not want to

desire to defend their country. But

think about it: How many countries

have nukes around them? Pakistan has

nukes, India has them, Israel has them,

the United States has them, China has

them, the Soviets have them. And they

are being threatened. War games are

being practiced, with the potentiality

of us being a participant in bombing

them.

Madam Speaker, it is time for us to

take a deep breath and reassess our position.