

nuclear weapons, their threats to Israel and their threats to dominate the Middle East.

The cost of an arms race in the Middle East and an arms race in the world with new nuclear weapons far surpasses anything we can imagine—as are the revenues we can get from oil.

So I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting this bill, the SECURE Act, so we can secure our own energy future, so we can lower gas prices, so we can create thousands of jobs right here at home: from drilling on these rigs, from developing the pipe, from building the rigs, from so many other supply chains of what we have in this Nation to do this, and above all, so we keep our domestic oil at home rather than pay for our own dollars to go to other nations.

We can drill for our oil and our own jobs, and we can boost our own economy; or we can continue to be dependent on unstable nations, rising prices and, sadly, paying for both sides of the war on terror. It is a sobering thought for Americans to think that every time they go to put gasoline in their tanks they're funding both sides of the war on terror.

That alone should be enough to make us change our approach. That alone should be enough to say let's use our oil and our resources instead of proping up the economies of other nations. That alone should be something that motivates us to make sure we are working on these issues. Hopefully, that means we can melt this moratorium on our own domestic oil production.

The choice is ours. I hope all of my colleagues will choose to support jobs of the United States of America as opposed to supporting those dollars that are just going to other countries.

EAT THE FUTURE OR LOSE THE FUTURE

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

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, by recklessly slashing more than \$60 billion from the budget, the Republican majority is trying to assume the mantle of fiscal responsibility. Yes, fiscal. Sometimes we in politics have problems with pronouncements, and sometimes we have problems with concepts. There are two "fiscals." There is the "fiscal" dealing with dollars, F-I-S-C-A-L, and there is the "physical," P-H-Y-S-I-C-A-L. They are trying to assume the mantle of fiscal responsibility.

Within the \$60 billion, there are certainly some cuts that should be made that would be cost effective, and there are other cuts that weren't made that should have been made from the Defense Department, farm subsidies and other places. Many of the programs that were cut or that were severely underfunded are programs that have a significant financial return. In fact, many of these underfunded or elimi-

nated programs actually save the government far more money than they cost.

Penny wise and pound foolish.

So the Republican claims that they are saving the Federal Government more than \$60 billion is simply untrue. Yes, they are eliminating \$60 billion from the budget, but in reality they are increasing the deficit in other areas that do not appear in the budget—or certainly not this year.

As Paul Krugman would say: Eat the future or lose the future. They're not concerned about the future. It's about today; and if it's the future, it's the 2012 election.

The problem is that the Republicans' so-called "budget hawks" fail to look at this holistically. The only costs they see are numbers on a page that they want to hold up as talking points.

□ 1020

This slide shows some of the cuts. The Food and Drug Administration received funding \$241 million below 2010 and \$400 million below the administration's 2011 budget request. That's the Food and Drug Administration. Remember thalidomide babies? Remember Fen-Phen? Remember the problems with meat, chicken, poultry, and spinach?

Food Safety and Inspection Service: It makes cuts of \$88 million below the 2010 funding levels and \$107 million below the administration's 2011 budget request.

The National Institutes of Health: Cuts appropriations for the NIH by \$1.6 billion below FY 2010 and \$2.5 billion below the President's budget. You know the National Institutes of Health—they're trying to find cures for Alzheimer's and Parkinson's and diabetes and cancer. Oh, let's cut them by \$1.6 billion.

Clean drinking water: The Republican bill slashes the Clean Water and Drinking Water State Revolving Fund by 56 percent. EPA: The bill includes an undesignated \$300 million rescission to EPA.

Medicare: Cuts appropriations for the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services by \$458 million below fiscal year 2010 and \$634 million below the President's budget request.

However, what they failed to consider are the benefits associated with these costs, many of which generally exceed the cost. And by failing to consider money saved, the Republicans are increasing the deficit and increasing cost.

Nowhere is this failure in fiscal policy more apparent than when it comes to the physical health of the American people. The Republican's continuing resolution will increase the deficit dramatically as a result of unseen health care costs associated with the degradation of the air we breathe, the water we drink, and the food we eat.

