

And Mr. Speaker, as Mr. Mandela recognized, we have a responsibility to work to minimize the harm of poverty. Therefore, I join with my colleagues in recognizing January as Poverty in America Awareness Month and promise to continue to promote programs—no matter what else it is that I do—that are designed to help eliminate and reduce poverty in America.

I thank you, Mr. Speaker.

ONE TEAM—ONE FIGHT—ONE NAME: THE DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, thank you very much.

Mr. Speaker, last month I introduced H.R. 24, legislation to redesignate the Department of the Navy to be the Department of Navy and Marine Corps.

For the past 7 years, the language of this bill has been part of the House version of the National Defense Authorization Act, and I would like to thank the former chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, DUNCAN HUNTER, the current chairman of the Armed Services Committee, IKE SKELTON, and all of the members of the committee for their support.

Each year, the full House of Representatives have supported this change. This year I hope the Senate will support the change and adopt the House position and join in bringing proper respect to the fighting team, the Navy and Marine Corps.

There is much I could say about the history of both great services, but the reason for this legislation always comes down to one issue—whenever a chief of Navy operations or commandant of the Marine Corps has come to testify before the Armed Services Committee, I've heard the Navy and the Marine Corps say, "We are one fighting team." This is true, and I believe this. Then why should not the team be named "Navy and Marine Corps"?

Changing the name of the Department of the Navy to the Department of the Navy and Marine Corps is a symbolic gesture, but it is important to the team.

This legislation is not about changing the responsibilities of the Secretary of the Department, reallocating resources between the Navy and Marine Corps, or altering their mission. The Navy and Marine Corps have operated as one entity for more than 2 centuries, and H.R. 24 would enable the name of their department to illustrate this fight.

Over the years, I have been encouraged by the overwhelming support I have received for this change from so many members of the United States Armed Forces. I will quote one supporter of this change, the Honorable Wade Sanders, Deputy Assistant Sec-

retary of the Navy for Reserve Affairs from 1993 to 1998, who said, "As a combat veteran and former Naval officer, I understand the importance of the team dynamic, and the importance of recognizing the contributions of team components. The Navy and Marine Corps team is just that: a dynamic partnership, and it is important to symbolically recognize the balance of that partnership."

Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit for the RECORD a list of others who have supported this effort to provide proper recognition for the Marine Corps. With their backing, I will continue to work diligently to see this bill through the House and push for the Senate's support. The Marines who are fighting today deserve this recognition. Mr. Speaker, in closing, I would like to show what this change could mean to a family of a fallen Marine.

Mr. Speaker, first, this is a copy of a letter to a Marine family, a Marine captain who was killed for this Nation. The Secretary of the Navy sent this letter. We have removed the name respectfully, and it says, "The Secretary of the Navy."

"On behalf of the Department of the Navy"—this is a proud team. "On behalf of the Department of Navy," the captain, Marine captain's wife received this letter of condolences. And I do commend the Secretary of the Navy for writing the letter of condolences.

But Mr. Speaker, if this bill should ever become the law of the land—and I hope this will be the year—that Marine family who gave a loved one for this country will receive the letter from the Department of Navy and Marine Corps and it will say in the heading, "Dear Marine Corps Family, on behalf of the Department of Navy and Marine Corps, please accept my very sincere condolences."

Mr. Speaker, this is what it should be: one Department of Navy and Marine Corps.

I hope, again, the House will send this to the Senate. I hope this year the Senate will accept the House position. It is the right thing to do for the team.

God bless America, and God bless our men and women in uniform, and please, God, continue to bless America.

H.R. 24: SUPPORTERS OF THE REDESIGNATION OF THE DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY TO BE THE DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

In the past eight years, the following have supported the change:

INDIVIDUALS

Secretary of the Navy Paul Nitz (1963-1967); Assistant Secretary of the Navy H. Lawrence Garrett, III (1989-1992); Acting Secretary of the Navy Daniel Howard (1992); Secretary of the Navy John Dalton (1998-2001); General Carl Mundy, 30th Commandant of the Marine Corps; General Charles Krulak, 31st Commandant of the Marine Corps; Admiral Stansfield Turner; Rear Admiral James T. Carey (Chairman, National Defense PAC); Deputy Asst. Secretary of the Navy for Reserve Affairs Wade Sanders (1993-1998); James Zumwalt, Jr., (Son of the former CNO).

