

full name is pronounced tah-DAY-oosh mah-zoh-VYET-skee) helped broaden it into an antibureaucratic social movement that became known as Solidarity.

He and his friend Bronislaw Geremek, a historian, persuaded 64 leading intellectuals, scholars, scientists and cultural figures to sign a petition that read in part: "In this struggle the place of the entire progressive intelligentsia is at their side. That is the Polish tradition, and that is the imperative of the hour."

Mr. Walesa thanked Mr. Mazowiecki and told him that he had a continued need for help from intellectuals in addressing government officials. Mr. Mazowiecki helped write the historic Aug. 31 agreement that ended the strike and established Solidarity by guaranteeing workers' rights to form independent trade unions with the right to strike.

The Communist government nonetheless felt threatened by Solidarity's mounting influence, and declared martial law on Dec. 13, 1981, making Solidarity and other pro-democracy groups illegal. As tanks rolled through Warsaw, Mr. Mazowiecki was arrested and imprisoned for more than a year. After his release, he was again one of Mr. Walesa's closest advisers.

The Polish economy worsened, and in 1988 Mr. Walesa and Mr. Mazowiecki coordinated a strike at the Gdansk shipyard. That strike brought no concessions. But a second, bigger strike brought the Communists to the negotiating table.

The Polish primate, Cardinal Jozef Glemp, appointed Mr. Mazowiecki a mediator, and he arranged the series of talks between the Communists and Solidarity that led to plans for quasi-free parliamentary elections in which a newly legal Solidarity would be allowed to participate.

In the June 1989 vote, Solidarity won overwhelmingly in the districts it was allowed to contest and, after parliamentary maneuvering with minor parties, was able to form a government. Gen. Wojciech Jaruzelski, head of the Communist government, asked Mr. Walesa for three candidates, of which he would select one as a Solidarity prime minister. He chose Mr. Mazowiecki. Many believed the Vatican influenced his choice, given Mr. Mazowiecki's role as an influential editor of Catholic weeklies and monthlies that promoted the social gospel underlying Solidarity's ideology.

Mr. Mazowiecki's V-for-victory sign to the chamber on appointment became the symbol of Poland's triumph over Communism.

The Communists retained control of the armed services, the police and the secret service, and Mr. Mazowiecki had to pledge to keep Poland in the Warsaw Pact, Moscow's military alliance. Still, he said in 2004, "I had this very strong conviction that we will make it, that we will be able to build the foundations for a democratic state."

He promised no "witch hunts" against the old government, saying it was "right and wise" to offer democracy to all Poles. When asked if he would be a Catholic prime minister or a prime minister of Solidarity, he replied: "Is there any contradiction between the two? I would like to reconcile the two."

At first, Mr. Mazowiecki told an interviewer, he was "terrified." With Poland facing staggering foreign debt, hyperinflation and a bankrupt treasury, he had reason to be. He had no choice but to accept harsh, unpopular conditions—including a wage freeze and an end to consumer subsidies—to secure a \$700 million loan from the International Monetary Fund.

With no economic experience and little charisma, he was defeated when he ran for president in 1990. Mr. Walesa was elected.

Tadeusz Mazowiecki was born on April 18, 1927, in the city of Plock, in central Poland.

His brother died in a Nazi concentration camp in World War II.

Mr. Mazowiecki studied law at the University of Warsaw but did not graduate. In 1953 he began editing a Catholic weekly, but was eventually fired because of his opposition to the Communist government. He started an organization of Catholic intellectuals and a new Catholic monthly.

In 1961 he was elected to the Polish Parliament, where he led the opposition to the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia in 1968 and unsuccessfully pushed for an investigation of the police massacre of striking Gdansk shipyard workers in 1971. As a result, he was barred from running for re-election in 1972. He then devoted himself to building alliances between the intelligentsia of the left and the fledgling Polish labor movement.

Mr. Mazowiecki, a tall, gaunt man with large, sad eyes, went on to hold various official and unofficial posts in Poland's government. In 1992 he was appointed envoy of the United Nations to war-torn Bosnia. He resigned in 1995 over what he regarded as the international community's insufficient response to atrocities there.

He was married twice; both wives died. He had three sons, Wojciech, Adam and Michal.

