

policy to assist countries in sub-Saharan Africa to develop an appropriate mix of power solutions for more broadly distributed electricity access in order to support poverty alleviation and drive economic growth, and for other purposes, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 297, nays 117, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 208]

YEAS—297

Amodei	Duckworth	Kuster
Bachus	Edwards	Lance
Barber	Ellison	Langevin
Barletta	Ellmers	Larsen (WA)
Barrow (GA)	Engel	Larson (CT)
Bass	Enyart	Latham
Beatty	Eshoo	Lee (CA)
Becerra	Esty	Levin
Bera (CA)	Farr	Lewis
Bilirakis	Fattah	Lipinski
Bishop (NY)	Fitzpatrick	LoBiondo
Black	Fortenberry	Loeb
Blackburn	Foster	Lofgren
Blumenauer	Frankel (FL)	Long
Bonamici	Frelinghuysen	Lowenthal
Boustany	Fudge	Lowe
Brady (PA)	Gabbard	Lucas
Brady (TX)	Galleo	Luetkemeyer
Braley (IA)	Garamendi	Lujan Grisham
Brooks (IN)	Garcia	(NM)
Brown (FL)	Gardner	Lujan, Ben Ray
Brownley (CA)	Gerlach	(NM)
Buchanan	Gibson	Lummis
Bucshon	Granger	Lynch
Bustos	Grayson	Maffei
Butterfield	Green, Al	Maloney,
Calvert	Green, Gene	Carolyn
Camp	Griffin (AR)	Maloney, Sean
Cantor	Grijalva	Marino
Capps	Grimm	Matheson
Capuano	Gutiérrez	Matsui
Cardenas	Hahn	McCarthy (CA)
Carney	Hall	McCarthy (NY)
Carson (IN)	Hanabusa	McCaul
Carter	Harper	McCollum
Cartwright	Hartzler	McDermott
Cassidy	Hastings (FL)	McGovern
Castor (FL)	Hastings (WA)	McIntyre
Castro (TX)	Heck (NV)	McKeon
Chu	Heck (WA)	McMorris
Cicilline	Herrera Beutler	Rodgers
Clark (MA)	Higgins	McNerney
Clarke (NY)	Himes	Meadows
Clay	Hinojosa	Meeks
Cleaver	Holt	Meng
Clyburn	Honda	Messer
Coffman	Horsford	Michaud
Cohen	Hoyer	Miller, Gary
Cole	Huffman	Miller, George
Collins (NY)	Huizenga (MI)	Moore
Connolly	Hultgren	Moran
Conyers	Israel	Murphy (FL)
Cook	Issa	Nadler
Cooper	Jackson Lee	Napolitano
Costa	Jeffries	Neal
Courtney	Jenkins	Negrete McLeod
Cramer	Johnson (GA)	Nolan
Crenshaw	Johnson, E. B.	Nugent
Crowley	Johnson, Sam	Nunes
Cuellar	Jolly	O'Rourke
Cummings	Joyce	Owens
Davis (CA)	Kaptur	Pallone
DeFazio	Keating	Pascarell
Delaney	Kelly (IL)	Pastor (AZ)
DeLauro	Kelly (PA)	Paulsen
DelBene	Kennedy	Payne
Denham	Kildee	Perlmutter
Dent	Kilmer	Perry
Deutch	Kind	Peters (CA)
Diaz-Balart	King (NY)	Peters (MI)
Dingell	Kinzinger (IL)	Peterson
Doggett	Kirkpatrick	Petri
Doyle	Kline	Pingree (ME)

Pocan	Schneider	Tonko
Polis	Schock	Tsongas
Price (NC)	Schrader	Upton
Quigley	Scott (VA)	Valadao
Rangel	Sensenbrenner	Van Hollen
Reichert	Serrano	Vargas
Renacci	Sewell (AL)	Veasey
Ribble	Shea-Porter	Vela
Richmond	Sherman	Velázquez
Roby	Simpson	Visclosky
Rogers (MI)	Sinema	Wagner
Rokita	Sires	Walberg
Rooney	Slaughter	Walden
Ros-Lehtinen	Smith (NJ)	Walz
Roskam	Smith (WA)	Wasserman
Ross	Southerland	Schultz
Roybal-Allard	Speier	Waters
Royce	Stockman	Waxman
Ruiz	Swalwell (CA)	Welch
Runyan	Takano	Williams
Ruppersberger	Terry	Wilson (FL)
Ryan (OH)	Thompson (CA)	Wilson (SC)
Sanchez, Linda	Thompson (MS)	Wolf
T.	Thompson (PA)	Yarmuth
Sanchez, Loretta	Thornberry	Yoder
Sarbanes	Tiberi	Yoho
Schakowsky	Tierney	Young (AK)
Schiff	Titus	Young (IN)

NAYS—117

Aderholt	Goody	Pitts
Amash	Graves (GA)	Poe (TX)
Barr	Graves (MO)	Pompeo
Barton	Griffith (VA)	Posey
Benish	Guthrie	Price (GA)
Bentivolio	Hanna	Rahall
Bishop (UT)	Harris	Rice (SC)
Bridenstine	Hensarling	Rigell
Brooks (AL)	Holding	Roe (TN)
Broun (GA)	Hudson	Rogers (AL)
Burgess	Huelskamp	Rogers (KY)
Byrne	Hunter	Rohrabacher
Campbell	Hurt	Rothfus
Capito	Johnson (OH)	Ryan (WI)
Chabot	Jones	Salmon
Chaffetz	Jordan	Sanford
Collins (GA)	King (IA)	Scalise
Conaway	Labrador	Schweikert
Cotton	LaMalfa	Scott, Austin
Daines	Lamborn	Sessions
Davis, Rodney	Lankford	Shimkus
DeSantis	Latta	Shuster
DesJarlais	Marchant	Smith (MO)
Duncan (SC)	Massie	Smith (NE)
Duncan (TN)	McClintock	Smith (TX)
Farenthold	McHenry	Stewart
Fincher	McKinley	Stivers
Fleischmann	Mica	Stutzman
Fleming	Miller (FL)	Tipton
Flores	Miller (MI)	Turner
Forbes	Mullin	Walorski
Fox	Mulvaney	Weber (TX)
Franks (AZ)	Murphy (PA)	Webster (FL)
Garrett	Neugebauer	Wenstrup
Gibbs	Noem	Westmoreland
Gingrey (GA)	Olson	Whitfield
Gohmert	Palazzo	Wittman
Goodlatte	Pearce	Womack
Gosar	Pittenger	Woodall

NOT VOTING—17

Bachmann	DeGette	Pelosi
Bishop (GA)	Duffy	Reed
Coble	Kingston	Rush
Crawford	McAllister	Schwartz
Culberson	Meehan	Scott, David
Davis, Danny	Nunnelee	

□ 1611

Mr. FINCHER changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. COFFMAN and Ms. KAPTUR changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to establish a comprehensive United States Government policy to encourage the efforts of countries in sub-Saharan Africa to develop an appropriate mix of power solutions, in-

cluding renewable energy, for more broadly distributed electricity access in order to support poverty reduction, promote development outcomes, and drive economic growth, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1615

ESTABLISHING SELECT COMMITTEE ON THE EVENTS SURROUNDING THE 2012 TERRORIST ATTACK IN BENGHAZI

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 575, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 567) providing for the Establishment of the Select Committee on the Events Surrounding the 2012 Terrorist Attack in Benghazi, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WOMACK). Pursuant to House Resolution 575, the resolution is considered read.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 567

Resolved,

SECTION 1. ESTABLISHMENT.

