

by one supporter of this change, the Honorable Wade Sanders, Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Reserve Affairs from 1993-1998:

"As a combat veteran and a 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."

Madam Speaker, the Marines who are fighting today deserve this recognition. Before I close, I would like to point out there are many, many justifications for renaming the department Navy and Marine Corps. We all know that the Navy and Marine Corps are one fighting team, and that is the history of both the Navy and the Marine Corps.

Madam Speaker, on this poster is a condolence letter from the Department of the Navy. This was sent to the wife of a Marine who was killed in Iraq for this country.

Madam Speaker, on the letter sent by the Secretary of the Navy, it says "The Secretary of the Navy." Then the first sentence, it says, "On behalf of the Department of the Navy, please accept our very sincere condolences."

Well, Madam Speaker, that is very kind of the Secretary of the Navy, and I am sure that the Marine family that gave a loved one who died for this country during warfare appreciates that letter, but I respectfully say that even more important to the Marine family who lost a loved one would be that if the letter had said, "The Secretary of the Navy and Marine Corps," with the flag of the Navy and the flag of the Marine Corps, and then it further stated, "Dear Marine Corps Family: On behalf of the Department of the Navy and Marine Corps, please accept my sincere condolences."

Madam Speaker, before I close, I have Camp Lejeune Marine Base and Cherry Point Air Station in my district, and also Seymour Johnson Air Force Base. Other parts of the Armed Forces have the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Air Force. Now we need to have a Secretary of the Navy and Marine Corps. It's only right to the Marine Corps that they be equally represented and equally respected.

With that, Madam Speaker, I ask God to please continue to bless our men and women in uniform and their families, and may God continue to bless America.

END OCCUPATION OF IRAQ

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Speaker, today I rise to deliver my 300th speech on the floor of the House, speeches demanding an end to the occupation of Iraq.

I take no pleasure in marking this milestone, except that in this great de-

mocracy we have it is possible for one Member of the House to stand here and express her opinions. But instead of pleasure, it deeply saddens me, for it reminds me just how long the Iraq occupation has been dragging on.

America's invasion and occupation of Iraq began 6 years ago this month. On March 21, 2003, the previous administration gave us "Shock and Awe." There were big explosions on our TV sets, but innocent people were being killed that night in Baghdad. And for the next 6 years, the body count continued to rise as Iraq became a hell on Earth.

Today conditions on the ground have improved, but the occupation goes on. Over 140,000 American troops remain in harm's way. Over 100,000 military contractors continue to roam the streets of Iraq, unaccountable to anyone but themselves. Military families continue to suffer here at home and tens of thousands of veterans suffer from injuries that will last a lifetime.

I voted against authorizing the use of force in Iraq, and I was the first Member of Congress to introduce a resolution calling for the withdrawal of our troops. For 6 years I have made the case that the occupation makes no sense.

On February 2, 2005, I said on the floor of the House "The sad irony is that after our Nation was attacked on 9/11 by al Qaeda, (our) response was to bomb and kill civilians in one of the few countries in the Middle East that was inhospitable to al Qaeda."

I also pointed out that the occupation wasn't making America any safer. On March 19, 2007, I said, "The rate of fatal terror attacks worldwide was increased by a factor of seven since the Iraq war began."

And I noted that the occupation was bleeding our Treasury dry and threatening our economy. On October 25, 2007, I said, "It's incredible to me that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, who lecture us daily about fiscal constraints, (do) not make a peep about the fiscal catastrophe" of Iraq.

I also raised my voice over and over again to decry the other tragic consequences of the occupation, which included the tragic loss of over 100,000 American and Iraqi lives, the refugee crisis, the torture at Abu Ghraib and elsewhere, the shabby treatment of our veterans at Walter Reed, the "Mission Accomplished" and weapons of mass destruction fiascos, the manipulation of intelligence to create a false cause for war, the cynical use of the 9/11 tragedy to justify military action against Iraq that the Bush administration had been planning all along, the scandal of sending our troops into battle without proper body armor and the terrible damage to our Nation's moral standing and reputation in the world.

