

The effects of the sequester extend beyond the gates of our installations and affect entire communities with local businesses standing to lose as a result of belt tightening by families experiencing furloughs.

At the Naval Surface Warfare Center at Indian Head, also in Maryland's Fifth Congressional District, 97 percent of civilian personnel will be furloughed. That's more than 1,870 people.

Mr. Speaker, there's no reason why our civilian defense workers should be kept from doing their job just because Congress hasn't done its job. As long as the sequester remains in effect, and as long as Republicans refuse to compromise on a balanced approach to deficits that can end it, I'll keep coming to this floor and remind them exactly what is at stake. And I continue to call on Speaker BOEHNER to end the unnecessary delay in appointing budget conferees, which would be a significant step toward beginning negotiations in earnest that could lead to a big and balanced compromise on deficits.

We need to bring deficits down. We need to get our country on a fiscally sustainable path, but we need to do so in a rational way which does not undermine our national security, does not undermine the services being rendered to the people who are relying on them, and that does not send a message to our employees and those whom we need to recruit in the future that we are a good employer, we're a caring employer, we're an effective employer, and you ought to work for us, you ought to work for your country, for your fellow citizens.

Mr. Speaker, we need to go to conference. We need to get rid of the sequester. We need to put America on a rational path to fiscal responsibility and effectiveness.

BENGHAZI MATTERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. COBLE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, Benghazi matters, and the American people deserve answers.

On the evening of September 11, 2012, terrorist factions successfully attacked America in Benghazi, Libya, when they torched our consulate and killed four Americans. Early in the morning the following day, they attacked our annex.

Secretary Clinton's response to the American people was that these attacks were in response to a video posted on the Internet. The following Sunday, on September 16, U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations Susan Rice repeated Secretary Clinton's assertion on five separate television talk shows.

Today is July 10, 2013, and we now know that without question these attacks were strategically planned and had no relation to Secretary Clinton or Ambassador Rice's initial assertions. The investigation into our failure to

protect those four Americans who were killed, our consulate, our annex, and the administration's abysmal explanation for informing the American public must continue.

Mr. Speaker, Secretary Clinton appeared before a Senate hearing and was asked about certain facts surrounding the attack. She replied: What difference does it make?

I suggest that Secretary Clinton may want to consult with the survivors of the four Americans who were slain and ask them what difference does it make. I take umbrage with her response, and I think it was done in a rather uncaring and very impersonal way.

Investigating this scandal is our duty and obligation as representatives of the American people and protectors of the public trust. To date, congressional hearings have raised far more questions than answers. We have to look no further than the testimony of Mr. Gregory Hicks before the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. Mr. Hicks is the former Deputy Chief of Mission in Libya, and his testimony is replete with contradictions from what Secretary Clinton and Ambassador Rice and others have told the American public. The matter, Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, smacks of a coverup. We must continue to pursue and develop answers and explanations as to what happened so we will ultimately know what really did occur on that fateful night and ensuing days.

Mr. Speaker, as I said at the outset, Benghazi matters, and we must continue thoroughly to examine this until the truth ultimately surfaces. It matters, and the American public, Americans taxpayers, here, there, and yonder, deserve a final resolution to this episode. I suggest that we continue to keep our eye on the ball, otherwise this is going to disappear into the wind and that would be inexcusable.

CALL TO ACTION ON CLIMATE CHANGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF) for 5 minutes.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, President Obama's call to action on climate change is another reminder of the large and growing threat posed by the warming of our atmosphere. Yet instead of taking a leading role to address the problem, Congress has been held hostage by those who would deny the science altogether. Every day that we delay, we are losing ground in the race to develop new sources of energy that can protect the planet and break the grip of our dependence on fossil fuels.

This past year was one of the most extreme years for our Nation's weather. It was the warmest year on record for the U.S.; and droughts, wildfires, and floods were far more frequent and far more intense. In fact, nine of the 10 hottest years since 1880 have been in the past decade.