There is hereby established the Select Committee on the Events Surrounding the 2012 Terrorist Attack in Benghazi (hereinafter referred to as the "Select Committee").

SEC. 2. COMPOSITION.

(a) The Speaker shall appoint 12 Members to the Select Committee, five of whom shall be appointed after consultation with the minority leader.

(b) The Speaker shall designate one Member to serve as chair of the Select Committee.

(c) Any vacancy in the Select Committee shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointment.

SEC. 3. INVESTIGATION AND REPORT ON THE EVENTS SURROUNDING THE 2012 TERRORIST ATTACK IN BENGHAZI.

(a) The Select Committee is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete investigation and study and issue a final report of its findings to the House regarding—

(1) all policies, decisions, and activities that contributed to the attacks on United States facilities in Benghazi, Libya, on September 11, 2012, as well as those that affected the ability of the United States to prepare for the attacks;

(2) all policies, decisions, and activities to respond to and repel the attacks on United States facilities in Benghazi, Libya, on September 11, 2012, including efforts to rescue United States personnel;

(3) internal and public executive branch communications about the attacks on United States facilities in Benghazi, Libya, on September 11, 2012;

(4) accountability for policies and decisions related to the security of facilities in Benghazi, Libya, and the response to the attacks, including individuals and entities responsible for those policies and decisions;

(5) executive branch authorities' efforts to identify and bring to justice the perpetrators of the attacks on U.S. facilities in Benghazi, Libya, on September 11, 2012;

(6) executive branch activities and efforts to comply with Congressional inquiries into the attacks on United States facilities in Benghazi, Libya, on September 11, 2012;

(7) recommendations for improving executive branch cooperation and compliance with congressional oversight and investigations;

(8) information related to lessons learned from the attacks and executive branch activities and efforts to protect United States facilities and personnel abroad; and

(9) any other relevant issues relating to the attacks, the response to the attacks, or the investigation by the House of Representatives into the attacks.

(b) In addition to any final report addressing the matters in subsection (a), the Select Committee may issue such interim reports as it deems necessary.

(c) Any report issued by the Select Committee may contain a classified annex.

SEC. 4. PROCEDURE.

(a) Notwithstanding clause 3(m) of rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Select Committee is authorized to study the sources and methods of entities described in clause 11(b)(1)(A) of rule X insofar as such study is related to the matters described in section 3.

(b) Clause 11(b)(4), clause 11(e), and the first sentence of clause 11(f) of rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives shall apply to the Select Committee.

(c) Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives shall apply to the Select Committee except as follows:

(1) Clause 2(a) of rule XI shall not apply to the Select Committee.

(2) Clause 2(g)(2)(D) of rule XI shall apply to the Select Committee in the same manner as it applies to the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

(3) Pursuant to clause 2(h) of rule XI, two Members of the Select Committee shall constitute a quorum for taking testimony or receiving evidence and one-third of the Members of the Select Committee shall constitute a quorum for taking any action other than one for which the presence of a majority of the Select Committee is required.

(4) The chair of the Select Committee may authorize and issue subpoenas pursuant to clause 2(m) of rule XI in the investigation and study conducted pursuant to section 3 of this resolution, including for the purpose of taking depositions.

(5)(A) The chair of the Select Committee, upon consultation with the ranking minority member, may order the taking of depositions, under oath and pursuant to notice or subpoena, by a Member of the Select Committee or a counsel of the Select Committee.

(B) Depositions taken under the authority prescribed in this paragraph shall be governed by the procedures submitted by the chair of the Committee on Rules for printing in the Congressional Record.

(6) The chair of the Select Committee may, after consultation with the ranking minority member, recognize—

(A) Members of the Select Committee to question a witness for periods longer than five minutes as though pursuant to clause (2)(j)(2)(B) of rule XI; and

(B) staff of the Select Committee to question a witness as though pursuant to clause (2)(j)(2)(C) of rule XI.

SEC. 5. RECORDS; STAFF; FUNDING.

(a) Any committee of the House of Representatives having custody of records in any form relating to the matters described in section 3 shall transfer such records to the Select Committee within 14 days of the adoption of this resolution. Such records shall become the records of the Select Committee.

(b)(1)(A) To the greatest extent practicable, the Select Committee shall utilize the services of staff of employing entities of the House. At the request of the chair of the Select Committee in consultation with the ranking minority member, staff of employ-

ing entities of the House or a joint committee may be detailed to the Select Committee without reimbursement to carry out this resolution and shall be deemed to be staff of the Select Committee.

(B) Section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 4301(i)) shall apply with respect to the Select Committee in the same manner as such section applies with respect to a standing committee of the House of Representatives.

(2) The chair of the Select Committee, upon consultation with the ranking minority member, may employ and fix the compensation of such staff as the chair considers necessary to carry out this resolution.

(c) There shall be paid out of the applicable accounts of the House of Representatives such sums as may be necessary for the expenses of the Select Committee. Such payments shall be made on vouchers signed by the chair of the Select Committee and approved in the manner directed by the Committee on House Administration. Amounts made available under this subsection shall be expended in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Committee on House Administration.

SEC. 6. DISSOLUTION AND DISPOSITION OF RECORDS.

(a) The Select Committee shall cease to exist 30 days after filing the final report required under section 3.

(b) Upon dissolution of the Select Committee, the records of the Select Committee shall become the records of such committee or committees designated by the Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS) and the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on 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, at this time, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER), the Speaker of the House.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, I believe the whole House and the American people deserve to know how I came to the decision that brings us here today.

On September 11, 2012, a terrorist attack on our consulate in Libya left four of our countrymen dead, including our Ambassador.

Since that time, four committees of the House have been investigating these events, and those committees have done exemplary work. Chairman ISSA, Chairman MCKEON, Chairman ROGERS, Chairman ROYCE, and all the members of their respective committees deserve our gratitude; but last week, a line was crossed in two places.

First, it came to light that the White House did more to obscure what happened and why than what we were led to believe.

Second, we now know that the administration defied a formal congressional subpoena.

Our committees sought the full truth, and the administration tried to make sure that they wouldn't find it, which means they tried to prevent the American people from finding the truth as well.

In my view, these discoveries compel the House to respond as one institution and establish one select committee, a committee with robust authority, a committee that will do its work while the House continues to focus on the people's priorities.

