A couple of opening comments. I

agree with Mr. Rohrabacher that this attack demonstrates that

Iran perceives us as weak and not without good reason. I will point

out that we have got a number of people in the audience with yellow

T-shirts that remind us that 450 days ago, a court declared

that the State Department should carry out the law, since they

don’t carry out the other laws we pass given about Iran, it is about

time that the judicial branch as well as the legislative branch can

be frustrated. But in this case, I would say that the only time that

the administration wants to—seems to really want to enforce our

terrorist laws with regard to Iran or the only time that they can

be accused of going overboard is with an entity that is an anathema

to the government that is trying to kill people on American

soil.

I want to focus on the airplanes that Iran Air and Mahan Air acquired

in the 1970s. These have General Electric engines. The engines

need repair and are unsafe. A number of our colleagues

joined with me in a letter saying that the planes should be grounded

until Iran changes its policy and that we should not repair

them. Under Secretary Sherman, is it still the position of the State

Department that we should grant a license to repair these planes?

Well, obviously there are a lot of

unsafe planes in the air. It is our responsibility to bring those to

the attention of world aviation authorities. But it is interesting

that other unsafe planes aren’t being fixed because nobody will pay

to fix them. We are not going to fix planes in Africa, but—or any

other poor part of the world. So we don’t mind there being unsafe

planes, except where Iran is willing to pay to make them safe. You

point out that these are ‘‘civilian planes.’’ These planes unify the

purpose of today’s hearing. These supposedly civilian planes or at

least other supposedly civilian planes owned by Mahan Air and

owned by Air Iran are used to take weapons and thugs from Iran

to Syria to kill the Syrian people. Now, I would say that is contributing

to the unsafety of civilians and yet the State Department in

a desire to once again, I don’t know, eviscerate our sanctions is

supportive of this license. The idea that it is fine for thousands of

Syrians to die at the hands of Iranian weapons and Iranian thugs,

that is okay, but we have got to make sure that the planes that

the thugs use are safe.

Now, let me turn to another issue. Under CISADA, we directed

the State Department to prevent—to sanction those firms that give

Iran the technology to suppress the Internet, and there is a Chinese

company that is—that we have great concerns is just about

to do that, recently having sold Iran Internet monitoring equipment.

The State Department, consistent with its policy under the Iran

Sanctions Act, has a policy of just ignoring the law and has refused

to identify any item of equipment that would trigger this provision

of CISADA. I know it has taking you 450 days to deal with the

court decision and this is less time than that. Any chance that the

State Department will, since this committee passed at least at the

committee level, a provision directing you to do so, identify those

items of equipment that are sanctionable under CISADA dealing

with Internet suppression?

Any chance you will get it done

within 450 days?

Any chance you will get it done

under the current administration?

Given the fact that Iran is engaged

in an act of war against the United States, you would think

that the State Department could act a little more quickly. Finally,

is there any chance that you are going to sanction any multinational

corporation under the Iran Sanctions Act for Investment

in the Iranian oil sector except for those companies owned by Iran

themselves?

Sanctions under the Iran Sanctions

Act, can you identify one company not owned by Iran that

was subject to sanctions for investment in the Iranian oil sector?