

growing up, and I was able to see firsthand the difference that this made. And some of them are still in touch with my family today.

To all those people across the country who are taking in a foster child today, I say thank you. I know you are making a positive difference in that child's life, and I encourage others to consider doing the same.

Foster children belong to all of us, and we have a moral obligation to treat them with the same love and care that we would our own children. And I encourage all of my colleagues to join me in recognizing May as Foster Youth Month.

#### BOURBON WHISKEY

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

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to mark the 50th anniversary of the passage of S. Con. Res. 19, which officially recognized bourbon as a distinctive product of the United States of America.

Specifically, the resolution provided that bourbon whiskey is a distinctive product of the U.S. and is unlike other types of alcoholic beverages, whether foreign or domestic; that bourbon whiskey has achieved recognition and acceptance throughout the world as a distinctive product of the United States; and the resolution further prohibited the importation of whiskey designated as "bourbon" to protect bourbon as a product distilled and aged in the United States alone.

Many great nations have a national spirit. Bourbon certainly belongs in the same class. As the report that accompanied the resolution notes, the name "bourbon" refers to the particular part of the world this distinctive distilled spirit first arrived from, Bourbon County, Kentucky. The name is now universally accepted as meaning American whiskey, and over 90 percent of all bourbon is distilled in my home State, the Commonwealth of Kentucky.

Today, Kentucky's bourbon industry is enjoying an explosive growth due to demand both here and abroad. I think this renaissance is the result not only of bourbon's timeless production process and depth of flavor, but is also thanks to its status as a uniquely American spirit.

This week we celebrate the 50th anniversary of Congress putting that concept into law, and we thank all of the hardworking men and women in my home State who make this uniquely American spirit such a great product.

#### UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

(Mr. PALLONE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I ask the Republican leadership to bring up the bill that would extend critical unemployment insurance. So far, the gen-

tleman from Ohio, Speaker BOEHNER, is telling struggling Americans that they are out of luck and out of money.

This bill was passed in the Senate on a bipartisan basis, 65-34, to move forward to help people who are unemployed, and yet the Republican leadership here still refuses to bring it up. It is also completely paid for. Still, the Republicans insist that there is no longer an emergency and that unemployment numbers are dropping, but the reality is just the opposite.

Long-term unemployment, defined as being out of work for 27 weeks or more, has not been this high since World War II. And we know that anyone receiving unemployment benefits, when they get their check, the money goes right back into the economy. In fact, unemployment insurance generates \$1.52 in economic activity for every \$1 spent.

So why does the Republican leadership simply not bring this up? Instead, they focus on issues like Benghazi or setting up a select committee on Benghazi. They should be focusing on job creation—creating jobs—and helping the unemployed.

#### PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. RES. 567, ESTABLISHING SELECT COMMITTEE ON THE EVENTS SURROUNDING THE 2012 TERRORIST ATTACK IN BENGHAZI

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 575 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 575

*Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the resolution (H. Res. 567) providing for the Establishment of the Select Committee on the Events Surrounding the 2012 Terrorist Attack in Benghazi. The resolution shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution to its adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question except one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Rules.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MESSER). The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), my friend, the ranking member of the Rules Committee, pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on House Resolution 575, which provides for a closed rule for consideration of H. Res. 567.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, it has been nearly 20 months since terrorists attacked the American diplomatic mission in Benghazi, Libya, killing four Americans, including then-U.S. Ambassador to Libya J. Christopher Stevens.

Since that time, the House Armed Services Committee, the Foreign Affairs Committee, the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, and the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform have all conducted investigations related to the events surrounding the attack and the administration's response. And I want to commend each of these committees and their chairmen and their members for work that has been done that is exemplary, that has aimed exactly on the questions that needed to be asked, and for those who have dedicated time and effort to make sure that these important issues are not only discussed but understood and resolved so that each of these committees, as they work with their particular agencies in the Federal Government, come to a clear and a clean understanding about what happened, what our responses might and should have been, and what they would be in the future.

We are here today because this administration has chosen not to fully participate, to block our efforts to know the truth, and to provide the necessary people in a forthright manner who could be a part of answering these questions. This blockage has included a timed delivery that has not been timely but the time interval for requesting information, for the redacting of information that has not been properly done, and, perhaps most importantly, for the remarks that have been made by the administration, including the President of the United States, the former Secretary of State, the Secretary of State, and other highly public officials who serve at the pleasure of the American people who have tried to thwart, who have tried to misdirect, and who have tried to—what I believe is—badger Republicans into believing that what they did was aboveboard and correct when, in fact, an evaluation and a proper lessons learned lesson being available not only for them, for the United States Congress, but also accountability to the American Government.

□ 1245

We are here specifically today because in the last few weeks an outside group, Judicial Watch, through the Freedom of Information Act, obtained information and received that information through the judicial system of the United States whereby they received emails that were not redacted, that were not doctored or altered, and that came to them and did not match up with the information that had been provided to official committees of the

United States House of Representatives for official business.

At a time when an administration decides that they are going to take advantage of the structure of the United States House of Representatives under official business, then that means that it is time for the United States House of Representatives to then learn that they are being duped, that they are being taken advantage of, and that our open system was being used, I believe, in a political way.

That is why we are here today, Mr. Speaker. We are here today not for political reasons but because the official business of the United States House of Representatives, article I, is to make sure that we understand and have oversight over those that are in article II and work with people who are in article III.

We work together in a careful balance to make sure that what we do is in the best interest of the people—the American people, who need to have faith and confidence in the work that is done on their behalf—but also be accountable to the American people when great things happen and when mistakes happen also.

To sweep something under the rug, to try and move people in another direction and try and fool them, to not be forthright about the actions that were taken or understood, I believe is a dereliction of duty. Most importantly, I think that what the investigation up to now has revealed is a lack of desire by this administration to fess up to what I believe might be failures or weaknesses in a system that we need to work on together.

Four Americans' lives were not only at stake, but the reputation of the United States of America was on the line. Terrible things happened. Worse things could have happened, also. And for the United States Congress to have oversight to work on these issues is, I believe, an important national security objective.