I have asked the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. GOWDY) to chair this panel. He is a well-respected Member of this body, and he has my complete confidence. I will convey to you what I conveyed to him. This doesn't need to be, shouldn't be, and will not be a partisan process.

Four Americans died at the hands of terrorists in a well-coordinated assault, and we will not take any shortcuts to the truth, accountability, or justice; and we will not allow any sideshows that distract us from those goals.

Our system of government depends on transparency and accountability, and either we do this well, or we face the terrifying prospect of our people having less knowledge and less power over their own government. We owe it to future generations to make the right choice.

I ask all the Members of this body to reflect on this matter, and I ask you to support this resolution.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, we all agree—I think all Americans agree, and we certainly understand from the Speaker that he agrees that the attack on Benghazi was a tragedy; but here we are, once again, riling up the community and the country and causing, again, grief to the families of the four people who died, in a pursuit of some kind of truth that they were unable to find in 2 years of hearings, over four committees, 13 congressional hearings, 50 briefings, five reports, 25,000 pages of documentation, and wasted millions of dollars, going nowhere, and that is just in the House.

The Senate has held hearings. The State Department did a thorough report; and yet, now, after all that, we want the truth.

What does it say about the House of Representatives that whatever that was going on over there did not get to the truth?

This is so reminiscent of what we have done in the House of Representatives by doing over and over and over again, like trying to repeal the health care, that we are just going to keep doing it until you reach whatever it is you want.

Well, we know what it is you want with this special committee. We understand that thoroughly. Earlier today—I want to make a comment, that one of my friends on the other side of the aisle—I deeply regret this—cited a report claiming that the Democrats were

fundraising off of the crass Republican fundraising off Benghazi.

Certainly, we looked into that because I was very concerned because I was the one making the charge about the fundraising. It is absolutely false that Democrats are doing that.

That report was from The Daily Caller, a conservative Web site, and all they found was that the chairman of the Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee posted a statement on his Web site condemning the Republican campaign committee for their attempt to capitalize and fundraise off the tragedy in Benghazi.

Let's stick to the facts here. You are going to continue. As I understand it, several reporters have asked the leadership do they intend to stop fundraising off these people's deaths; and the answer is, no, they don't.

So what we are doing here, again, is an awful waste of time, is looking for another answer to something that—unless you get some answer that you want, I guess we will go on even yet another year or so.

Now, one more committee that will be weighted in favor of the majority, as this one is expected to do, will do absolutely nothing to yield different results.

I had an amendment to this bill that was based on a simple premise, that the investigations and reports on the tragic attack in Benghazi produced by the House committees so far have been nothing but partisan and political.

My amendment would have made membership on the committee equally divided between the minority and the majority and would have guaranteed minority signoff on subpoenas and depositions and guaranteed equal distribution and money and staffing and other resources of the committee and certainly have ensured that the witnesses who come before that committee, unlike the other witnesses that the Oversight and Government Reform Committee has had, who were totally ineligible to even speak on the subject—one of them, I gather, was giving all the details of what happened that night, but he happened to be in Germany at the time.

Had our amendment passed, we could have added some decorum to this process, and we could have worked to ensure the tragedy never happens again, but it is clear that this majority will not allow that.

So we have seen all the reports. We know what everybody thinks; and we know that, once again, we will be going into this because you are the majority, and you have the votes to do it.

I am appalled by this posturing. To use the tragedy of those four deaths for political and financial gain is shameful and contemptible.

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

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CANTOR), the Majority Leader of the House of Representatives.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the chairman. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of this resolution, to proceed with a select committee to find out what happened at the American consulate in Benghazi, Libya, on the night of September 11, 2012.

Mr. Speaker, it has been almost 2 years since a terror attack claimed the lives of four brave Americans in Benghazi: Ambassador J. Christopher Stevens; U.S. Foreign Service Information Management Officer Sean Smith; former Navy SEAL Glen Doherty; and former Navy SEAL and Bronze Star recipient, Tyrone Woods.

Over the past 2 years, our committees in the House have aggressively investigated what happened that night in Benghazi and the Obama administration's preparedness and response to those terror attacks.

Unfortunately, the White House has engaged in a pattern of obstruction, consistently ignoring subpoenas, redacting relevant information, and stonewalling investigators. This obstruction gives cause to the grave concerns expressed by countless Americans across the country.

Mr. Speaker, what is worse, as the White House refuses to turn over documents, they go in front of the American people and claim to be transparent. Those in the administration claim to be cooperating. They claim to be focused on bringing the perpetrators of that attack to justice.

Mr. Speaker, the attacks in Benghazi brought the first time an American Ambassador was killed in the line of duty since the 1970s and, to this day, not a single perpetrator of the attacks has been arrested or brought to justice. We should be using every tool necessary to find those responsible and bring them to justice.

After ignoring for nearly a year a lawful congressional subpoena, the White House, under court order, finally released emails showing that administration officials deliberately and deceptively misled Americans, claiming that the attack in Benghazi was the result of an offensive Internet video, rather than the product of a failed foreign policy that allowed radical Islamic terrorists to flourish in post-Qadhafi Libya.

This obfuscation and refusal to come clean to Congress has left us, as well as the people of this country, wondering: What else is the White House hiding?

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle want Americans to believe that this investigation is motivated by politics. No. This investigation would not be necessary had the Obama administration come clean. This investigation would not be necessary had the Obama administration complied with congressional subpoenas.

This investigation would not be necessary had the Obama administration not misled the Congress, the American people, and the media about what happened in Benghazi.

The American people deserve the truth and, most importantly, the fami-

lies of those four brave men deserve the truth.

This committee will build upon the excellent oversight work conducted to this date and ask questions and demand answers. Constitutional checks and balances were intended to ensure that each branch of government conduct itself with the utmost integrity and do so within the law. That is our duty, and we will solemnly and judiciously carry this out.

Today, we have an opportunity to stand together and take another step closer to accomplishing that goal, to finding the truth; and I urge my colleagues in the House to support this resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) will control the time.

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS), my good friend and member of the Oversight and Government Reform Committee, as its ranking member.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman for yielding, and I rise in strong opposition to this resolution.

Benghazi was a tragedy. We lost four brave Americans that night, and I extend my deepest sympathies to their families. In my opinion, we honor their memories best by bringing their killers to justice and by working in a bipartisan way to strengthen security for all U.S. personnel overseas.

As family members of Ambassador Stevens have stated, "What Chris never would have accepted was the idea that his death would have been used for political purposes."

□ 1630

Unfortunately, that is what House Republicans have been doing for the last year and a half.

On April 23, 2013, the Republican chairmen of five different House committees issued a highly partisan staff report with absolutely no consultation or input from a single Democratic Member of the Congress of the United States of America. Their report included a reckless accusation that Secretary Clinton personally authorized security reductions in Benghazi. Chairman ISSA then went on national television and said, Secretary Clinton "outright denied security, in her signature, in a cable."

When we located the cable, however, we discovered that the Republican report distorted the facts. The cable had only a printed stamp of Secretary Clinton's name, the same stamp that appears on hundreds of thousands of cables sent from the State Department every year.

