

levels—much higher than they should be. The fact is, we need to reform this program—and we need to encourage work. The 1996 welfare-reform law brought millions of children out of poverty. By strengthening work requirements in SNAP, we can build on the bipartisan work started in the 1990s and reduce poverty. This farm bill is a missed opportunity. Despite making modest changes, the legislation doesn't pursue real reform.

I want to commend Chairman LUCAS for bringing good ideas to the table. But I'm afraid this bill has serious flaws, and therefore I must vote no.

IN HONOR OF THE STATE OF
WEST VIRGINIA'S SESQUICENTENNIAL

HON. DAVID B. MCKINLEY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 20, 2013

Mr. MCKINLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the 150th birthday of West Virginia's statehood. As a seventh generation West Virginian, I am proud of the special history of the Mountain State.

On June 20, 1863, West Virginia became the 35th state in the country. While the Civil War divided the nation, few states faced more internal strife because of the conflict than Virginia. Bitter relations between eastern and western Virginians had been growing for years before the Civil War as people living in both regions were divided geographically, culturally, economically and politically. After Virginia voted to secede from the Union on April 17, 1861, people living in western Virginia pushed for the creation of a new state by formally petitioning President Abraham Lincoln for statehood.

A public referendum on the issue of statehood passed on October 24, 1861, and a constitutional convention held in my hometown of Wheeling in February 1862 produced a constitution that was intensely debated, with one controversial issue being the emancipation of slaves. The first draft of the new state constitution was not well received by the U.S. Senate because it contained no emancipation clause, so the Willey Amendment, which called for the gradual emancipation of slaves, was added. It apparently worked. The measure passed by a vote of 23 to 17. After another contentious debate, the measure passed the House on December 10, 1862, by a vote of 96 to 55.

In late December 1862, President Lincoln turned to his Cabinet for advice on whether the legislation that would create the state of West Virginia was constitutional. He received contradictory opinions, and no consensus. Lincoln agonized over his decision and weighed arguments from both sides before announcing his decision. On New Year's Eve 1862 he signed the bill that gave birth to West Virginia.

It was a controversial decision that scholars continue to debate to this day, mainly because the petition for statehood was approved by the government representing the territory that would become West Virginia and not the territory that would remain Virginia. Lincoln recognized the questionable nature of the state's creation, noting that "a measure made expedient by a war, is no precedent for times of

peace." But he said he signed the bill because he could not afford to lose the support of loyal West Virginians.

"Her brave and good men regard her admission into the Union as a matter of life and death," the president said in his written opinion. "They have been true to the Union under very severe trials.

"We have so acted as to justify their hopes; and we cannot fully retain their confidence, and cooperation, if we seem to break faith with them."

After the Civil War, the new state experienced an era of unprecedented industrial development with burgeoning industries based on its rich natural resources—coal, oil, natural gas and timber—along with the construction of hundreds of miles of new railroads that helped to open up the Mountain State to trade with the world. By the turn of the century, West Virginia had grown to become a significant contributor to the nation's industrialization and expansion.

While the state remains a leader in energy, it also is a global supplier of chemicals and a national hub for biotech industries. Its diverse economy now includes aerospace, automotive, healthcare and education, metals and steels, media and telecommunications, manufacturing, hospitality, biometrics, forestry, and tourism.

West Virginia also is a great place for outdoor recreation with 32 state parks, Alpine and Nordic ski areas, whitewater rafting, and other attractions, such as The Greenbrier resort in White Sulphur Springs and the Summit Bechtel Family National Scout Reserve in Glen Jean. The state's beautiful mountains, lakes and rivers, low crime rate, and other lifestyle factors continue to draw tourists and retirees alike.

From its difficult beginnings until today, West Virginians have remained "true to the Union," as Lincoln said. More than 500,000 West Virginians have answered the call of duty since the Revolutionary War. More than 10,000 West Virginians have given their lives in combat, and the state, though only 1.8 million strong, leads the country in the number of military veterans per capita.

As the only state born of the Civil War and the only state formed by presidential decree, West Virginia proudly celebrates its sesquicentennial.

LETTER TO THE SPEAKER URGING
THE CREATION OF A HOUSE SELECT COMMITTEE ON THE TERRORIST ATTACK ON THE U.S. CONSULATE IN BENGHAZI, LIBYA

HON. FRANK R. WOLF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 20, 2013

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I submit a copy of my June 19, 2013 letter again urging the creation of a bipartisan Select Committee to investigate the terrorist attack on the U.S. consulate and annex in Benghazi last September.

