

the United States Marine Corps that the children can have for years to come, and whenever it comes up that the crash on April 8, 2000, in Arizona, was pilot error, Mr. Speaker, they can say, No, that's not true. I have a letter from the United States Marine Corps Commandant that clearly states that my father was not at fault.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank *The Hill* magazine today. I'm sorry that I had to be featured in it, because the most important thing about the article—and I want to thank Jeremy Herb, who spent so much time on this article. He interviewed the Commandant; interviewed General McCorkle, who was the aviation chief at the time of this crash; and he interviewed the wives. Again, they clearly understand that if you want to bring rest to two outstanding marines who have been blamed for this crash, Mr. Commandant, all you have got to do is write a letter with one paragraph in it. The wives have given you what they request.

I'm calling on the United States Marine Corps today, the Commandant of the Marine Corps, to please do what is right. You have the evidence. The attorneys that sued Bell-Boeing over this accident know more than anyone, including the Commandant, about what happened and who was at fault.

Again, Jim Furman and Brian Alexander have joined in this effort. I hope that the Marine Corps will give the wives what they're asking for.

Mr. Speaker, if we can ever bring this journey to an end, I intend to go to the cemetery in Jacksonville, North Carolina, with Connie Gruber and her daughter Brooke, and I want to walk to the grave of the husband and the father and say, Major Brooks Gruber, Rest in peace. The blame game is over. You're not to blame for the accident.

And then, Mr. Speaker, I would like to go with Trish Brow and her sons, Matthew and Michael, to Arlington and say the same thing to Colonel Brow. Colonel, you have earned the rest. You did nothing wrong to cause that accident.

Mr. Speaker, it makes no sense that these wives and their children have had to carry this burden because, Mr. Speaker, too many times articles are written, books are written, that say one accident in the history of the Osprey was caused by pilot error. And they're talking about John Brow and Brooks Gruber, and they're talking about the accident in Arizona.

I give you one quick example, Mr. Speaker. A book called "Leathernecks" was published about 4 years ago. The father of Colonel Brooks Gruber is living. His name is Bill Gruber. He lives in Naples, Florida. He fought for this country as a marine in the Korean War. He's carried the pain of this blemish on his son's name.

He called me a couple of years ago. He knew what I was trying to do for the families. He called me here in Washington, D.C., about 2 years ago,

and said, Congressman, they've done it again. I said, What's that, Mr. Gruber?

On page 113 of the new edition of "Leathernecks" they've got a section on the Osprey. They say one accident was due to pilot error.

□ 1600

Mr. Speaker, I'm a strong man of faith, and I prayed every night that God would touch the hearts of those who could make the decision to clear the names of Colonel John Brow and Major Brooks Gruber. And as long as I serve in the Congress, as long as I have the energy to fight for these two men, I will continue to fight until the Marine Corps does what is right. And what is right is to give Connie Gruber and Trish Brow an official letter with one paragraph on it. And we will ask that the Marine Corps issue a national press release that the commandant has done this so that the press in years to come will always be able to look at that press release by the Marine Corps and see that Colonel John Brow and Major Brooks Gruber, young men who died too early in their life, through no fault of their own, they were 17 young marines, the oldest being 23, in the back of the V-22 that crashed, that they are not at fault for this accident.

Mr. Speaker, as I do before I close, I ask God to please bless our young men and women in uniform and their families. I ask God to bless the families who have given a child dying for freedom in Afghanistan and Iraq. I ask God to please bless the families of John Brow and Brooks Gruber, and I ask God to touch the heart of the Marine Corps and the commandant to bring these two men's image to respect and not an image that is blemished by the accident. I ask God to bless my good friend sitting here and his family.

I ask God to bless everyone in America. I ask God to bless the House and Senate that we will do what is right in the eyes of God for God's people. And I ask God to please bless the President, that he will do what is right in the eyes of God for God's people. And three times I will ask, God please, God please, God please continue to bless America.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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. Well, Mr. Speaker, my name is KEITH ELLISON. I'm cochair of the Progressive Caucus, and I say, God, please bless WALTER JONES.

Mr. Speaker, we are here today with the Progressive Caucus message today. Our Web site is listed on the bottom, cpc.grijalva.house.gov. We come every week with the progressive message. The Progressive Caucus is a caucus in the Congress. There are several. Of

course, the two big caucuses are the Democratic Caucus and the Republican caucus; but within both, there are different groups that have points of agreement that they come together around. On the Republican side, there's the Republican Study Group. On the Democratic side, there are several caucuses. There's the Black Caucus, the Hispanic Caucus, and there is the Blue Dog caucus. There are different groups.

