

as a threat in this country, the Muslim Public Affairs Council recommended the United States Government find other terminology. As a result, the FBI Counterterrorism Lexicon and the 2009 National Intelligence Strategy included not a single reference to Islam, Muslim, the Muslim Brotherhood, Hamas, or Hezbollah.

Furthermore, after Major Nidal Hasan's attack on Fort Hood, the Department of Defense Report used the terms "violent extremism" and "Islam" only once in a footnote. Again, that incident was officially classified as workplace violence.

Mr. Speaker, we must also be concerned about North Korea. I was stationed in North Korea in 1995 along the demilitarized zone. I stood on the 38th parallel and looked through the barbed wire and landmines. And there, Mr. Speaker, you can see a repressed Nation. I saw for myself what a ticking timebomb that country can be. Sooner or later, North Korea will either implode or it will explode. The situation in North Korea most closely resembles a street gang, where the leader of the gang is killed and a young guy must step up.

□ 1410

In that instance, it is critical for the newly appointed "top dog" to establish his credibility by proving himself. And today, North Korea is ruled by a 28-year-old appointed four-star general.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it took me 22 years to become a lieutenant colonel. You can begin to understand how dangerous a situation is brewing just west of the Sea of Japan. The tactics do not change, and the game is getting tired. Anytime North Korea finds itself in need of money, it saber rattles with the threat of a secret nuclear arms program. It has fired artillery onto the South Korea island and sunk five South Korean Naval vessels.

Again and again, the international community responds with misguided attempts to "buy" the country off. Threaten to go nuclear and get funding in exchange? I call that international extortion. The DPRK newspaper, *Nodong Sinmun*, and other mouthpieces for the Workers' Party of Korea sensed this policy of weakness and referred to the disbursement of food and aid as "tribute." If there's one thing we've learned, it's that the North Koreans cannot be trusted to voluntarily disarm. They are playing our country and the entire Western world for fools. Sooner or later, we'll need to step up and stand up to this simmering menace just a few hundred miles from Japan.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, if we miss this opportunity to recognize the 21st century battlefield—and understand, we did not talk about Africa, we did not talk about Somalia, and we did not talk about our own border security. I thank my colleague from Indiana for speaking about energy independence. But if we miss this opportunity for understanding what this battlefield truly

is, to understand the threats and to lay out a strategic vigil for victory, we will lose the opportunity to ensure that our children and grandchildren of America will have a secure future.

As a country, we must roll up our sleeves and devise a roadmap for security. We must be mindful of the wise words penned by Sun Tzu in the book "The Art of War" more than 25 centuries ago:

To know your enemy and to know yourself and to know your environment, in countless battles, you will always be victorious.

If we do not understand this simple maxim, we face dark days ahead indeed. And that shadow could not only fall on this country, but on the entire world. Because no matter what our detractors may think, we are that beacon, we are that lighthouse. We are, as President Ronald Reagan said, "the shining city that sits upon a hill."

For the sake of our Nation and of all nations that seek freedom for their citizens, we must be prepared to fight on this 21st century battlefield, and we can settle for no less than victory upon it.

Mr. Speaker, those of us who have served in battle are the last to desire it. But as John Stuart Mill once wrote:

War is an ugly thing, but not the ugliest of things. The decayed and degraded state of moral and patriotic feeling which thinks that nothing is worth war is much worse.

Policymakers and those of us here in Washington, D.C., should heed the wise words of George Santayana:

He who does not learn from history is doomed to repeat it.

I will always stand by the men and women of the Armed Forces, and I am proud to represent them as a combat veteran in the United States Congress. I will always continue to protect our Nation, as I once did on the battlefield, and as I am now honored to do in this, the people's House, steadfast and loyal.

And I yield back the balance of my time.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBER TO COMMISSION ON INTERNATIONAL RELIGIOUS FREEDOM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to section 201(b) of the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998 (22 U.S.C. 6431 note), as amended, and the order of the House of January 5, 2011, of the following member on the part of the House to the Commission on International Religious Freedom for a term effective March 23, 2012, and ending May 14, 2014:

Mr. Robert P. George, Princeton, New Jersey

THE PROGRESSIVE MESSAGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, my name is KEITH ELLISON. I will claim the time over the next several minutes, and I want to talk about the issues before us today, namely, the budget. The budget is the issue today, Mr. Speaker.

As you may know, the House majority has come out with their budget, and, of course, the Progressive Caucus has come out with its budget, and that's what I want to talk about tonight.

The Congress, Mr. Speaker, is made up of a lot of diverse interests. We have people who span the spectrum of political thought. On the far right, those folks are present here and they allow themselves to be heard.

But we have other folks who have different points of view and believe that the best of America is the idea of liberty and justice for all. That's the Progressive Caucus—the idea that all Americans, no matter what their color is, no matter what their religion is, no matter whether they are male or female, no matter who they may be, have a right to live in a safe, free country with an opportunity to make a good, decent living with a retirement and with good, solid services like public schools, like police, fire and all these things, and we should live in a nation where we can really promote the common welfare. What that means is that the public sector and the private sector together—we have a mixed economy—need to work together to elevate the best interests of all American people.

To that end, the Progressive message, which I want to share tonight, is going to be about this budget, this Budget for All. The Progressive Caucus budget is called the Budget for All, and that's the Progressive Caucus message. Tune in at cpc.grijalva.house.gov to learn more about it, Mr. Speaker. Now, this is the hashtag for the Budget for All. It's #Budget4all. We want people to check it out and read about it.