ASSOCIATIONS

Fleet Reserve Association; Marine Corps League; National Defense PAC; National As-

sociation of Uniformed Services; Veterans of Foreign Wars.

□ 1700

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DEFAZIO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

OUR BRAVE VETERANS NEED GOOD JOBS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, there are many reasons to support the President's economic recovery package. Today, I rise to talk about one especially good reason, a reason that will help our Nation's brave veterans to get good jobs.

As we know, President Obama has ordered his military commanders to draw up plans for the withdrawal of our troops from Iraq. Many of them will be returning to civilian life. Making the transition from battlefield to the civilian workforce is always challenging. But, in these hard times, it's going to be harder than ever.

Last March, the Veterans' Affairs Department reported that returning veterans were having a harder time finding work than their civilian counterparts, and were earning less. That, Mr. Speaker, was before the economic crisis hit with full force.

We got another look at the problem in November, when the recruitment Web site, Monster.com, surveyed veterans about their experiences in the job market. It found that 81 percent of veterans don't feel fully prepared to enter the workforce and, of that number, 76 percent said they were having trouble translating their military skills to the civilian world. In addition, hundreds of thousands of veterans are struggling with fiscal and mental problems, making it that much more difficult to get and to keep a job.

Mr. Speaker, veterans and their advocates have begun to report that some employers are ignoring the Federal law requiring them to give returning soldiers their jobs back—their jobs back, at the same pay. To make matters even worse, many military family members have taken time off from their own jobs or even left those jobs completely in order to take care of their injured loved ones.

I was proud to sponsor the bill in the last Congress that doubled the amount of time that a military family member could take off under the Family and Medical Leave Act. But it's still unpaid leave, Mr. Speaker, and few Americans can afford that, particularly now. That is why we need to revisit the law and to amend it to provide paid leave under FMLA.

Mr. Speaker, there are many other things that we must do to help our brave veterans. Our new Veterans' Affairs Secretary, former General Eric Shinseki, has promised to make employment to veterans a top priority. He also wants to fast-track implementation of the new GI Bill, which will help more veterans to get the education they will need to succeed in the workforce.

I also know that my good friend, HILDA SOLIS, will make veterans' employment a priority when she becomes our new Secretary of Labor. She has seen firsthand the challenges that the servicemen and women face when they try to get jobs. I know that she will work to expand the Department of Labor's programs and job training and job search assistance for veterans.

Most importantly, Congress must move with a sense of urgency to pass an effective and far-reaching economic recovery package. The President's proposal is a very good start, but it needs to do even more to create jobs for veterans, because veterans have a lot to offer employers. They are mature, they are skilled, hardworking, dedicated, respectful of authority, and they know how to be part of a team. And they have proven that they can do their job even under the toughest of circumstances.

All they need, Mr. Speaker, is a chance. They did their job in Iraq and Afghanistan. Now it's time for us to do our job and to send an economic recovery package to the President's desk that will give our veterans and their families the bright future that they deserve.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. PENCE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

BRING FEDERAL SPENDING UNDER CONTROL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, when a family is deeply head-over-heels in debt, they don't go out and borrow even more so they can double or triple spending, even if it would help the economy. And that is exactly the situation our government is in in regard to the so-called stimulus package, which we will take up again next week.

I voted against the big bailout of our financial firms both times. But the majority voted for this, and raised our national debt limit to an astounding \$11.315 trillion. No one can comprehend a figure like \$11.315 trillion. However, even worse, the Government Accountability Office has told us that we have over \$55 trillion in unfunded future pension liabilities.

If we don't bring Federal spending under control, we will soon not be able to pay all of our Social Security, veterans' pensions, and all the other things we have promised our own people with money that will buy anything.

