

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Kaptur

NOT VOTING—20

Baca	Davis (IL)	Sánchez, Linda
Blumenauer	Hinojosa	T.
Boswell	Jackson-Lee	Skelton
Boyd	(TX)	Sullivan
Camp	Johnson (GA)	Waters
Capuano	Marchant	Wilson (OH)
Carter	Rogers (MI)	
Courtney	Ruppersberger	

□ 2011

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. CAPUANO. Madam Speaker, due to the fact that I had to return to my district for family reasons, I was unable to take rollcall votes 308, 309, and 310. Had I been present, I would have voted "no" on rollcall vote 308; "no" on rollcall vote 309; and "aye" on rollcall vote 310, in favor of final passage of H.R. 626, The Federal Employees Paid Parental Leave Act of 2009.

RECOGNIZING TOYS FOR TOTS LITERACY PROGRAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAFFEI). The unfinished business is the question on suspending the rules and agreeing to the resolution, H. Res. 232.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 232.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. CANTOR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CANTOR. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland, the majority leader, for the purpose of announcing next week's schedule.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman from Virginia for yielding.

On Monday, the House will meet at 12:30 p.m. for morning-hour debate and at 2 p.m. for legislative business with votes postponed until 6:30 p.m.

This transparency issue has apparently come up again.

On Tuesday, the House will meet at 10:30 a.m. for morning-hour debate and at noon for legislative business. On Wednesday and Thursday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for legislative business. On Friday, as is usual, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business.

We will consider several bills under suspension of the rules. The complete

list of the suspension bills will be announced by the close of business tomorrow.

In addition, we will consider Representative BETTY SUTTON's bill, the Consumer Assistance to Recycle and Save Act of 2009; H.R. 2410, the Foreign Relations Authorization Act for fiscal years 2010 and 2011; and H.R. 1886, the Pakistan Enduring Assistance and Cooperation Enhancement Act of 2009.

We will also expect to consider a conference report on H.R. 2346, the supplemental appropriation bill. I was hoping to consider that tomorrow, but discussions between the Senate and the House have not been concluded.

I yield back.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman that he just referred to and announced that we would be considering the war funding supplemental conference report next week. I would ask the gentleman: Does he expect the very controversial Senate-passed provision providing for the IMF money to be included in the conference report?

I yield.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

As you know, the Senate added the IMF funding to the bill. It is a loan guaranty. We expect the probability that there will be no out-of-pocket money for the United States, but there is a loan guaranty to the IMF.

As you know, the G-20 met. Our President, obviously, participated in that meeting of the G-20 with 19 other leaders of major nations in the world, talking about how we can bring not only each individual country out of the recession but, in some cases, depression that some countries are in; that there was a need to invest sums in assisting particularly smaller, poorer countries to try to recover from the devastation that has occurred by, in some cases, the very sharp economic downturn of the larger, more prosperous countries.

□ 2015

The G-20 agreed that they would come up with \$500 billion. The United States, the wealthiest of the G-20 by far, has a 20 percent share of that. The President agreed that the United States would, with the G-20, meet its part of the obligation that had been agreed upon. The Senate included that. And the answer to the gentleman's question is, I fully expect that to be in the supplemental that we'll consider on the floor.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman.

And, Mr. Speaker, I say to the gentleman that the belief on our side is the purpose of the war funding bills should be to provide our troops with the support they need, not this controversial global bailout money. Mr. Speaker, I would say more than that, what we believe is—currently from the reports is that the bill would eliminate \$5 billion from the defense spending directly for our troops and provide that \$5 billion credit towards the guarantee

that the United States would have to provide to the IMF.

Mr. Speaker, even further, we understand that in this provision in the bill, in essence we would be providing for more money for foreign countries in terms of a global bailout than we would be for our own troops.

And the even more troubling part to many of us, Mr. Speaker, is the fact that the IMF program allows eligibility for countries like Iran, Venezuela, Zimbabwe, Burma and others. And that these countries, Mr. Speaker, are not necessarily in pursuit of policies that help the national security of this country. And given the fact that our President has said we don't have the money, how is it, Mr. Speaker—and I would ask the gentleman—does he think that we ought to be delaying the funding of our troops by including the provisions that we've just spoken of? And I yield.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The gentleman's premise is incorrect. None of us on this side think we ought to delay this bill. None of us. We believe that the troops need the funds, our President has asked for the funds, we're for passing those funds. Very frankly, in the Senate, as you know, they added a lot of extraneous matters. Some Republicans added extraneous matters that, very frankly, we're not happy about on this side of the aisle. Large sums of money which have nothing to do with the troops. They were added because those Members of the Senate, who happen to be very high-ranking Republicans, believe those matters are very important.