It's very different from the Ryan budget. It's very different because we have a different vision for our country. It's very different because the Progressive Caucus believes that responsibility and the benefits of being an American should be shared; whereas, I think it's fair to say that the Ryan budget believes that if you give rich people a lot of money, maybe they'll start some businesses and maybe they'll hire someone and maybe people who are working class and middle class might benefit. It's called trickle-down economics, and I'll talk about that in a minute. But this is a very sharp contrast to the Progressive Caucus budget, which is the Budget for All.

Let me tell you a little bit about it, Mr. Speaker, because I think you're going to like it.

The Budget for All makes the American Dream a reality again. By putting Americans back to work, the Budget for All enhances our economic competitiveness by rebuilding the middle class and investing in innovation and education. Our budget, the Progressive

Caucus budget, Budget for All, protects the basic social safety net, which is Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security.

Now, it's very important to protect these programs, Mr. Speaker, because these programs go to help the people who basically made America for those of us living now. Let America never be a nation where our senior citizens who literally forged a way for younger people like me and those younger will have to eat dog food, have to choose between their medication and their meal, won't have enough to make their basic ends meet.

We need to support Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security. That's what the Budget for All does. The Ryan budget, which is really the Republican budget, does something very, very different, and we're going to talk about that in a minute.

Now, it's important, Mr. Speaker, to bear in mind that when you talk about the budget of a nation, what you're really talking about are the priorities of that nation, the values of that nation.

If you show me a family budget and that family spends a lot of money on potato chips and soda pop and none on the gym, I'll tell you what they value. If you show me a family that puts money into their kids' education and spends on making sure that they live in a neighborhood that's safe, then I'll tell you what their values are. If you show me a family that buys nutritious foods, I'll tell you what their values are.

Our budget is a reflection of what we believe, and our budget as a nation is also a reflection of what we believe.

□ 1420

Our Budget for All, here's what it reflects:

First of all, it puts Americans back to work. That is the number one thing the Budget for All of the Progressive Caucus does. Our budget attacks America's persistently high unemployment levels with more than \$2.4 trillion over 10 years in job-creating investment. This plan utilizes every tool at the government's disposal to get the economy working again, including—and Mr. Speaker, this is important—direct-hire programs that create a School Improvement Corps; also a Park Improvement Corps, a Student Job Corps, and others.

So, right now, when we have literally 14 million people out of work looking for jobs, why don't we send them to our schools and make these schools top-quality institutions and make the facility well painted, well cared for, well taken care of so that when the boiler breaks, the principal doesn't have to say, oh, my goodness, do I take it out of the maintenance budget to fix the boiler? What do I do?

We've got aging infrastructure in this country, and our schools are part of that. They're crumbling, and we've got to do something about it. Under

the Progressive Caucus Budget for All, we spend money to hire people to help rejuvenate and improve our schools, School Improvement Corps.

Also, in many districts where State and local governments have been cutting back, you have teachers who are trying to service 50 kids, 40 kids. This program can help teach kids and give the teacher some real help in the classroom so that they will not be overburdened.

Also, we invest in a Park Improvement Corps. Now, in my great city of Minneapolis—and I'm going back there today, I hope—you can walk around our beautiful lakes. One of the lakes we have is called Cedar Lake, and everybody loves Cedar Lake. You can walk through the paths there. And recently, Mr. Speaker, I stopped at a picnic table along the paths of Cedar Lake and stamped on this—Mr. Speaker, you'd be surprised to see—it said "WPA 1934." Now, that's the Works Progress Administration, a great American institution that put people back to work at a time when Americans were, in high numbers, out of work.

I think that if that generation at that time could respond to the needs of Americans who weren't working back then in the Depression, given the high rate of unemployment, our generation should not do less. A Park Improvement Corps to help take care of the paths, take care of the parks, make sure that these great national monuments dedicated to the enjoyment of all Americans are cared for and we hire people in the process, this is a good idea.

Also, the Student Job Corps. Mr. Speaker, one of the things that our unemployment numbers reflect is that a lot of young people are out of work. A lot of people who just got out of college are still looking for their first job. A lot of young people who decided that they didn't want to go to college but wanted to just jump right into the workforce are having a very tough time. So the Student Job Corps would be a program to put students to work.

You know, Mr. Speaker, there's lots of work to be done around America. According to the American Society of Civil Engineers, there's \$2 trillion worth of maintenance that needs to be done all across America. I'm talking about the roads, the bridges, the transit, all kinds of stuff. There's young people who need intervention. There's tutoring that needs to happen. There's all kinds of things that need to happen. And between the School Improvement Corps, the Park Improvement Corps, and the Student Job Corps, we will be able to literally hire millions of people. This would be great. It would spur our economy; it would increase aggregate demand; and it would give a lifeline to some people who've been out of work for a long time.

People would really rather work, Mr. Speaker. Of course, I'm a very firm believer in our social safety net for the non-elderly. I believe in it. I think

Medicaid is very important. I believe that food stamps is a critical program. I believe in all these programs. But I do know—and everyone knows—that folks would rather work. So let's set up a work program so that people can do their job in jobs that need doing.

Also, Mr. Speaker, I talked about some of our direct-hire programs. But what about the other aspect of the Budget for All, which focuses on the targeted tax incentives that spur clean energy, manufacturing, and cutting-edge technological investment in the private sector?