Now the physical impact of the Republican cuts. The FDA: \$241 million. The Republican majority is working to

undo this historic improvement and reduce food safety by cutting FDA's food safety programs by about \$241 million. In the United States, an estimated 76 million people get sick each year with food-borne illnesses and 5,000 die, according to the U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. All of the medical costs and economic losses associated with food-borne illnesses add up to a staggering price of \$152 billion, says the Pew Charitable Trusts. By slashing funding from the FDA's food safety programs, more and more people will get sick, and the \$152 billion annual pricetag is going to climb even higher. That doesn't sound like a responsible physical or fiscal policy to me.

Clean water: Although more than 70 percent of the Earth is covered in water, only about 1 percent of all the water on the planet is safe to drink. H.R. 1 will reduce that 1 percent by allowing major corporations and developers to pump toxins into our water, and by failing to invest in the necessary infrastructure to maintain, treat, and deliver safe drinking water. It reduces the Drinking Water State Revolving Fund by 56 percent, a program that leverages significant private finances by providing low and no-interest loans to States to fund drinking water infrastructure improvement projects.

Leaking pipes and deteriorating mains lead to costly bacteria contamination and cause chronic health problems to thousands of Americans.

As you can see, the physical health of our Nation is being threatened, not just the fiscal health. We need to be concerned about the physical health of our children and be concerned about how the long-term effects of this will be.

A TRIBUTE TO CONGRESSMAN STEVE HORN

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, the week before last, just before we adjourned, we got the sad news of the passing of our good friend and former colleague Congressman Steve Horn.

Steve Horn was without a doubt one of the most intelligent and accomplished Members to ever serve in this body, and at the same time, Mr. Speaker, he was one of the kindest and most decent Members. He got his bachelor's degree from Stanford University, his master's from Harvard, and went back and got his Ph.D. at Stanford University. He served in strategic intelligence in the early 1950s in the U.S. Army Reserve, and then he got involved in public service in a big way. He served in the Eisenhower administration, and he went on to become legislative assistant to California Senator Tom Kuchel.

From that point forward, he dedicated himself to public service, and he expanded that greatly. He got into education, and for nearly two decades,

from 1970 to 1988, he served as president of the California State University at Long Beach. During that period of time, he was named one of the 100 most effective college presidents in the country.

Mr. Speaker, then he joined us here as a Member of Congress, serving for five terms. He was an individual who spent a great deal of time and effort focusing on issues. In fact, one of the great stories about Steve Horn I heard from his former staff member, who I'm happy to say when he left came to work for me, Alisa Do, who was his legislative assistant, now my legislative director—she told me of how they would often be looking for Congressman Horn. There were votes taking place here in the House, and he was over in the Library of Congress, didn't have a pager with him—we didn't have BlackBerry's at the time. And yet he was over there in the library studying, trying to get more and more information and develop his knowledge.

He also was someone who never hesitated to go against the grain. He served on the Government Operations Committee—government reform was a priority for him—and Transportation. He represented the Long Beach area, and he understood that 40 percent of the goods going to and from the consumers and workers of the United States go through the ports of Long Beach and Los Angeles, and he was always dedicated to ensuring that that was a very high priority. And he had this great focus on reforming and improving the operations of the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, he was an institutionalist. He loved this body, understanding that the deliberative nature of service here and of our work is very important and can't be forgotten.

Steve leaves his wonderful wife, Nini—they were married for 57 years—two children, and one grandchild. And I've got to say that I miss his advice, counsel, friendship, and camaraderie.

I would now like to, in the spirit of bipartisanship, yield to my friend from Manhattan (Mrs. MALONEY), who served with him on the Government Reform Committee.

Mrs. MALONEY. I thank the gentleman.

I rise in tribute to Representative Steve Horn. He was a thoughtful, dedicated, honorable man who built his record on bipartisan cooperation and commitment to good government.

He was a legislator's legislator. He was deeply committed to doing the right thing, writing the right bill, getting it passed. And he was also a very good friend of mine. He came with his wife and visited me in my home in New York. I went to visit him in his district, the district that he loved and was totally dedicated to.