There are only five legislative weeks left before the one-year anniversary of the attacks. Yet there remain too many unanswered questions resulting from too few public hearings with key witnesses who were present the night of the attack.

That's why 158 Members have cosponsored H. Res. 36 to create a Select Committee to conduct a full investigation with public hearings. The Select Committee has also been endorsed by family members of the Benghazi victims, more than 700 retired Special Operations officials and the Federal Law Enforcement Officers Association.

I urge the prompt creation of a Select Committee to ensure the American people learn the truth.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

June 19, 2013.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House, House of Representatives,
The Capitol.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: The American people are losing confidence in their government. The tragedy in Benghazi, along with a stream of recent controversies, including the IRS and the Justice Department's targeting of reporters at Fox News and the Associated Press, as well as the ambiguity about recently disclosed programs at the National Security Agency, are eroding public trust in the institutions of government.

This diminishing of public confidence isn't limited to the Executive Branch. Congress' approval rating is at an all-time low. A June 14 National Journal article said, "Nearly 8 in 10 Americans told Gallup pollsters this month that they disapprove of the way Congress is handling its job, the 45th consecutive month that more than two-thirds of Americans graded Congress poorly. The problem isn't as much what Congress is doing as what it is not getting done." I believe most Americans would agree that one of the items "not getting done" is a thorough, comprehensive and ultimately definitive investigation into the response to the Benghazi attacks.

That is why I have been pushing so hard for a bipartisan Select Committee to investigate the September 11, 2012 terrorist attack in Benghazi. The response among most of our colleagues and the public has been overwhelming. Since January, when I proposed including the Select Committee in the House Rules package for the 113th Congress, more than two-thirds of House Republicans—a majority of the majority—have cosponsored my bill, H. Res. 36, to create the Select Committee. Since that time, there has been a growing chorus of support. The bill has been endorsed by the parents of some of the victims, by more than 700 retired Special Operations officials, by the Federal Law Enforcement Officers Associations, which represents the State Department security officers who were on the ground in Benghazi, and by The Wall Street Journal editorial page in addition to dozens of other commentators, former diplomats and military officials. I believe this broad support speaks to the public's hunger for clear answers on Benghazi—answers which to date have been elusive. That is why more than nine months after the devastating attack, my resolution continues to add new cosponsors; it now has the support of 158 Republicans.

I recognize that "regular order" has made some progress over the last six months; most notably Chairman Issa's constructive hearing with several State Department whistleblowers. I also understand that Chairman McKeon has planned a hearing with Gen. Carter Ham for next week, but like so many of these hearings, this, too, will be held behind closed doors. There is no reason Gen. Ham's testimony shouldn't be public. This latest classified hearing is symptomatic of a broader problem with respect to the current congressional approach to investigating Benghazi: Too much has been done in a piecemeal fashion, behind closed doors,

thereby robbing the American people of clear answers to important questions surrounding the murder of a sitting U.S. ambassador and three civilian employees, and the grievous injury of untold others.

Deuteronomy 16:20 tells us, "Justice, justice shalt thou pursue." As we quietly marked the nine-month anniversary of the attacks last week, I know many people wondered if there will ever be any clear resolution to this investigation, let alone justice.

Writing about Benghazi in *The Wall Street Journal* last month, columnist Peggy Noonan pondered, "Was all this incompetence? Or was it politics disguised as the fog of war? Who called these shots and made these decisions? Who decided to do nothing?"

More than nine months later, the Congress still cannot answer these questions. No one has been held responsible for the failure to respond that night. A few mid-level career officials have been penalized, but ultimately those senior officials who were in the position to actually say the buck stops here—cabinet secretaries and political appointees at the White House, State Department, Defense Department and CIA—have emerged unscathed, and in some cases, seemingly the better for it.

Consider that former Secretary Clinton now earns hundreds of thousands of dollars for every speech she gives, former Secretary Panetta just signed a \$3 million book deal and former CIA Director Petraeus recently joined an investment firm in New York.

Similarly, several other administration officials associated with the Benghazi response to the attack have been promoted. Ambassador Rice has been promoted to national security advisor, then-deputy national security advisor Dennis McDonough has been promoted to White House chief of staff, and then-White House chief of staff Jack Lew has been promoted to Treasury Secretary.