The Progressive Caucus is a caucus within the Democratic Caucus. We'd be happy to have Republican Members if they ever wanted to join, but all of our members are Democrats, and we believe that America should be a place where there's liberty and justice for all. That means whether you're Hispanic or Latino or African American, one America. We believe that the working men and women of America should get a fair, decent wage, and that the people who are most privileged in our society, God bless them, but they should pay adequate taxes so that we can afford the basic necessities of a society—schools, roads, take care of our environment and things like that. We believe we should stay out of these wars unless they're necessary to defend the American people, so we are promoting diplomacy, and we are very proud to say that we are the liberal caucus.

We're the Progressive Caucus. We're the ones who believe fairness, inclusion, and that, yes, the government has a responsibility, because it is our collective—the way we all come together as Americans to the poor, and we should stand by that and stick by that. That is who the Progressive Caucus is.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we've been dealing with the budget this week. It's been "budget week," you could say. We started out the week, we were talking about the Republican budget drafted by Mr. PAUL RYAN. We went from there, and we talked about the Democratic budget drafted by Mr. CHRIS VAN HOLLEN. And then, of course, the Progressive Caucus budget came up, the Black Caucus budget came up. I think Mr. MULVANEY came up with a budget proposal. They put the President's—a very, very watered down and inaccurate version of the President's budget up there, and we've been talking budget.

Mr. Speaker, when we talk about the budget, what we're talking about is the values and priorities of America. It's important to keep this in mind. What shows up in your budget is what you care about. What does not show up in your budget is what you don't care about. Now, Mr. Speaker, I always caution people not to just take their family budget and the United States budget and assume they're basically the same thing, one just is bigger than the other. That's not exactly accurate. There are important differences, and we shouldn't mix up the two. But in this way they are similar in that they reflect what it is that people value.

If you have a family and their budget, you can look at their budget; they

spend a lot of money on entertainment, you can pretty much figure they value that. If they put a lot of money into food, you can figure they definitely think that is a priority for them. You can go through the family budget and see what people spend their money on, see what people don't have in their budget, and then you can pretty much figure, well, maybe that's not a priority for them. Of course, they may not be able to afford it at this time. But if you talk about reasonably middle class people, their budget reflects what they care about, what matters and what doesn't.

And for our Nation, that certainly is true. If our Nation puts more money into warfare than it does into social uplift, jobs and the economy and infrastructure, that says something about who we are. If our national budget puts more money into infrastructure and jobs and putting people back to work, then that says something about who we are. The various budgets that have come up, Mr. Speaker, reflect what the various caucuses think is important and project a vision for our country. I want to talk about that today.

I want to start by talking about PAUL RYAN's budget. PAUL RYAN is the Republican Budget Committee chair. He's a nice guy. I don't have anything bad to say about him personally because he is actually a nice person. But the fact is we disagree in a significant way about what the priorities of America should be. For example, the Republican budget, 20 children will lose access to Head Start to pay for one millionaire's tax cut. That's their budget. Just if you want to understand what their tax cuts represent, it means 20 kids don't get to go to Head Start so that a millionaire can get a tax cut—150,000 equals 20 times 7,500. So, if you look at this tax cut, a millionaire's tax cut, which will amount to about \$150,000, these little guys don't get to go to Head Start.

Now, what is Head Start? Head Start is a great program for low-income kids to make sure that they have a chance at getting a quality education and don't fall behind in school. And so this is a great program. It has great results. These Head Start kids, 20 of them going to Head Start, versus what a millionaire's tax cut would be, which is \$150,000. Now, this is the choice we're making.

Mr. Speaker, we should not act like we're not making choices. We are making choices. We are deciding. My friends on the Republican side of the aisle like to say, oh, we shouldn't pick winners and losers. We're always doing it. They just pick the rich people, and we—I—pick the kids in Head Start.

Also, Mr. Speaker, if you just want to get a sense of what the Republican budget, what it does and what the tax cuts that it's calling for mean, Republican budget, 150 college students will have their Pell Grants cut by \$1,000 to pay for one millionaire's tax cut. So one millionaire's tax cut, \$150,000, but

150 times 1,000, all these kids, these college kids trying to make something of themselves, their Pell Grant is going to get whacked by 1,000 bucks.

So again, choices. Do we want to make sure the country club set is doing even better, or do we want to make sure that these aspiring engineers, these aspiring doctors and teachers, these aspiring police officers, these aspiring workers of tomorrow, will have a shot at an affordable college education?