Furthermore, let me say to the gentleman we just honored a President that you believe was a great President of the United States. We honored him yesterday with a statue. I know you'll be interested in some quotes from that President:

"I have an unbreakable commitment to increased funding for IMF." Ronald Reagan, September 7, 1983.

He went on to say in that same speech, "The IMF is the linchpin of the international financial system."

He went on to say on July 14, "The IMF has been a cornerstone of U.S. foreign economic policy under Republican and Democratic administrations for nearly 40 years." That was, of course, in 1983.

I suggest to the gentleman it has continued for the 26 years after that.

And it remains, he said, a cornerstone of the foreign economic policy of this administration.

Another President on September 25, 1990, said this: George Bush, President of the United States, "The IMF and World Bank, given their central role in the world economy, are key to helping all of us through this situation by providing a combination of policy advice and financial assistance." September 25, 1990,

He went on to say, "As we seek to extend and expand growth in the world

economy, the debt problems faced by developing countries are central to the agenda of the IMF. The international community's strengthened approach to these problems has truly provided new hope for debtor nations.'

I would suggest to you, also, that 11 of the Members—which is to say approximately a little over 25 percent of the votes, Republican votes in the United States Senate—supported this legislation in this bill. So it came to us in a bipartisan fashion from the United States Senate.

Our President has indicated that the United States of America will in fact participate with the other 19 leading industrial nations of this world in trying to lift out of the mire of economic distress some countries whose distress will impact our recovery as well.

That is why I say to my friend no one, no one, no one wants to delay this bill. I would hope that we have the 368 votes that voted for this bill the first time it passed intact when it comes and be consistent with the principles enunciated by Ronald Reagan and George Bush in the 1990s.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

And first of all, there is obviously a delay in this bill. We were expecting to see the bill and the war supplemental for our troops to come through tomorrow, and I would ask the gentleman, number one, does he know the amount of support given to the IMF back when Ronald Reagan made those quotes? That's number one.

And is it appropriate in a war-spending bill for the taxpayers of this country to be guaranteeing \$108 billion dollars to the IMF when we're only providing our troops \$80-some billion? So that's more than we're providing our troops for a global bailout. And that is the first line of questioning, Mr. Speaker.

Secondly, does he expect to produce more than the 200 votes that the gentleman's side produced on the first go-round on this supplemental bill? Because if not, then he would need to have some support from this side of the aisle. And Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman, the New York Times has pointed out May 27, Hezbollah, the Shiite militant group, has talked with the IMF and the European Union about continued financial support.

So is he aware that this money that we are affording the IMF to extend to countries who are in need would include countries where Hezbollah would have some impact on the disbursal of those funds?

And I yield.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The last time Iran got money from the United States of America was 1984. You recall who was President of the United States in 1984, I'm sure. That was the last time Iran got money from the United States—excuse me, from the IMF.

With respect to your second observation, the gentleman knows how the

IMF works. The gentleman knows the United States is involved, as are the other countries, in overseeing the distribution of IMF funds. There is no intention—and there will be no action, certainly, that the United States would support—to give any assistance.

I don't know whether they've talked to the IMF or not. The gentleman may have more information than I do.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time.

I will tell the gentleman, New York Times, May 27, 2009, pointed out Hezbollah, the Shiite militant group involved in Lebanon and its government, had talks with the IMF to discuss the possibility of the extension of credit. And are we not, I would ask the gentleman, affording the IMF the ability to extend credit to groups such as that, in countries such as that, as well as the potential for countries to access the credit, including Iran, Venezuela, Zimbabwe, Burma, et cetera?

We are very, very concerned. There is a real possibility that some of the world's worst regimes will have access to additional resources that will be provided to the IMF, and is he not concerned about that?

And I yield.

Mr. HOYER. Of course. We're all concerned about the fact that any money would go to those regimes. The fact of the matter is the IMF could have given to very bad regimes during the Reagan administration or the Bush administration. The reason the Reagan administration and the first Bush administration—and I might say, although I don't have a quote from the second Bush administration, the second Bush administration, as well, was a supporter of the IMF as the gentleman, perhaps, knows.

The fact of the matter is the United States will play a very significant role in the decisionmaking of the IMF because we're a very significant contributor. It is a red herring, from my perspective, to raise the fact that money could go somewhere. Of course money could go somewhere.