We are here today because President Barack Obama and his administration are not forthright or interested in working with official Members of the United States House of Representatives to clear the issue, and to understand what happened so that we may move forward with great confidence; that as our men and women who are in the State Department are engaged in the sensitive work, the work that is done on behalf of this great Nation, that we can understand that relationship with the United States military, with intelligence, with the money that we spend and the mission that the President of the United States decides that these men and women will be engaged in.

We are here today to gain answers, to gain knowledge, and to gain corrective action. And that is why I believe last night in the Rules Committee, the Rules Committee moved forward on an original jurisdiction hearing whereby the Rules Committee would make and take the responsibility, Mr. Speaker,

to make sure that we understood that we would be taking the time of the House of Representatives, that we would be taking, in essence, jurisdiction and putting that to a select committee, a select committee which would have the authority and the responsibility to ensure that the things which I have spoken of this morning were achieved.

This is not political. This is public policy at its most important level. It is national security that is being discussed not only today but discussed in private among Members of Congress with this administration to ensure that the events that occurred on that day were well understood and reflective to the Members of Congress who provide money, resources, and oversight relating to those events.

Unfortunately, it became apparent to me and others, including the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Honorable JOHN BOEHNER, that these committees are struggling with an unwanted partner: the administration. And this administration, by refusing to completely comply with congressional subpoenas, by delaying the delivery of important documents, by heavily redacting critical information—not sensitive or information that might be considered national security—and by retroactively classifying previously unclassified files, the Obama administration has thrown roadblocks at every turn of the road.

The most recent example of this was the deliberate subversion of the investigation which occurred on April 17, less than a month ago. This is why the Speaker of the House of Representatives, JOHN BOEHNER, who has been very deliberative and most involved but careful to let each committee operate to the level of its jurisdiction, to make sure that each committee had not just the resources but the ability to make sure that they were on a process for the delivery of the things which I have talked about, up to and including the truth, Mr. Speaker, the truth behind the events, the truth behind how we would describe this event so that lessons would be learned, and evince how we would effectively and capably understand the new and current threats against the United States and what occurred on that day and on a moving-forward basis. If you refuse to participate with the United States Congress, if you subvert the process and take advantage of our structure, the Honorable JOHN BOEHNER will then respond with that which is given to him and to the United States House of Representatives, and that is to honorably pivot based upon something that happened less than a month ago, April 17.

This administration chose to deliberately mislead the United States Congress, and we responded therein. On that day, the administration delivered 276 documents consisting of 779 pages. They gave these to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform,

many of which continued to be heavily redacted. The same day, the State Department complied under a Freedom of Information Act requested by Judicial Watch. I believe that the timing of these two productions is not a coincidence as to whether or not Congress would have received these documents absent Judicial Watch's FOIA request. The two sets of documents are incredibly similar, and, shockingly, some of the documents received by the committee are more redacted than those received by Judicial Watch.

Well, I get that. That is because under FOIA, the Freedom of Information Act, there is a criminal statute attached to that which those lawyers preparing these documents knew they could be criminally held liable.

Mr. Speaker, the bottom line of this is this administration has not respected the United States Congress, did not respect the committees that were asking for this information, and there, too, made sure that they made their job even more difficult. These roadblocks, I believe, serve as two important points for us to remember: that the Speaker of the House of Representatives did not choose to be where we are today but, rather, it was this administration through its deliberate attempt to place us exactly where we are.

So, first, the committee will have questions that it has to ask, and they are going to this administration to make sure that we have complete documentation. Every Member of this select committee will have the opportunity—and should have on a bipartisan basis—to see the documents. The select committee will consolidate itself into a centralized location in order to make sure that they work together. We are going to streamline congressional efforts when we find out the things which we could have and should have known but know now to avoid in the future.

And lastly, we are going to come with an answer to the American people that we believe is what they are due, and that is: what happened; how could we have avoided it; and what do we look for in the future.

Our representative government is founded on the assumption of a transparent government. Our President, Barack Obama, stated when he was elected that this would be the most open and transparent government. Mr. Speaker, we are here today to take the President at his word. The question is: Will the President live up to his word and expect this administration to join with the House of Representatives in this new era, this new way of trying to go about getting an answer for the American public?

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the customary 30 minutes and yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the 2012 attack on Benghazi was a tragedy that took the

lives of brave American public servants representing and serving our country. And Congress has an obligation here—both to the families of the victims and to the country—to try to prevent this from ever happening again. But that is not at all what we are doing here today.

The Senate has produced two bipartisan reports on the issue, and the State Department's Accountability Review Board has produced a constructive, unbiased report. There is a vast body of evidence already collected, and none of it demonstrates any sort of coverup or conspiracy.

The majority here has had 13 congressional hearings over four committees, 50 briefings, produced five reports and 25,000 pages of documentation, wasted countless millions of dollars, and has gotten absolutely nowhere. One more committee weighted in favor of the majority is not going to do any better. We have bottomed out on Benghazi.

Nonetheless, the majority has repeatedly demonstrated that rather than engaging in a serious, objective examination of the circumstances, they want to use the tragedy as an excuse to generate partisan talking points, and then has descended into the crass and the unbelievable.

Several press reports this week, including one from Politico, indicate that the National Republican Congressional Committee sent out a fundraising email entitled "You Can Become a Benghazi Watchdog Right Now," and that leads to a donation page where you have to pay to be a Benghazi watchdog. And even after their fundraising effort was exposed, Republicans are continuing to use this effort to raise money off of this tragedy. This morning's Politico says: "Republicans stick with Benghazi cash grab."

Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit into the RECORD these two articles from Politico, May 8 and May 9. The first one, "NRCC"—which stands for the National Republican Congressional Committee—"fundraising off Benghazi," and the second one this morning, "Republicans stick with Benghazi cash grab."

[From POLITICO, May 7, 2014]

NRCC FUNDRAISING OFF OF BENGHAZI

(By Jake Sherman)

The House Republican campaign arm is buffing the chairman of the Benghazi select committee and is raising money off the GOP's investigation into the 2012 attack.

A post on the National Republican Congressional Committee website dated May 6 is titled "You Can Become a Benghazi Watchdog Right Now."

"House Republicans will make sure that no one will get away from [Trey] Gowdy and the Select Committee," the blog post says. "This is going to be a national effort for a national investigation."

Once a visitor to the site enters their name, email and ZIP code, it asks for a donation to "stop Democrats from controlling all of Washington."

