

Whereas, on November 9, 2006, Argentine Judge Rodolfo Canicoba Corral, pursuant to the request of the State Prosecutor of Argentina, also issued arrest warrants for Ali Fallahijan, a former Iranian Minister of Security and Intelligence, Ali Akbar Velayati, a former Iranian Foreign Minister, Mohsen Rezaei, a former commander of Iran's Islamic Revolutionary Guards Corps (IRGC), Ahmad Vahidi, a former commander of the elite Al-Quds Force of the IRGC, Hadi Soleimanpour, a former Iranian ambassador to Argentina, Mohsen Rabbani, a former cultural attaché at the Iranian Embassy in Buenos Aires, Ahmad Reza Asghari, a former official at the Iranian Embassy in Buenos Aires, and Imad Moughnieh, a leading operations chief of Hezbollah;

Whereas, on March 5, 2007, the Executive Committee of INTERPOL unanimously supported the issuance of Red Notices for Hezbollah operative Imad Moughnieh and for Iranian officials Ali Fallahijan, Mohsen Rezaei, Ahmad Vahidi, Mohsen Rabbani, and Ahmad Reza Asgari, thereby allowing arrest warrants for those individuals to be circulated worldwide with an eye to their arrest and extradition;

Whereas, on November 7, 2007, the General Assembly of INTERPOL upheld the Executive Committee's decision to support the issuance of six Red Notices in connection to the AMIA case;

Whereas, on February 12, 2008, Hezbollah operative Imad Moughnieh reportedly was killed in Syria;

Whereas in June of 2008, the Government of Saudi Arabia hosted an international Muslim conference that was reportedly attended by Iranian officials Ali Akbar Hashemi Rafsanjani, against whom an Argentine arrest warrant has been issued, and Mohsen Rezaei, against whom both an Argentine arrest warrant and INTERPOL Red Notice have been issued;

Whereas the Government of Saudi Arabia reportedly made no attempt to detain or arrest Ali Akbar Hashemi Rafsanjani or Mohsen Rezaei during their time in Saudi Arabia, and the two departed Saudi Arabia without incident;

Whereas, on May 22, 2008, Argentine prosecutor Alberto Nisman filed a request with Argentine Judge Ariel Lijo for the arrest of Carlos Saul Menem, who was president of Argentina at the time of the AMIA bombing, and four other former Argentine high officials in connection with the AMIA case;

Whereas Mr. Nisman claimed in his request for an arrest warrant that Menem and the other four officials had attempted to cover up the involvement of a Syrian-Argentine businessman, Alberto Jacinto Kanoore Edul, in the AMIA bombing;

Whereas Argentine investigators have stated that prior to the AMIA bombing, Mr. Kanoore Edul was in contact with at least two men who have been identified as suspects in the AMIA case;

Whereas, on December 16, 2008, at the AMIA Special Prosecutor's request, the presiding Argentine judge in a civil suit against the Iranian suspects and Hezbollah ordered the attachment of six commercial properties in Argentina allegedly owned by former Iran cultural attaché and named suspect Mohsen Rabbani;

Whereas in December of 2008, the judge also requested that select European governments freeze up to \$1 million in bank accounts allegedly belonging to former Iranian leader Ali Akbar Hashemi Rafsanjani and another Iranian accused of involvement in the attacks;

Whereas between October of 2008 and March of 2009, nearly a dozen Iranian properties have reportedly been seized in the Buenos Aires area in connection with a civil

suit presented by an unnamed survivor of the AMIA bombing;

Whereas in May of 2009, former IRGC commander Mohsen Rezaei, against whom both an Argentine arrest warrant and an INTERPOL Red Notice have been issued, announced his intention to seek the leadership of Iran;

Whereas in May 2009, Argentina issued an international arrest warrant for Samuel Salman El Reda, a Colombian citizen of Lebanese descent who Argentine prosecutor Alberto Nisman believes was the top local connection in the AMIA attack;