I also spoke about the tremendous bravery and the skill of our troops and the amazing courage of the mothers of section 60 at Arlington National Cemetery, and I rose time and time again to

offer a real alternative to the occupation, a smart security plan, a plan that would defeat terrorism without the need to wage immoral and unnecessary wars.

Most recently, I rose to declare that the current plan to leave 50,000 residual troops after August 2010 in Iraq is unacceptable. I believe the best approach now is to withdraw all our troops by August 2010 and coordinate their removal with reconciliation and reconstruction efforts, efforts to promote the unification of the Iraqi people.

Madam Speaker, the occupation of Iraq violates America's core values of peace, freedom and human rights. I will continue to raise my voice on the floor of the House for these values until we bring all our troops home to their families and the peace and sovereignty of Iraq is restored.

I will also continue to raise my voice on this floor for a new and better foreign policy based on diplomacy and peaceful international cooperation.

I shall soon deliver speech number 301.

CUT GOVERNMENT SPENDING AND TAXES

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Madam Speaker, the Washington Post the other day commented about the President's support of the \$410 billion omnibus spending bill that's crawling through the Senate, and they said that it borders on the irresponsible for the administration to try to blame this on last year's administration because they are the ones that are going to sign the bill into law and spend the money.

In another newspaper here in Washington D.C., the Washington Examiner, they wrote "In quick succession, (President) Obama rolled out a \$2 trillion financial services bailout, \$2 trillion, a \$788 billion stimulus package, the \$13.4 billion preliminary bailout for automakers, a \$410 billion spending plan to cover the rest of the current fiscal year, a proposed \$275 billion foreclosure rescue plan, and a \$3.5 trillion budget that includes a \$634 billion fund for health care."

People in America, their eyes glaze over when they hear this. Trillions and trillions and trillions of dollars that we don't have are going to be spent for all of these programs.

And so people say, well, how are you going to solve the economic problems facing this country if you don't spend that money? If we spend the money, we are not going to solve the problems. The economic conditions will continue to go in the wrong direction, but we will be loading on the backs of our kids and grandkids and future generations, higher inflation and higher taxes and a quality of life that won't be anything like what we have today.

The key to solving these problems is to cut government spending, and to cut

taxes for every American so they have more disposable income, and to cut taxes on capital gains so people will take stocks, bonds and property they have and sell it and reinvest it someplace else, thus creating money for investment in business and industry so they can create jobs and cut business taxes across the board.

□ 1445

If we did those three things, we would have an immediate movement toward improvement in our economy, and we wouldn't be doing it by loading trillions and trillions of dollars on the backs of our kids and grandkids.

This chart here shows what's happened in the last several years as far as the growth in the money supply. It was pretty consistent up until the year 2000, and now it's going straight up. That means to every single American that the cost of living is going to go up because there's more money in circulation, fewer goods and services, and the cost of everything is going to rise because of the inflation that's created by printing all this money.

John F. Kennedy said that the way to solve these problems—back in the early sixties, a Democrat—that it was to cut taxes. Here's exactly what he said. "Our true choice is not between tax reduction, on the one hand, and the avoidance of large Federal deficits on the other. It is increasingly clear that no matter what party is in power, so long as our national security needs keep rising, an economy hampered by restricted tax rates will never produce enough revenues to balance our budget, just as it will never produce enough jobs or enough profits. In short, it is a paradoxical truth that tax rates are too high today, and tax revenues are too low, and the soundest ways to raise the revenues in the long run is to cut taxes now."

The best way to raise revenues for the Treasury is to cut taxes. The best way to stimulate economic growth is to cut taxes. Yet, this administration is going to be raising taxes in one way or another on every single family in this country, either through the tax that is going to be on energy or the taxes they are going to levy on the upper income people. But there's going to be taxes levied on every single American, and that is the wrong way to stimulate economic growth.

What they are doing is they are throwing money at this problem, saying that that will solve the problem. It has never worked in the past. It will not work now.