Now, Republicans, if the economy is doing great, they want a tax cut. If the economy is doing bad, they say, Tax cut. If the economy is kind of up and down, they say, Tax cut. These guys think that we should always cut taxes all the time, except when working people want a tax cut. They really fought us tooth and nail over the payroll tax cut. But if ever some really rich people want a tax cut, they're all for that. And it's not that they're bad people. It's because they mistakenly assume that trickle-down economics works. They think that if you give rich people money, then rich people will maybe hire somebody, or at least that's what they're hoping for.

The tax cuts we're talking about are targeted so that we can spur clean energy, manufacturing and cutting-edge technological investment in the private sector. Of course, President Obama has presided over America now with 23 straight months with private sector job growth—long way to go, but definitely the right direction.

The third aspect that we need to spend on for jobs is in a surface transportation bill. We propose a \$556 billion surface transportation bill spread out over a number of years. But when we think about the potholes, the roads, the bridges that are old—I mean, I was at a bridge recently in St. Louis Park in my district. This was a 73-year-old bridge. This bridge needed some care and needed to be refurbished to make sure that it stays safe. There are bridges like that all over my district, all over America. So this \$556 billion surface transportation bill and the approximately \$1.7 trillion in widespread domestic investment.

The Budget for All, Mr. Speaker, is all about putting Americans back to work first. But here's something about the Budget for All that people need to know, and it's that our budget is more fiscally responsible than the Republican budget.

Now, if you ask Republicans, they think, oh, well, liberals, you know, they may not be bad people, but they're not realistic. They just want to give all the money away; they don't want to hold people responsible. Well, you know what? Our budget is more fiscally disciplined than the Republican Ryan budget.

Unlike the Republican budget, the Budget for All substantially reduces the deficit and does so in a way that

does not devastate or set back our recovery. We achieve these notable benchmarks by focusing on the true drivers of our deficit—unsustainable tax policies, overseas war, and policies that help the recent recession—rather than putting America's middle class social safety net on the chopping block.

Our budget creates a fairer America.

We end tax cuts for the wealthiest 2 percent of Americans on schedule at the year's end, which are set to expire; and we let them expire for the top 2 percent.

Extends tax relief for the middle class households and the vast majority of Americans.

Creates new tax brackets for millionaires and billionaires in line with the Buffett Rule.

Eliminates the Tax Code's preferential treatment of capital gains and dividends.

Abolishes corporate welfare for oil, gas, and coal companies.

Eliminates loopholes that allow businesses to dodge true tax liability.

Creates a publicly funded Federal election system that gets corporate money out of politics for good.

Now, it has always bothered me, Mr. Speaker, that two-thirds of American corporations don't pay any taxes, because there's one-third that do. Because we have this system of loopholes everywhere, some corporations have to pay full freight and others don't have to. GE, for example, was said to have paid no or very low taxes, but there's a lot of big ones that didn't pay. Bank of America didn't pay. There's a lot of them that didn't pay. I don't think Boeing paid.

I'm saying that for the one-third of American corporations that do pay, we've got to make sure that everybody ponies up something. If more people pay, the burden on the ones that do pay will be lower. The Budget for All recognizes this important truth, unlike the Ryan budget, which protects coal, oil and those dirty polluting industries—oil, gas, and coal companies.

Now, another aspect of the budget driver, another big budget driver are these overseas wars.

□ 1430

Let's face it, in Iraq they told us that we were supposed to be getting rid of weapons of mass destruction. There weren't any. They told us that Saddam Hussein was connected to al Qaeda. He wasn't. They said that we had to go there to make sure that there would be peace. We're leaving now, and the Iraqis—it's their country, and they are managing the best they can. Still, it's not that peaceful, but the fact is 10 years couldn't solve that problem.

It was right to get out of Iraq, but it's also right to get out of Afghanistan. We need to responsibly and expeditiously end our military presence in Iraq and Afghanistan, leaving America more secure at home and abroad.

Our budget adapts our military to 21st century threats because we defi-

nately believe that America should be strong, but we should be adapting ourselves to the reality that we're in.

One of the attributes of our bill, one of the very important components is a piece of legislation called the SANE Act. This excellent piece of legislation reduces our nuclear weapons arsenal because this is all Cold War stuff designed to fight the Soviet Union, and there is no more Soviet Union. What are we doing with these 20th century weapons systems in the 21st century? We need to bring some sanity to that. We reduce the budget so that it reflects the modern reality.

The Budget for All protects American families by providing a make work pay tax credit for families struggling with high gas and food costs. This make work pay tax credit for families that are struggling with high gas and food costs is the kind of thing that incentivizes work, which is what we want to do. We extend the earned income tax credit and child dependent care credit.

I'm very happy to say I've just been joined, Mr. Speaker, by a good friend of mine from the great State of Texas, SHEILA JACKSON LEE. Whenever she is ready, she can just stand on up and hold forth. But I'm looking forward to sharing some mike time with her, because her insights are always very important.

Moving forward on this issue of protecting American families, the Budget for All invests in programs to stave off further foreclosures to keep Americans in their homes. This is very important. A lot of the economists who look at the problems with our economy have concluded that until we get our hands around this foreclosure crisis, we're going to continue, Mr. Speaker, to have very slow growth.

The Budget for All addresses this problem. We deal with investing in programs that stave off further foreclosures. We also invest in children's education by increasing in education, training, and social services.

The Budget for All is a good budget. It's a budget that makes sense. It's a budget for America. It's a budget designed to help the middle class and to put Americans to work. It's a budget that really reflects what Americans want, which is to get out of Afghanistan and Iraq. And we're already out of Iraq, but we're still kind of there. But we don't have a military presence there; we've got contractors there.