Mr. CANTOR. Reclaiming.

Mr. HOYER. If the gentleman is going to reclaim his time—the gentleman asked me a question.

Any money that we appropriate could go any place. It could go to a bad place. We don't want it to go to a bad place. And I don't think any of the 19 other nations want it to go to Hezbollah or other organizations that might be negative in the use of those funds as far as we're concerned.

What we do want, however—and that's what Ronald Reagan was talking about, that's what George Bush was talking about, and that's what President Obama is talking about—we do want to see the international economy rebound as well because it impacts on us as we impact very severely on it. That is why the G-20 made this determination.

I yield back.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

I just say to Mr. Speaker, he points out the difficulty that the U.S. taxpayers will have in holding accountable this Congress and the IMF for the direction of that spending. And given the unprecedented economic situation this country and its taxpayers are facing, it is a belief on our side of the aisle that we ought not be extending the ability to the IMF to extend \$108 billion when the primary purpose of this particular piece of legislation is to provide support for our troops. And let's get on with it, Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would also say to the gentleman that today, the Speaker of the House acknowledged that she is continuing to receive national intelligence briefings from the CIA. Now, Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman knows, the Speaker has made serious allegations about the CIA's truthfulness to Congress in the briefings. As the gentleman also knows, the Speaker of the House is one of only four Members of this body who receives the highest level of briefings from the CIA in accordance with the practices of this body in our oversight capacities. These briefings, Mr. Speaker, are an essential part of the House's oversight responsibility of the Nation's intelligence, and in fact, our national security.

So I ask the gentleman that, in accordance with the custom of this House, shouldn't the House temporarily designate a replacement for the Speaker in these briefings to maintain the integrity of our oversight? And I yield.

Mr. HOYER. Absolutely not. Nobody has questioned the Speaker's integrity.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I would respond to the gentleman. If the Speaker has alleged that there is untruthfulness, if there is a lack of candor on the part of those giving the briefings, isn't it somehow compromising in those briefings the national security of our country? And I yield.

Mr. HOYER. Absolutely not. There is no belief, I think, of anybody in this House, I hope—and I certainly do not believe that in any way the Speaker has ever, nor would she ever compromise in any way the security of our country, the security of our troops, and the security of our people, period.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I would respond to the gentleman and say, what has changed? Because the Speaker has made very serious allegations about the veracity of the briefings that are given by the CIA, and if we are to believe that she is correct, shouldn't we be either having an investigation of those allegations, or is it that she has now changed her mind and believes that the briefings are worthwhile because we can count on the veracity of the information given in those briefings? And I yield.

□ 2030

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I must say, I really have difficulty following the gentleman's reasoning, with all due respect. The fact of the matter is that we have oversight. I see Mr. HOEKSTRA on the floor. I don't know that Mr. REYES is on the floor. But we have a mechanism for oversight of the CIA and of our intelligence units. My presumption is that intelligence oversight is, in fact, working. I certainly hope it's working. My expectation and belief is that it is working. The fact of the matter is that a number of people on both sides of the aisle have raised questions from time to time with respect to the information they have received. Vice President Cheney on television just the other day made some allegations with respect to information that he had received. The fact of the matter is that it seems to me that the gentleman somehow interprets the fact that somebody in an intelligence agency may have given wrong information—may have—that somehow the receiver of the information is the guilty party. I cannot follow that reasoning, I tell my friend from Virginia.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the gentleman again, hasn't the Speaker of this House—not just any Member, but the Speaker of the House, second in line to the President, the constitutional officer presiding in this House—hasn't she indicated her belief and her position that there has been a pattern of misleading information given to this body by the CIA? And if that is the case, I would ask the gentleman, what value is it for the Speaker then to engage in these briefings if she cannot trust the veracity of the information?

Mr. HOYER. The gentleman's reasoning continues to somewhat confound me. The fact of the matter is, I am hopeful that the intelligence agencies are, in fact, giving accurate assessments of what they believe to be the situation as it relates to America's national security interests to the Speaker and to any others that they might brief, including myself from time to time. I expect that to be the case. I think the Speaker expects it to be the case. I'm sure that every other person being briefed expects it to be the case. I certainly hope that it is the case. But whether it is the case or not, the gentleman's logic, therefore, that the Speaker shouldn't listen I don't follow.

Mr. CANTOR. I reclaim my time to try and clarify my logic, Mr. Speaker.