Whereas Mr. Nisman believes El Reda had connections to Hezbollah and the Tri-Border area, a zone between Argentina, Paraguay, and Brazil suspected of being a haven for Islamic radical groups;

Whereas during the past several years, the Government of Argentina has made significant advances in the AMIA investigation and other counter-terrorism efforts;

Whereas the issuance of an Argentine arrest warrant for an attaché of the Iranian Embassy in Argentina in connection with the AMIA case, indicates that Iran has used its embassies abroad as tools and extensions of radical Islamist goals and attacks;

Whereas, on January 27, 2009, Secretary of Defense Robert Gates said, "I'm concerned about the level of . . . subversive activity that the Iranians are carrying on in a number of places in Latin America . . . They're opening a lot of offices and a lot of fronts, behind which they interfere in what is going on in some of these countries."; and

Whereas, on March 17, 2009, Navy Admiral James Stavridis, Commander, United States Southern Command, indicated that he shared Secretary Gates's concern, explaining "We have seen . . . an increase in a wide level of activity by the Iranian government in this region . . . That is a concern principally because of the connections between the government of Iran, which is a state sponsor of terrorism, and Hezbollah": Now, therefore, be it

Mr. BERMAN (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The amendment was agreed to.

The concurrent resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMITTING OFFICIAL PHOTOGRAPHS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES TO BE TAKEN WHILE THE HOUSE IS IN ACTUAL SESSION ON A DATE DESIGNATED BY THE SPEAKER

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk a resolution and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 658

Resolved, That on such date as the Speaker of the House of Representatives may designate, official photographs of the House may be taken while the House is in actual session. Payment for the costs associated with taking, preparing, and distributing such photographs may be made from the applicable accounts of the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, on Monday, the House will meet at 12:30 p.m. for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business, with votes postponed until 6:30 p.m. On Tuesday, the House will meet at 10:30 a.m. for morning-hour debate and noon for legislative business. On Wednesday and Thursday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. On Friday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business.

We will consider several bills under suspension of the rules. The complete list, Mr. Speaker, will be, as usual, disclosed by the end of business today.

In addition, we will consider H.R. 2920, the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2009; the 2010 Transportation, Housing, and Urban Development Appropriations Act; the 2010 Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Appropriations Act; and possibly the Food Safety Enforcement Act of 2009.

In addition, Members ought to be advised that on Tuesday, July 21, we will take the official photograph for the 111th Congress. We don't have a time on that, but we will try to give Members time for that as soon as possible. I imagine it will be sometime after the first votes.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I would ask the gentleman if he could give me some indication of the progress on the offer of compromise to move forward on appropriations bills to get us back closer to what has been the precedent of this House in terms of open rules in consideration of expending taxpayer moneys.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for the question.

As the gentleman knows—he and I discussed this issue—it's my understanding that Mr. BOEHNER and the Speaker are having ongoing discussions with respect to that. I know the Speaker is having ongoing discussions with the committee as well. Hopefully, whatever happens between Mr. BOEHNER and the Speaker will be disclosed to you as well as to me.

Mr. CANTOR. I would note, as we are almost nearing the end of the July session and with three appropriations bills left, there is yet limited opportunity, but still some, and the minority stands ready and willing to work with the gentleman, with him and his desire, as

is mine, to return to an open process in appropriations rules.

□ 1500

Mr. HOYER. If the gentleman will yield just briefly.

Mr. CANTOR. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. I want to say to the gentleman that I want to continue to work with him towards—whether it's on these appropriations bills or other bills—so that we can try to effect a degree of comity that I know both you and I would like to reach.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman for that. I would ask the gentleman if he could give us some sense of where we are in terms of the health care reform bill working its way through the committee process right now. As the gentleman knows, I'm on the Ways and Means Committee; and we completed our markup on the bill last night or in the early hours this morning. The other two committees I know are hard at work in terms of delivering their products. But I did note that the gentleman was reported as having said in the press—I believe it was this morning in his response to a question about the Congressional Budget Office's commentary and analysis of the health care proposal. Mr. Speaker, if I could loosely paraphrase the gentleman's remarks, I believe he said, We need to go back to the drawing board as far as the scoring of the bill is concerned. I would like to inquire about what the gentleman had in mind as far as that's concerned.

