

only that high because we have increased some private investment, some local government funding and, of course, the reviled stimulus funding that helped reduce some of the more egregious shortfalls while putting people to work.

It is ironic that some of the rationale for some of this bizarre budget behavior, which, thankfully, will never be enacted into law, is the need to save taxpayer money and reduce deficits.

In reality, if this budget were approved, it would actually end up costing American taxpayers more. Families will earn even less if we continue this funding level for infrastructure that is inadequate. There will be hundreds of millions of hours of time lost as people are stuck in traffic, and the number of miles of congestion increased over 30 percent. Of course, our businesses will pay almost a half trillion dollars more in transportation costs and repair while business will be underperforming, and that will cost money too.

The path forward is clear. We should provide increased funding for transportation and infrastructure. The gas tax has not been increased in 20 years, which, incidentally, was the last time we had balanced budgets. This is the quickest way to get the new revenues that many feel are necessary to be part of any rational, long-term grand budget agreement and tax reform.

It would be supported by a wide array of business, labor, environmental groups, and local government. Indeed, there is a vast coalition that is saying, tax me so I can do my job better and we can revitalize America's communities and our sagging economy.

It is no longer acceptable for us to talk past one another. By dealing boldly with the infrastructure crisis in the context of realistic budgets and meaningful tax reform, we can put Americans back to work. We can break the logjam here on Capitol Hill. We can strengthen the economy while we make our communities more livable and our families safer, healthier, and more economically secure.

TENTH UNANSWERED BENGHAZI QUESTION

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, over the last 2 weeks, I raised a series of questions focusing on the attack on the U.S. consulate in Benghazi, as well as Washington's response, or lack thereof.

To date, little is known why Ambassador Stevens was in the U.S. consulate in the days leading up to the anniversary of 9/11. Even less known is about the other American facility in Benghazi: the CIA annex. When was the annex established? How many people worked at the annex? Of these, how many were direct agency employees and how many were contractors? What was the ratio of CIA staff to security

contractors? Why was there a facility operated by the CIA in Benghazi? Perhaps it was established to assist in U.S. efforts to secure weapons in the wake of the Libyan revolution.

As early as 2011, National Journal reported:

The U.S. is also planning to ramp up spending to help Libya's interim government secure and destroy the shoulder-fired surface-to-air missiles and weapons looted from Qadhafi's stockpiles. A senior State Department official said Clinton will tell Libyan leaders that the U.S. contribution to these efforts will go up to \$40 million.

The same article noted:

The U.S. has already spent nearly \$6 million on its conventional weapons disposal efforts, sending a quick reaction force of weapons experts to Libya by October 2011.

If, indeed, the facility in Benghazi was involved in the collection of these weapons, where are they? The \$40 million promised by Secretary Clinton would buy a very large quantity of weapons. Were they shipped out of Benghazi? Are they in warehouses on U.S. soil? Are they in other allied countries? Or did they end up elsewhere?

There has been speculation that some of these weapons may have ended up in Syria.

It is particularly noteworthy that during the same time period that the U.S. engaged in collecting weapons in Libya, respected national security reporter Mark Hosenball wrote on August 1, 2012:

President Barack Obama has signed a secret order authorizing U.S. support for rebels seeking to depose Syrian President Bashar al-Assad and his government, U.S. sources familiar with the matter said. Obama's order, approved earlier this year and known as an intelligence "finding," broadly permits the CIA and other U.S. agencies to provide support that could help the rebels oust Assad.

The article continued:

The White House is for now apparently stopping short of giving the rebels lethal weapons, even as some U.S. allies do just that, and precisely when Obama signed the secret intelligence authorization, an action not previously reported, could not be determined.

However, Hosenball also reported this important information:

A U.S. Government source acknowledged that under provisions of the Presidential finding, the United States was collaborating with a secret command center operated by Turkey and its allies, and NBC said the shoulder-fired missiles, also known as MANPADS, had been delivered to the rebels via Turkey.

Is it possible that the President's intelligence finding included an authorization for the weapons collected in Libya to be transferred to Syrian rebels? Was the CIA annex being used to facilitate these transfers? If so, how did the weapons physically move from Libya to Syria? By plane? By ship?