□ 1610

This is what we're talking about. These are the choices that we're making, Mr. Speaker, and I think it's very important that Americans know it. It's critical that we know it.

Now, let's just not stop there. Let's talk about other critical choices being made, Mr. Speaker. Because I think it is so critical that as we're talking budget week and all the budget decisions that we are making, that we make it real clear to the American people what it is we're choosing.

Republican budget: 216 pregnant or postpartum women, infants, and children would lose access to WIC—that's the Women, Infants and Children program, and it provides food for poor women and their kids—to pay for one millionaire's tax cut. So, \$150,000 tax cut for a millionaire—again, this is the country club set—equals about 216 pregnant women or postpartum women and the amount of money that Americans give them so that they can have good nutrition for their kids. These are poor women. These are women who are struggling economically. But just because they're struggling economically, we don't want their kids to go without good, nutritious food. So as Americans, we have the WIC program. Well, they're going to get slashed out of the program because a millionaire needs a tax cut. That's the choice that we're making.

I want to talk about why we're making that choice in a minute, but I want to give one more example. Republican budget: 25 seniors paying \$6,000 or more for Medicare to pay for one millionaire's tax cut. So, if you're a millionaire and you get a tax cut under what the Republicans want to give you—you're already doing good, but they want you to even do better—that will mean that you've got about 25 seniors who have to pay \$6,000 a piece more for their Medicare. So, Mom, Dad—if you're my age, Mom and Dad are senior citizens. If you're younger, they're not. But if your parents or grandparents are on Medicare and they're doing all they can on their fixed income to make it, they're going to need a little extra help because we've got to make sure that that millionaire gets his \$150,000 tax cut. These are the choices that we're making.

Now, my friends in the Republican caucus—God bless them—it's not like they don't like poor people. Many of them are very charitable. They give in

their different walks of life, maybe their faith community, or whatever, they just don't think government should do it. This is what they say. They think that government needs to get out of that and let churches, mosques, synagogues, and other folks do it. Of course, that would mean that it wouldn't get done, because even though churches, mosques, and synagogues do great work, they can never possibly come up to meet the need that's out there.

What they're really believing is—this is what they really believe: They believe in something called trickle-down economics. They believe that if you give this millionaire 150,000 more dollars than he already has, he will maybe, hopefully, perhaps invest it in plant and equipment and maybe somebody will get a job because of it. Or maybe not. Or maybe he will invest in China. He'll improve jobs, but just not in America.

Nobody knows what they will do with this tax cut, but this is what the Republicans believe. They think that if you give rich people more money, they will invest in plant and equipment, create more economic activity, and it will trickle down to the rest of us. The only problem is that it has never worked. It doesn't stop them from saying it, but it's never worked.

In fact, the GOP budget will destroy more than 4 million American jobs in the next 2 years, according to the Economic Policy Institute. The Economic Policy Institute estimates that:

The shock to aggregate demand from near-term spending cuts would result in roughly 1.3 million jobs lost in 2013, and 2.8 million jobs lost in 2014, or 4.1 million jobs through 2014.

So, a little bit more than 4 million jobs over the next 2 years.

Now, people might think, well, KEITH, is that right? Well, yeah, it's right. And I'll tell you why it's right. It's right because when Republicans say we need to cut government waste, we need to cut government, cut government, cut government, they act as if there's just some Big Government thing over there, like it's a big giant piece of Styrofoam and they can just cut it and it doesn't change anything. What they're talking about cutting are Federal workers. They're talking about laying off Federal workers. And they're very derisive about government jobs and act like people who work for the government don't do anything of value—of course this is not true at all. But if you look on this chart right here, Mr. Speaker, it says:

I earn less than \$45,000 a year. Explain to me, GOP, how cutting my pay creates jobs.

This particular person is named Paul, and he is an Army depot worker. I think we need Army depot workers.

Teresa is a nurse—and this is her right here. She lives in my district. And she says:

Twelve percent of the salary I earn caring for veterans goes to my retirement. Explain to me, GOP, how cutting my retirement puts people to work.

Well, one of the things that they do in the Ryan budget is cut into Federal workers' retirement. They act like, oh, the government. No, the government is people. The government is nurses. The government is Army depot workers. And what about Federal prisons that keep dangerous criminals behind bars:

I pay more than \$9,000 a year for my family's health insurance. Explain to me, GOP, how cutting my take-home pay lowers unemployment.

This guy is a corrections officer. And thank goodness for correction officers or the streets that we live on wouldn't be so nice.