This is a good budget that I hope that people will take a very strong look at. It is more fiscally responsible than the Ryan budget. We spend more upfront to get the economy moving, but then we save money on the back end, and we end up getting to primary surplus in the year 2016. This is an important thing that we need to do.

Let me just pass the microphone and yield to Congresswoman JACKSON LEE, who has distinguished herself in many areas, not the least of which is fighting for a fair budget for our Nation.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. I thank the cochair of the Progressive Caucus for once again reminding America of America's greatness. That's why over 90-plus Members join together to be members of the Progressive Caucus. We have a sense of optimism that reflects our commitment to investing in human capital.

Earlier today, I had the opportunity of listening to a discourse about the transportation bill, and I will point to what we've done with infrastructure. There was the representation by the majority leader that we're living in hard times, we don't have money, that we can't be looking, for example, at the Senate bill and we can't move forward. And I just listened as our minority whip spoke about the urgency of moving forward on an infrastructure bill.

What I think is important, and really the theme that I wanted to focus on as I listened to you in my office—I just left about 12 constituents who are the beneficiaries of community health clinics, one of the items that we've supported as a Progressive Caucus for a very long time and championed along with the Tri-Caucus, to put in the Affordable Care Act, which, by the way, the 2-year anniversary is tomorrow.

The point is that we have optimism. We have the sense that America can get it done. You've just put up a very telling poster that when our Republican friends begin to talk, we're headed toward a pathway of devastation: no Medicare, no Medicaid, allowing reckless investments or speculation to occur, jobs overseas, and not focusing on our recovery.

By the way, we understand a balanced budget. We are using war savings for the people of the United States of America. Our troops come home, and we realign our national security focus. I think most Americans will understand that, even national security experts will tell us that it is probably a challenge to think we will have a ground war invasion like we've had years past ever again, that we're now fighting a war on terrorism or acts of terrorism.

Certainly, as we look to tell others to, in essence, become unnuclearized, we too must join the world's family because it's only one-upmanship.

I would just say that we do not disarm our Nation. We believe in defending our Nation, but we believe in doing it in a smart way. What we have done is that we have these words, "comprehensive economic recovery," but I'd like to say this is a smiley-faced optimistic pathway for Americans.

Don't you think young people who are now sophomores, juniors, and seniors in college looking for their bright day—does anyone remember as we come upon May how exciting it was to look forward to a college graduation, a trade school graduation? You were just tickled pink. You were making sure your invitations were out. You were hoping that all relatives could make sure they had no conflicts. You really

wanted Grandma there or your aunt there or your favorite brother there or Mom and Dad there or family there. This was an exciting time. The Progressive Caucus budget speaks to that excitement and optimism and hopefulness.

Our budget has an infrastructure bank that allows the private sector to come together and effectively bring about infrastructure projects in all manner of areas, from the hamlets that are so small, to the villages, to the county governments, to the city governments and State governments.

I introduced a surface transportation bill that has been slowed, another bill that would generate income and transportation security and recognize that we must secure our surface transportation. In this bill, we proposed a 6-year \$556 billion reauthorization bill that, over 10 years, would lead to a \$213 billion increase in transportation funding. What it would also do is create many jobs that provide for small contractors, minority-owned contractors, women-owned contractors. It would create work. It's an optimistic view.

The making work pay tax credit from 2013–2015 is about let's let folks who are working, let those get a benefit that makes sense. Then we have more than \$2 trillion in domestic investment packaging.

Just let me mention the idea of when you work with emergency jobs to restore the American Dream, getting people out where improvement is needed—student improvement, park improvement, student jobs, neighborhood heroes, community health clinics, federally qualified clinics, and child care corps—getting folks to work.

□ 1440

In my town, Mr. ELLISON, in the Southwest as you well know, we had a great drought in the last year. Volunteers are trying to plant trees, but I tell you we could stand for a Heroes Corps, we could stand for a Community Corps to get out there and help us reseed America, if you will. We know that. We know the Job Corps. But this is a concept that gets folks out working.

I also want to congratulate the University of Houston-Downtown that is heavily minority that just won the distinguished honor roll recognition for the largest amount of community service done by a campus across the Nation, cited by the Department of Education. That means people are ready to put that to work.

Tax credits for investment in advanced energy. I've got a company right in my community that's been awarded for its new, innovative work on energy, manufacturing, capital access for entrepreneurs of small business.

Now, let me just say this. I am excited about the 3 million Apple 3s that were sold because I think that is optimistic, and it employs the genius of America and it goes against the sad, deflated concept.

Now, let me be very clear. I am not ignoring the unemployed Americans. I want to be very clear on that. I don't think the Progressive Caucus has for a moment. We did a job tour. We're going back out again. We have no reason to dismiss the person who is now sitting unemployed.

What I want to say is there is some optimism. We've got to get all of those folks to be part of this new surge of optimism which this Progressive Caucus budget, if passed, would generate.

But I want to just say this to my good friends at Apple. Bring the jobs home. You are manufacturing Apple 3 in China. I certainly believe in an international framework. I know that everything can't be made in America, made at home. But I do know that aspects of the talent that you're using in China can be found here in the United States. And the cost of shipment—I can tell you you can save some dollars. Let's put our thinking caps on for companies like Apple and find a way that you can balance those resources.

I'm just going to cite General Electric. I know that we had put a real heavy heat on General Electric. I am told by their employees they are bringing jobs home. I met with some employees in my district who have indicated that they have been bringing them on home. I looked at them. They were real. They were alive. So, they have jobs, and they said they work for General Electric. Let's have a number of companies looking that way.