If all responsible for the government's response to Benghazi have been rewarded with lucrative contracts or promotions within the administration, what signal does this send to the American people about accountability?

Mr. Speaker, we're fast approaching the Independence Day recess. We will only have four legislative weeks in July before the August recess. When we return in September we will be just days away from the one-year anniversary of the Benghazi attacks.

We must not wait until the second year of this investigation to commit the focused resources of a Select Committee in pursuit of government accountability and, ultimately, truth. Sources are disappearing and leads are drying up. The Select Committee legislation needs to be swiftly brought to the floor for a vote, so the House can hold public hearings over the summer—focused exclusively on the core issues about why no assistance was sent to the Americans under fire in Benghazi—and attempt to provide a final public report by the first anniversary of this attack.

You have a number of committee chairman who would be excellent at leading the Select Committee. Chairman Issa has shown in his hearing with the State Department whistleblowers that he would be a good chairman. Similarly, Chairman Royce, Chairman Rogers, Chairman McKeon, Chairman Goodlatte and Chairman McCaul are all strong leaders and would ably chair a Select Committee. Further, we have a lot of talent in our conference to draw from. There are a number of newer members who have proven themselves to be capable and insightful investigators. You could consider appointing some of them to the Select Committee, too.

As I mentioned earlier, a number of new controversies involving the Obama Administration have surfaced in recent months that demand the committees' full attention. This is all the more reason to take the best of the

best under a Select Committee to build, at no additional cost, on the work that has already been done through regular order. There would be no need to start over, as some have tried to say. Nor would there be additional costs—the resolution specifically states that we should use existing resources.

We owe it to the families of the Benghazi victims and to the not yet named survivors, whose lives will be indelibly marked by the wounds they endured protecting the annex, to honor their sacrifice and their service. Harkening back to Deuteronomy, we must pursue justice on their behalf, recognizing their heroism and an accounting for the failures in leadership that left them exposed and vulnerable. We also owe it to the men and women who serve our country now and in the years ahead to restore confidence that if they come under fire, we will make every effort to come to their defense. For these reasons alone, we should not give up on this issue.

I am afraid that if we don't move on a Select Committee, we'll never find out the truth. Just as *The Wall Street Journal* editorial page in May said, "A Select Committee is the only means available now for the U.S. political system to extricate itself from the labyrinth called Benghazi."

The need for a Select Committee is underscored by the difficulty we're having getting answers on a number of current investigations. Consider that in the case of the IRS scandal, both the Ways and Means Committee and the Oversight and Government Reform Committee have opened up independent investigations that will likely take significant resources for months to come. It is important that they investigate, and they are doing an excellent job. But despite these efforts, much remains unknown about the IRS scandal—which involves only a single agency and does not have to deal with sensitive, classified information—including whether the political targeting of groups was confined to the Cincinnati office or was actually directed by Washington. We still don't have a clear answer.

In comparison, the Benghazi case cuts across multiple national security agencies and the White House involving sensitive information, thereby putting it in a league of its own among the various scandal investigations. Also of great interest is the increasing concern that the FBI is being used by various agencies as an excuse to avoid answering questions on Benghazi, especially as this investigation drags on longer. The American people should be troubled by the anemic pace of the FBI's investigation of those responsible for the attacks. Nearly a year later, the U.S. does not have a single suspect in custody. The Tunisians released one suspect earlier this year, after making the FBI wait for months to interview him. Another person of significant interest has been held since last fall by the Egyptian government, a recipient of billions of dollars in U.S. foreign assistance, but they will not allow the FBI to interview him.

Even more concerning, last month the Associated Press reported that the FBI allegedly has identified five men believed to be responsible for the Benghazi attacks, but won't detain them because it does not have enough evidence to try them in a U.S. civilian court. For the U.S. to know the identities and possible locations of those who killed four Americans and fail to take action immediately because the administration insists on an Article III trial is shameful. For these reasons, any worthwhile Benghazi investigation must also consider how the Justice Department has managed its investigation into the terrorists over the last year.

Despite these serious issues, much of the House's investigation on Benghazi to date

has centered on secondary discussions like the "talking points" and the Accountability Review Board process, to the detriment of more fundamental issues like the administration's apparent abandonment of Americans who were facing a deadly siege.

