

this bill—just a few that I've picked out; there are a lot more—that I question whether or not these will stimulate the economy. By Congress taking taxpayer money and giving it to certain entities, does it stimulate the economy or is it just more pork? Is it just more favoritism to certain entities?

In the new Stimulation Economy Act, there's \$4 billion that goes to neighborhood stabilization activities. What is that? That's the community groups like ACORN. You know ACORN. That's the one being investigated for voter fraud in several States, yet to be prosecuted, of course, but money to give to these organizations. How does that stimulate the economy? I don't know.

Three billion dollars goes to wellness programs; how we can take care of ourselves better. Does that stimulate the economy? Maybe not.

One billion dollars for census follow-up. What that means is after the census is taken, then a billion dollars is given to follow up on that.

Eight hundred million dollars goes to Amtrak. You know, Amtrak loses money every year. We have to give them money of the taxpayers to fund this subsidy.

Four hundred million dollars for climate change research. Now, I'm sure we all think we ought to study the climate and global warming and that sort of thing, but does that stimulate the economy to give \$400 million to certain special interest groups to study climate change?

Six billion dollars to colleges. No question about it. Universities and colleges need money. But shouldn't a bill that appropriates money to the universities go in an appropriations bill rather than a bill that stimulates the economy?

Six hundred million dollars is going for new cars for government workers—not the average taxpayer but just government workers.

Fifty million dollars goes to the National Endowment of the Arts. Don't see how that's going to stimulate our economy.

I like this one a lot: \$250 million for tax breaks for Hollywood movie producers so they can buy more film. Now, I don't know that those people in Hollywood need taxpayer money, but they're going to get it. And how that stimulates the economy, we'll let the taxpayers decide.

The Coast Guard is getting a new ice breaker, \$88 million. Stimulate the economy? Maybe not.

Homeland Security is getting new furniture in the amount of \$250 million taxpayer expense.

Seventy-five million dollars for stop-smoking programs. I'm not sure that will stimulate the economy.

And the one I like the most is \$25 million for tribal, alcohol, and substance abuse reduction.

Now, this is taxpayer money. This doesn't belong to the Congress, it be-

longs to the people. And we have the obligation to take the people's money and use it wisely; in this case, to make the economy better. I doubt if these programs that I mentioned—and many, many others that are in this massive pork bill—will stimulate the economy. It's just another way of giving taxpayer money out to different groups.

What can we do to stimulate the economy? We ought to do the simple things. There are two things that I would suggest. One of those is a bill that Mr. GOHMERT has sponsored, my cohort from Texas. It's no taxes for 2 months. Everybody in the United States that works, no W-2 taken out of their income for 2 months. When we have our own money—that's the taxpayers—we will spend the money how we see fit, not how the government sees fit. Don't you think that might stimulate the economy in the short term?

And in the long term, rather than spend money that we do not have, that we have to go in debt for, that we have to borrow from the Chinese of all people, and saddle that debt to our kids and our grandkids and our great-grandkids, why don't we have a tax break for everybody that pays taxes? Straight across-the-board income tax reduction. People keep their own money. They will decide how to spend it. They will decide better than government how to spend the money.

These suggestions won't cost the government anything. Won't cost the people anything. It's an approach that I think that it's worth that we have a lively debate about on the House floor.

It's important that we get out of this economic decline, but the way to do it is not to spend more money and make government bigger. And the stimulus package is a big spending bill for government. More government control, more government involvement in our lives, and it doesn't help the economy a bit.

And that's just the way it is.

#### RECOGNIZING JANUARY AS POVERTY IN AMERICA AWARENESS MONTH

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

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize this past January as Poverty in America Awareness Month and to thank the young intern in my office, Ms. Foster, for developing this very excellent statement.

Mr. Speaker, Nelson Mandela once proclaimed, "Overcoming poverty is not a gesture of charity. It is an act of justice. It is the protection of a fundamental human right: the right to dignity and a decent life."

During this season of economic crisis, we policymakers have an obligation to promote justice and to protect our citizens who are struggling. Poverty is a reality for far too many peo-

ple in Chicago, Illinois, and throughout the Nation.

In the United States, 36 percent of our Nation is considered low income, with 17 percent living in poverty. In Illinois, 33 percent of the population is low income, with about 15 percent living in poverty.

In 2007, 21 percent of Chicagoans lived in poverty, with another 21 percent teetering on its edge.

The current economic crisis is exacerbating these conditions. The unemployment rate in Illinois in the Nation is over 7 percent. Hundreds of thousands of jobs in Illinois have been lost in recent months. There are more than 500,000 foreclosures, 50,000 foreclosures in Cook County alone.

And due to an almost \$4 billion State budget gap, programs vital to assisting the public, such as mental health centers, are facing funding reductions in the range of millions of dollars.

Poverty is most harmful to children, especially young children. Children in poverty are more likely to experience child abuse or neglect. Families in poverty often cannot provide appropriate resources for healthy child development. Children's physical health and cognitive abilities can be compromised. When compared with wealthier children, poor children have poorer outcomes in the areas of school achievement, emotional control, and behavior.

Living in poverty affects the quality of education, health care, and living conditions.

Mr. Speaker, I'm proud to be a part of a Congress that has crafted an economic recovery package that provides critical aid to families experiencing poverty. The substantial increases in the food stamp program will directly help families make ends meet. The provisions providing health care for those who lost their jobs during this crisis will help many in Chicago and throughout the Nation.

The one-time payment for families who rely on supplemental security income for the poor, elderly, and individuals with disabilities will provide a lifeline for families that are barely making it. The increases in the child tax credit will help families stand on their own feet.

In addition to these provisions of the American Recovery Bill that will help alleviate the effects of poverty, I look forward to moving towards a system of universal health coverage during this Congress to help all Americans have access to health care. I also anticipate that Congress will consider ways in which to improve public assistance programs, such as simplifying enrollment procedures for Medicaid and other safety net programs.

During this economic downturn, it is critical that we continue to support safety net programs to assure that those in need are assisted. The role of the Federal Government is especially necessary given that many State governments are cutting vital support programs to comply with State balanced-budget requirements.

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.