Let me quickly just mention because this is all exciting, and I think people need to hear about excitement and opportunity.

We already talked about the manufacturing community's tax credit, tax credit for the production of advanced technology vehicles. Again, everybody is saying we're slow on the hybrid, we're slow on the electric car. But all of that can create opportunity, tax credits for alternative fuel commercial vehicles, which is very possible. Double the amount of expense startup expenditures. So that means that if you've got a startup, we're going to double what you can expense. I think that makes a lot of sense.

Young people are the ones that are always starting startups. We need to encourage that. Enhance and make permanent the research and experimentation tax credit. That is right in the line of the Texas Medical Center. Many of our medical research hospitals, MD Anderson in the 18th Congressional District, while it's our neighbor, is working on new technology. This fits an optimistic view on how we can cure the worst of the worst.

Let me also say that I want to make mention that we are dealing with tax brackets, and we are looking, I think, at sensible policies dealing with capital gains and State policy. What I would say to people who are listening to us: Get on our Web site and give us your input. We're interested in what you have to say.

As well, let me just put in a pitch that no one likes the season when April 15 comes around. But we've tried to make our tax reform palatable. As far as I can see, we have left alone the charitable tax exemption. I tell you there are those who are very concerned that we leave little room for those who have that on the table, have everything on the table; that they would attack the charitable tax exemption and not go to some of the ones that the Progressive Caucus has focused on, because this nonprofit, this foundation, said they would be stopped in their tracks.

I had one foundation, one nonprofit talk to me today and say how challenging it is to get funding for the disadvantaged and programs that deal with intercity. So I want you to know that the Progressive Caucus recognizes the value of the charitable tax deduction, and you don't find that on our table.

I want to say something to Mr. ELLISON. I wanted to mention, for a moment, Trayvon Martin.

Mr. ELLISON. By all means I yield time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. He is certainly a lawyer who's practiced law, but I have met Mr. ELLISON's wonderful family of youth and young people, a young man. That's what happens. People don't realize that we have families on both sides of the aisle. Good Republican friends who've been with our families. So whatever you see us saying here on the floor of the House, we are particularly sensitive and warm toward Members' families because we are, in essence, despite our policy debates, we are a family here.

So I simply wanted to indicate first to give good wishes to Congresswoman CORRINE BROWN, who is now with her constituents in a major protest in Florida on this sad and tragic incident. I wanted to say that we will gather on Tuesday to present an opportunity for the case to be heard on this issue and the Federal Government's responsibility or authority.

One of the things that in this budget we are very keenly sensitive to are the needs of the Department of Justice. Again, an optimistic budget, because the Department of Justice is the armor in many instances that will come in and help a community when they cannot get help locally.

Mr. Martin was killed on February 26. He was buried on March 1. Today is March 22. It was only when his parents came out or used their grief that they're still grieving to start asking why, law-abiding citizens who were waiting for the city attorney and waiting on the chief of police, waiting on the Governor of the State of Florida to say something. Nothing was said.

So, as the voices began to raise and the astonishment and outrage began to percolate, Mr. ELLISON, it was not isolated to Florida or Sanford. If you listen to the various media outlets, parents, no matter what their background,

were calling and asking, What about my child?

I think it is important that we show this young man. It could be any of our family members. Can we imagine our youngsters wearing the clothing of the day—hoodies, sneakers, jeans. Do I need to remind you that Mr. Trayvon Martin was simply getting some Skittles, on the phone with his girlfriend, walking back to where his father was and going to look at some games. In this instance, it was basketball.

I come from local government. You come from State government. We know about Neighborhood Watch. We champion Neighborhood Watch. We have this Community Night Out, Police Night Out, whatever it is, and all of us have gone to it. We tell neighbors to watch out for each other. It's important for it to be said this was not watching out for each other.

The basic 911 tape, if you frame it, the call came in, that's the right thing to do. The description I may not adhere to, some of the words in the description, but so be it, you described this individual as such. But it came back and asked the specific question, "Are you following him?" "Yes." "Do not do that."

□ 1450

This youngster, football player, babysitter—likes to babysit, eating Skittles—a fun food to eat with a basketball game—was on the sidewalk. Not coming out of a window, not knocking on a door, not standing in front of a door, not on a lawn—walking on a sidewalk, which the Progressive Caucus has stood many times on that First Amendment right, we've stood many times. He was walking, and we are now in an abyss of darkness in terms of what next happened, but the description is, this young boy was shot point-blank in the chest.

We have to call upon the Federal resources. We've called for a Federal investigation. We've been joined by many colleagues. We have tapes of witnesses, meaning people inside their homes, saying they heard shouting and crying for help. We've heard people ask the question: Why didn't the neighborhood watcher stand down in the car? Move away? We've also heard the author of the "stand your ground" bill—which, by the way, is in 20 or so States—a Republican State representative, articulate in newspaper clips that it is not a pursue and attack. It is that you can stand your ground upon someone coming, but it is not a pursue and attack.

I just wanted to indicate that it is important for Members of Congress—and I believe there is a sense of outrage. We are not taking this to the level that does not respect the family that is mourning. We're not creating hysteria. We are only begging for the relief of others whose names have not come up. There are people calling in and telling us about cases from the west coast to the east coast, to the

North and the South. So I wanted to indicate that we will be joining as Members of Congress in hearing the circumstances, as much as we can, on the theory of the Federal Government's responsibility or authority. I think that is the more appropriate approach to take.

I want to thank the gentleman for letting me articulate, I think, just the sheer horror of having our kids leave our home—for innocence—and not come back. As a mother, I believe that, and as one who sees this, I believe we owe that family a response.