In 2012, 9.3 million acres of land across the country burned in wildfires,

more than double the annual average, and the second highest ever. Rainfall was far below the average, and it was one of the driest years in memory. Droughts, heat waves, and wildfires are now the norm rather than the exception.

The extreme weather was also a significant drag on our economy: Superstorm Sandy cost \$65 billion; western wildfires cost over \$1 billion; and losses from drought cost \$30 billion. Greenhouse gases emitted as a result of human activity are the biggest drivers of climate change. That is a fact that is accepted by virtually every scientist around the world.

We're only beginning to understand the impact of a global temperature rise on a nation's long-term environmental health and the health of the world; but with each new report by NASA, by the U.N., by universities here and overseas, we see that the threat grows and the possibility that we can avoid catastrophe and catastrophic consequences in the future recedes.

Some in this body have questioned the science, noting that droughts, floods, and climatic variations have been observed for centuries, often recalling Noah and his ark; but the speed and magnitude of the changes we are witnessing are consistent with scientific modeling of the effects of human activity on the climate. We must act now.

First, we have to diversify our energy sources. Instead of tax breaks for Big Oil, we should be investing in the development of new and renewable energy sources.

Second, we must work to reduce our emissions. Power plants are the single largest source of emissions in the U.S., accounting for roughly 40 percent of all domestic greenhouse gases, and the EPA must put in place Federal standards that will regulate both new and existing power plants.

Third, we must build a 21st-century transportation infrastructure and system that will support a growing economy and population. This means we need to invest in mass transit systems, and car makers must continue to improve fuel economy standards.

□ 1015

And fourth, we need to work with the international community, not against it, as many in this body have tried to do. America must take a leadership role. We need the cooperation of China and India, but we should not let their foot-dragging prevent us from taking actions that will protect our future.

President Obama took an important step in exerting American leadership on climate change when he called for action at the Federal level to curb carbon pollution, just as we limit our toxic chemicals, like mercury, sulfur, and arsenic. The President also wants to allow wind and solar energy companies to use government-owned land to generate more power.

These are good ideas, but a major effort on climate change depends on congressional action, and so far we have

allowed this important issue, one that will affect our children and grandchildren, to become a partisan wedge issue.

This country did not become great by ignoring problems or wishing them away. We did not become great by mocking scientists and those who would rely on cold, hard facts or, in this case, long, hot, endless summers. And we did not become great by ceding leadership in new technologies and new markets to our competitors, like China.

The time to address climate change is now.

IN DEFENSE OF LEGAL IMMIGRATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, America is a Nation of immigrants. We're all either immigrants ourselves or were the sons and daughters of immigrants. America's motto is "E pluribus unum"—"From many, one." From many nations we've created one great Nation, the American Nation.

There's only one way to accomplish this remarkable feat, and that's through the process of assimilation. Unlike other nations, our immigration laws were not written to keep people out. They were written to assure that those who come here demonstrate a sincere desire to become Americans, to acquire a common language, a common culture, and a common appreciation of American constitutional principles and American legal traditions.

Illegal immigration undermines that process of legal immigration that makes our Nation of immigrants possible. If we allow illegal immigration, then legal immigration becomes pointless, the process of assimilation that our immigration laws assure breaks down, and the bonds of allegiance that hold a country like ours together begin to dissolve.

As a recent article by John Fonte of the National Review points out, earlier immigration bills included a provision calling for "patriotic integration of prospective citizens into the American way of life by providing civics, history, and English . . . with a special emphasis on attachment to the principles of the Constitution of the United States, the heroes of American history, and the meaning of the Oath of Allegiance."

But the director of immigration policy for La Raza objected to this language, writing that "while it doesn't overtly mention assimilation, it's very strong on the patriotism and traditional American values language in a way which is potentially dangerous to our communities."

Well, that language is pointedly missing from the Senate measure, suggesting a purpose fundamentally different from past immigration laws. It

raises the question of why groups supporting this bill find the mention of assimilation objectionable and consider patriotism and traditional American values not only disagreeable but, in their word, "dangerous."