And, again, I ask, if these weapons were not being transferred to other countries like Syria, where exactly did they end up? Was the CIA annex being used as a logistics center to track and

transfer these weapons? Was Ambassador Stevens' visit to the CIA annex on September 10 associated with these operations? And if these activities were taking place, was this consistent with the President's intelligence finding? Was the Congress notified?

Mr. Speaker, I raise these questions knowing that CIA operations anywhere are sensitive and there is an appropriate time and place for the discussions. However, I don't think the American people will ever learn the truth about what happened that night and why—including the questionable U.S. response—unless they understand what exactly was taking place at the annex.

That is why I continue to believe that a House select committee is the most appropriate path forward to investigate this and many other unanswered questions about Benghazi.

□ 1015

IN HONOR OF JAMES WATTS

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

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I rise, along with my colleague Representative STEVEN PALAZZO, to honor James Watts for his many years of service to community and country.

Born in 1919 in McComb, Mississippi, Mr. Watts has dedicated his career to public service. His children and stepchildren have followed in their parents' footsteps and have been leaders in their own right throughout the United States.

During World War II, Mr. Watts defended his country by tracking German submarines as a member of the United States Coast Guard. Later, in civilian life, he would go on to hold executive board positions in both the Boy Scouts of America and the Girl Scouts of America organizations.

Mr. Watts' passion for volunteerism speaks volumes about his character. While he lived in Grand Junction, Colorado, he volunteered as an EMT and then as a paramedic for what is now St. Mary's Hospital and Regional Medical Center in Grand Junction, Colorado. Upon relocation to Gulfport, Mississippi, Mr. Watts taught CPR and first aid for the American Red Cross and various organizations around the country—a testament to his devotion to the well-being of the communities he has lived in and visited.

Perhaps one of his biggest accomplishments was in 1956 while he worked for the Atomic Energy Commission. As a mine safety engineer in New Mexico, Mr. Watts noticed a uranium boomtown of more than 10,000 residents who were living without access to a local hospital for emergency services. With ambition and selflessness, he took it upon himself to spearhead organizational efforts for the creation of the Cibola General Hospital, which has been committed to serving the medical

needs of the community since 1959. Ever since, patients continue to be saved; the critically ill continue to be treated; and the 24-hour emergency care is still available to the community.

Now at 94 years old, Mr. Watts resides with his wife, Barbara, in Gulfport, Mississippi. Although he is retired, the organizations and community projects developed under his leadership are still in operation today. I believe Mr. Watts' life is a great example of generosity and devotion to the greater good of society. We can all learn from Mr. Watts' inspiring story of public service, and I join my colleague in recognizing and in thanking Mr. Watts for his life of service.

We wish him, his wife, Barbara, and their children—Susan, Rick, who is here with us in the gallery, Jane, Danette, and Paul—all of the best in their future endeavors, and we thank them for continuing their father's legacy of noble service to the community.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would remind Members to refrain from referring to occupants of the gallery.

GOVERNMENT WASTE

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

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise this morning in strong support of the eight bills before the House today or, more importantly, in support of what they represent, which is commonsense government reform.

As a Representative of the hard-working taxpayers in southeastern Pennsylvania, it is my duty to make sure that they are getting value for every dollar that they send to the Nation's Capital. Right now, our Federal Government seems to find better ways to waste money than to save it. The culture of systemic waste, abuse, and lack of accountability needs to end.

We have the opportunity this week. We can vote to streamline the Federal Government to make it work for the American taxpayer. The Stop Government Abuse legislative package being considered today works to rein in widespread waste and inefficiency throughout Washington. These bills represent commonsense, bipartisan solutions that actually solve problems.

After this week, Members will leave for a month to head back to our districts. Many of us are going to be attending events and hosting town halls to facilitate conversations with our constituents. I am eager to report to them that, despite our differences, this body was able to come together to support so many commonsense reforms. So I urge my colleagues to support the bills being considered here and to vote to begin restoring faith in government.