Mr. ELLISON. It's funny you should make that particular point about your family tie, because, when I first heard about the case of Trayvon, I mean, my thought went immediately to my own 17-year-old son. We live in Minneapolis, and he could very well be running to go get some Skittles, and could be talking on his cell phone. It's horrifying to me, deeply disturbing and troubling, that somebody would think that, first of all, he was some sort of a problem because he was walking down the street, and then to follow him. Then even after 9/11, when people say don't follow, they still follow.

You're right. Much has been said about the Florida law, the "stand your ground" law, but this gentleman did not stand his ground. There is no evidence to suggest that that is what happened. He went after this kid. Then you hear the tape of the boy as he was screaming. Somebody said to me earlier today, Well, don't call Trayvon a boy. Hey, he was 17. He was a boy.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. He was a boy.

Mr. ELLISON. He was killed by a grown 28-year-old man. It's deeply disturbing. I wish the people who don't quite get it yet could feel how some of us feel about this case. I mean, I spent 16 years in the criminal justice system. I know that horrible things happen, and it's heartbreaking any time we lose anyone, but to think that law enforcement would operate and treat this person with impunity is absolutely an abandonment of every principle of serve and protect. If a cop did what this guy did, they would take his gun, they would make him give a urine sample, and they'd put him on administrative leave until this thing was sorted out. This guy walked away.

Here is another thing. As a criminal defense lawyer, I find it nothing short of shocking that this man's representation—shooting him in self-defense—was good enough. I mean, if you've got a self-defense claim, then after you're charged with murder, you can raise that and see if you can convince a jury of it. We have a dead young man here, and the chief of police is like, Well, these things happen. No, there needs to be accountability. Do you know what I don't want to see happen? I hope people don't think this is only because this kid is black. You know, this could be a kid of any color.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. That's right.

Mr. ELLISON. Any parent should be shocked. Any 17-year-old who's walking the streets ought to be worried that some overzealous wannabe police officer would just shoot him down. This case is a national outrage.

Do you know what? You know and I know, because we've both worked in the system, that if the police would have made the arrest and processed this case in the ordinary course, it probably wouldn't have even hit the national news. But because nothing was done—cold-blooded murder; it looked like first-degree murder—we're all horrified.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. You're speaking as a parent, and I think everyone can appreciate that. You really highlighted it. In this instance, of course, we have to look and see whether there was a hate crime or if his civil rights were violated.

But you're absolutely right. We had nothing to go on. We had a person walking. We have the police, themselves, and so many of us have worked to ensure that the guns on these streets don't go after our law enforcement officers because, obviously, there are many who believe the more guns the better off we are—guns, guns, guns. This has nothing to do with the Second Amendment. It's just guns, guns, guns. So he has a concealed weapon. I'm not here to cast any aspersions, but as the reports are coming out, he has some challenges—meaning Mr. Zimmerman—to his record. He has some challenges.

With that in and of itself, the officer should have brought him in, but there is no evidence of that. Maybe they did, but there is no evidence of that, and they should have done, as you indicated, the normal police work. He has a defense, so be it—that of a concealed weapon permit and "stand your ground." But you have a dead person, and you have no witnesses, at least not that the police have offered to say Mrs. Jones, Mr. Smith, Mrs. Gonzalez said that they were in a knockdown, drag-out. There is not any glimmer of information that has come out. The young man happened to be a person of color. We have placed to a bipartisan vote both hate crimes laws, the 1964 Civil Rights Act, and other bills that have been voted on in a bipartisan manner simply because we don't want America to violate those very precious rights.

I want to just share with you, because, as I said to you, I've got a neighborhood watch, The Washington Post says, Experts say neighborhood watches shouldn't be police.

Mr. ELLISON. They should watch.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. That is correct.

What I don't understand, and what we will be, if you will, perusing is, where did this case go wrong and the fact that the Federal Government has to come in when things go wrong.

Someone said to me in my office that this case has riveted like Emmett Till's case riveted.

Mr. ELLISON. Yes.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. And you're right. There are cases across America. Members have raised cases in conversations that we've had, and we need to have all of that in an inventory so we can, out of this tragedy, say to those parents: Trayvon counts. We care. Young people count. Children count. Your community counts and our communities count.

I wanted to share that. I'm not going to let this go. As for the Judiciary Committee; the Congressional Black Caucus; the Tri-Caucus, which involves the Asian Caucus and the Hispanic Caucus; letters that have been written by a number of Members of Congress; the work of Congresswoman BROWN—and the Progressive Caucus, I know, is a willing partner when it comes to issues of justice—we are not going to let this rest without finding some relief and rest for this family.

□ 1500

And I thank the chairman for his personal story. I met the young man, and we've all traveled together, our family, at the Dem caucus events where families come together.

I will just conclude by simply holding up, again, this picture. And for those who don't know the terminology, let me just show. He is in football attire here; and we don't know what college he would have gone to or what football team, if that had been his choice, that he would have played on.

Let me just put this up. If you can see it, this is an innocent face. But he is wearing a hoody. And if anyone needs to know, I have a hoody. It's my local college's paraphernalia that you buy, and you wear it to the game, and it has a hoody. And it's something that I think everybody has seen in this country. I see nothing on here that says: Bad guy. Criminal. Shoot me. That's not what we do in America. I want to thank the gentleman for allowing me to share and to say that we will find some resolution to this.

