

HONORING PEACE CORPS ON ITS  
50TH ANNIVERSARY

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

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the 50th anniversary of the Peace Corps and the nearly quarter million people who have served in the Peace Corps in the name of peace.

Fifty years ago, John F. Kennedy signed the executive order creating the Peace Corps, and the significance of this executive order reverberated around the world. At that moment in our history, America was in the throes of a Cold War, and the international community viewed our great Nation with increasing cynicism.

Amidst this global tension, the Peace Corps showed the world the enduring values of peace, commitment to national service, and an optimism that had been eclipsed in the Cold War and World War II.

Under the masterful direction of Sargent Shriver, the Peace Corps' ranks swelled to 15,000 volunteers in 44 developing countries within the first 5 years of existence.

I was one of those early recruits. Right after college, I found myself in Peace Corps training and ended up in a poor barrio in Medellin, Colombia. I saw the grinding cycles of poverty that left so many men, women, and children without hope. I committed then to work to end the culture of poverty. It is in no small part because of that experience in the Peace Corps that I am standing here today in the well of the United States Congress.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FARR. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DREIER. I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I would simply like to join in congratulating my friend for his extraordinary service in the Peace Corps. He not only served at that time, but he continues to share that experience with us today; and as we focus on countries that are dealing with difficulty all around the world, the expansion of the Peace Corps is something that has been very important and recognizing the 50th anniversary is something that I am happy to join my colleague in doing.

Mr. FARR. Thank you, Mr. DREIER, and I appreciate your support as well.

Over the past 50 years, through war and conflict, the Peace Corps has shown the world the hopeful, uplifting side of America that reflects our fundamental ideas of peace, service and grass-roots development. That great legacy continues today. At this moment, 8,655 volunteers are serving in 76 developing countries around the world.

□ 1010

I am proud to say that 25 of those volunteers are from my district. Among them is Gabe LaHue, who was the valedictorian at Aptos High

School. He then went on to study plant sciences at Cornell. Just 4 months after graduating summa cum laude from college, Gabe entered into the Peace Corps in Paraguay to serve in an agricultural role there. Right now, Gabe is working shoulder to shoulder with community members in eastern Paraguay on rural agricultural development. Like many Peace Corps volunteers, Gabe's service ripples out far beyond one single project. He also helped to start a composting initiative, teaches English, and is working to set a library up and get it running.

There are others, like Ashley Burke from Marina, who is teaching English at an orphanage in Rwanda; and there is James Staples from Pacific, who is working on sustainable rural tourism in Guatemala.

Gabe, Ashley, and James are powerful ambassadors who have committed 2 years of their lives to serving America's best values abroad. The American taxpayers reap a huge return on their investment in this remarkable program. To date, more than 20 countries have requested Peace Corps volunteers, and other countries want an increase in the number of volunteers allocated to them.

The Peace Corps is able to build this goodwill on a shoestring budget. Dollar for dollar, Peace Corps volunteers are one of our most effective ambassadors of international development and diplomacy. In fact, the Peace Corps amounts to, roughly, 1 percent of our total Federal budget. For the cost of sending one soldier to Afghanistan, the Peace Corps can send 13 volunteers to developing countries to serve U.S. interests in the name of peace. In the midst of our tight budget climate, the Peace Corps is one of the most low-cost, high-return tools in our foreign policy toolbox.

In honor of the 50th anniversary of the Peace Corps, I am proud to join my fellow returned Peace Corps volunteers, who are TOM PETRI, MIKE HONDA and JOHN GARAMENDI—all Members of Congress—to introduce a bipartisan bill to establish a commemorative work in the District of Columbia to recognize the founding of the Peace Corps, which will be at no expense to the U.S. taxpayer.

This bill, which passed the House by voice vote last Congress, commemorates the creation of a unique form of public service that promotes peace through people-to-people diplomacy and cross-cultural understanding, and it doesn't cost the taxpayers a single penny. I urge my congressional colleagues to honor America's commitment to peace by supporting the swift passage of this timely legislation.

So today, as we mark a significant milestone in America's history, I urge each of you to join me in honoring your constituents who have served in and who are supporting the Peace Corps funding so that we can usher in the next generation of Americans who want to serve this country in the name of peace.

SECURE ACT INTRODUCTION

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

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, currently, U.S. families spend about \$1 billion per day on imported oil. We import about 1.6 billion barrels from politically unstable nations with a corresponding instability in prices, which influences our dollars, our economy, and sometimes our soldiers having to look at defending these areas.

We are currently losing 220,000 barrels per day in domestic production because of the administration's moratorium on Gulf of Mexico oil rigs. This also means the government is losing almost \$1.4 billion in revenue that we so sorely need. Keep in mind that each one cent increase in the price of gasoline costs American families \$1 billion per year. That's money that is not going into our economy. Because 60 percent of our oil comes from foreign countries, it is money that is going into other economies.

Now, while this moratorium is taking place, at least 12 rigs have already departed from the gulf, some not to return, as they move these rigs to operate in other countries, which can cost \$1 million a day. Four more are considering leaving. That's 6,000 jobs in jeopardy. Currently, more than 30 drilling rigs in the Gulf of Mexico are idle; and even though the administration is now allowing just one of those rigs to move forward with exploration, all other exploration is still off limits with something of a permitorium, as they're looking at their permits all over again.

That is why yesterday I introduced the Safe Exploration Coming from Underwater Reserves of Energy Act, or the SECURE Act. This bill allows all of those Gulf of Mexico drilling permits to move safely forward, those which have already been approved by regulators. Keep in mind, all of these have been reviewed thoroughly. It takes a lot of time to do that, and they all follow strict regulations. There are no shortcuts on safety, and there is no bypassing environmental regulations. Quite frankly, I trust our environmental regulations to protect the environment more so than those of other countries.

What we have from the lost production of the domestic oil industry means we are increasingly dependent on those unstable foreign regimes to meet our needs, which puts our economy at risk should another spike in oil prices occur like the one we have now. Add to this and punctuate this with the recent unrest in Libya, Egypt, Bahrain, Yemen, and whatever country may come next, which helps point out a lot of our vulnerability: the vulnerability of what happens if the Suez Canal is closed down even for a short period of time; the vulnerability that comes if Libyan oil production declines; the vulnerability that comes with Iran and its use of oil revenue to put pressure on other nations to support their efforts to develop

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 propping 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,