

So when the country next-door was attacked 4 hours later, the military still was not prepared.

There are millions of questions about what happened that night. Were we overwhelmed by a highly organized military force? Was it a street protest that went violent like the administration first claimed? The administration claims the attack was so overwhelming that additional American security forces would not have made a difference.

I know how we can resolve this issue: release the video of that attack that night. For some reason, the administration cannot identify the killers that night because none of them have been brought to justice a year and a half later. I have an idea: if the administration cannot identify them, show the world the video of the attack and let the world help identify who that is.

If there is a bank robbery, the next day the video footage is on television so that everyone can figure out who that person is and they can be brought to justice. That is standard practice for the FBI here. Why is the video of the attack in Benghazi being withheld? If you cannot figure out who attacked the compound, ask CNN or FOX News or The New York Times. They have all interviewed the people who attacked the compound, but the administration can't seem to find them. Many Americans have not even heard there is high quality, multiple angle video footage of that night, both on the ground and from the air in drones.

There is only one reason why the administration will not release the video: they do not want the American people to see what really happened that night and to see that two additional security personnel would have made a huge difference. We need to release the video, allow the American people to see what really happened. Let's get these questions answered.

BREAKING THE IMPASSE IN BANGLADESH

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

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, the political standoff between the two main political parties in Bangladesh has rocked that country and threatened its democracy, its stability, and its economic progress.

Throughout 2013 and in the run-up to elections last week, a series of general strikes paralyzed Bangladesh, and hundreds were killed in clashes between rival political factions. Opposition leaders and human rights activists were arrested, and Bangladeshi courts were used to target opposition figures and their sympathizers.

The feud in Bangladesh pits Prime Minister Sheikh Hasina, the leader of the ruling Awami League party, against Khaleda Zia, a former Prime Minister who is the leader of the opposition Bangladesh Nationalist Party, or

BNP. The leaders, known to their countrymen as the "two ladies," have dominated Bangladeshi politics since democracy was restored in the mid-1990s, when Hasina's Awami positioned itself as secular and social democratic in ideology and Zia's BNP as more centrist and religious.

Tense relations between the two women and their supporters were further inflamed last year when a third party allied with BNP was barred from participating in the elections and the government declined to dissolve itself in favor of a caretaker government that would exist only to supervise the elections. This had been the custom in Bangladesh in prior elections.

Prime Minister Hasina's actions convinced Ms. Zia that BNP would be better served by boycotting the polling, which the BNP did in the hopes that the government would be pressured into resigning before the vote. When the government did not accede to the BNP's demands, the opposition took to the street. But the government held firm and, amid diminished voter turnout and widespread violence, Awami swept last week's vote, deepening the crisis.

Born from a brutal civil war in 1971, Bangladesh has faced enormous challenges in its 43-year history—endemic poverty, one of densest populations in the world, and unpredictable weather that both sustains and destroys the country's year-round agricultural production.

Governance, too, has been a challenge, with the country consistently ranked among the world's most corrupt and the nation's institutions highly politicized. And nothing has come to symbolize the failure of governance like the garment industry and its horrific record on worker safety, a record that threatens the cornerstone of Bangladesh's economy.

In spite of these and a host of other challenges, Bangladesh has made remarkable strides. According to a report issued by the World Bank last June, from 2000 until 2010, Bangladesh experienced steady and strong GDP growth of nearly 6 percent per year on average. Even so, about a third of Bangladeshis live in poverty, and economic hardship is especially prevalent in the rural parts of the country.

Given the country's history, its recent progress and the hurdles remaining, if Bangladesh is to reach its goal of becoming a middle-income country by 2021, the question of governance is central and makes the political standoff that has gripped the country even more tragic and counterproductive. Bangladesh's middle-income aspirations are contingent on a significant rise in GDP growth and a broad reform agenda, neither of which is possible under current conditions.

Fortunately, there is a precedent that could allow for an exit from the impasse through new elections. In February 1996, elections were boycotted by Awami and other opposition parties,

and the BNP took nearly all of the seats, touching off a crisis of legitimacy similar to that now gripping Dhaka. Four months later, new elections were held under the auspices of a caretaker government, and the outcome favored Awami.

