I thank the Chair.

I thank the Senators from Michigan

and Delaware. I will stay within the 6

minutes.

Madam President, I strongly support

H.R. 2709. I come to the floor, however,

rather worried about the administration’s

decision last week to waive sanctions

against a French energy company

that is doing a massive billion-dollar

oil deal with Iran. The President’s decision

to waive imposed sanctions on the

French energy company was done

under the guise of national security. I

have to wonder, and we all wonder,

whose national security is he referring

to when he chooses to waive the sanctions?

Certainly, it is not the national

security interests of the United States

for Iran to improve its oil-exporting

capability so that it can turn around

and then use the same money to fund

missile development. I certainly can’t

believe it is in the best interests of the

State of Israel to have Iran improving

its foreign cash reserves for the very

same reasons.

Iran is improving its cash reserves,

and they are improving their missile

technology. Just in January of this

year, the CIA told the Senate that Iran

would be able to target ballistic missiles

at Israel much sooner than the 10

years that we had previously been led

to believe. So, therefore, I have to conclude

that he made this decision in the

national interest of France and Russia.

I think that is a very poor reason to

make a decision of this magnitude.

Here we go again. We are passing a

good bill to impose sanctions on individuals

who transfer missile technology

to Iran. But section 105 of the

bill permits a waiver based on the national

security interests of the United

States. The part that concerns me is

the waiver. I am concerned about how

the President has interpreted this in

the other Iranian sanction bills. I

think there should be no waiver. I do

not trust the President’s decision on

waivers. Given that Israel was the only

sovereign state, outside Kuwait, that

was attacked by Iraq during the gulf

war as they were attacked by missiles,

I think there should be language in

this bill and in the Iranian-Libyan section

that mandates consultation with

Israel before we choose to waive any

sanctions for missile production or oil

production. I think we owe it to our

friends—the true friends in the Mideast—

the Israelis.

I hope that such legislation wouldn’t

be necessary and that the President

would be more frugal in his actions.

So I plan to introduce this as freestanding

legislation. I hope we could

consider this sometime in the very

near future. We should be consulting

with Israel before making decisions affecting

their interests, just as much so,

and more so, than we should be with

Russia and France. Israel is a country

that is most threatened by missile production

by rogue states like Iran and

Libya.

I know there are some who think the

Iranian regime is moderating itself. I

personally don’t think they are. But

even if they are, I don’t think that we

should be lulled into a sense that we

have turned the corner in our relations

with Iran. They only respect the

United States for its power. They simply

laugh at us when we are weak.

They take the President’s waiver as a

sign of weakness—not as a gesture of

improved relations.

The Mideast is still an extremely

volatile area. The United States is at

its best when we stand behind our true

ally, the Israelis, as they have been our

true ally. They have been our sea anchor

in a turbulent part of the world.

We should negotiate from a position of

strength—not when we accommodate

murderers and terrorists who pretend

to be government figures. We should be

supporting our true ally in the Mideast.

Again, I strongly support the legislation.

I yield the remainder of the time, and

I thank the Senator from Delaware.