But Rep. Trey Gowdy (R-S.C.), whom Speaker John Boehner (R-Ohio) tapped to

chair the panel, said Wednesday morning on MSNBC's "Morning Joe" he would ask Republicans to forgo fundraising off the attacks.

"Yes, and I will cite myself as an example," Gowdy said. "I have never sought to raise a single penny on the backs of four murdered Americans."

For right now, the NRCC doesn't appear to be backing down.

"The Obama administration has not been honest with the American people with regards to the security failures in Benghazi, which left four Americans dead," said NRCC spokeswoman Andrea Bozek. "Our goal is to hold Democrats in Congress accountable who vote against creating the select committee on Benghazi and who continue to try to sweep this controversy under the rug."

[From POLITICO, May 7, 2014]

REPUBLICANS STICK WITH BENGHAZI CASH GRAB

(By Byron Tau and Katie Glueck)

Republicans have no intention of listening to Trey Gowdy.

A number of Republican candidates and conservative groups have openly used the Sept. 11, 2012, attacks in Benghazi, Libya, as a cash grab. And that's likely to continue despite a strongly worded rebuke from the new chairman of the Republican select committee assigned to investigate the response to the attacks.

Gowdy, a South Carolina Republican, commented on MSNBC Wednesday that he and fellow Republicans should not fundraise off "the backs of four murdered Americans"—creating a new standard by which the party can be judged and opening the GOP up to charges of past, present and future hypocrisy.

That's put the party in an awkward spot. Republicans on Capitol Hill are eager to lend the looming committee investigation into the murder of four Americans an air of sobriety, dignity and seriousness. But political strategists are eager to mobilize the GOP base and amp up grassroots fundraising by capitalizing on the base's outrage over how the Obama administration handled the attacks.

The 2012 consulate attack and accusations of a White House cover-up are catnip for grassroots donors and activists. And Benghazi—and the select committee assigned to investigate it—is a key part of the GOP fundraising and mobilization strategy. This week, the National Republican Congressional Committee rolled out a new fundraising campaign called "Benghazi Watchdogs"—an effort by the aiming to raise money off Gowdy's new position. Publicly available domain registration data shows that the site was registered Tuesday.

Other fundraising solicitations about Benghazi include:

A fundraising page from the NRCC with a photo of Obama and former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton, accompanied by big bold text proclaiming: "Benghazi was a coverup. Demand answers!"—and asking for donations of up to \$500.

A May 2 blog post from the National Republican Senatorial Committee titled "Dude, You're Being Lied To About Benghazi." The post was in response to former White House spokesman Tommy Vietor's appearance on Fox News last week where he used the line "Dude, that was like two years ago." It concludes: "Americans deserve the truth about Benghazi and it's clear Democrats will not give it to them. Donate today and elect a Republican Senate majority."

A May email blast from the conservative nonprofit Special Ops OPSEC Education Fund that asks for an "immediate contribu-

tion" of \$25, \$50, \$100 or more to "hold Obama and Hillary's feet to the fire until justice is done."

A January email from Sen. Ted Cruz (R-Texas) in the aftermath of the State of the Union noting that Obama "failed to mention Benghazi, the IRS, or the NSA" and asking for donations.

A John Bolton PAC email from April accused Obama, Clinton and former Defense Secretary Leon Panetta of refusing to take responsibility for "leaving Americans to die at the hands of terrorists."

An email from Senate candidate Joe Miller saying that there is "strong evidence that senior administration officials crafted a false narrative for purely political purposes."

An email this week from Rep. Scott Rigell's (R-Va.) campaign asking for "\$5, \$10, \$20, or \$50 to help keep him in Congress and hold the Administration accountable" that also asks "Why didn't the military respond to the events in Benghazi? Were there even military assets in the region available? If not, why not? Who made the decision not to send support? House Republicans are committed to finding out the truth about Benghazi."

An email from House candidate Andy Tobin accusing Obama of "covering up vital information about what happened that night" and asking for donations.

Conservative pundits and former politicians like Mike Huckabee, Allen West and others have sent emails to their lists, according to the liberal watchdog group Media Matters.

Brad Dayspring, a spokesman for the NRSC, said that there hasn't been a coordinated effort from the committee to fundraise off of the issue, even though his committee wrote a blog post with a fundraising solicitation about the hearings.

"Part of politics is fundraising. I think fundraising is a separate activity than calling attention to important issues," he said in an interview. "Benghazi is going to be a topic of discussion because it deserves answers, and I think it's important for both candidates and elected officials to discuss it."

GOP strategist Rick Wilson said that while fundraising off of such a sensitive topic needs to be done within the "bounds of propriety," candidates on both sides of aisle aren't hesitant to try to turn the "story du jour" into donation pitches, especially when seeking to round up small-dollar contributions.

"It's a tragedy, a serious national security question that has to be resolved, and the administration owes answers," Wilson said of Benghazi. "On the other hand, you're going to see people on both sides use it to build mailing lists, build name ID, fundraising lists, etc. There's a base level of inevitability."

Democrats pointed to both the committee itself and the fact that it was being used as a fundraising ploy as evidence that the entire investigation was a political farce.

Chris Lehane, a veteran Democratic strategist, said that Republicans fundraising off of Benghazi could easily overplay their hand.

"At the end of the day you're dealing with an issue that was a tragedy," he said. "From a political perspective, that's raising money from a situation where people representing our government were killed. It's a politically perilous, treacherous thing to do."

In a general election, he said, a Democrat could easily dismiss such a Republican as "playing politics with people's lives."

White House Deputy Press Secretary Josh Earnest on Wednesday jabbed the NRCC for its fundraising efforts.

"I think that the fact that the National Republican Congressional Committee is raising money off the creation of this committee

is a pretty good indication of the political motivation that's at work here," he said aboard Air Force One.

And Republicans aren't the only ones to use national tragedies for fundraising or list-building.

The nonprofit Organizing for Action has come under fire several times for using gun-related events to build their email list—sending emails on the anniversary of the Newtown shooting and the day of the Navy Yard shooting.

Republican officials defended their tactics as giving voters answers to pressing questions.