Mr. HOYER. As you know, the President, the Speaker and I and others have indicated that we expect this bill to be fully paid for. Obviously scoring will be the litmus test by which we determine whether it is paid for. When Mr. Elmendorf made the statement before the Budget Committee in the Senate, he was speaking more of the bending of the curve, which is going to be longer term than whether or not we determine whether the bill is paid for. But in my view, we need to do both. Of course the bill he was talking about was the Senate bill. The House bill has not yet been fully scored. But if, in fact, that score shows that it is not fully paid for, what I meant by "going back to the drawing board," we will then have to assess how we can get the bill to a place where it is scored as a fully-paid-for bill, consistent with PAYGO. That's our pledge. That's my intent, that's the Speaker's intent, and we will work towards that objective.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman. I know the gentleman does share all of our concerns as well as, I'm sure, the President's concern that we actually do something to bring down health care costs while at the same time preserving the quality of care that the Americans who do have health care coverage right now receive. I would like to ask the gentleman, Mr. Speaker, does he expect the House and the American public to have 72 hours to

read the entire bill once the committee process has concluded and prior to the bill's coming to the floor for a vote?

Mr. HOYER. I would think the Members and the public would have more than 72 hours to read the bill. Now obviously there may well be changes as it moves along. I served in the State legislature. I'm not sure if the gentleman served in the State legislature.

Mr. CANTOR. Yes, I did.

Mr. HOYER. In our State legislature, the process was a little different. You got the bills on your desk, and the amendments were either highlighted or in italics or underlined, depending upon what the stage of consideration of the bills was so that Members could well have read the bills before they got there weeks ahead of time and then see what amendments are made in the bills as it went through second reader and third reader. We have that here, but it's not as transparent a process because it's a much more quick process as we go from the second to third reader.

The fact is that I think, as I said, Members and the public have now got the draft of the bill, as introduced. The gentleman referenced that the Ways and Means Committee, a committee on which he serves, completed its work I think about 2 a.m. this morning. Education and Labor completed its work at 6 a.m. this morning. Energy and Commerce, which has a greater portion of the bill, will probably complete its portion of the markup, we hope, on Wednesday of next week. They'll be marking it up on Monday, Tuesday and Wednesday. We expect there to be a substantial number of amendments offered. I don't know how many will be adopted or what changes will be made to the bill.

The point I want to make, therefore, is that when we say that this bill, however many pages it is, 500, 1,000, 1,500 pages, however long it is, essentially most of that bill is ready for review as we speak. There will be changes. There will be amendments as the process goes forward. But the public really ought to have an understanding, as I'm sure you would want them to have, that the bill is largely on the table now so that what you're really going to be giving notice of is amendments as they occur, which are much shorter and will be able to be read much more quickly.

Now having said that, the gentleman mentioned 72 hours. I certainly have indicated that we're going to have it in place, as a final draft, 48 hours in place. That's our intent. That's what I intend to do. That's why the committees have worked so hard this week and why the Energy and Commerce Committee is going to be working so hard and is hoping to complete its work by Wednesday so that we will not be considering the bill itself until at least a week after that. So my expectation is that there will be substantial time available for review of the bill.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman for that. I know the gentleman shares

my concern with the reality that took place around the stimulus bill and around the 300-some-odd page amendment to the cap-and-trade bill that was rushed to the floor, having come out of the Rules Committee with an extensive manager's amendment without the ability for anyone in this House to read the manager's amendment and the bill in its entirety. I do think—and I think the gentleman would agree with me—that it is in the interest of the American public, and it is their right to know that we do give adequate time for the Members to read the bill as well as for the American public.

