

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

House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Monday next for morning-hour debate, and further, when the House adjourns on that day, it adjourn to meet at 10:30 a.m. on Tuesday, June 9, 2009, for morning-hour debate.

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

There was no objection.

**PERMISSION TO FILE REPORT ON
H.R. 2454, AMERICAN CLEAN EN-
ERGY AND SECURITY ACT**

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Energy and Commerce may have until 11:59 p.m. on Friday, June 5, to file its report to accompany H.R. 2454.

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

There was no objection.

**GENERAL MOTORS AND HEALTH
CARE REFORM**

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

Mr. DINGELL. We all know the terrible situation in the auto industry and in the Nation in general. On Monday, General Motors filed for Chapter 11 bankruptcy. I know that GM will emerge from the court poised to again lead the world in the automotive sector, but the process will be painful. The company will cut 21,000 employees, 34 percent of its workforce; and this does not include elimination of 2,600 more dealers. Furthermore, it comes on the heels of Chrysler's layoffs and downsizing.

Unfortunately, this problem is not at an end. A recent study for the Center for Automotive Research shows that when you include jobs losses from suppliers and other companies tied to GM and Chrysler, we could see 250,000 jobs, or more, lost over the next 19 months.

This week GM announced they are closing the Willow Run transmission plant in Ypsilanti Township, Michigan, in my district, along with 13 other plants, six of them in Michigan. By 2010, 1,110 more GM workers will lose their jobs in my district. This is associated with not just loss of jobs and retirement, but loss of comprehensive health care for our people. This becomes now a major reason for us to pass major health care reform and a greater reason to see to it that we address this problem of health care reform and legacy costs so that our industry will not be destroyed.

**THE IMPORTANCE OF NUCLEAR
ENERGY TO AMERICA**

(Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California asked and was given permission

to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, I listened with interest to the President as he spoke in Egypt today. There are a lot of things to talk about, but in 1 minute you can't talk about most of them.

Let me just make one comment. It was interesting that the President made a very pointed statement that the country of Iran deserves to have the opportunity to use nuclear power in a peaceful way. I find it very interesting that the President thought that that was a part of energy that he ought to emphasize overseas.

My question is this: When will the President, when will his administration, when will this House understand that energy produced from nuclear power is appropriate not only for Iran and other countries around the world, but for the 50 States in the Union? When will the President understand that nuclear energy is a source that we ought to look at? And as the President gives us his various plans under the climate change rhetoric, why does he not realize the importance of nuclear energy for his own people?

**STOP E-VERIFY DELAYS AND
PROTECT AMERICAN WORKERS**

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, 13 million Americans are out of work, but 8 million illegal immigrants hold jobs in the United States. Yet the Obama administration has just delayed for the third time a requirement that Federal contractors use E-Verify to make sure that they hire legal workers. U.S. citizens and legal immigrant workers should not have to compete with illegal immigrants for employment, especially taxpayer-funded Federal contract jobs. The Federal Government has several hundred billion dollars worth of contracts, each with good jobs that rightfully belong to American workers. E-Verify is the best tool to ensure job security for them. E-Verify works. It immediately confirms 99.6 percent of work-eligible employees. More than 127,000 companies now use E-Verify, and Federal contractors should be required to use it. The Obama administration should put American workers first. They must stop delaying the requirement that Federal contractors hire legal workers.

□ 2045

HEALTH CARE REFORM

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

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, Republicans stand for health care reform, and there are a number of things that we think should be a part of it.

Number 1, we want good intelligence. We want high technology so that Americans can figure out what are the best procedures, who are the best doctors, who are the best providers, and what are the best prices. We think we should take advantage of all the IT that is out there.

Number 2, we want medical savings accounts. We believe that the market should be put into action so that people can save money and be incentivized to put some of that money in their pocket if they don't spend it by the end of the day.

Number 3, we don't believe that health care decisions should be made by insurance companies, HMOs or Washington bureaucrats.

Number 4, we believe there should be less frivolous lawsuits. We certainly want to protect the tort laws in America, but we don't want frivolous lawsuits.

Number 5, we believe the patient-doctor relationship should be preserved and that we should not have a British-, Canadian- or German-style centralized government planning where the doctor-patient relationship is destroyed.

**WHY ARE AUTOMOBILE
DEALERSHIPS BEING CLOSED?**

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

Mr. MORAN of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to express confusion and concern. For much of the week, I have tried to find an answer to the question about why automobile dealerships across the country are being closed. I thought maybe this week I would return to Washington, D.C., and find the solution, that someone would know and provide an explanation. I cannot understand how closing automobile dealerships, those who sell automobiles, is advantageous to the bottom line, the profit of General Motors or Chrysler. This can't be a market-based decision. There must be some political consideration that is ongoing to encourage these dealerships to be closed.

The closing of those dealerships is devastating to communities as well as the businesses that we are closing, and at the same time provide no economic improvement in the bottom line of our automobile manufacturers.

So, Mr. Speaker, I again ask those of my colleagues and those at the White House, the automobile task force, is it a political consideration that is occurring to encourage General Motors and Chrysler to disenfranchise their franchisees or is there some market-based decision on which this is based? And yet no one can provide that answer.

**THE INTELLIGENCE COMMITTEE
LACKS INFORMATION FROM THE
SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE**

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