"The Obama administration has not been honest with the American people with regards to Benghazi, and if Nancy Pelosi becomes speaker the American people will never know the truth. Our goal is to hold Democrats in Congress accountable who vote against creating the select committee on Benghazi and who continue to try to sweep this controversy under the rug," said NRCC spokeswoman Andrea Bozek.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Additionally, reports today from a prominent journalist say that Mr. BOEHNER himself says that he will not try to stop the fundraising.

The majority is demonstrating without a shadow of a doubt that like the many, many votes we have taken trying to kill health care, this is a political move. That is the most crass and awful thing to do to the families of these four people who died. We keep over and over rubbing salt into that awful wound by bringing this up over and over. And how do you think they feel now knowing what this game is about in the House of Representatives?

I am appalled the majority would use these deaths for political gain and political money when what the families of the victims and Americans want to do is to ensure it never happens again. But we are doing nothing in the world to ensure that.

Not only is the majority disregarding the bipartisan findings, but their own process is so wrought with error, partisanship, and deception that leaders in their own party are calling foul.

The Oversight Committee has produced several witnesses of dubious quality, but the most recent one is a brigadier general, to testify about the minority, and the minority was only give his name and had no way—we didn't have any address or anything else—to even verify his credentials.

□ 1300

We are indebted to Congressman BUCK MCKEON, Armed Services Committee chairman, who discredited this witness by calling Brigadier General Robert Lovell an unreliable witness and criticized Lovell's assertion that the State Department was not quick to deploy troops to respond to the 2012 terrorist attack in Libya. Lovell testified Thursday before Issa's oversight panel.

Congressman MCKEON stated:

Brigadier General Lovell did not serve in a capacity that gave him reliable insight into operational options available to commanders during the attack, nor did he offer specific courses of action not taken.

MCKEON added:

The Armed Services Committee has interviewed more than a dozen witnesses in the operational chain of command that night, yielding thousands of pages of transcripts, emails, and other documents. We have no evidence that State Department officials delayed the decision to deploy what few resources DOD had available to respond.

How tragic is that? How tacky is that? How beneath the dignity of the House of Representatives is that?

I have an amendment to this resolution based on a simple premise that, if this thing is going to be put together and funded, that it really does some kind of work bipartisanly, which would be really strange in this House, but the idea of having another committee to try to get different results from all of other committees and all of the other hearings with the results they have had really is a foolish waste of time.

Our amendment makes membership on the committee equally divided between Republicans and Democrats. We know already that is not going to happen.

It guarantees the minority signoff on subpoenas and depositions—no such luck.

It guarantees equal distribution of money, staffing, and other resources of the committee.

It requires the committee to establish written rules—that would be a good one—specifically including rules concerning how documents and other information may be obtained, used, or released.

It guarantees equal access to evidence and materials of the committee and perhaps can identify witnesses who are going to be coming before the committee.

It provides for transparency of the committee's expenditures and budgeting.

It ensures that a quorum for taking testimony or receiving evidence includes at least one minority member.

Finally, it ensures that the majority has a say in decisions about extended questioning and staff questioning of witnesses.

Mr. Speaker, it is shameful what is happening here today. People, not just persons right now, but I believe that future historians looking at the setup of this committee will be appalled, as all of the rest of us are on our side, that to make use politically and financially of the tragedy of the loss of four brave Americans is beneath contempt.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, the Rules Committee is the committee that meets upstairs. We decide what legislation will come to the floor. In this case, the House Rules Committee has original jurisdiction over this bill, but the Rules Committee is made up of specialists, of experts across this Congress, not only on the Republican and Democrat side, but people who represent people back home who hear from and want to know about the effects that Congress does and about the daily impact.

One of those Members comes with vast experience and comes to us as former chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee. She is a person who is well respected and thoughtful.

More importantly, she was on duty as the chairwoman at the time Benghazi occurred, and we are delighted she is on the Rules Committee. She has brought incredible integrity and insight into this matter.

At this time, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN).

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman SESSIONS for his inspiring leadership on the Rules Committee on every issue, but most especially as he spearheaded the creation of this select committee on Benghazi to examine what happened, what led to this attack, and what has happened since. Thank you for your leadership, Chairman SESSIONS.

Mr. Speaker, I stand here to fully support this measure, but it really is unfortunate, it is sad, it is tragic that it has come to this. We shouldn't have to be here today debating the rule and, later, the underlying resolution on having to form a select committee to be able to get to the truth about what happened on that tragic day and night of September 11, 2012; but, unfortunately, our patience has been sorely tried, so here we are.

The administration has, for nearly 2 years now, been stonewalling and obfuscating, anything it can do, to avoid letting the truth out about that tragic terrorist attack in our consulate in Benghazi, Libya.

As chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee at the time of the attack, as Chairman SESSIONS has pointed out, I know, perhaps as well as any of our colleagues, just how much the administration has been trying to protect this false narrative and President Obama, the narrative that Libya was a political success. Repeated requests for more protection were ignored.

When the Accountability Review Board report was released, I planned on convening a hearing to examine the assessment and the recommendations; but in true stalling fashion, the State Department did not release the report to us until about 8:30 p.m., just a few hours before our hearing was set to begin.

Then, of course, there was a new song and dance every time we tried to secure a date for Secretary Clinton to come before our House Foreign Affairs Committee to testify.

We would even have taken any administration official, for that matter. It took 3 months for the administration to provide us with witnesses, and it did not provide Secretary Clinton to our committee until the following year.

This is not the moves, Mr. Speaker, of an administration that had planned on being the most transparent in history. In fact, this administration has been anything but transparent, as we

have seen with the emails, having been the latest revelation in the never-ending attempt to avoid telling the American public the full truth about what happened, what was the lead up to the terrorist attack, what happened during the many hours of that firefight, and what happened to all of those documents afterwards.

That is why, Mr. Speaker, we need this select committee, to get the truth out there for the American public, so that we can have an open and honest debate about what happened on that fateful day and to ensure that we can do everything in our power to prevent another terrorist attack like this from happening in the future.

Let's remember these names, Mr. Speaker: Ambassador Chris Stevens, Information Officer Sean Smith, and former Navy SEALs Tyrone Woods and Glen Doherty. These are names that the American people need to remember each and every day.