Now, as then, the time has come for cooler heads to prevail and for a new election to be called that will give all parties the time and space needed to organize and campaign. The recent release of Ms. Zia from house arrest should be followed by the release of others detained for political reasons. There should be a mutual pledge of nonviolence, guarantees of noninterference in political campaigning by police and security forces, and a pledge to respect the people's mandate.

The people of Bangladesh, who have suffered mightily and who have also risen to every challenge over the course of more than four decades, deserve better than to be caught between two stubborn matriarchs. New elections should be scheduled and Bangladeshi voters given a free and fair chance in determining their country's future.

THE WRONG DIRECTION

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

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, the House is scheduled to take up the omnibus appropriations bill for 2014, and I rise this morning to outline my objections to this measure.

This is not the "regular order" promised to the American people in which each of the 12 appropriations bills is painstakingly vetted. It is all 12 bills rolled into one, with no opportunity for meaningful debate or amendment. True, it adheres to the budget that was passed in December, but that budget is nothing to brag about. That budget destroyed the only meaningful constraint on Federal spending that we have.

One Member said he is surprised by opposition because "this bill, for the 4th year in a row, cuts discretionary spending." Well, it only cuts it by Washington math. Last year, the discretionary spending of the United States Government was \$986 billion. The measure appropriates \$1,012 billion. That is an increase. And it is \$45 billion more than the sequester would have allowed. After all, they didn't blow the lid off the sequester because they wanted to cut spending, now did they?

So what is this money going for?

Well, it increases money for Head Start by \$600 million, despite the fact that every credible study has concluded that this program provides no lasting benefit for children;

It continues wasteful TIGER grants, which, under the guise of transportation, puts money into projects like a 6-mile pedestrian mall in Fresno and streets that actually discourage automobile traffic;

It continues funding for the scandalous essential air service that pays to fly empty and near-empty planes across the country;

It continues to throw money at all manner of expensive and failed green energy programs and other forms of corporate welfare.

We are told to be grateful that it doesn't fund other wasteful programs, like high-speed rail. But when we vote for these appropriations, we are responsible for the money that we waste, not the money that we don't waste. The regular order would at least give the House a chance to examine and debate these questionable programs before we cast our vote. But not this process.

But do not believe for a moment they won't be debated after we have cast our votes. This measure will face the full light of public scrutiny in the days ahead, and that may prove to be very harsh, indeed.

□ 1030

True, the measure makes some cuts, but in many cases it makes the wrong cuts.

For example, although this bill reverses the cuts made to disabled military veterans' pensions, it maintains the pension reductions for all other military veterans—about 82 percent of our military retirees. According to published reports, over a 20-year period a retired enlisted servicemember will lose an average of \$72,000 of promised pension payments and commissioned officers will lose \$124,000.

The Payments in Lieu of Taxes, or PILT, is not funded at all. That is the program that makes up a small portion of the revenues that the Federal Government has cost our rural communities as it has appropriated vast tracts of their land.

To add insult to injury, this bill adds roughly \$200 million to pay for more Federal land grabs, which will cost local communities still more of their local revenues and economic activity.

We are promised that PILT funding will be restored in the farm bill, which is little consolation. That is the bill that continues to provide massive subsidies to agribusiness at the expense of both taxpayers and consumers.

I am not unmindful of the challenges that faced the Appropriations Committee—not the least of which is that the measure must ultimately have the consent of the Senate and the President, which are responsible for the most fiscally irresponsible period of our Nation's history. I understand that.

Under our Constitution, a dollar cannot be spent by this government unless the House says it gets spent. The buck literally starts here. As long as we continue to increase spending on frivolous programs at the expense of working families, and at a time when our accumulated debt threatens to sink what is left of our economy, we are clearly moving this Nation in the wrong direction.

I appreciate the fact this is a bipartisan agreement, but a bipartisan agreement that moves our country in the wrong direction is still wrong.

With all due respect, I must dissent.

TRIBUTE TO MRS. EARLEAN LINDSEY: A TRUE COMMUNITY HERO, PRIDE OF THE WEST SIDE OF CHICAGO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to a dear friend and colleague who passed away a few days ago.