I will simply conclude by saying that I do believe in an optimistic America. Revealing my pain about this young man is pain for all those whose names we have not called. But in believing in an optimistic America, I want to be a problem solver. I want to solve this problem or answer this problem with respect to Trayvon Martin.

I want to say that as I perceive this product that has been produced, this Budget for All, I am so grateful that over 90-plus members of the Progressive Caucus saw that the right route to take was the optimistic upturn, positive, open opportunity budget to give to all of America. That's what we should be supporting, not the downturn, the "no way out," but really that there is a new day for America.

I yield back to the gentleman and thank him for his courtesy.

Mr. ELLISON. I thank the gentlelady for joining me tonight.

We talked about the Budget for All, and the hashtag again is #Budget4all.

People can check it out on Twitter or on anywhere else. It will be on U.S. Progress. We want people to look at the Budget for All. We want your ideas.

But I think it's also important to draw a contrast. The recently released Ryan budget, the Republican budget, does some critical things that Americans should know about. It ends Medicare. It devastates Medicaid, rewards Wall Street, punishes Main Street, protects corporations that ship jobs overseas, threatens the recovery. It preserves tax breaks for the people who don't need them and actually cuts into the social safety net for America's everyday heroes, police, fire, job training, small business, infrastructure, college affordability.

I think the facts show that in the course of the last couple of months, I guess 18 months or thereabouts, I believe that the Republican majority really hasn't been working on solving problems.

People can say whatever they want about Dodd-Frank, or they can say whatever they want about the Affordable Care Act or the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act for women, or they can say anything they want about the credit cardholders' bill of rights. But in the last Congress, these are bills the Democratic House majority passed that were designed to try to solve problems for Americans.

Now, some people say, Well, it should have done this more. It shouldn't have done so much of that. Fine. That's what we do here. We debate stuff. But I'm not aware of any single piece of legislation we looked at since they took the majority designed to solve a problem. It's all been: cut everything; whack everything. Let's not take a surgical look at what should be cut, what's not working. Just cut everything.

They have created budget crisis after fiscal crisis after debt limit crisis. I mean, this is the Congress of crisis.

And the Speaker may be aware that because the Ryan budget basically goes below the nonmilitary discretionary in the Budget Control Act, which was a deal, when the Senate comes in with their budget and this bill and theirs don't match, we're going to have another standoff.

Oh, and by the way, we're going to have a standoff in 10 days because the transportation bill is expiring. The House majority, the Republican Caucus, will not agree with the Senate to pass a 2-year transportation bill. So the transportation bill within 10 days is looking to expire. They say, We'll only do a 3-month bill. Three months? This is putting everybody's lives in jeopardy. They just did it with the FAA not more than a few months ago. This is the crisis Congress, where they will not make long-term decisions because they are playing politics.

I believe that since the Republicans have put defeating the President as their primary goal, therefore, of course, they're not operating on the basis of trying to solve any problems.

But before any Republicans get upset with me for saying these things that I honestly believe to be true, don't get mad at me. Americans believe that that's what they're doing. Now here's a question put to Americans. Republicans would rather see President Obama lose than see America win. Half of Americans believe the Republicans are sabotaging the recovery to win an election. This is a Washington Post poll: fifty percent responded positively to that; 44 percent said no.

If you've got most people thinking that your main goal is to get rid of the President and not help them, that's a problem. And look, some folks might say, Oh, look, Keith, that's not true. That's just you politicians arguing again. Well, MITCH MCCONNELL said it. He said, Our main priority is to defeat the President, make the President a one-term President.

So at the end of the day, this budget reflects that politics-playing theme that they seem to be on. They are rigging the system even more heavily in favor of the richest 1 percent. Their budget gives generously to the rich and protects existing tax breaks for those at the top of the income scale.

Also, the reality is that the only way to pay for such huge tax cuts for the 1 percent is to make the 99 percent pay the tab. Their budget would weaken the middle class of America. First and foremost, the plan ends the Medicare guarantee of decent, affordable health insurance in retirement. It also slashes critical middle class investments, such as education and infrastructure by 45 and 24 percent. It cuts education by 45 percent, infrastructure by 24 percent. It includes not a single new measure to help the nearly 13 million unemployed. Though we've recently enjoyed several months of solid jobs growth, our current economic recovery is by no means assured; and we still have a long way to go.

Not only does the House Republican majority's budget fail to propose a single new idea for spurring job growth, but it would even force us to swerve into severe austerity. The Ryan budget, which is the Republican budget, cuts the following: it kills even more jobs by cutting the Federal workforce by over roughly 210,000 over 3 years, cuts food stamps and welfare, cuts retiree benefits from Federal employee pensions, cuts support for farmers, cuts antipoverty programs and uses the proceeds to give rich people even more tax cuts.

As I said before, the Republicans, who believe—and so many of them believe in it. They believe in trickle-down economics. This is the idea that rich people don't have enough money and poor people have too much. The problem is that that belief system has never succeeded.

□ 1510

One of the best economies since World War II was in the 1990s. One of the best. We had the Clinton-era tax

rates, which we hope we'll return to, at least for the top 2 percent. The top 2 percent were doing great during Clinton's time. And yet the Republicans say that unless we give rich people more money, the economy is not going to be good. Well, it's not good now, and they have been in charge for a long time.

So the bottom line is the Ryan budget proposal is bad for America, cutting basic criteria for seniors and not investing in jobs. The Budget for All invests in America and puts Americans as the top priority, not just winning some election.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

BROKEN PROMISES IN OBAMACARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HULTGREN). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. FLEMING) for 30 minutes.