Mr. HOYER. There has been much talk about the 300-page amendment. And very frankly, I think that process was not one which was optimal. I would prefer not to repeat that process. Obviously we were driven by the fact that we were at the end of the session. We wanted to complete the bill so that people would have an opportunity, as we moved forward, to have plenty of time to work on the health care bill, which we knew was coming. But I must say that about half of that manager's amendment was the so-called GREEN Act which had been introduced literally I think months before but certainly weeks before and was available for review.

But the gentleman has a good point. I want him to know that the Speaker and I both are committed to making sure that we have at least a couple of days—we think it will be more—but a minimum of 2 days, a full 2 days to review both the bill and any amendments that might be attached to a manager's amendment. Obviously that may not be the case. Other amendments might be offered on the floor.

Mr. CANTOR. Well, I thank the gentleman for that commitment.

Mr. Speaker, I will then turn to the issue surrounding the stimulus debate and really a related issue to what the gentleman had referred to as far as the scoring on the health care bill and that is the continuing concern over the exploding debt and what we are doing in this Congress and the impact that expanding the debt load of this country will have on America's families. I do know the gentleman has indicated a notice for a PAYGO bill for next week. I would like to ask the gentleman whether this bill will be identical to that which has been introduced by the members of the Blue Dog Coalition. I think the chief sponsor on that bill might be the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HILL).

Mr. HOYER. I was a cosponsor of that. As a matter of fact, I introduced the bill. Mr. HILL was a sponsor, along with a number of others. Your colleague from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) was a cosponsor of that bill, Mr. MILLER from California was a cosponsor of that bill and Mr. WELCH from Vermont was also a cosponsor. So it is a pretty broad spectrum of our membership, indicating that there is a real commitment to paying as you go. We believe that's an important principle.

As I'm sure the gentleman knows, PAYGO was first adopted in 1990 as a result of a conference that was held out at Andrews Air Force Base. Mr. Darman was representing President Bush. He was then the head of OMB, and there was a bipartisan agreement to adopt the statutory PAYGO. In fact, we did that. In 1997 Mr. Gingrich and Mr. Clinton entered into an agreement on statutory PAYGO that we passed in a bipartisan way in 1997. When it was to be reauthorized in 2002 and 2003, it was allowed to lapse. I think that was unfortunate. My premise is it was allowed to lapse because making the tax cuts that you wanted to propose in '03; and indeed in '01—you waived it in '01—would have been impossible, from your perspective, to pay for those cuts. So statutory PAYGO did not apply over the last 6 years. I think that, to some degree, has led us to the deficits.

Of course in the last administration Vice President Cheney made the observation that Ronald Reagan had taught us that deficits don't matter. I think the Vice President's observation was certainly not right in terms of that Ronald Reagan taught us that deficits don't matter; but Ronald Reagan certainly taught us that deficits add up and create large debt. As you know I like to say so often, we went from a \$5.6 trillion surplus in January of 2001, which President Bush observed was the estimate in March of '01, to what is now an \$11 trillion debt. Unfortunately because of the status of the economy, we've added to that. I believe, and I think my colleagues believe, that this is a critical problem that we have to address. And I know you agree with that as well. We believe that this is one way to do so. It was helpful in 1990 when it was adopted in a bipartisan way. It was helpful in 1997 when it was adopted in a bipartisan way. I am very hopeful that it can be adopted in a bipartisan way this coming week.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman. Without delving into a rehash, perhaps, of past fiscal practices or whether Vice President Cheney's remarks may have been taken out of context, I would ask the gentleman again, is the bill that will be brought to the floor identical to that which he indicates he signed on to and that which is being sponsored by the chief sponsor, the gentleman from Indiana?