NEW HEALTH CARE REFORM PRODUCTS

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

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, over the past few months, I have come to the House floor to sound the alarm regarding the emptiness of the promises the President made when he sold his health care law, promises such as: if you like your health care plan, you can keep it, and that premiums would drop by \$2,500. Those promises, Mr. Speaker, are now on the ash heap of history.

Here is what I am hearing from my district: a woman from Allegheny County recently showed me the letter she got from her insurance company. The letter begins, "This is to inform you that we will discontinue your health care plan on December 31, 2013."

A father in the north hills of Pittsburgh tells me his family's coverage is also being terminated next year.

Another woman from the north hills wrote to tell me that she gets insurance through her employer, a small business, but that her share of the premiums are tripling.

When a product comes with a promise that is broken, you take it back and look for a new product. The Empowering Patients First Act and the American Health Care Reform Act are just some examples of possible new health care reform products that we can look at. There are solutions that empower consumers and not Washington elites, and they are a good place to start.

CYBERSECURITY AWARENESS MONTH

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

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I, too, want to join my colleagues in offering

condolences on the passing of the gentleman from Missouri, Ike Skelton. He was a wonderful Member, a mentor, and a dear friend. And let me say how much he will sadly be missed. He is in our thoughts and prayers, as is his family, in this difficult time.

Mr. Speaker, as cochair of the Congressional Cybersecurity Caucus, today I rise to commend the efforts of the Department of Homeland Security, the National Cybersecurity Alliance, the Multi-State Information Sharing and Analysis Center, and other organizations working to improve cybersecurity in the United States on the 10th anniversary of National Cybersecurity Awareness Month.

Throughout October, these organizations and public and private sector partners have worked tirelessly to create events and initiatives across the country to educate Americans about cybersecurity and increase the resiliency of our Nation's cyber-infrastructure.

Cyberspace today is inextricably linked to every aspect of our daily lives; and efforts such as these are crucial to creating a safe, secure, and resilient cyber-environment. I hope my colleagues will join me in congratulating all who have made Cybersecurity Awareness Month a success.

CONGRATULATING MARY PATRICIA HECTOR

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize an everyday hero, a young constituent of mine who has set an example we would all do well to follow.

Mary Patricia Hector, a 15-year-old from Lithonia, Georgia, refused to sit idly by while children across the Nation died in playgrounds, while funerals outnumbered graduation ceremonies, and where violence beget more violence.

Mary Pat channeled her outrage into a campaign to combat youth gun violence aptly named Think Twice. Her campaign encourages youths to think twice before picking up a gun. Mary Pat's work earned her the Peace First Prize, a prestigious peace-making award. I am proud of her achievements, and I am glad to have the privilege of representing her.

Like those before me, I also pray that my good friend from Missouri, former Chairman Ike Skelton, rest in peace.

CLIMATE CHANGE

(Ms. LEE of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Sustainable Energy and Environment Coalition and the Safe Climate Caucus, I rise to call for

urgent congressional action on climate change.

We must follow the examples of my home State of California, Washington, Oregon, and British Columbia. These leaders came together Monday and signed the Pacific Coast Action Plan on Climate and Energy. The action plan will help them to collectively reduce carbon pollution and greenhouse gas emissions, which will not only help the environment and public health but will also strengthen our economy.

This is a small, but significant step to act on climate change. These leaders are taking these important steps because they know the consequences of inaction. They recognize that the effects of climate change cross borders freely. Republicans and Democrats should follow this good example of action, and our leadership should move forward to combat climate change.

I, too, want to give my sympathy and my prayers with the loss of a great leader, Chairman Ike Skelton. And I know on behalf of my predecessor, my former boss, my colleague Congressman Skelton was a personal friend, and I know that he would want me to say today that he misses him.

May his soul rest in peace.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Brian Pate, one of his secretaries.

BENGHAZI

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WILLIAMS). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, last week, a new national poll was released by a respected pollster, Patrick Caddell, a Democrat, and John McLaughlin, a Republican, making clear that the American people still don't feel they know the truth about what happened in Benghazi nearly 14 months ago.