This report was issued under the direction of the Speaker. It was posted on his Web site, and it was prepared only for Members of the House Republican Conference. How is this a bipartisan search for the truth?

House Republicans have also excluded Democratic Members from fact-finding delegations to Libya, in violation of the rules issued by the Speaker. How is that bipartisan?

Democratic Members have been denied equal access to witnesses, and Republicans have selectively leaked documents and cherry-picked transcript excerpts without any official committee consideration. How is that bipartisan?

Republicans have also been doing something worse. They have been using the deaths of these four Americans for political campaign fundraising. I call on the Speaker of the House to end that process right now.

For example, on February 17, Chairman ISSA traveled to New Hampshire to attend a political fundraiser, where he spoke about Benghazi. He suggested during his speech that our military's response on the night of the attacks was deficient because Secretary Clinton ordered Defense Secretary Panetta to "stand down." That was a shocking accusation, and he had absolutely no evidence—none—to support it. In my opinion, his statements were reprehensible not only to the Secretary of State but to our brave men and women in uniform.

And so today, we are here to consider a resolution to create another partisan committee to investigate what the Speaker and his five chairmen have already been investigating.

With all due respect, if the Republicans want to fix the problems with their partisan investigation, they need more than just a new chairman. They need a new approach. I have tremendous respect for the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. GOWDY), and I am glad that he said that fundraising should not be done on the deaths of these four people, and I hope that the Republican Conference will finally agree with that. We are better than that.

They need a new approach, one that is truly bipartisan, and one that seeks the facts before drawing conclusions, rather than the other way around.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, today is a historic day for this institution. As a result of the Obama administration's unwillingness to openly work with House Republicans in our ongoing effort to uncover the facts surrounding the events of the 2012 terrorist attack on the American diplomatic mission in Benghazi, Libya, the United States House of Representatives is left with no option except to establish a select committee on Benghazi.

As the author of this resolution, I would like to take the opportunity to provide the American people with a sequence of events that have led us to this point and explain how the newly formed select committee will operate on their behalf.

Immediately following the attacks on Benghazi on September 11, 2012, which took the lives of four brave Americans, including then-U.S. Amba-

sador to Libya J. Christopher Stevens, four House committees began investigations into the events prior to the attacks, those that occurred during the attacks, and the administration's response afterwards.

And I want to thank our House chairmen and the committees who did what I believe was an outstanding job in supporting this effort—Chairman DARRELL ISSA of the Oversight and Government Reform Committee, Chairman BUCK McKEON of the Armed Services Committee, Chairman ED ROYCE of the Foreign Affairs Committee, and Chairman MIKE ROGERS of the Intelligence Committee—and for their exemplary work that has advanced this issue and brought up new facts. Without their diligent work, we would not be where we are today.

But, Mr. Speaker, that work was thwarted; and by this administration not proactively addressing the issue equally themselves in an open and, I believe, transparent way, they have placed us where we are today. It comes as a result of their being an unwilling partner. It comes as a result of many, many turns. The administration has chosen to build roadblocks to the congressional inquiry. Whether failing to comply completely with opportunities to come speak to Congress, objecting to and not complying with subpoenas, delaying the delivery of important documents, heavily redacting critical information, and retroactively classifying previously unclassified files, this administration earned exactly the title that has been placed on it today, "uncooperative."

Mr. Speaker, this will not be tolerated, and this is what has brought us to where we are today. I will tell you that many of the things which you have heard on the floor today are accusations pitched our way; and I will tell you that the American people, through this process, will find out exactly who is after the truth and who is exactly for hiding the truth, because I believe that it is not just mismanagement at the top, but bad decisions that they should and will be embarrassed to have uncovered by the select committee on Benghazi.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I will yield myself 1 minute before yielding to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. Speaker, last night in the Rules Committee, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER) offered an amendment that was supported by all the Democrats on the committee. That amendment would have allowed for membership on the committee to be equally divided between Republicans and Democrats. It would guarantee minority signoff on subpoenas and depositions. It would guarantee equal distribution of money, staffing, and other resources of the committee. It would require the committee to establish written rules, specifically including rules concerning how documents and

other information may be obtained, used, or released.

I will offer a caveat there about the intelligence that you are about to get into with the select committee. It would guarantee equal access to evidence and materials of the committee. It provides for transparency of the committee's expenditures and budgeting, and it would ensure that a quorum for taking testimony or receiving evidence includes at least one minority Member.

Finally, it would ensure that the minority has a say in decisions about extended questioning and staff questioning of witnesses. That would produce a bipartisan result that would be credible.

I am very pleased at this time to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLAY), my good friend and a member of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

Mr. CLAY. I thank my friend from Florida for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to oppose this misguided, highly partisan select committee that seeks to exploit the tragedy of the attack on our consulate in Benghazi for purely political purposes.

There have already been eight—eight—reviews of that terrible incident. There were legitimate oversight questions about Benghazi, and we explored them in exhaustive detail. More than 25,000 documents have been produced, and dozens of witnesses have been interviewed. Millions of tax dollars have already been spent responding to repetitive and partisan congressional requests. The majority has alleged multiple conspiracy theories, each of which has been dispelled by the facts.

Ambassador Chris Stevens, Sean Smith, Tyrone Woods, and Glen Doherty are American heroes who gave their lives in brave service to our Nation. But instead of honoring their memory, even before it convenes, this sham select committee is already blatantly being used for political purposes. Evidence of that comes directly from the National Republican Congressional Committee, which created an online fundraising solicitation yesterday. And it reads, in part:

You're now a Benghazi watchdog. Let's go after Obama & Hillary Clinton. Help us fight them now.

So this is not about discovering new facts about Benghazi. This is about creating a partisan vehicle to exploit this tragedy to raise money and to provide the majority's echo chamber on cable TV and talk radio with red meat rhetoric to influence the 2014 midterms and the 2016 Presidential election.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose this resolution.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas, Judge POE.

Mr. POE of Texas. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, on September 11, 2012, terrorists stormed the American consulate in Benghazi. Four Americans were murdered. Nineteen months later, the killers are still running loose. One killer was even interviewed on CNN, but this country cannot capture him and his fellow outlaws.

Why? What has been the problem?

Today there are more questions than answers. Americans are still not really sure what happened that night and the days following the attack.

Several House committees launched investigations but were stonewalled. Subpoenas were issued but ignored. And last week, a White House email was disclosed that indicated there may have been coordination to purposely deceive Congress about what really happened.

Did the administration deceive America? If so, why? Let's find out.

We have no choice but to establish this select committee to ensure that the full story is told, even if the evidence reveals an inconvenient truth, to shine light on what happened when Americans overseas were murdered in the darkness of the night.

And to those who oppose this bill, I ask the question, Mr. Speaker: Why don't they want to know all of the facts?

Let's find the truth—the good, the bad, and the ugly truth. Justice demands it, and justice is what we do in this country.