END HUNGER NOW

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. HARTZLER). The Chair recognizes the

gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, for the 20th time this Congress, I stand here to talk about how we can end hunger now. Hunger is a political condition. We have the food; we have the means; and we have the systems to end hunger now. We know how to do it. We just don't have the political will to make it happen, but that wasn't always the case.

In the late 1960s, America began seriously to confront its poverty problem. President Johnson fought the war on poverty, and his programs, including Medicare, Medicaid, and title I education programs—just to name a few—started to combat the poverty and inequality that were rampant across many parts of this country. President Nixon followed in his footsteps by hosting the first and only White House Conference on Food, Nutrition, and Health, a conference that focused on hunger in America.

The result of that conference was a precipitous drop in the number of hungry people in America. Contrary to Budget Committee Chairman PAUL RYAN's belief, the antipoverty programs from the Johnson administration and the antihunger programs created by the Nixon administration worked. In fact, hunger and poverty would be much worse today if it weren't for these programs.

The truth is we almost eradicated hunger in America thanks to a strengthened food stamp program and the creation of the WIC program in the 1970s, but those gains were erased and hunger increased because of the policies of Ronald Reagan. Since then, we've seen food stamp usage increase during every single administration. We can and we must do better.

One of the highlights of the effort that nearly ended hunger in America in the 1970s was the WIC program, formally titled the Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children. WIC is an innovative program that provides nutritious food and food counseling for pregnant women, nursing mothers, infants, and children under the age of 5.

Why is this program so critical?

Madam Speaker, prenatal enrollment in WIC is associated with lower infant mortality, in fewer premature births, and in a lower likelihood that infants will have very low or low birth weights; and because an infant's medical costs increase tenfold if he is of low birth weight, every dollar invested in WIC yields between \$1.90 and up to \$4.20 in Medicaid savings. This is literally about improving the physical well-being of developing children. This program affects these participants for the entirety of their lives. It's just that important, and it's critical that we get it right.

But, unlike SNAP, WIC is a discretionary program. This means that it is subject to the appropriations process; and in this time of budgetary aus-

terity, WIC was included in the across-the-board cuts to defense and non-defense discretionary programs under the sequester. SNAP was excluded because it's an entitlement like Social Security and Medicare, but WIC was included in the sequester because it is not an entitlement.

As if the cuts in sequester were not bad enough, the House Agriculture appropriations bill now cuts the program even further by more than \$500 million. The 7.3 percent cut to WIC in this bill could result in over 200,000 pregnant mothers and infants losing nutritious food. Even factoring in the reserve fund, 55,000 moms and kids will go without the nutrition that they need. It is sad that the Republican-controlled House of Representatives is cutting vital health and development programs for pregnant and nursing mothers and their very young children while at the same time they've found billions of dollars to send overseas in a wasteful war in Afghanistan.

Madam Speaker, during my series of End Hunger Now speeches, there has been one unifying theme that, I believe, puts us on the path to end hunger now. That theme is Presidential leadership. We need Presidential leadership to end hunger now. The last White House Conference on Food, Nutrition, and Health nearly ended hunger in America. I know that we can do even better if President Obama would convene such a conference. With a White House conference on food and nutrition, we could focus on ways to reduce hunger and obesity in smart, not arbitrary ways. We could figure out how to treat hunger and obesity as health issues while we work on ways to properly attack these scourges.

Madam Speaker, we desperately need Presidential leadership. We need a comprehensive plan. We need the political will. We need a White House conference on food and nutrition. I urge the President to act now.

THE FACE OF A HERO

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

Mr. HECK of Nevada. Madam Speaker, I come to the floor today with a heavy heart to pay my respects and to bid a solemn farewell to Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Officer David Vanbuskirk. Officer Vanbuskirk was killed in the line of duty on Tuesday, July 23 while participating in a rescue mission outside of Las Vegas. He was 36 years old.

To me, Dave was more than a constituent, and he was more than a public servant. He was one of my medics and a teammate. You see, prior to coming to Congress, I was a member of the LVMPD Search and Rescue team and the department's medical director.

A 13-year veteran of the department and one of only seven commissioned search and rescue officers on this elite force, Officer Vanbuskirk was called