Mr. Speaker, some folks have mentioned the fundraising aspect of this Benghazi investigation, and that is rather sad and pathetic to bring that up, but it is interesting because I was reading a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MEADOWS). The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. SESSIONS. I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. It is interesting that this says that the Democrats are fundraising off GOP fundraising off Benghazi. It is a very interesting article, and I hope that all of our colleagues will look at it.

It is an article, and it says:

Contribute now, Democrats 2014.

I am not pointing fingers and calling names; but if we are going to get blamed for something, I think that there is enough blame to go around. To sensationalize this and to fundraise off it, this is something some groups are trying to do, but I believe that the pot is calling the kettle black.

Mr. Chairman, thank you for your respected leadership on this issue. The American people deserve to know the truth. We must not keep promoting a false narrative. Libya was not a political success. Libya continues, to this day, to be a tinderbox waiting to explode.

Terrorist groups are all over the place. Let's not ignore the facts on the ground. Let's get to the truth about what happened to Benghazi, and having this select committee is a way to get to the truth—pure and simple—no politics.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY), the ranking member of the Oversight and Government Reform Committee on Government Operations.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my dear friend, the former chairman of the Rules Committee, LOUISE SLAUGHTER from New York.

I rise in strong opposition to the rule and the underlying resolution, H. Res.

567. The majority's obsession with keeping Benghazi conspiracy theories front and center through the midterm elections, despite the fact that Republicans have held 10 Congressional hearings already, nine classified Member briefings, and 16 Intelligence Committee oversight events on the Benghazi attack, despite those 35 congressional proceedings here in the House alone on Benghazi, the most astonishing information to emerge has been the striking level of disinterest exhibited by certain Members of the majority with respect to posing substantive questions that actually might inform efforts to enhance the security of American personnel abroad.

In fact, the independent Accountability Review Board of Admiral Mullen and Ambassador Pickering, two of the most respected civil servants in our lifetimes, as well as the report of the Republican majority-controlled House Armed Services Committee, have thoroughly vetted and debunked the outrageous and irresponsible Benghazi conspiracy theories that may make for good Republican fundraising, but disgracefully slander the service and dedication of public servants in the military and diplomatic corps.

In a USA Today op-ed published yesterday, my friend, Mr. GOWDY, from South Carolina asked:

Was our military response during the pendency of the siege sufficient?

To save us all the time and resources that the Speaker now apparently plans to spend on his proposed partisan show panel, respectfully, I would recommend that my colleagues pose that very question to the esteemed Republican chairman of the House Armed Services Committee who stated last week:

The Armed Services Committee has interviewed more than a dozen witnesses in the operational chain of command, yielding thousands of pages of transcripts, emails, and other documents. We have no evidence that the Department of State officials delayed the decision to deploy those resources available to the DOD to respond.

With their one-sided partisan select committee, we will not further an investigation or get at the truth the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) talked about.

We will reveal nothing new; rather, we will do our great Nation a grave disservice in continuing to perpetuate myths and conspiracies that cloud a simple, painful truth: the attack on Benghazi was a tragedy perpetrated by jihadist terrorists—not by foreign diplomats, not by U.S. diplomats.

There was no coverup. There was no soft-pedaling of this act of terror, not by the President, not by the Secretary of State, not by the Secretary of Defense, nor our Intelligence Committee; and to suggest otherwise is a great slander.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Instead, Republicans on the Oversight Committee re-

main obsessed with recycling tired and worn talking points in a cynical attempt to fire up the GOP base before the midterm elections this November.

Unfortunately, the regression into crass demagoguery has real world consequences, Mr. Speaker. Our country's diplomatic corps cannot operate effectively if we lock them in fortresses and prevent them from engaging in foreign nations because there might be a risk.

The reality is that striking the right balance between necessary security and effective diplomacy is an inherently complex and daunting challenge for our foreign service every day, everywhere.

As Ambassador Pickering and Admiral Mullen accurately stated in their review report:

No diplomatic presence is without risk, and the total elimination of risk is a non-starter for U.S. diplomacy.

In closing, I would ask my colleagues on the other side of the aisle: Why do they not trust the judgment of this Chamber's foremost military expert, the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, who pronounced himself "satisfied that where the troops were, how quickly the thing all happened, and how quickly it dissipated, we probably couldn't have done more than we did"?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman.

□ 1315

Mr. CONNOLLY. We probably couldn't have done more than we did.

Those are the words of our colleague from California, the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services.

I urge all Members to oppose this cynical, exploitative, partisan ploy that is not worthy of this House.

Mr. SESSIONS. I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Lewisville, Texas (Mr. BURGESS), a member of the Rules Committee.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I thank you for the recognition. I thank the chairman of the committee, the distinguished Texan, for yielding me the time. I certainly thank him for his confidence in me in allowing me to be on the Rules Committee this past year and a half.

Mr. Speaker, it is now nearly 2 years, an administration that ran on the concept of transparency but now only functions in opacity. We heard from the administration on September 12 of 2012:

We will not waiver in our commitment to see that justice is done for this terrible act. And make no mistake, justice will be done.

It seems strange now, almost 2 years later, to think on those words. That seemed like a sincere promise. The American people believed that promise that was made just days after the attack. If then we could have known that 19 months later the President's press secretary would stand before the White House press corps and laugh about the

event and call it a conspiracy theory. I don't think we would have believed it if someone had told us what the future held, but sadly, that is the state of affairs today.

Here we have a tragic event against our Ambassador, against American citizens, and the darned thing has nearly become a cold case because of the refusal of the White House to prioritize anything related to the investigation except for their own bizarre political spin about what happened.

Mr. Speaker, we have been forced to look into the anguished faces of the victims' families and tell them that we have not been able to find answers for them about the attack, the attack that killed their sons. We have an entire Caucus that has threatened to boycott an investigation that they have simply dismissed as political excess. It is not political excess to those families, Mr. Speaker.

In turn, we as a Congress must do everything in our power to do what the President said, what the President stated back in 2012: to ensure that justice is done for this terrible act. The only way to deliver that justice is to establish the select committee.

This is another step in what has become a very long process. I urge my colleagues to support the rule and support the underlying bill.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentlewoman, the ranking member on the Rules Committee, and my friend, the distinguished gentleman from Texas, for the hard work that the Rules Committee engages in.