During his 10 years of service here in the House of Representatives we worked together on the Oversight and Government Reform Committee. He chaired the Subcommittee on Government Management, Information and

Technology for 6 years, and I was the ranking member with him. So not only was he dedicated to running government better, saving taxpayers money, but he also legislated and passed many important bills.

He helped me pass a bill that I authored, the Nazi War Crimes Disclosure Act, which we worked on together for roughly 7 years—it took us that long to pass it. A book has been written about that process and the bill, and what it has done to help in problem-solving now as we confront delicate issues going forward.

□ 1030

The first hearing on the Debbie Smith bill, which has been called the most important anti-rape bill in the history of our country, was in his committee where Debbie Smith testified about her rape, the fact that no one was reacting to it. And this whole effort, including that hearing that he chaired, was made into a movie called "A Life Interrupted" and how DNA has been used to put rapists behind bars.

He was a dedicated, wonderful person. He also chaired the Arts Caucus and worked hard for its funding.

In a time when we talk about bipartisanship, Steve Horn was the real deal: a bipartisan problem-solver. He wanted to get the problems solved. He wanted to help this country, help his community. He was devoted to his wife and two children and grandchild. He was just a great guy.

Mr. DREIER. I thank my friend for her very thoughtful contribution.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to say that our thoughts and prayers are with Nini and their wonderful family.

FOOD SECURITY IS NATIONAL SECURITY

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, at the end of January, the United Nations reported that the cost of basic food commodities—basic grains, vegetable oils, sugar—were at their highest levels since the U.N. created this index in 1990.

Two weeks ago, World Bank President Robert Zoellick announced that the Bank's food price index shows food prices are now 29 percent higher than they were a year ago. Zoellick warned the G-20 to put food first when they next meet.

The World Bank estimates that these recent food price spikes have pushed about 44 million people into extreme poverty. That's under \$1.25 a day.

This is a global security crisis.

The lack of food security contributes to political instability. Food was a primary reason people first took to the streets in Tunisia. Food and poverty were right at the top of the list in the squares of Egypt right next to the call for political freedom.

In 2007 to 2008, the last global food crisis, there were major food riots in nearly 40 countries. In May 2008, my fellow cochair of the House Hunger Caucus, Congresswoman JO ANN EMERSON, and I were briefed by the GAO about the lack of coordination and continuity in U.S. food and development programs. We started calling for a comprehensive approach to address global hunger and food insecurity.

Now, thanks in large part to the efforts and leadership of Secretary of State Hillary Clinton and USAID Director Raj Shah, the U.S. Government responded to that call and, over a 2-year period of time, initiated a comprehensive, government-wide approach to reduce global hunger and increase nutrition and food security—not because it feels good, not even because it's the right and moral thing to do, but because it's in our national security and economic interest to make countries' food secure, more productive, healthier, and more stable.

This strategy is known as the Global Hunger and Food Security Initiative. It includes our bilateral programs and efforts with other governments and multilateral institutions. To be successful, everyone has to pitch in.

Feed the Future is the signature program of the U.S. strategy. It works with small farmers and governments to increase agricultural production and strengthen local and regional markets in order to reduce hunger and grow economies.

Other key elements include the McGovern-Dole Food for Education and Child Nutrition Program that brings kids to school and keeps them there by making sure that they get at least one nutritious meal each day at school. This program has proven to be especially effective in convincing families to send their daughters to school.

And finally, there is our Food for Peace Program, which provides food to millions of women, children, and men caught in life-threatening situations brought on by natural disasters, war, and internal conflict. This program provides U.S.-grown commodities and locally purchased foods that literally keep people trying to survive in the world's most dangerous situations alive.

Mr. Speaker, I have never heard anyone say that they would like to see more hunger in the world, that they would like to see children too weak from hunger to be able to learn, or young girls forced to work long hours because they no longer are being fed at school. But that's exactly what the budget cuts that passed the House 1 week ago would do.

The House cut \$800 million out of the food aid budget and over 40 percent from the development assistance, which is where Feed the Future is funded. If these shortsighted and, quite frankly, callous cuts are allowed to stand, we would literally be taking the food out of the mouths of over 2 million children. We would be depriving