And that's just the way it is.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentlewoman from New York will control the remaining time for the minority.

There was no objection.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH), a member of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, 30 years ago, America suffered an incredible tragedy; 241 Marines in Beirut lost their lives when terrorists bombed the barracks in which they were living. At that time, we had a President whose name was Ronald Reagan, and we had a Speaker of the House whose name was Tip O'Neill. Different parties.

That was an enormous tragedy. An investigation needed to be done, and it was done. It was done on a bipartisan basis. One investigation was done. And there was a presumption that no matter how tragic this was and no matter how important it was to hold people accountable—and that was done—that everybody involved had the best intentions for America's future strength.

And there seems to be a premise, at least to me, that this President of the United States has any less commitment to protecting the lives and safety of the American people than any other President.

□ 1645

I will tell you, I was an opponent of the war in Iraq, and I was critical of

the policies and the decisions of our then-President George Bush. But never once did I question that his motivations were anything less than what he thought was best for America.

We are going off the rails here. This is a tragedy. But there is a real question, at least on the part of many of us, and I think many Americans, as to whether we are doing this right. How is it that there is such glee that the decision is made to go forward after seven other committees, 25,000 documents—more work could be done—but how is it that there was such glee on one side that they turned it into a fundraising opportunity? Who would do that?

Mr. GOWDY won't do it, and he is a good man. But do you know what? If we are going to proceed, it has got to be on the level. We have a seven-to-five committee that is being organized. It is not even-handed. You can't have these tough decisions that not only have to be made right but have to be made so that there is credibility with the American people that they are on the level and not political where you don't have a bipartisan approach, you don't have everybody weighing in on subpoenas.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, there are lots of questions. The first one is, Why didn't the military come help these men when they were in need over this firefight for several hours? We will just start there.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, I would like to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Dardanelle, Arkansas (Mr. COTTON), who is a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. Speaker, a couple of lessons I learned in the Army were you move to the sound of gunfire, and the most important step in the troop-leading procedures is to supervise the execution of your orders.

When Americans were fighting for their lives in Benghazi, Barack Obama did neither. He sent no Quick Reaction Force, and he didn't even stay in the Situation Room to supervise the execution of his orders. We expect more from lieutenants in the Army than our President gave us that night. For 2 years, he has covered up this failure of leadership by stonewalling. Not anymore. We will now get to the truth.

But what do our colleagues on the other side of the aisle say to this? They express great outrage at politicizing this matter. When I was leading troops in Iraq in 2006, men and women who were being shot at and blown up by al Qaeda, where was the outrage as they fund-raised endlessly off the Iraq war? Where was the outrage as they viciously attacked our commanders? Where was the outrage when they said that soldiers were war criminals? Where was the outrage when they said the war was lost? Where was the outrage when they said that only high school dropouts join the Army?

Forgive me if I don't join my Democratic colleagues in sharing their fake outrage. Four Americans lost their lives that night in Benghazi. They de-

serve justice, and the American people deserve the truth.

One other lesson I learned in the Army is we leave no man behind, and we will not leave these four men behind.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, let me yield myself 20 seconds to just respond to that.

Mr. Speaker, I would be outraged, too, if anybody did the things that he accused us of doing, and I don't believe a word of it.

I am now pleased to yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF).

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor today to urge my colleagues to vote against the creation of this select committee. Because this is not a select committee to investigate what happened in Benghazi, which has been done many times already, it is not a select committee to investigate what we can do to better protect our embassies, consulates, and diplomatic corps, which appears to have generated little interest in the majority, it is not even a select committee to probe where we were in the hunt for those responsible, which involves classified information and is something done best in closed session.

No. This is a proposal to create a select committee on talking points.

I have been involved with the investigation into Benghazi from day one as a member of the Intelligence Committee because, like every other American, I wanted to know what happened, why it happened, and how we can keep it from happening again. And I want to bring to justice those who perpetrated this horrible attack.

But almost 18 months later, and after eight reports from House and Senate committees and the Accountability Review Board, the questions that this select committee purports to investigate have been asked and answered time and time and time again. There is no question that this select committee on talking points will waste potentially millions of taxpayer dollars in a purely partisan exercise and serve as little more than a fundraising vehicle for Republicans.

Up until last Friday, the Speaker of the House resisted the siren call from his base for yet another wasteful committee. Here is what he said just a month ago:

There are four committees that are investigating Benghazi. I see no reason to break up all the work that has been done and to take months and months and months to create some select committee.

I agree with the Speaker's previous assessment.

Democrats made a proposal to structure the committee so that it had equal numbers of members of each party, so that it required cooperation on subpoenas and depositions, and so that it guaranteed equal access to evidence and material collected by the committee. Yet, in each case, we were rejected.

If this isn't a fair investigation and select committee, there is no reason for Democrats to vote for it or to participate in it. Let's end the political circus and focus our efforts on preventing another Benghazi and accelerating the hunt for the murderers of four Americans, including Ambassador Stevens.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I would like to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. FORTENBERRY), a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Mr. Speaker, when pressed last week by a reporter about the tragic events on September 11, 2012, in Benghazi, Libya, the former spokesperson for the National Security Council said this: "Dude, this was like 2 years ago."

Now, this juvenile and unprofessional response has only added to the concern that we do not—still do not—have a full understanding of what occurred that night. What we do know is that our Ambassador, Chris Stevens, and three other Americans are dead.

Now, several congressional committees have looked into this question and have concluded different things, and there are many lingering questions still unanswered. They have reached different conclusions. But these lingering questions are made worse by the fact that we now know that emails from the administration may have been withheld from Congress.

This is the reason that we need a select committee, to probe deeply and get clear answers with a singular goal in mind: to restore the public trust.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY), the ranking member of the Oversight and Government Reform Committee's Subcommittee on Government Operations.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my dear friend.

By the way, Mr. Speaker, we don't need a select committee because a particular chairman who is subpoena-happy can't quite draft a subpoena to capture the emails in question.

I rise in strong opposition to H. Res. 567, which represents yet another unfortunate chapter in the majority's relentless commitment to wasting taxpayer dollars on round after round of Benghazi political theater.

There is a reason that State's slogan is "diplomacy in action." To effectively represent our Nation, American personnel overseas and their families make significant sacrifices. Ambassador Stevens' own family knows that. They issued this eloquent statement after his death:

Chris was not willing to be the kind of diplomat who would strut around in fortified compounds. He amazed and impressed the Libyans by walking the streets with the lightest of escorts, sitting in sidewalk cafes, chatting with passersby. There was a risk to being accessible. He knew it, and he accepted it.

What he would never have accepted was the idea that his death would be used for po-

litical purposes. There were security shortcomings, no doubt. Both internal and outside investigations have identified and publicly disclosed them. Steps are being taken to repair them. Chris would not have wanted to be remembered as a victim. He knew and accepted that he was working under dangerous circumstances.

He did so—just as so many of our diplomatic and development professionals do every day—because he believed the work was vitally important.