According to the poll commissioned by Secure America Now, 63 percent of Americans "think the Obama administration is covering up the facts about Benghazi"; and only 29 percent of registered voters say the Obama administration has been honest about Benghazi. Think about that for a moment. A supermajority of Americans believe they have been misled by their government about what happened in Benghazi. This is remarkable.

The American people know how significant it is that Ambassador Stevens, the President's personal envoy to Libya, was the first Ambassador killed in the line of duty in four decades on September 11, 11 years to the day that nearly 3,000 people were killed by al Qaeda terrorists.

The American people intuitively understand that a plot of this scale was

not spontaneously inspired, as claimed by the administration's now infamous talking points. The American people also know that it is remarkable that no effort was made by Washington to rescue the Americans in Benghazi or dispatch a hostage rescue team after the Ambassador went missing that night.

I think the American people also wonder just what the CIA was doing in Benghazi. Was it involved in the collection and transfer of weapons to foreign countries? Possibly to support the Syrian rebels? And could some of those weapons have fallen into the wrong hands, like the Syrian jihadists?

It is too easy to say that this is "classified information" and expect the American people to look away. Four Americans were killed that night, several were wounded, and no one came to help them.

□ 1500

Was it because the CIA was conducting a covert operation and if something went wrong, that was just the price of doing business? Were the CIA activities in Benghazi part of the reason the consulate and annex were targeted?

These are legitimate questions the American people are asking that deserve clear answers.

The McLaughlin-Caddell poll also found that 62 percent of the American people support creating a "special bipartisan committee with broad powers to get to the truth about the attacks in Benghazi."

Eighty percent of Republicans and 58 percent of independents support the idea. Notably, nearly half of Democrats said it was important to create a bipartisan committee to learn the truth.

The bottom line is Americans from across the political spectrum recognize that not only are they not being told the truth, but they feel Congress needs to change its approach to the investigation by creating a special committee.

Why is it that, despite more than a year of investigations in five separate committees, the American people feel they still don't know the truth about what happened?

Perhaps it is because, despite more than a year of investigations by five committees, most of the questions raised about that night remain unanswered.

Perhaps it is because, despite more than a year of investigations by five committees, hardly any of the key witnesses responsible for the government's response that night—or lack thereof—have publicly testified.

Perhaps it is because, despite more than a year of investigations, none of the survivors that could help answer key questions have publicly testified before Congress.

Perhaps it is because, despite more than a year of investigations, so few committee hearings have been held publicly.

Or perhaps it is because, despite more than a year of investigations, what little the American people have learned has come from news reports from CNN, CBS, FOX, and other news organizations and not from congressional hearings or testimony.

I think all these factors have contributed to the sense among the American people that Congress has failed in its oversight responsibility.

The American people know they haven't been told the full story about what happened that night, and they believe they have been intentionally misled by the administration.

I have come to the floor today to once again call on my leadership to create a House select committee on Benghazi.

I am often asked what is holding up the creation of this select committee. The simple answer is because the Speaker has not agreed to it. I like the Speaker. He has a tough job, and he may have good reasons for not wanting to establish a select committee, but I don't know what it is. And more importantly, I don't think the American people know what it is.

Let me be clear: my criticism is not with the chairmen of committees that are looking into this. They are all good men. They have worked very hard. Their hands are tied. They are required, though, to stay within their jurisdictional lanes, examining only what they are allowed to investigate according to their committee charter.

What happened in Benghazi is interrelated. The "lanes" crisscross. The White House, the State Department, the CIA, and the Defense Department were all involved, resulting in overlapping, but uncoordinated, investigations.

Benghazi was a terrorist attack. We need a team effort to find out what happened, why it happened, and how we are going to bring the perpetrators to justice. Any of these chairmen would be capable of leading the select committee, and other members of their committees would be very good to serve as well. They would do a good job. I have confidence in them.

And let me be clear: I have no intention of chairing or serving on the select committee. I will not serve on the select committee. I just want to learn the truth, just like the American people.

There is a history in Congress that when things overlap between committees and transcend jurisdictions, select committees were established. Two well-known examples are Watergate and Iran Contra. And I will submit a list of the past select committees over the past 50 years at the end of my statement.

A select committee would take members from each committee with their individual expertise—and many of the members from these various committees have tremendous expertise—and have them work on this investigation