Trying to describe Earlean Lindsey for me is not very easy. She was not quite old enough to have been my mother, although she was "mother like." She was like a big sister. She and Nola Bright would look after me at conferences and conventions, make sure that I ate lunch, had some milk, and did not drink too much alcohol.

I got to know her family, her children, and grandchildren. I want to thank them for inviting me to participate in her funeral services. They know that Earlean and I were confidants; we were like family.

She was my boss for about 15 years during a period when I worked formally as executive director of the Westside Health Planning Organization. She was the board chairman. She was my running buddy and traveling companion. We went all over the United States of America helping to organize and implement program concepts and initiatives of the war on poverty, which grew out of the civil rights movement—the marches, the demonstrations, the Johnson era.

She was with Ernie and Gloria Jenkins, Ma Fletcher, Reverend Carter, Bertram Mims, Leahmon Reed, Hats Adams, John Harris, Joseph Rosen, Warner Saunders, and others when we organized the Westside Association for Community Action.

Earlean was steeped in her church, her family. She believed in God and in education. Earlean was the education leader for what in the mid-seventies and eighties we called District 8 and District 9 in Chicago. In a way, she was responsible for a Black West Side resident being appointed to the Chicago Board of Education.

Earlean was one of several Black women on the West Side that we called our leaders, women like Illinois Daggett; Rachael Ridley; Beatrice Ward; Ida Mae "Ma" Fletcher; Mary Alice "Ma" Henry; Nancy Jefferson, who headed the Midwest Community Council; Julia Fairfax; Brenetta Howell Barrett; Gloria Pughsley; Belle Whaley; Rose Marie Love; Rosie Lee Betts; Lucy Jean Lewis; Vivian Stewart Tyler; Reverend Janice Sharpe; Reverend Helen Cooper; Martha Marshall; Commissioner Earlean Collins; Congresswoman Cardiss Collins; Alder-

women Deborah Graham and Emma Mitts; Representative Camille Lilly; Viola Thomas; Senator Patricia Van Pelt; Commissioner Barbara McGowan; Commissioner Iola McGowan; Mrs. Lillian Drummond; Mrs. Juanita Rutues; Mrs. Lucinda Ware; Mrs. Irene Norwood; Representative Annazette Collins; Mrs. Vera Davis; Mrs. Mamie Bone; Mrs. Devera Beverly; Mrs. Artensia Randolph; Senator Kimberly Lightford; Recorder of Deeds Karen Yarborough; Mayor Edwina Perkins of Maywood, Illinois; Ms. Barbara Minor; Mrs. Gus Cunningham; and countless other women who have provided leadership and have been actively involved in the struggle for self-direction, community improvement, and self-determination.

Earlean went to city hall, the State House, and the White House. Through her interactions she walked with kings and queens but never lost the common touch.

Earlean's two main issues were health care and education. She was a founding member of the Mile Square Health Center and the National Association of Community Health Centers.

I remember a meeting we were having at the University of Illinois School of Public Health, and as people introduced themselves or were introduced, they would always be introduced as "doctor" or they would say John Smith, MSW, or Joy Jones, FACHA.

When it came Earlean's time, she said that I am Mrs. Earlean Lindsey, CSTA. There were a group of medical students present. One of them raised their hand and said, could I ask Mrs. Lindsey a question? Earlean said, gladly. She said, can you tell me what your degree stands for, CSTA? I have never heard of that one. Earlean said, common sense, talent, and ambition.

That is who Earlean was and that is what Earlean has always been—strong, talented, compassionate, outspoken, bossy, sensitive, caring, tireless, fearless. Long live the life and long live the legacy of Earlean Lindsey. If she was here right now, I am sure she would join with Representative JIM MCGOVERN and say, don't cut SNAP.

Earlean, may you rest in peace.

RALEIGH HOUSING AUTHORITY/ HUD

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

Mr. HOLDING. Mr. Speaker, at a time when the national debt is over \$17 trillion and growing by the second, the government continues to borrow and spend money that we simply do not have. Each day that we do not address this problem, the American people continue to lose faith in Washington's ability to spend their tax dollars wisely.

Mr. Speaker, one of our jobs as Members of Congress is to provide aggressive oversight as to how our tax dollars