Now, to those who say that we need a path to citizenship, I must point out we already have such a path that is followed by millions of legal immigrants who have obeyed all of our laws, who have respected our Nation's sovereignty, who've done everything our country's asked of them to do, including waiting patiently in line, and are now watching millions of illegal immigrants try and cut in line in front of them.

The 1986 Immigration Reform Act promised a balanced approach that combined legalization of the 3 million illegal immigrants then in the country with promises of employer sanctions and tougher border security. As we all know, legalization occurred instantly, but the promises of enforcement were first ignored and, later, actively resisted by the Presidents who followed.

The current administration, for all its rhetoric, has unlawfully suspended enforcement of our existing immigration laws and actively obstructed States from assisting in their enforcement. If this administration will not enforce our existing law, why should anyone believe its promises to enforce even stricter laws in the future?

Now, a common tactic of those on the left is to blur the distinction between legal and illegal immigration and to paint those in opposition to amnesty as "anti-immigrant." This is simply dishonest.

Legal immigration is the very essence of our country. It sets us apart from every other nation in the world, the fact that citizenship is open to all who evince a sincere desire to understand, adopt, and revere those uniquely American principles enshrined in our Declaration of Independence and animated by our American Constitution.

They do so by the thousands, every day, by obeying our immigration laws, renouncing foreign loyalties, and embracing American principles. By doing so, as Lincoln said, they become the "blood of the blood and the flesh of the flesh of the men who wrote that Declaration."

Illegal immigration destroys all of that, and any measure that encourages more of it, by granting special privileges to those who defy our immigration laws, is a direct affront to every legal immigrant who has become an American, and it is a direct challenge to the process of immigration that built our Nation.

To those illegal immigrants who seek citizenship out of a sincere desire to become Americans, I ask only that they respect our laws, and I invite them to begin the process of legal immigration that's already available to them and that's been followed by the millions who've come before them.

RURAL HUNGER IN AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, nearly every week that this House has been in session this year, I've come to the floor to talk about the need to end hunger now. Fourteen speeches later, I still hear from some of my colleagues who doubt that hunger is a problem in the 21st century here in this country, the richest, most prosperous Nation in the world.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I hope that anyone who doubts that we have a hunger problem in America has a chance to read the article by Eli Saslow in Sunday's Washington Post, titled, "Driving Away Hunger," subtitled, "In Rural Tennessee, a New Way to Help Hungry Children, A Bus Turned Bread Truck."

Mr. Speaker, this is a heartwrenching story of hunger, where children of all ages have trouble getting enough food in the summer months in rural Tennessee. It breaks your heart.

The article may focus on a small area in rural Tennessee, but it really tells the story about the 50 million hungry Americans in this country, and more specifically, the 17 million kids who are hungry in this country.

And the blame shouldn't be cast on these poor Americans who are doing their best to make ends meet. Consider the Laghrene family portrayed in this article. Jennifer, a mother of five, works full-time as a cook at a nursing home. Yet her kids don't have enough to eat because Jennifer only makes \$8 an hour.

SNAP helps during the school year when kids get to eat two meals a day at school. Combined, these five kids, ranging from 14 years old to 9 months old, ate a total of 40 free meals and snacks at school every week, but there's very little help during the summer months when school is out of session.

While the \$593 food stamp allotment lasted throughout the month during the school year, Jennifer only had \$73 in food stamps left, with 17 days to go in the month that she was interviewed for this article in The Washington Post.

And if that weren't enough to convince people about this ugly side of hunger, consider this heartbreaking paragraph from the article.

Desperation had become their permanent state, defining each of their lives in different ways. For Courtney, it meant that she had stayed rail thin, with hand-me-down jeans that fell low on her hips. For Taylor, 14, it meant stockpiling calories whenever food was available, ingesting enough processed sugar and salt to bring on a doctor's lecture about obesity and the early onset of diabetes, the most common risks of a food stamp diet. For Anthony, 9, it meant moving out of the trailer and usually living at his grandparents' farm. For Hannah, 7, it meant her report card had been sent home with a handwritten note of the teacher's concerns, one of