I think the first comment that I would like to make is what we have been making, Ms. SLAUGHTER, throughout this process, is our deep and abiding sympathy for the Americans who lost their lives in the name and in the duty to this country. I don't think there is a divide on that issue.

I would take a different perspective from a cold case. This is a hot and ongoing case that has been investigated and has evidenced individuals whom I would believe that, in any other instance, my friends on the side of the aisle would hold to the integrity of their representation.

One hundred years of military experience testified on the question of Benghazi, I believe, in the Committee on Armed Services. We have heard over and over from those in the State Department. We have had conclusions on the question of coverup, and we have seen nothing pointed to the administration to do so.

I think the issue today is a question of fairness. That is what Democrats have always stood for. I have watched my leaders through the endless investigations, starting from Waco and the impeachment process, and I can almost say—maybe I should even say that I come from a district where the Honor-

able Barbara Jordan served. She was on the Watergate Committee and the impeachment process as a member of the Judiciary Committee. I remember her posture on that committee and holding up the Constitution. As a Texan, as a Democrat, we admired that. That is the premise upon which I believe we should be looking at this process.

As I read this resolution, I am troubled, Mr. Speaker, because if we are going to do fairness and if we are going to reach a level of ethical respect, then there is a concern. We need an amendment, because this follows the rules of the House, which means that the chairman is solely given and ceded the authority—that means he or she could—of subpoena power. That does not rise to the level of fairness.

Now, someone refuted our leadership's request for a bipartisan, even-numbered committee and cited that the only committee that is even-numbered is the Committee on Ethics, and they are right, Mr. Speaker. We want this to be an ethical, fair, responsibly, constitutionally grounded committee investigation report, because the committee is unending. It will end only 30 days after the completion of its work; therefore, it can go on and on and on. The question is will the American people see fairness.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield the gentlewoman another minute.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, what we want them to see, if we truly honor those dead Americans that died in the line of battle and duty, then we need the kind of face to the American people that balances the subpoena power so that we all—meaning Republicans and Democrats who are on that committee, if that committee is finalized—can responsibly question witnesses, and that the issue will not be the committee in its process, but it will be the fairness, it will be the Constitution, it will be the dignity and honor we give to those who have fallen.

I ask my friends on the other side of the aisle, we can waive the point of order, amend this on the floor of the House to give a balance to this committee, to add the balance that our leadership has asked for, the fairness that our leadership is asking for, give the subpoena powers in a balanced manner, pay tribute to those who have honored this Nation by being willing to stand in the line, in the eye of fire.

I conclude simply by indicating we are the people of this Nation. Respond to our concerns. And I ask my colleagues to reject this rule and the underlying bill.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds.

Members of Congress who attend hearings and heard the testimony yesterday should not mislead the American people by their statements on the floor as the gentlewoman from Texas did.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS), a member of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, my good friend from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) just talked about how we have proposed that this be a balanced committee like the Ethics Committee. That was done with regard to another special committee, in fact, the bill that was sponsored by current Speaker, then-minority leader, JOHN BOEHNER in the 110th Congress.

They set up a special committee with regard to voting irregularities. They had an equal balance between Democrats and Republicans to remove any taint of partisanship from the proceedings. That would be a welcomed change, but again, that was not even allowed to be discussed under this rule.

Another language of concern in the underlying bill which we tried to address in the Rules Committee but unfortunately were voted down is that this bill allows for such funds that are needed to be appropriated for this purpose. We were not even presented with any cost estimates for this committee.

On the committee, it was noted that Kenneth Starr's investigation of then-President Clinton cost in excess of \$80 million. We simply don't know if this is a \$1 million, a \$10 million, a \$50 million, or a \$200 million endeavor; nor were we allowed to even allow for a vote our very simple bipartisan proposal to pay for this bill, which would have been to allow a vote on H.R. 15.

H.R. 15, which is a bill that has bipartisan support, has already passed the Senate by more than two-thirds, would pass as a pay-for if brought to the floor of the House, actually generates over \$200 billion. Even if this select committee were to spend hundreds of millions of dollars, if we were able to include immigration reform as a way of paying for it, it would still reduce the deficit by \$199 billion or more.

We weren't even allowed an up-or-down vote on that topic. In the spirit of bipartisanship, I offered to support the establishment of the select committee if we could establish immigration reform as the way of paying for this. Unfortunately, despite support from both sides of the aisle in committee, we were, nevertheless, voted down.

I want to be clear that the issue of immigration reform will not go away. We will continue to offer it as a way of paying for various bills. I hope that a discussion is allowed about how to pay for this committee, and that is why I oppose the rule.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL), the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from New York for yielding me this time.

I rise in strong opposition to both the rule and the bill. It is really a political charade and a pointless attempt to find a scandal that simply doesn't exist.

What happened in Benghazi in September 2012 was a tragedy. The loss of those four Americans broke our hearts, and it reminded us that diplomacy can be dangerous work and that we need to do all we can to protect those who represent our country around the world.

What have we seen from certain members of the majority since that day? Partisan games. And this select committee would be nothing more than the next chapter in this political farce, just in time for the midterm elections and with 2016 peeking over the horizon.

What is it exactly that my colleagues are after? After the attack in Benghazi, we all wanted answers: What happened that night that led to the death of Chris Stevens, Sean Smith, Tyrone Woods, and Glen Doherty? Where did we fall short in protecting our people, and who was responsible? What could we do to make sure something like this wouldn't happen again?

Well, an Accountability Review Board led by Ambassador Thomas Pickering and Admiral Michael Mullen, two men with seriousness of purpose and no partisan agenda, helped answer those questions. They found serious management and leadership failures at the State Department. Bipartisan reports from the Senate Homeland and Intelligence Committees supported those findings.

Former Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton sat before committees in both Houses and took full responsibility. She and her successor, John Kerry, have said over and over again that the State Department is implementing all of the recommendations of the Review Board.

That didn't satisfy some of my friends on the other side. They started moving the goalpost, and so began this long, costly exercise. They tried to tie Secretary Clinton directly to the security failures that led to this tragedy, but that didn't turn up anything. Then they floated the idea that our military was told to stand down in the moment of greatest need in Benghazi. Even the Republican chairman of the Committee on Armed Services said that claim had no merit.