Back in the 1970s, under Jimmy Carter, this was tried. And we ended up with double-digit inflation—14 percent inflation, 12 percent unemployment—and they ended up raising interest rates to 21.5 percent to stop the runaway inflation that was killing the economy of the United States, and they put us into another real bad recession. It wasn't until Reagan came in in 1980 and cut taxes across the board that

we ended up with the longest period of economic recovery in the United States history.

History shows that cutting taxes in times of economic stress is the way to work our way out of this situation. And throwing money, trillions and trillions and trillions of dollars, and move us toward a socialistic economy, is not the solution.

I hope my colleagues will look into history. Look at what John F. Kennedy, what Ronald Reagan, and others said about this, because it's extremely important that we profit from history.

RON BROWN FEDERAL BUILDING NAMING

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

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida. I rise to celebrate the life of former Secretary of Commerce Ron H. Brown, who was the first African American to hold that position, and the first African American to serve as chairman of the Democratic National Committee. I want to thank Chairman RANGEL for bringing this resolution to the floor, designating the Federal building located at the United Nations Plaza in New York City as the "Ron H. Brown United States Mission to the United Nations Building."

At the time of his death in 1996, Mr. Brown was a figure of global importance and an advocate for American businesses at home and abroad. Through his example, Ron was a pioneer for many African Americans, and a role model, and was respected for his leadership, intelligence, and public service.

Born in Washington, DC, on August 1, 1941, and raised in Harlem, New York, he spent most of his life working for the people of New York and the citizens of the United States. As Secretary, he circled the globe spreading goodwill with his enthusiasm.

I remember traveling with Ron once to Africa as he was cultivating opportunities and markets for American products. It was on one of these trade missions that he died in a plane crash in war-torn Eastern Europe on April 3, 1996.

Ron left behind a wife, Alma, two devoted children, Michael and Tracey, and a record of commitment to the job he loved. Since his death, Ron has been recognized with many awards and scholarships, including the Ron Brown Award for Corporate Leadership and Responsibility, established by President William J. Clinton; the annual Ron H. Brown American Innovator Award, established by the U.S. Department of Commerce; and the largest ship in the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's fleet named in honor of his public service, the *Ronald H. Brown*.

Please join me today in celebrating the life and service of one great Amer-

ican statesperson and pioneer, Mr. Ron H. Brown.

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

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

EARMARKS

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

Mr. PAUL. I would like to address the subject of earmarks today. I think there's a lot of misunderstanding here among the Members as to exactly what it means to vote against an earmark. It's very popular today to condemn earmarks, and even hold up legislation because of this.

The truth is that if you removed all the earmarks from the budget, you would remove 1 percent of the budget. So there's not a lot of savings. But, even if you voted against all the earmarks actually, you don't even save the 1 percent because you don't save any money.

What is done is, those earmarks are removed, and some of them are very wasteful and unnecessary, but that money then goes to the executive branch. So, in many ways, what we are doing here in the Congress is reneging on our responsibilities, because it is the responsibility of the Congress to earmark. That is our job. We are supposed to tell the people how we are spending the money, not to just deliver it in a lump sum to the executive branch and let them deal with it, and then it's dealt with behind the scenes.

Actually, if you voted against all the earmarks, there would be less transparency. Earmarks really allow transparency, and we know exactly where the money is being spent.

The big issue is the spending. If you don't like the spending, vote against the bill. But the principle of earmarking is something that we have to think about, because we are just further undermining the responsibilities that we have here in the Congress.

If we want to get things under control, it won't be because we vote against an earmark and make a big deal of attacking earmarks because it doesn't address the subject. In reality, what we need are more earmarks.

Just think of the \$350 billion that we recently appropriated and gave to the Treasury Department. Now everybody's running around and saying, Well, we don't know where the money went. We just gave it to them in a lump sum. We should have earmarked everything. It should have been designated where the money is going.

So, instead of too many earmarks, we don't have enough earmarks. Transparency is the only way we can get to