Mr. FLEMING. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is indeed a pleasure to come to the floor today to speak to this Chamber about a subject that I think is very important on the minds of the American people, and that is the 2-year anniversary of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, also known as PPACA, and certainly more commonly known as ObamaCare.

I want to give you a little context, Mr. Speaker, of where I come from. I'm a Congressman from Louisiana in the 4th District, centered in Shreveport Bossier. I have been a family physician for 36 years. I still see patients when I have the opportunity. I also have businesses on the side that are not related to health care.

So in my world for many years, and in raising a family, the responsibilities of meeting payrolls have included not only running a small medical practice but also a growing business dealing with all of the regulations, the taxation, and the many different issues—personnel problems, human resource problems—that we must deal with. And certainly providing health care has been a great challenge over the years. And there's no question that the system has not been what it should be prior to this time.

In fact, one of the reasons why I ran for Congress—and many other of my colleagues who were physicians—we have 15 just in the Republican section alone, and I think we'll have more next year—the reason why we've become so activated, if you will, when it comes to Federal policy on health care is because of all the failures that we've seen over the years and the problems with government trying to micromanage health care.

So what I want to talk about today is broken promises with regard to ObamaCare. You may recall that Candidate Obama, Senator Obama, says you will not have to change your

health care plan if his health care plan is brought into law. For those of you, he said, who have insurance now, nothing will change under the Obama plan except that you will simply pay less.

Another quote from him is this. This is President Obama in June of 2009:

And that means that no matter how we reform health care, we will keep this promise to the American people. If you like your doctor, you will be able to keep your doctor. If you like your health care plan, you will be able to keep your health care plan.

Well, what is the truth of this? By the administration's own estimates, new health care regulations will force most firms and up to 80 percent of small businesses to give up their current plans by 2013. Grandfather plans would be subject to the costly new mandates and increased premiums under the President's health care plan.

Again, my own business is back home. We still cover our employees, and we would fall under the grandfather. But here's what we're up against. If we change just one dotted "i," one crossed "t," that totally nullifies the grandfather rule that applies to our plan. So what that means is if we change anything—the cost structure, anything—then simply we will fall into the government-mandated plan in which we have to choose among the three specified, certified government plans that would be chosen for us.

Now you could say, Well, we could keep exactly what we have without changing one scintilla of it. The problem is, what if the cost continues to go up—and it will—and we say maybe let's raise the deductible, raise copayments, cut some coverage someplace, change the way we cover pharmaceuticals, do something to lower that cost so we can afford it as a company and our patients can afford it. No. It then nullifies the grandfather clause and then it activates, of course, ObamaCare, and we will be required to be in it.

Let's go to broken promise number two. I have many broken promises but I'm going to focus on six today.

Broken promise number two. President Obama in September of 2009 says:

First, I will not sign a plan that adds one dime to our deficits either now or in the future. I will not sign it if it adds one dime to the deficit now or in the future.

Well, is that true? An honest accounting of the health care plan finds that it will increase the deficit by hundreds of billions in the first 10 years alone. For instance, the law double-counts the Medicare savings.

It's interesting the way we have something in Washington, in Congress, called the CBO, the Congressional Budget Office. It uses a scoring mechanism. It works out of a 10-year budget window. So whatever we do, it either costs more or costs less, based on what happens for it in the next 10 years.

And so this was a big challenge for the Obama administration to get this bill passed because they saw what we saw, and that is it will add billions of

dollars to the deficit. So what did they do? They manipulated the budget window to make it look like it paid for itself. And how did they do that? Well, for one thing, the way the bill is set in motion and the way it's implemented is that for the first 4 years—you've noticed that even though it passed in March of 2010, it hasn't been implemented. Why? A very good reason. Because the costs don't begin until it's implemented. However, the revenues already began soon after the bill passed. So the way it was scored is we have 10 years of revenue—that's income—and 6 years of costs.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I could run any business profitably that way if I have 10 years of revenue and only 6 years of cost. That's precisely what happened here. However, the law has been rescored and in fact what was supposed to be a \$900-some billion bill over 10 years is now rescored at \$1.75 trillion. And next year, which will then stretch it out the full 10 years, it will be well over \$2 trillion.

Former CBO Director Douglas Holtz-Eakin has written that:

Under a realistic set of assumptions, the law will increase the deficit by at least \$500 billion in the first 10 years and more than \$1.5 trillion in the second decade.

Mr. Speaker, let's go back to where we are with government health care pre-ObamaCare. Back in the nineties, the last time that we balanced a budget was under President Clinton and after, of course, a Republican-controlled House and Congress in general sent a balanced budget three times in a row. He vetoed it twice and finally signed it the third time.

□ 1520

How did they do it and we can't do it today? Well, one reason is very important, and that is that at that time 30 percent of the budget was made up of mandatory spending, that's entitlement spending, which would be Medicare, Medicaid, Social Security, and other forms of mandatory spending such as welfare, section 8 and so forth. So that meant that 70 percent was discretionary spending, which means that you could cut budgets out of certain departments and agencies and you could begin to balance a budget once again.

Well, today it is 60 percent of the budget that's mandatory or entitlement spending—and growing—which means that we have certainly much less to work with in order to balance the budget, and it continues to grow. The largest piece of that is Medicare itself.

Mr. Speaker, I guarantee you that most Americans do not realize that today Medicare is very much a subsidized and entitlement program. Even though its recipients and those of us who are in the workforce paying into it, even though we pay premiums into it, the return on those premiums are threefold; that is to say, for every dollar you put into Medicare, you get \$3