Since there is no wrongdoing to be found with respect to the actual attack, now we are focused on the talking points and the so-called coverup. I ask again: What is it my colleagues are after? What is allegedly being covered up?

At the time the attacks took place, American Embassies from Southeast Asia to the Middle East, to North Africa, to England were surrounded by protestors angered over an anti-Islamic video. In Egypt, our Embassy was stormed.

So as the fires in Benghazi were still burning and the air was thick with smoke, the CIA's assessment was that the attack was the result of a sponta-

neous protest. They were wrong. In the days that followed, they corrected that mistake, confirming that the attack was a deliberate and organized terrorist attack carried out by extremists.

In the days after the attack, these protests in the region were still raging. Some of them were violent. In Yemen, additional marines were deployed to protect our personnel. The latest conspiracy theory centers on an email sent at the time. In context, it is clear that Ben Rhodes, the Deputy National Security Adviser, was concerned about protecting Americans amid a volatile climate around our diplomatic facilities all over the world.

Those who want to create a scandal where none exists call this a smoking gun. That is not much to go on. Nevertheless, after more than a year of turning up nothing new, my colleagues want to create a new committee with sweeping powers, a broad mandate, and no fixed timeline for producing any sort of report.

When I heard of the terrible idea to create this special committee, I could not help but think of Iraq where, not four, but 4,000 Americans died. My Republican colleagues conducted virtually no investigations into that tragedy based on a lie. They set up no committees to uncover the truth behind the phony intelligence, the torture, the secret prisons, or the spin about how Iraqis would greet us with flowers. Nothing.

So I have to ask a final time: What is it my colleagues on the other side are after? I think the answer is pretty clear. They are after a political win. They want to tear down leaders in the Democratic Party and raise money for their campaign committees, and they are willing to politicize the deaths of four Americans to do it.

□ 1330

Our constituents aren't interested in this. They want us to do our jobs, not waste millions of taxpayer dollars on a fabricated scandal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ENGEL. Let's do what they sent us here to do. Let's protect our diplomats and development experts. Let's work to create jobs and shore up our crumbling infrastructure. Let's fix our immigration system and promote energy security. Let's vote "no" on this resolution and get back to governing.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Colorado will control the time.

There was no objection.

Mr. POLIS. I would like to inquire if the gentleman has any remaining speakers on his side.

Mr. SESSIONS. In fact, I do not.

Mr. POLIS. Then I am prepared to close.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire as to how much time is remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Colorado has 8 minutes remaining.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

As we have seen time and time again, sadly the Republicans are taking an unspeakable tragedy—the death of four brave American citizens—and turning it into a partisan talking to the point of selling membership to become Benghazi investigators on a partisan Web site rather than engaging in a bipartisan process to get to the root of the matter.

The families of those who died deserve more than that. They deserve that Democrats and Republicans work together rather than use their pain for political or financial gain for either party.

Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to make in order our amendment to ensure that the select committee has a chance to succeed where four previous House investigations have not to ensure that we have a full, accurate, and objective accounting for the American people of the events in Benghazi. By ensuring equal representation, equal resources, and equal say over the use of subpoenas and depositions, we can fulfill our obligations to our Nation and to our institution to ensure that we get to the bottom of this matter for the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment in the RECORD along with extraneous material immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, we and my colleagues on the Rules Committee have tried to make this process work. We tried to propose a bipartisan way of paying for these efforts, we tried to propose a balanced way for this committee to go about its business. But at every turn we were shot down. That is why I ask my colleagues on both sides of the aisle who care about honoring those who lost their lives, who care about getting to the bottom of the events, join me in opposing this rule and defeating the previous question so that we may begin a process that has the confidence of the American people rather than just speaks to one partisan base or the other.

The American people deserve this institution acting at its best with regard to this matter, Democrats and Republicans acting in concert, both enjoying the power of subpoena, the ability to schedule witnesses, equal resources on the committee, so we can have a full, objective, and hopefully unanimous account of the events.

That should be the goal of the legislation. Under this rule, we are not even

allowed to discuss our proposals to ensure equal representation on this committee. We are not allowed to discuss our proposal to pay for the proceedings under this bill with a bipartisan bill that passed the Senate with more than two-thirds.

This is a closed process that, frankly, Mr. Speaker, risks losing the faith of the American people in the outcome of this process. I fear, Mr. Speaker, that whatever the outcome of this process, if it moves forward, will fall on deaf ears of the American people because they will know that there was not an institutional commitment to being objective, there was not an effort to reach out in a bipartisan manner to find the truth, there was not a bipartisan effort to even pay for the costs of this investigation or this bill or contain or estimate those costs in any way.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question so we can get this process right. I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on the previous question, “no” on the rule, and “no” on the underlying resolution.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

There is an old saying that the closer to the target you get, the more flak comes up. While that is probably a naval or an Air Force term whereby pilots who are on their duty know when they are getting close to the real target. Mr. Speaker, we are getting closer to the real target.

The facts of the case are really pretty simple. There is no gag order involved here. We spoke last night and yesterday in a very open, probably several-hour meeting on original jurisdiction at the Rules Committee. I was very open with the members of the committee. I told them, which has not been expressed today, that the last day of the 113th Congress this investigation, if it is still going on, would have to be reauthorized by the next Congress. It is not like there is a never-ending date. As a matter of fact, we say in the original jurisdiction that 30 days after the completion of their report this select committee would go away.

Secondly, we spoke very openly about not having new money available, but rather the money that was originally given to the House of Representatives for the purposes of running the House. The Speaker of the House would have to make sure that this committee operates within what we had originally asked for. There are not unlimited amounts of money. And to suggest as has been done on the floor, up to \$200 million to run this investigation, that simply would not be truthful.

Mr. Speaker, the closer to the target we have gotten, we have found that the Obama administration is trying to do everything they can to keep the United States House of Representatives and the committees from doing their job to try and misdirect us, to try and trick

us, to try and fool us, to try and redact information that did not fall under a national security title but rather was to politically save them from what might be an embarrassment.

What are some of those embarrassments? Well, some of the embarrassments would be: Why didn't the State Department understand on September 11 of any year why you probably do not conduct official operations, especially in a dangerous area? That might be one question.