On the issues that matter most, there is nothing that happened that deadly night in Benghazi that can't be addressed in a public hearing and accompanying report of findings. There are ways to protect classified information while still allowing the public to learn what actually happened that night. There is no legitimate reason that the public shouldn't know what calls for help were made from Benghazi, who received those calls and, most importantly, why no support was sent to the Americans under siege. There is no reason that officials in the chain of command at various agencies shouldn't be asked to answer publicly why no effort was made to rescue those in Benghazi.

It has been repeated often that there were no military assets in the region that could have responded in time to stop the initial attack on the consulate. But when the attacks started, no one could have known whether it would last eight minutes, eight hours, or eight days, or longer. It appears that not even a single plane was scrambled. We can't help but draw the deeply troubling conclusion that within minutes of the attack, the decision was made that the battle was lost and the Americans left there would be collateral damage in the greater War on Terror.

If our government never sent a plane to help defend the annex, it begs the question: Did they even send an American plane to get the bodies and survivors out of Benghazi after the attacks? There's no reason the public should not learn the answer to this question, too.

As Lt. Gen. William G. Boykin (ret.) and other former Special Operations officials have noted, a bedrock American ethos—that our nation never leaves anyone behind on the battlefield—was shattered that night in Benghazi. No one came to rescue them despite pleas for help. More than nine months later, too many questions remain unanswered: Who took the call that night? What were they told and how did they respond? Why was the determination made not to intervene in a horrific assault on a U.S. diplomat and his brave support staff?

In the dangerous world in which we live there are undoubtedly hard fought battles where American blood is spilled, and lives lost—our nation is painfully aware of this reality through our experience in distant lands like Iraq and Afghanistan. But Benghazi was an unanticipated battlefield where terrorist elements seized on the occasion of the anniversary of 9/11 to strike at an American outpost abroad. They did so with deadly consequence, and their attack was met with silence from a superpower.

This is a black mark on our national history. It emboldens others with similarly gruesome aims. It leaves vulnerable Americans serving in dangerous posts. And ultimately, the lack of transparency from the various government agencies and entities involved undermines the faith of the American people in their government.

This is a less obvious "casualty" of that dark day, but it has lasting implications which we as public servants know well. For in a functioning democracy there is a sacred trust that must exist between the government and the governed and that trust is precipitously eroding.

As the *Wall Street Journal* noted in its May editorial, "Let Benghazi's chips fall. The House should appoint a Select Committee."

Best wishes.

Sincerely,

FRANK R. WOLF,
Member of Congress.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. HAROLD ROGERS

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 20, 2013

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 251 on the passage of the District of Columbia Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act, I am not recorded because I was absent due to illness. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

FEDERAL AGRICULTURE REFORM
AND RISK MANAGEMENT ACT OF
2013

SPEECH OF

HON. TAMMY DUCKWORTH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 19, 2013

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1947) to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2018, and for other purposes:

Ms. DUCKWORTH. Mr. Chair, the Farm Bill that we are considering today includes massive cuts to the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) program—\$20.5 billion to be exact.

I am offering an amendment that will help us understand the repercussions of these drastic cuts.

My amendment will require the Secretary of Agriculture to report to Congress on the effects of SNAP cuts on charitable food providers, like food banks and soup kitchens. Should these devastating cuts become law, it is common sense that we should know the consequences—my amendment is about taking responsibility.

There is little room to cut this vital program. The average SNAP benefit is now only \$4.50 a day. That's just \$1.50 a meal. And this benefit will get even lower in November when the 2009 Recovery Act increase expires.

The reality is that these cuts will significantly increase demand on charitable food providers who are already stretched to the limit trying to meet the needs of our communities during this tough economic time.

These providers are facing the perfect storm—over the past few years demand for their services has been increasing as the federal, state and local, and private funding they depend on has dwindled. Higher food and fuel prices are also making it harder for them to purchase and distribute food.

Charities simply do not have the resources to fill the growing funding gaps. This means that when the SNAP program faces further cuts, hungry Americans will have nowhere else to turn.

I hope every Member in this body will agree that in the wealthiest nation in the world, no American child should go to school hungry and no parent should have to make the difficult decision between paying rent or paying for groceries. This is simply unconscionable.

At this point we've all heard the numbers—these cuts will end food aid for nearly 2 million

Americans and cut 210,000 children off of school lunch and breakfast programs.