That is the statement of Chris Stevens, the deceased, murdered Ambassador to Libya, his family.

I deeply understand the demands we place on our Foreign Service, and I know the stakes are high. As a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee staff from 1979 to 1989, I vividly recall shortly after I returned home from a visit to the U.S. barracks in Beirut, a horrific truck bomb was detonated there, killing 241 U.S. members of the Marine Corps. Our Embassy was blown up twice in Beirut in that same timeframe.

The Democrats didn't pile on. The Democrats didn't call for a select committee to investigate Ronald Reagan and his administration for malfeasance and incompetence. We didn't darkly hint there was a conspiracy by the Reagan administration to hide the facts and to deny terrorism had occurred. We were patriots. We came together. We mourned our losses. We worked with a Republican President to make it better. That is the spirit in which we should approach this issue.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I would like to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. TERRY), a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, this bill is absolutely necessary when we look at the facts as we know them currently and we look at the information that we are uncertain about. Number one is we have lost four people in an attack that we now know is a terrorist attack. We now know that some things could have been done to save these people, but for some reason they weren't done.

Now, Beirut has been raised a couple of times, showing the cooperation between Speaker Tip O'Neill then and Ronald Reagan when we lost 241 soldiers in that attack. I remember it vividly. But the difference is how the leadership between then and now reacted.

The leadership at the White House responded to this attack by developing a false narrative to—probably, we don't know why they came up with this fake story about an impromptu protest gone bad, therefore causing these deaths, so if they are making up a story, what are they trying to hide? Their own incompetence? We don't know that.

We talked about then in Beirut, as my friends from the other side of the aisle had mentioned, about all of the documents that were received in the Beirut investigation. Well, that is because they were cooperative. The documents that we received, despite what the gentleman from Virginia just said,

that they were subpoenaed incorrectly, the documents we received were heavily redacted. They were purposely not providing that information. It was redacted.

Now, why was that redacted? Why was it that we had to find out some of the truth about the coverup that occurred on that narrative about a protest gone bad from an outside group that provided the unredacted? So, now, what we have before us is an email that was redacted from the White House and another one that was obtained through an outside source that provided us the same but unredacted that says now that the White House was telling us something different.

When you have a White House that has gone out of their way to cover up the truth, it is incumbent upon all of us on both sides of the aisle to fight for the truth so that the four people that lost their lives—one of which an Ambassador, for God's sake—they are the ones that deserve justice by this select committee.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, for rebuttal, I am going to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY).

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I say to my friend, it is amazing that he claims the White House is covering up when the same White House gave an unredacted version to the Judicial Watch. The easier conclusion—

Mr. TERRY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONNOLLY. I am rebutting what I just heard.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman says this is about getting at the truth. Really? Because there have been so many falsehoods propounded on this subject by the other side of the aisle. There was a stand-down order proved conclusively by our own Republican-controlled House Armed Services Committee. There was no such thing.

We could have and should have mobilized the military to intervene and save lives. The military did what it could, but there was not enough timeframe for the military efficaciously to intervene in the tragedy unfolding in Benghazi.

The Secretary of State knew and deliberately covered up. There were talking points that deliberately avoided the word "terrorism," even though the President of the United States a few days later most certainly did use the word "terrorist" to describe what happened in Benghazi.

The Islamic video had nothing whatsoever to do with Benghazi. The Islamic video was erupting—

Mr. TERRY. Will the gentleman yield now? Because that is absolutely wrong, and you know it.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will suspend.

Let me remind the other side that the gentleman from Virginia has the floor. He has been unwilling to yield. Let the gentleman have the floor.

The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. CONNOLLY. I thank the Speaker for returning us to regular order.

Mr. Speaker, these are all falsehoods used to justify a needless expense of taxpayer dollars to beat to death for political purposes the tragedy that occurred in Benghazi. And the invocation of the name of the deceased Ambassador, Chris Stevens, even though his own family has pleaded that he not be used as a political pawn in a political partisan game, is something that is beneath contempt.

□ 1700

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the reason why Judicial Watch received the information they did in an unredacted basis was because there are criminal penalties associated with that act. Those criminal penalties do not exist in a congressional inquiry. The administration is simply taking advantage of that, and they know that and so do all Members of Congress.

This administration was playing games. They are taking advantage of the structure which has been established in the relationship of trying to have the three branches of government coexist, and that is exactly what this administration did, and that was the trigger point to where the Speaker then said enough is enough.

When we recognized that the documents that we were getting, which are heavily redacted, did not coincide or agree with what outside groups would get because they, Mr. Speaker, asked for it under FOIA, which has criminal penalties associated with it, which meant that those lawyers knew exactly what they were doing and could be held to that criminal penalty point, but in providing them to Congress, they would just redact it and then claim national security, and we might not ever know the difference.

We are not stupid. We have been deliberate. We have been cautious. We have stayed after it. But redaction after redaction after redaction and wrong, wrong direction and trying to lead us down a path that was not correct is exactly where this administration has been, and they deserve what they are getting.

They are the ones that brought this to Congress. We are simply properly and carefully responding.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished chairman for bringing this important resolution forward and also Congressman FRANK WOLF, who has been tenacious in insisting that there be a select committee.

There are serious gaps. We all know it. The people who lost their lives who died unnecessarily their loved ones and the American people deserve to know the truth about Benghazi.

When Secretary Clinton came before the Foreign Affairs Committee, I asked her point blank:

You have said, Madam Secretary, that you take full responsibility. How do you define "full responsibility"?

She defined it from the day of, and all that preceded Benghazi is precluded from that definition.

Despite the fact that there was one cable after another, suggesting that there were serious gaps in security, all of that seemed to have not made its way to either her or her senior staff. That is very much of a lack of attention to detail, and a light needs to be brought to that.

I asked two of the people who headed up the ARB, the Accountability Review Board, why they did not interview Secretary Clinton. They had no good answer. I asked them twice—no good answer.

Back in 1998, when we got hit in Dar es Salaam and in Nairobi, I chaired the hearings of the Accountability Review Board. We looked painstakingly at all of the gaps that existed and I wrote the Secure Embassy Construction and Counterterrorism Act of 1999.

There were lessons learned. Those lessons were not applied the way they should have been to Benghazi. Requests were made for help. We still don't know the truth. The new select committee will leave no stone unturned. It will get answers.

Again, those who died, their loved ones, and the American people deserve to know the truth.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire if my colleague has more requests for time?

Mr. SESSIONS. In fact, I do.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I reserve the balance of my time to close.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tampa, Florida (Mr. JOLLY).

Mr. JOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution, a resolution necessitated today by a crisis in trust, a crisis in trust between this Congress and this administration.

This body has the article I constitutional authority to provide oversight over the administration, an authority that has been repeatedly ignored by this administration, and ignored with an audacity rarely seen in modern politics. Today, with this resolution, we confront that audacity.

Here are the facts. We have a President that rules by pen and a phone. We have an Attorney General that selectively enforces laws when he wishes to and in which States he wishes to. We have a Veterans Affairs administration that is withholding documents about the death of veterans.