Another question might be: Who is it that said no? We have heard that there are serious flaws in the State Department. We already knew that. The former Secretary of State has numerous investigations that have revealed inadequacy all the way to the top of the State Department when Hillary Clinton was Secretary of State.

But what we are about here is to get to the bottom of it, to effectively get this done, to report to the American people, and they, Mr. Speaker, will see exactly why this was done, because the oversight responsibilities of the House of Representatives were done at the highest levels of this House. And by the way, we will read the bills before we pass them, we will understand the facts of the case and be able to explain them, and, more importantly, the Speaker of the House of Representatives will be in support of the American people knowing the truth.

Mr. Speaker, thank you for allowing the Rules Committee to bring forth its rule today to talk about this important, not just intelligence operation and national security and State Department and military operations, but to be able to say that the confidence that the American people have in the brave men and women who represent America—that we will never leave them on the battlefield alone in hours of firefights without a backup position of knowing that the next sound you hear will be the United States Navy or the United States Air Force coming to aid the men and women who are in harm's way. That is the bottom line to this: an apology, not just stating a mismanagement, based upon the facts of the case.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote “yes” on the resolution and “yes” on the underlying legislation. I believe what we are doing today is an honorable day for the American people, and I am proud to be here as an American, as a Member of Congress, saying we will get to the bottom of this, it will be done quickly, and it will be done efficiently, and the American people can then make their decisions and us move on, knowing that we will support the men and women who wear the uniform.

The material previously referred to by Mr. POLIS is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 575 OFFERED BY  
MS. SLAUGHTER OF NEW YORK

Strike “except” and all that follows and insert the following:

“except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and rank-

ing minority member of the Committee on Rules; and (2) the amendment specified in section 2 of this resolution if offered by Representative SLAUGHTER of New York or a designee, which shall be in order without intervention of any point of order, shall be considered as read, shall be separately debatable for 30 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.”

At the end of the resolution, add the following new section:

SEC. 2. The amendment referred to in the first section is as follow:

Page 1, lines 9 and 10, strike “after consultation with” and insert “on the recommendation of”.

Page 4, strike lines 15 and 16 and redesignate accordingly.

Page 4, line 22, after “Select Committee”, insert “, including one of the members who was appointed to the Select Committee after consultation with the minority leader under section 2(a).”

Page 5, line 3, strike “chair of the”.

Page 5, line 7, before the period, insert “, only upon an affirmative vote of the majority of its members or with the concurrence of the ranking minority member”.

Page 5, lines 8 and 9, strike “upon consultation with” and insert “with the concurrence of”.

Page 5, line 16, before the period, insert “, and shall be taken only upon concurrence of the ranking minority member”.

Page 5, line 18, strike “after consultation with” and insert “with the concurrence of”.

Page 6, after line 3, add the following new subsections:

(d) All Members of the Select Committee shall have equitable and timely access to all evidence and other material received by the Select Committee.

(e) The Select Committee shall adopt written procedures governing how documents and other information may be obtained, used, or released by the committee or any members or staff of the committee.

Page 7, after line 11, add the following new subsections:

(d) The chair and ranking minority member of the Select Committee shall receive equal allotments of resources for the expenses and staff necessary to carry out this resolution.

(e) A complete report of the expenditures of the Select Committee shall be made available to the public on a monthly basis.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT  
IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the Democratic minority to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives (VI, 308-311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as “a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge.” To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that “the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition” in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the



opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

The Republican majority may say "the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever." But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: "Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule. . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment."

In Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled "Amending Special Rules" states: "a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate." (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: "Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon."

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Mr. SESSIONS. I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would inform the House that, pursuant to House Resolution 574, the Speaker has certified to the United States Attorney for the District of Columbia the refusal of Lois G. Lerner to provide testimony before the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 10, SUCCESS AND OPPORTUNITY THROUGH QUALITY CHARTER SCHOOLS ACT; RELATING TO CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4438, AMERICAN RESEARCH AND COMPETITIVENESS ACT OF 2014; AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 576 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 576

*Resolved*, That at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 10) to amend the charter school program under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed 90 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Education and the Workforce now printed in the bill. The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommend with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. On any legislative day during the period from May 12, 2014, through May 16, 2014—

(a) the Journal of the proceedings of the previous day shall be considered as approved; and

(b) the Chair may at any time declare the House adjourned to meet at a date and time, within the limits of clause 4, section 5, article I of the Constitution, to be announced by the Chair in declaring the adjournment.

SEC. 3. The Speaker may appoint Members to perform the duties of the Chair for the duration of the period addressed by section 2 of

this resolution as though under clause 8(a) of rule I.

SEC. 4. It shall be in order at any time on the legislative day of May 8, 2014, for the Speaker to entertain motions that the House suspend the rules, as though under clause 1 of rule XV, relating to the bill (H.R. 4366) to strengthen the Federal education research system to make research and evaluations more timely and relevant to State and local needs in order to increase student achievement.

SEC. 5. The Committee on Appropriations may, at any time before 5 p.m. on Thursday, May 15, 2014, file privileged reports to accompany measures making appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015.

SEC. 6. During consideration of the bill (H.R. 4438) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to simplify and make permanent the research credit, pursuant to House Resolution 569, the further amendment printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution shall be considered as adopted.

SEC. 7. House Resolution 569 is amended by striking "90 minutes" and inserting "one hour".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from North Carolina is recognized for 1 hour.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

□ 1345

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 576 provides for a structured rule providing for the consideration of H.R. 10, the Success and Opportunity through Quality Charter Schools Act.

My colleagues on the House Education and the Workforce Committee and I have been working to reauthorize the Elementary and Secondary Education Act; and to that end, the House passed H.R. 5, the Student Success Act, last July.

Our efforts in reauthorization have centered on four principles: reducing the Federal footprint in education, empowering parents, supporting effective teachers, and restoring local control. H.R. 10, the Success and Opportunity through Quality Charter Schools Act, takes a small bipartisan step in the reauthorization process and ensures that local communities have the flexibility needed to meet the needs of their students.

While H.R. 5 is languishing in the Senate, the House remains committed to continuing its work and has broken out the charter school programs as an area of agreement between House Republicans and Democrats.

Despite good intentions, there is widespread agreement that the current