

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,