We have agencies that legislate by regulation, and we have an Internal Revenue Service that has targeted organizations and refuses to testify about it. So is it any surprise that, last week, additional information comes to light about Benghazi? No, it is not.

This administration has kept information from this Congress, and they

have refused to recognize the gravity of this obstructionism. They have done so in the context of a loss of American lives and a loss of life that is personal for a family in my district. That family deserves answers.

Yes, we have a crisis in trust between this Congress and this administration, but this is not political theater. This has not been brought upon this House by this side of the aisle. It has been brought upon this house by the stonewalling of the administration.

It is a rightful execution and a proper execution of the article I oversight authority of this Congress. I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA), a member of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, I am going to ask a couple of questions. First of all, I have to give a disclaimer that I was one of the Members on this side of the aisle that did not favor a select committee. I actually took my name off of a request by Mr. WOLF. I thought we could handle this matter in regular order. Four committees proceeded to investigate the matter.

I am the senior member of the chief investigative panel of Congress. I have been through many investigations. I have never in my life seen the stonewalling. I have never seen the contempt for Congress displayed by this administration.

Then last week, to make a mockery of the entire system, we saw from an outside party getting information that four committees of Congress had never received and requested. I have never seen anything like this. Why are we doing this? The other side has brought this, the administration has brought this upon themselves.

Let me ask a fundamental question: What difference does it make? What difference does it make?

I want you to tell that to the State Department employees who every day go to work, sometimes put their life at risk. Four American officials were killed—murdered—and no one has been held accountable. No one has been brought to justice, and to have an official come before a committee of Congress and say: What difference does it make? Ask that to the families of the State Department people who work for the American people.

What difference does it make? Ask the military.

Oh, there is no evidence of an order to stand down, but we know our military had the ability to save those Americans. We know that the State Department had the ability to keep those Americans safe, and no one acted.

What difference does it make? What difference does it make to those four families?

What difference does it make? We don't have to investigate anything. We don't have to hold anyone accountable.

No one died in Watergate. Four American officials lost their lives. Under our system, individuals—whether it is the Secretary of State or the President of the United States or any official at any level—need to be and must be held accountable and responsible under our system.

Otherwise, we make a mockery of this whole business of a government of and for and by the people.

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

Mr. SESSIONS. I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman.

Mr. MICA. What difference does it make?

People were asleep at the switch. They need to be held accountable again, regardless of rank. This is the United States of America. This is the Congress. People sent us here. They are out there trying to make a living, provide for their families, pay their taxes. They sent us here to keep this government responsible, accountable.

What difference does it make? It makes a great deal of difference, not only to the men and women of the State Department, our United States military, the families of those slain, but it makes a big difference to the people of the United States who sent us here to keep this a responsible government and accountable, no matter who must be held responsible or accountable.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I reserve the balance of my time as long as my colleague has speakers.

Mr. SESSIONS. We are now through with our speakers, and I am prepared to close.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

I think probably the best way that I can close would be with another quote from the man who is fast becoming my favorite Member of the House of Representatives, Congressman BUCK McKEON, Republican chair of the Armed Services Committee.

He said to the Associated Press on April 10:

I think I pretty well have been satisfied that given where the troops were, how quickly the thing all happened, and how quickly it dissipated, we probably could not have done more than we did. At some point, we think we will have as much of this story as we are going to get and move on.

Mr. McKEON, it is long past time for us to move on.

I really appreciate so much hearing from Mr. CONNOLLY, the statement from Ambassador Stevens' family—I had not heard it before—and the eloquence with which they talked about him. Remember, he had only been there in Benghazi—was basically there for the day, and everybody said—and all of the things that I have read, he was that kind of man.

He spoke the language, and he wanted to be out with the people. He would not have wanted to be behind the walls of a compound, and he knew what he was doing, and he made his choices.

The thing that rang so strong with me was the one thing that they said that he would not have wanted was to become a political pawn, and that is exactly what we are making of Ambassador Stevens and the other three Americans who died in that tragic event.

Without any question, we are also causing, once again, to those four families of people who loved them most grievous hardship to deal with all this again, and it is being done for politics. It is being done to raise money.

So I want to close by paraphrasing another great American at another time and ask the majority: Have you no shame? At long last, have you no shame?

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

I do want to thank the gentlewoman from New York, the ranking member of the Rules Committee, my dear friend, who presided over a very long hearing yesterday, where we went through, in a meticulous fashion, the understanding of why this committee, who this committee might comprise itself of, and what their mission would be.

We intervened into this process as a result of a real problem, Mr. Speaker. We have intervened in this process because the administration and the standing committees here in the House of Representatives were unable to quickly and thoroughly accomplish their goal of providing not only proper oversight, but getting a fair and transparent answer back.

Hiding the ball is one thing; deception is another.

□ 1715

This administration has gone out of their way. They have lawyered up to make sure that they could, I think, mislead Congress. Well, they would make sure that we really could never get involved in anything but a goo ball, and then they would try and explain themselves in such a way that they would blame our insistence upon getting the truth as a political witch-hunt.

Mr. Speaker, that must mean there is a witch somewhere. And I don't have any clue what that answer is. What I will tell you is this: we must get to the bottom of this without it being a political witch-hunt.

So yesterday, I meticulously went through with the committee an understanding, and I stated three important parts of what this resolution is about: a select committee is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete investigation and study; and to issue a final report and its findings to the House regarding all policies, decisions, and activities that contributed to the attack on the United States facilities in Benghazi, Libya, on September 11, 2012, as well as those that affected the ability of the United States to prepare for these attacks; and number three, in particular, that information related to

lessons learned from the attack and executive branch activities and efforts to protect the United States facilities and personnel must be understood.

Mr. Speaker, JOHN BOEHNER, the Speaker of the House, has announced that the gentleman from South Carolina, a distinguished Federal prosecutor, a reliable person who serves in this body, is not the least bit interested in the political outcome. In fact, he is interested, because I know him and know him well, in doing the things which are under the charge that we at the Rules Committee and that this House today, I believe, will give him, that he will well and faithfully discharge those duties that have been given to him as the chairman of this select committee.

And I believe that the Speaker of the House has met with former Speaker PELOSI, now the minority leader, to ask the minority leader to please offer him the names of those five personnel, Members of Congress, who might represent the Democrats, or the minority in this case, an opportunity to be a full and forthwith member of this committee.

It is our intent that these 12 people will work together, not apart, that they will work with a mandate that is clear and that provides them the necessary information and the discretion to the full extent of the law.

It is also understood by this that these members of this select committee need to be met forthwith by the administration of the United States of America, and that is the office and the executive branch of the Presidency.

It is a full request that I would make at this time for the American people to understand that we are asking this administration to lay down their sword, to lay down those things which have been impediments to properly providing transparency and things that are information that would allow us to get to the bottom of this.

We have heard over and over how people accepted that the buck stopped there and they took full responsibility. In accepting full responsibility, we have not learned enough about what those mistakes were if they are willing to accept the responsibility.

