

increase hunger in America. Go to any food bank in America; they are at capacity right now. Leading economists have told us that further cuts to SNAP will undermine the economy. SNAP is actually a stimulus. People who get SNAP have to spend it on food, and it helps our economy grow. Doctors and medical researchers have documented time and time again with a gazillion studies that further cuts to SNAP will cause avoidable health care costs to millions of our fellow citizens.

Sometimes I wonder when we have these debates is if anybody is paying attention. My question to this Congress is: Is anybody listening? Why would anybody cut this program more and more and more and more? Why are so many in this Chamber so indifferent to this problem that affects close to 50 million of our fellow citizens?

I plead with my colleagues to say “no” to any further SNAP cuts, and I appeal to this administration to work with Congress to develop a plan so that nobody in this country goes hungry. The silence on this issue in this Congress and in this administration is sad, and it is a missed opportunity to do something meaningful and positive for millions of our fellow citizens. We can do more. We can do better. We can end hunger now, but not by coldly, callously, and arbitrarily cutting SNAP.

[From the New York Times, Jan. 6, 2014]

STUDY TIES DIABETIC CRISES TO DIP IN FOOD BUDGETS

(By Sabrina Tavernise)

Poor people with diabetes are significantly more likely to go to the hospital for dangerously low blood sugar at the end of the month when food budgets are tight than at the beginning of the month, a new study has found.

Researchers found no increase in such hospitalizations among higher-income people for the condition known as hypoglycemia, suggesting that poverty and exhausted food budgets may be a reason for the increased health risk.

Hypoglycemia occurs when people with diabetes have not had enough to eat, but continue taking medications for the disease. To control diabetes, patients need to keep their blood sugar within a narrow band. Levels that are too low or too high (known as hyperglycemia) can be dangerous.

Researchers found a clear pattern among low-income people: Hospital admissions for hypoglycemia were 27 percent higher at the end of the month than at the beginning. Researchers said they could not prove that the patients' economic circumstances were the reason for the admission, but the two things were highly correlated.

The study, published online Monday in the journal Health Affairs, comes as Congress continues to debate legislation that includes the food stamp program for poor Americans. House Republicans are advocating \$40 billion in cuts to the program, a step that Democrats oppose.

About 25 million Americans, or 8 percent of the population, have diabetes, according to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. The poor are disproportionately affected. The United States spends more than \$100 billion a year treating people with the disease, the agency estimates.

Researchers from the University of California, San Francisco, matched hospital dis-

charge records from 2000 to 2008 on more than two million people in California with those patients' ZIP codes. People living in the poorest ZIP codes, where average annual household income was below \$31,000, were counted as low income.

The researchers then examined cases of patients admitted for hypoglycemia. The symptoms include dizziness, sweating or nausea. In rare cases, hypoglycemia can cause death.

For each 100,000 admissions of poor people, about 270 of them were given a primary diagnosis of hypoglycemia, more than the 200 per 100,000 among people of higher incomes. Dr. Hilary Seligman, assistant professor of medicine at U.C.S.F., and the study's lead author, said the difference was statistically significant.

Dr. Seligman said that she and her colleagues, aware of the debate about food stamps, sought to document whether running out of food stamps or money to buy food at the end of the month damaged people's health. Previous research had already established that people often give a higher priority to paying monthly bills for rent or utilities, for example, than to buying food, which is managed from day to day.

“People who work minimum wage jobs or live on benefits often have this typical pay cycle pattern,” Dr. Seligman said. “We wanted to examine whether there were adverse health consequences to running out of money at the end of the month.”

Sara Rosenbaum, a professor of health law and policy at George Washington University who was not involved in the study, said the findings were persuasive.

“The patterns here are significant,” she said. “The researchers obviously can't say if food deprivation was the definitive triggering event, but the findings show a strong association between lack of food and adverse health consequences.”

BENGHAZI

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

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, over the past months since September 11, 2012, we have learned a great deal about what happened in Benghazi that fateful night when Chris Stevens, Sean Smith, Glen Doherty, and Tyrone Woods were murdered in our facility. Their work to make the world safer and to build peaceful relationships was met with aggression and brutality.

While we have some answers, I grow weary of asking questions over and over again in hearings, letters, and on this floor to get some very basic answers for the families and the American people. Let me run some of those questions past us again.

It was known within the State Department at the highest levels that neither facility in Libya, the one in Tripoli or the one in Benghazi, met the minimum physical security standards set after our Embassy was attacked in Kenya in 1998. Who made the decision to put so many American diplomats in facilities that did not meet that standard? That same question was asked yesterday by a Senate committee intelligence report asking the same question. Who made the decision to put people in facilities we knew did not meet the minimum security standards?

The Embassy had access to additional military personnel for security and training. They had been there for a long time. The regional security officer and the Ambassador requested to keep the additional security on the ground. That request was denied in August 2012, and in September 2012 there was an attack on our facility, and we did not have the manpower to repel them. What was the reason for the decision to remove the existing security force from Libya and leave only a small security team there?

In fact, the security force was so small that when the Ambassador traveled in Tripoli, it took the entire security team just to travel with him. So for long stretches during the day, the other American diplomats were completely exposed; so exposed, the diplomats asked the security forces to train them how to use a gun so they could defend themselves in the moments when they were left with no defense.

In a country that has just gone through a brutal, long civil war and there was no strong central government or national police force, why were diplomats left to defend themselves in Tripoli?

Multiple intelligence reports from the CIA, the Ambassador, and the regional security officer all noted increasing violence in Benghazi and terrorist training camps nearby. There were more than 20 security incidents in that area in the previous month. Every other international facility in Benghazi closed in the previous year because of security risks. Their facility or personnel was attacked, and they made the determination, one of two things, either increase security or pull out. They chose to pull out. We had the same option; but, instead, we chose to stay and decrease our security. Who made that decision, and what information did they use to make that decision?

We have a joint operation called the Foreign Emergency Support Team to assist during and after State Department crises. They never mobilized that night because no one ever sent them. Apparently, they were too far away. They were stationed in the United States. Can someone tell me why we have a Foreign Emergency Support Team if they are not for events like this? What level of attack is required to mobilize that team? If they are too far away to make a difference, why are they stationed in America? We are not worried about our embassies in America being attacked. We spend millions of dollars training and equipping this team to apparently stand down during an emergency. Why?

On September 11, our American Embassy in Egypt was stormed about 6 local time. The mob climbed the walls and put up the al Qaeda flag. I would assume it is an event that would warrant some sort of status change in our military preparedness, but no one from the State Department requested a status change or increased preparedness.

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

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

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

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

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

BREAKING THE IMPASSE IN BANGLADESH

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

THE WRONG DIRECTION

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

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

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

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

So what is this money going for?

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

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