

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. RON KIND

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 17, 2008

Mr. KIND. Madam Speaker, I was unable to have my vote recorded on the House floor on Thursday, June 12, 2008, having returned to my district to assist my constituents with the severe flooding that recently struck Wisconsin. Had I been present, I would have voted in favor of H. Res. 1257 (Roll No. 405 and No. 406), H. Res. 1265 (Roll No. 407 and No. 408), H.R. 1553 (Roll No. 409), H.R. 5749 (Roll No. 410 and No. 412), and S. 2146 (Roll No. 413). I would have voted against the motion to recommit H.R. 5749 (Roll No. 411).

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. RON KIND

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 17, 2008

Mr. KIND. Madam Speaker, I was unable to have my vote recorded on the House floor on Wednesday, June 11, 2008, having returned to my district to assist my constituents with the severe flooding that recently struck Wisconsin. Had I been present, I would have voted in favor of H. Res. 977 (Roll No. 404).

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. BRUCE L. BRALEY

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 17, 2008

Mr. BRALEY of Iowa. Madam Speaker, unfortunately, I was unable to vote on Wednesday, June 11 and Thursday, June 12 due to massive flooding throughout Iowa's 1st Congressional District. Although I realize how important it is to cast votes in Washington, the well-being of my constituents comes first, and I need to be in the District to assist in any way I can.

On rollcall 397, H.R. 6003, I was not present. If I had been there, I would have voted "no."

On rollcall 398, H.R. 6003, I was not present. If I had been there, I would have voted "yes."

On rollcall 399, H.R. 6003, I was not present. If I had been there, I would have voted "no."

On rollcall 400, H.R. 6003, I was not present. If I had been there, I would have voted "yes."

On rollcall 401, H. Res. 1258, I was not present. If I had been there, I would have voted "yes."

On rollcall 402, H. Res. 1235, I was not present. If I had been there, I would have voted "yes."

On rollcall 403, H.R. 5749, I was not present. If I had been there, I would have voted "yes."

On rollcall 404, H. Res. 977, I was not present. If I had been there, I would have voted "yes."

On rollcall 405, H. Res. 1257, I was not present. If I had been there, I would have voted "yes."

On rollcall 406, H. Res. 1257, I was not present. If I had been there, I would have voted "yes."

On rollcall 407, H. Res. 1265, I was not present. If I had been there, I would have voted "yes."

On rollcall 408, H. Res. 1265, I was not present. If I had been there, I would have voted "yes."

On rollcall 409, H.R. 1553, I was not present. If I had been there, I would have voted "yes."

On rollcall 410, H.R. 5749, I was not present. If I had been there, I would have voted "yes."

On rollcall 411, H.R. 5749, I was not present. If I had been there, I would have voted "no."

On rollcall 412, H.R. 5749, I was not present. If I had been there, I would have voted "yes."

On rollcall 413, S. 2146, I was not present. If I had been there, I would have voted "yes."

IT'S TIME TO TALK TO IRAN

HON. BARBARA LEE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 17, 2008

Ms. LEE. Madam Speaker, on Tuesday of this week I had the wonderful experience of participating in a very important and worthwhile exercise in civilian diplomacy.

Coordinated by the Campaign for a New American Policy in Iran, Tuesday's event, called "Time to Talk with Iran," brought together a bipartisan gathering of Members of Congress, citizen groups, and religious organizations calling for bilateral negotiations without preconditions between the United States and Iran to dissuade Iran from seeking to acquire nuclear weapons.

Our message was simple: It is time to talk to Iran.

In fact it is past time we talk to Iran.

Because we hear the same people who supported a disastrous war of choice in Iraq now steadily beating the drum for war with Iran.

We have been down this road before and Americans have learned a simple truth from five hard and bitter years in Iraq:

No unjust war ever produced a just and lasting peace.

It has not worked in Iraq. It will not work in Iran.

We do not need another rush to unwarranted, unnecessary, and misguided military action. We need instead to launch a diplomatic surge for peace and reconciliation.

That is why earlier this year I introduced H.R. 5056, the Iran Diplomatic Accountability Act of 2008, which directs the President to appoint a high-level envoy empowered to seek to conduct direct, unconditional, bilateral negotiations with Iran for the purpose of easing tensions and normalizing relations between the United States and Iran.

My bill takes a common sense approach and it is one the American people understand.

Six out of 10 Americans do want their president to talk to Iran's president, according to the most-recent Gallup poll.

Many leading organizations active in the nuclear nonproliferation movement support this

approach as indicated by the attached letter in support of diplomatic dialogue with Iran from the Friends Committee On National Legislation, FCNL.

Foreign policy experts also support direct negotiations without preconditions. In fact, a group of 5 bipartisan former U.S. secretaries of state have called for the U.S. to open talks with Iran to find common ground and resolve differences on Iraq, Iran's nuclear program, and other issues.

They understand that the current policy of avoiding serious negotiations with Iran until Iran suspends uranium enrichment has not worked. They understand that an offer of bilateral negotiations with a precondition is essentially no offer at all, when the precondition is the object of the negotiations.

Not only is talking to Iran the most sensible approach—it is far superior to preemptive military action against Iran. We know from the misadventure in Iraq that the humanitarian, economic, political, and military consequences of military conflict with Iran would be staggering.

Simply put: this Nation cannot afford these costs—especially on top of the tremendous costs of the debacle in Iraq.

Finally, Madam Speaker, although many persons were responsible for planning this extraordinary exercise in civilian diplomacy, I would like to single out for special recognition Carah Ong of the Center for Arms Control and Nonproliferation; Bill Goold, Executive Director of the Congressional Progressive Caucus; and Nicole King of my personal staff. They did a wonderful job organizing this event.

It is time to talk to Iran. As the "Time to Talk to Iran" event this past Tuesday, all it takes to begin is one "Hello."

FRIENDS COMMITTEE ON
NATIONAL LEGISLATION,
Washington, DC, June 3, 2008.

DEAR MEMBER OF CONGRESS, We write to call your attention to the recent call from five former U.S. secretaries of state for the U.S. to open talks with Iran. We urge you to speak out in favor of such talks and to support legislation to encourage them.

Colin Powell, Henry Kissinger, James Baker III, Madeleine Albright, and Warren Christopher all urged the U.S. to open a dialogue with Iran to find common ground and resolve differences on Iraq, Iran's nuclear program, and other issues.

The administration's policy of avoiding serious negotiations with Iran until Iran suspends uranium enrichment has not worked. We agree with those in Congress and elsewhere who have argued that to offer bilateral negotiations with a precondition is no offer at all, especially when the precondition is the object of the negotiations. This position guarantees that the negotiations with the best chance of settling U.S.-Iran differences will not begin.

Former national security advisor Zbigniew Brzezinski and the late former National Security Agency director William Odom wrote recently that "Current U.S. policy toward the regime in Tehran will almost certainly result in an Iran with nuclear weapons." They and many other analysts have concluded that U.S. military action against Iran would only delay an Iranian nuclear weapons program and insure their determination to acquire nuclear weapons. Extreme elements would be strengthened and the cause of reform in Iran would be set back for years to come. Military action would also increase animosity toward the U.S. in the Middle East and elsewhere. It would prompt a big spike in the price of oil and would likely lead to retaliatory actions against the U.S. in Iraq and Afghanistan.