This is not going to be wished away, Mr. Speaker. Our young chairman, TREY GOWDY, will not whitewash this investigation. Our committee is not empowered just to go off and fritter away the time. They will be serious members of this body.

I look forward to finding out who former Speaker PELOSI, minority leader, appoints to the committee. I will be intensely interested to see who Speaker BOEHNER appoints. And I would bet that they will represent the very best from this body, that they will be young men and young women who have been in and a part of understanding how to carefully look for the facts of the case and not an inch beyond, how to ask questions that are fair and those that represent the very best of only learning the truth and not an inch more.

I have confidence that this House of Representatives, through the leadership of Mr. GOWDY, will bring not only excellence, but will stand as a model of how the House of Representatives should conduct itself when they have a problem with an administration, whether it be Republican or Democrat. I will predict today that those people that former Speaker PELOSI brings to the table and that we bring to the table will be prepared to do exactly that.

Mr. Speaker, with that, I know I am ending my time. I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, this week the House will debate and vote on a resolution authorizing a new Select Committee on Benghazi. Indeed, the attack in Libya was a tragedy, as is losing an Ambassador doing official work for the United States abroad, but using these deaths to score political points is politics at its worst. After 9/11, our nation came together to do what is best for all Americans. There were no gotcha politics, no hearings to blame the victims; instead, we worked together as a unified body on Capitol Hill to protect the American people.

There have already been seven reviews of that terrible attack: one by the State Department's Accountability Review Board, two bipartisan reviews in the Senate, and four partisan reviews in the House. It certainly seems as though the Republicans' proposed special committee is nothing more than an attempt to exploit the deaths of four brave Americans to divert attention away from their own do-nothing record here in Washington.

Moreover, this new select committee is in reality, nothing more than a monumental waste of time and taxpayer dollars to help Republicans mobilize their extreme base ahead of the election. According to the Department of Defense in fact, they have already spent millions of dollars and thousands of hours responding to congressional inquiries. Nor will the new select committee have any additional powers that Chairman ISSA doesn't have already—including the ability to issue unilateral subpoenas for any document or any witness, authority he just used to subpoena the Secretary of State.

To be sure, Benghazi was not the first time Americans have been killed in an embassy while in the service to their country. In the last 100 years, there have been 39 attacks on U.S. embassies with at least 44 American deaths. In one Embassy bombing in fact, a constituent of mine, Mr. Julian Bartley, Sr. one of the most senior African Americans in the U.S. Foreign Service, was the highest-ranking U.S. official killed in the August 7th, 1998 explosions at the American Embassies in Nairobi and Dar es Salaam, Tanzania. Jay, his son, a sophomore at the U.S. International University in Nairobi, also died in that explosion.

On that day in August, Osama bin Laden and his terrorist group, al-Qaeda, simultaneously set off bombs at the American embassies in Nairobi and Dar es Salaam, Tanzania. More than 250 people were killed, including 12 Americans, and 5,000 wounded in the twin bombing attacks: we were all outraged at these coordinated attacks on Americans.

However, as Dana Milbank of the Washington Post put it: 'Benghazi doesn't qualify as a scandal because the Republican allegations, even if true, don't amount to much. It is indeed

scandalous that weak security allowed the killings to occur, and that the perpetrators still haven't been brought to justice. But Republicans are focusing on (United Nations Ambassador Susan) Rice's TV talking points, under the theory that she emphasized the role of a provocative video and street protests so the violence wouldn't disprove President Obama's contention before the 2012 election that terrorists were being defeated.'

Mr. DUFFY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 567 and urge the House to approve the measure as soon as possible.

On September 11, 2012, a group of terrorists ruthlessly attacked our consulate in Benghazi and killed four Americans: U.S. Ambassador to Libya Christopher Stevens, Foreign Service Information Management Officer Sean Smith, and two private security contractors and former Navy SEALs, Glen Doherty and Tyrone Woods. The terrorists who perpetrated the attack have still not been brought to justice and the State Department officials, whose failure of leadership contributed to grossly inadequate security in Benghazi, have not been held accountable.

Despite numerous House oversight hearings on this issue, it is clear that there are too many questions that remain unanswered. Additionally, the Administration's unwillingness to present full and accurate information to these Congressional committees show officials are more interested in maintaining their public image than providing real answers.

That is why I am proud the House of Representatives is considering H. Res. 567 that establishes a Select Committee on the events surrounding the 2012 terrorist attacks in Benghazi. In fact, I was a proud cosponsor of a similar measure. I also want to thank you Mr. Speaker for appointing Rep. TREY GOWDY to head the Select Committee. A former federal prosecutor who never lost a case, I know my friend and colleague from South Carolina Rep. GOWDY will help these grieving American families finally get the answers they deserve.

I am hopeful that this Select Committee will finish the much needed work of holding the Administration accountable for its failures surrounding this attack, deliver justice to those terrorists who murdered these four Americans, and bring peace to the families of the victims.

I urge Members to support this resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 575, the previous question is ordered on the resolution.

The question is on the resolution.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. 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.

AGREEMENT FOR COOPERATION BETWEEN THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE GOVERNMENT OF THE SOCIALIST REPUBLIC OF VIETNAM CONCERNING PEACEFUL USES OF NUCLEAR ENERGY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 113-109)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am pleased to transmit to the Congress, pursuant to sections 123 b. and 123 d. of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (42 U.S.C. 2153(b), (d)) (the "Act"), the text of a proposed Agreement for Cooperation between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam Concerning Peaceful Uses of Nuclear Energy (the "Agreement"). I am also pleased to transmit my written approval, authorization, and determination concerning the Agreement, and an unclassified Nuclear Proliferation Assessment Statement (NPAS) concerning the Agreement. (In accordance with section 123 of the Act, as amended by title XII of the Foreign Affairs Reform and Restructuring Act of 1998 (Public Law 105-277), a classified annex to the NPAS, prepared by the Secretary of State in consultation with the Director of National Intelligence, summarizing relevant classified information, will be submitted to the Congress separately.) The joint memorandum submitted to me by the Secretaries of State and Energy and a letter from the Chairman of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission stating the views of the Commission are also enclosed. An addendum to the NPAS containing a comprehensive analysis of Vietnam's export control system with respect to nuclear-related matters, including interactions with other countries of proliferation concern and the actual or suspected nuclear, dual-use, or missile-related transfers to such countries, pursuant to section 102A of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 403-1), as amended, is being submitted separately by the Director of National Intelligence.

The proposed Agreement has been negotiated in accordance with the Act and other applicable law. In my judgment, it meets all applicable statutory requirements and will advance the non-proliferation and other foreign policy interests of the United States.

The proposed Agreement provides a comprehensive framework for peaceful nuclear cooperation with Vietnam based on a mutual commitment to nuclear nonproliferation. Vietnam has affirmed that it does not intend to seek to acquire sensitive fuel cycle capabilities, but instead will rely upon the