The Federal Government has become addicted to spending. The stimulus is a short-term fix that will cause even more serious problems in the very near future. Drug addicts prove every day that short-term fixes do not satisfy for very long.

When another Member of this body was asked a few days ago on MSNBC that, since our house was on fire, did we not need to pour water on it? He replied, Yes, but what we are doing with this stimulus package is like pouring kerosene on that fire.

The bill has some good things in it, but we simply cannot afford them. Probably the falsest charge made against those who oppose this stimulus is that we have to do something, and that if you vote against this, you're voting to do nothing.

First of all, we have, through the Treasury Department and the Federal Reserve, taken hundreds of billions of dollars worth of action in just the last few months. Because we rushed into some of those moves, we have been finding out that some of that money has been spent in ways that are simply ridiculous and in ways that justifiably angered the taxpayers.

One example. In fact, the Bank of America took \$7 billion of the first \$15 billion it received and increased its investment in a bank in China.

Now we are rushing through this stimulus package, and the taxpayers will find out over the next few weeks or months some of the ridiculous or wasteful things this money will be spent on.

What we should do is give these hundreds of billions in actions already taken some time to work, coupled with some really effective stimulus moves, like a cut in the payroll tax and a tax credit for people who buy or build homes or purchase cars or equipment.

Now, some of our leaders seem to be looking back in a dreamily but blind way to the New Deal. Most historians do not seem to realize this, but most economists realize that the New Deal delayed our recovery during the Depression.

In fact, in today's Washington Times, Mr. Speaker, 203 leading university economists have signed a full page ad which says, "We, the undersigned, do not believe that more government spending is a way to improve economic performance. More government spending by Hoover and Roosevelt did not pull the United States economy out of the Great Depression in the 1930s. More government spending did not solve Japan's "lost decade" in the 1990s. As such, it is a triumph of hope over experience to believe that more government spending will help the U.S. today."

These economists continue, "To improve the economy, policymakers

should focus on reforms that remove impediments to work, saving, investment and production. Lower tax rates and a reduction in the burden of government are the best ways of using fiscal policy to boost growth."

That is an ad signed by 203 leading university economists in today's Washington Times.

Unemployment—just speaking about that—unemployment averaged over 17 percent a year all through the 1930s, and even averaged 10 percent during World War II. The Nation did not really begin the return to prosperity until after World War II ended.

Those who do not believe this should read a 2003 book by Jim Powell, called FDR's Folly—How Roosevelt and his New Deal Prolonged the Great Depression. Mr. Powell quotes David Kennedy, who wrote a Pulitzer Prize-winning book in 1999, called Freedom From Fear, about the Great Depression.

Mr. KENNEDY wrote, "Whatever it was, the New Deal was not a recovery program or, at least at any rate, not an effective one."

Economists Richard Vedder and Lowell Gallaway wrote in 1977 that New Deal policies raised, "labor costs, prolonging the misery of the Great Depression, and creating a situation where many people were living in rising prosperity at a time when millions of others were suffering severe deprivation."

Vedder and Gallaway estimated that by 1940, unemployment was eight points higher than it would have been in the absence of higher payroll costs imposed by New Deal policies.

Economists Thomas Hall and J. David Ferguson reported, "It is difficult to ascertain just how much the New Deal programs had to do with keeping the unemployment rate high, but surely they were important. A combination of fixing farm prices, promoting labor unions, and passing a series of antibusiness tax laws would certainly have had a negative impact on employment."

Economist David Bernstein reported, "New Deal labor policies contributed to a persistent increase in African American unemployment."

Historian Michael Bernstein made a case that New Deal agriculture policies "sacrificed the interests of the marginal and the unrecognized to the welfare of those with greater political and economic power."

Mr. Powell summed his book up by saying, "A principle lesson for us today is that if economic shocks are followed by sound policies, we can avoid another Great Depression. A government will best promote a speedy business recovery by making recovery the top priority, which means letting people keep more of their money, removing obstacles to productive enterprise, and providing stable money and a political climate where investors feel that it's safe to invest for the future."

WE CANNOT SUBSIDIZE OR BORROW OUR WAY TO GROWTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOCCIERI). Under a previous order of