I think the gentleman and I both agree that we have heard the Speaker indicate her position that she is not being told the truth. And if she continues to have the briefings, has something changed? Has something been restored to the process that there is integrity in these briefings? And if so, does that mean that the Speaker of the House has retracted her position that somehow we've been misled by the CIA?

I would yield.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The gentleman continues to state his position. I continue to tell him that his reasoning confounds me; and, therefore, I find it not worthwhile to repeat it for a fourth time.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman for his patience and would say, again, that we have still not given the American people the transparency on this issue that they deserve. The Speaker of this House has made allegations in a very serious way about our intelligence community. This House is given the oversight responsibility for our Nation's intelligence structure and operation. We all are here sworn to uphold our duty in that respect and the paramount duty of this body, to ensure this Nation's security. It is our belief that we should get to the bottom of this. We should have some sense of an investigation that can ensue to understand why the Speaker made such allegations. That is our position, Mr. Speaker. And if the gentleman doesn't agree that there needs to be something to shed some light on this on behalf of the people, then I guess we agree to disagree.

Mr. HOYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANTOR. I yield.

Mr. HOYER. I will repeat, we have a mechanism to do exactly what the gentleman suggests, finding out whether the truth has been told with respect to the briefings. Obviously there are differences of opinion. The gentleman knows that Senator Graham, a former chairman of the Senate Intelligence Committee, says that he was not briefed on the issues in question. He is a former governor of Florida, a respected Member of the United States Senate, mentioned for the presidency of the United States, a gentleman for whom I have great respect, as I have great respect for the Speaker. There is a mechanism that is in place, that is available; and I would certainly hope, very frankly, that the committee is, in fact, pursuing the facts as they perceive them to be necessary to be disclosed.

So there is a mechanism in place. I hope that mechanism is being pursued. But it does not relate to the Speaker. The gentleman wants to focus on the Speaker, in my opinion, for partisan reasons.

Mr. CANTOR. I reclaim my time, Mr. Speaker.

Again, the gentleman and I can have a discussion here without such allegations being made on the floor. The position that we have taken is in response to direct statements made by the Speaker. There is no partisan accusation here. This is in response to direct statements made by the Speaker. We have a situation that we need some type of independent third party to intervene here. If there is ever an analogous situation in a court of law when one party accuses another of not being truthful, there must be some way, some independent mechanism to determine whether and what was the truth. This is my question again, and the gentleman may continue to be confounded.

My question again is, what has changed? If the Speaker doubts the veracity of the information she receives from the CIA but continues to receive that information, how is it that that process doesn't harm the national security of this country?

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. I continue to be confounded. I presume and hope, and the Speaker hopes, I'm sure, and everybody who receives information from the intelligence community believes and hopes that it is accurate and is as good an assessment and as honest an assessment as can be given. Everyone hopes that. Mr. HOEKSTRA, who is on the floor, hopes that. Mr. REYES, who is the chairman of the committee, hopes that. I hope it when I am briefed. I am sure you do as well when you are briefed. But if it's not, I don't hold myself culpable, you culpable, Mr. HOEKSTRA culpable or Mr. REYES culpable.

So I continue to be confused that your focus is on the Speaker, not on the quality of the information.

Mr. CANTOR. Reclaiming my time.

Mr. HOYER. Every time you don't like my answer, frankly, Mr. CANTOR, you reclaim your time. I regret that.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I would just respond to the gentleman. I am focusing on the Speaker because that's where the statements came from.

Mr. HOYER. No. The statements came from the CIA, apparently.

Mr. CANTOR. The statements came from the Speaker that she believes she has been misled, and this Congress has been misled. And she said again today that she is continuing the process of being briefed. What has changed? I would ask the gentleman, what has changed in the Speaker's mind that she continues to receive briefings when she alleges mistruths?

Mr. HOYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANTOR. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding. Let me pose to the gentleman a question:

The CIA briefs you. You believe the information that you have received is inaccurate. But on your premise if you say I believe it is inaccurate, the solution you suggest is that you no longer get briefed. That is what confounds me. That is what I think is perverse reasoning and with which I do not agree. That is my answer. I think this discussion is not bearing fruit.

Mr. CANTOR. Again, Mr. Speaker, I would respond by saying that the American people deserve some transparency. We deserve to get to the bottom of the very serious allegations that have been made about the CIA and their conduct in front of this body.

So with that, Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

I yield back my time.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, JUNE 8, 2009

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the