Mr. HOYER. I know exactly what it is. It's not identical. There have been some changes which will be included in a manager's amendment. I will make sure that that manager's amendment is available no later than Monday. Essentially what it does is it ensures that it is consistent with the PAYGO rule that we have here in the House and it does somewhat modify it as to the tax cuts that will be effected, that will mirror the budget that was adopted by this House earlier this year. It also directs that CBO scoring be controlling so that we have a neutral arbiter, not an administration, whether it's a Democratic or Republican arbiter, as to

what the costs are. Those are the major changes that I think make it more consistent with what the House's position has been in the past.

Mr. CANTOR. I will just end my comments by indicating that I have read some reports which say—perhaps inaccurately reported or not—that the bill that you expect to come to the floor will not include the discretionary spending cap. The cap certainly would be a necessary thing to limit the double-digit increases that we're seeing in spending this Congress and the appropriations bills that have been coming to the floor. So I will indicate to the gentleman that we certainly will be supportive of those types of common-sense spending caps.

Mr. HOYER. That's very interesting. They weren't in in 1990, they weren't in in 1997, and they weren't in in any proposal you've made to date.

Mr. CANTOR. The gentleman knows we are in extraordinary economic times, and we have got tremendous job loss, and we've got a debt burden that continues to amass that may very well impact the ability for an investment-led recovery.

□ 1515

I would indicate to the gentleman we stand ready to work with him in trying to return to some sense of fiscal sanity in this body.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, JULY 20, 2009

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Monday next for morning-hour debate, and further, Mr. Speaker, when the House adjourns on that day, it adjourn to meet at 10:30 a.m. on Tuesday, July 21, 2009, for morning-hour debate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KRATOVIL). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

CORRECTING ENGROSSMENT OF H. RES. 469

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in the engrossment of House Resolution 469, the Clerk be directed to strike the words "born and" from the first whereas clause on page 1.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

A NEW AMERICAN TRAGEDY

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, there have been some real tragedies

because of the way the economy, in general, has been handled and how the automobile industry, in particular, has been handled.

I received a letter from a lady named Jane Denney from Wabash, Indiana, in my district. She talks about how her family has owned an automobile dealership for the last 75 years. Her husband was the head of all the mechanical work there. He was a service manager. And General Motors was sending all kinds of equipment there and all kinds of supplies, urging and almost mandating that they buy that. They also mandated that they consider buying a Pontiac dealership there, which they did buy.

Then, after they bought the Pontiac dealership and bought all this equipment, General Motors contacted them and said they were going to do away with their dealership, and they did not indicate in any way that they would make restitution for the expenses that these people had to bear. They owe money for the dealership. They owe money for the supplies. They owe money for all of this, and the rug has just been jerked out from under them.

That is an American tragedy, something that should not happen. And the way this government and this administration has handled this and the way the auto companies have handled this is a real tragedy.

Dear Mr. Burton: Thank you for speaking out for the auto dealerships today. My husband's family recently were told they would be closing after 75 years. My husband is the service manager and GM keeps sending him essential tools which he must pay for and cannot send back for new cars they will not send him. They have parts they had to stock but GM won't buy back. In recent years they bought the local Pontiac dealership because GM wanted them to. Now they owe for it and won't be paid by GM for the franchise. I am a teacher and also feel the ISTA was treated unfairly. I cannot believe this is happening in the USA. I am glad I voted for you and appreciate your speaking out for us. I feel so powerless again all that is happening. God bless you.

A CASE FOR THE HIPPOCRATIC OATH FOR CONGRESSMEN

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

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, the economy is in a tough situation, 9.5-plus percent unemployment, 14.7 million people are unemployed. Actually, the number is higher than that.

Since January, 1.9 million foreclosures have occurred. People are losing their homes. Foreclosures are up 9 percent since this President took office.

And today we take up the welfare for wild horses. That's right. We are going to spend \$700 million for wild horses' habitat. But how about the habitat for Americans? We have got the health care effort to socialize medicine. And do you know who gets hurt? The seniors get hurt. We owe them so much better.