This is a very personal issue for me. I was one of those hungry children. My father lost his job when I was a teenager and it was food stamps that kept me from going hungry. Food stamps, school breakfast and school lunch were there for me so I could worry about school instead of hunger. They nourished me so I could develop the skills to serve our country in the Army, the VA, and here in Congress.

This is also very personal for many of my constituents like Christine from Elgin, Illinois. It is because of her SNAP benefits and the Willow Creek Community Church's Food Pantry that Christine is able to provide food for her family. Her husband was laid off from the manufacturing company he worked at for 29 years. Christine, who is now disabled, can no longer work as a Nursing Assistant. Theirs is one of 3,000 families that Willow Creek Community Church in South Barrington, Illinois serves per month.

It is personal for the husband and wife who now count on SNAP benefits and the Church of the Holy Spirit Food Pantry in Schaumburg, IL after the husband lost his job as an electrician due to nerve damage in his hand, and they saw their savings quickly drain.

It is personal for the hard working employees and volunteers at the Greater Chicago Food Depository who serve 77 percent more people today than they did in 2008.

These stories are just a tiny sample. Forty-seven million Americans—most of whom are children, elderly or disabled—rely on the SNAP program.

These cuts are not just numbers on a page. They affect real human beings. They will have devastating consequences for real families.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment and face the reality of what these devastating cuts will mean for families and charities all across the country.

PANCREATIC CANCER AWARENESS

HON. LORETTA SANCHEZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 20, 2013

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to draw awareness to the impact of pancreatic cancer in the United States.

My staff and I have had recent conversations with individuals from my district on the effects of pancreatic cancer on their lives and their loved ones.

Last Congress, we came together to support the Recalcitrant Cancer Research Act which provides the strategic direction and guidance needed to make true progress.

These strategic plans are desperately needed in these types of cancers for which we have made so little progress.

Pancreatic cancer is still the only major cancer with a five-year survival rate in the single digits at just 6 percent; there are still no early detection tools or life-saving treatments.

The answers that could lead to changing the statistics for pancreatic cancer could lie in one of the grants currently under review at the National Cancer Institute (NCI). However, we may never realize the potential because cuts to the NCI's budget are resulting in good grants being thrown out with the trash.

We cannot let this situation continue. I therefore urge my colleagues to support a permanent fix to sequestration and provide the resources needed to conquer these deadly cancers.

ALAMOSA COUNTY COLORADO
TRIBUTE**HON. SCOTT R. TIPTON**

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 20, 2013

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 100th anniversary of Alamosa County, Colorado. In these past-paced times, we often overlook the foundations of America—small towns with hard-working people.

Since 1913, Alamosa has been a model of American values, with a proud heritage of honest, hard work, perseverance and community. As the legend goes, Alamosa, originally intended as a rail center for the Rio Grande Railroad, was built from the ground up practically over-night. Industrious from the outset, the citizens of Alamosa built the town with bricks forged from local clay and fired in the city's own kiln.

It's this spirit of industry that drives Alamosa County's 9,000 residents today. It provides opportunities for the next generation to grow and prosper at Adams State College and Trinidad State College, in one of Colorado's most diverse landscapes that boasts the Great Sand Dunes National Park and the Alamosa National Wildlife Refuge.

Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to recognize the 100th anniversary of Alamosa County and pay tribute to the people, past and present, who have built this community and continue to embody hard work and dedication, values which have made our country strong.

COMMEMORATING THE 50TH
ANNIVERSARY OF ACDI/VOCA**HON. JOHN GARAMENDI**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 20, 2013

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, it is my great pleasure to congratulate ACDI/VOCA on the occasion of their 50th anniversary. This outstanding organization was founded in 1963 with the mission of empowering people around the world to take advantage of economic opportunities and improve quality of life for their families and communities. To this date, ACDI/VOCA continues to fulfill this mission, as they help millions of individuals and families fight their way out of poverty. Their notable accomplishments include contributing to the launch of the Green Revolution in India, strengthening Ethiopian co-ops to bring their coffee into global prominence, and pioneering grassroots financial services across the former Soviet Union. With a staff comprised of 90 percent locally-hired employees, and working through a network of over 3,000 local partner organizations, ACDI/VOCA combines the best in international development expertise with powerful grassroots capacities to implement effective programming that has a real and sustained impact. I commend ACDI/VOCA on their history of outstanding service and am confident