The bottom line is, when Republicans say, oh, we're going to shrink the size of government, what they mean is they're going to lay off and cut the pay and cut the employment benefits of Federal workers, people who work in prisons at risk to themselves, nurses who care for our veterans, people who are Army depot workers, and people who work in our parks and people who fix our roads and a whole lot of other people.

Here's a chart for you, Mr. Speaker. If you look at the Ryan budget, if you look at the GOP proposal, if you look at it and it could do what they want it to do, it could cause a loss of up to 7 million jobs by 2016. Because it would cut Federal workers, and then they wouldn't be able to have the money to spend in the neighborhoods they live in anymore. That would then have a ripple effect in their neighborhoods because they're buying less. For example, if that young nurse at the VA in Minnesota, if she doesn't have the same pay as she had before, then she can't buy as much as she bought before, then the company she shops at doesn't sell her as much as they have before. You do that enough, multiply it times enough people, and that company then needs to start laying off people. So it's a ripple effect, what the Republicans are asking for.

But if you look at what they wanted—and I'm talking about going all the way back to H.R. 1, which is their proposal—you would see repealing health care reform, that would cut about \$2 million; the GOP budget, that would cut about \$3 million; cuts to the Federal workforce, that would cut about 285,000; the so-called JOBS Act, that would cut a lot; the Fair Tax, that would cut; and they would just cut on down the line. What they're basically proposing is by shrinking government and by doing all that stuff, they're getting rid of people.

Now, I just want to be on the record because your words do get twisted. If there is a Federal program that is not justifiable, and it's so poorly run that it's of no value to anyone, I'm okay with cutting it. I just want to say that on the record on the House floor, Mr. Speaker. I'm all right with cutting programs that don't work. But when you're talking about VA nurses and you're talking about corrections workers in Federal prisons, we need these

people. They do good stuff. And I believe that we should stand by them as they stand by us.

The GOP budget—now going back to the budget we addressed today—will shift costs to seniors for the Medicare guarantee, according to the AARP. And what's AARP? That's the leading organization representing retired persons. And the CBO—what's the CBO? That is the Congressional Budget Office. And for folks who like to watch C-SPAN, I'd just say, Mr. Speaker, you need to know what CBO is because this is very important, Congressional Budget Office. They're the nonpartisan group that says what's really going on with the numbers.

□ 1620

At the same time, it is raising the seniors' cost. This GOP budget gives those making more than a million a year an average tax cut of about \$394,000. So I put 150 up there a moment ago. That was the generic millionaire. The actual number is about 394 for the average millionaire, per year, on the average tax cut.

And also, the tax breaks for Big Oil companies. You know, they get about \$4 billion a year. I'm talking about if you look at Conoco, ExxonMobil, and all the Big Oil companies, they get about \$4 billion a year.

Now how much did you pay for gasoline?

I'm not saying that they're not good people. I'm not saying that they don't run a good business and supply an important product. I'm just asking you this: Does ExxonMobil really need your money through a tax subsidy? Do they?

I think that they don't need your money. I think their \$4 a gallon is taking care of them just fine. And I think it's outrageous that the Republican budget that we dealt with does not eliminate that tax break.

In short, the Big Oil companies who are gouging Americans at the pump and the wealthiest Americans win, while middle class and working class families get the short end of the stick.

Last year, oil profits—and this is an exact number or close to it. Last year, Big Oil profits totaled about \$137 billion. But you don't need to remember \$137 billion. All you need to remember is Big Oil profits were the biggest ever that the oil industry ever had. And yet we're forking it over to them through our tax money, not through the pumps.

Some people might think, well, of course we're paying them, KERTH, through the pump. They give us gas. We've got to get to work, so we need to buy the gas.

I'm not talking about that. I'm saying they get—they can apply for grants and subsidies, and it all adds up to about \$4 billion a year. With soaring gasoline prices, Big Oil's 2012 profits will even be bigger. Yet Republicans want to give Big Oil more money in our tax dollars, and it just doesn't make any sense.

Now, of course you shouldn't expect the Big Oil companies like ExxonMobil

to say we don't want the money. Of course they want the money. Who doesn't want money? Everybody does, including them. But the people who have a public responsibility to look out for the American people should be willing to say "no" to public subsidies for the ExxonMobils of this world.

And again, if you work for ExxonMobil, I'm not running you down. I'm just saying that you're doing well enough and you don't need the help of the American people. You can do fine on your own.

Now, those kids on Head Start need help. They need help. Those college kids need help, but not ExxonMobil executives.

The major consequence for Medicare and Medicaid, the Ryan budget, the Republican budget, has big consequences for Medicaid and Medicare. Many seniors will be forced to pay sharply higher premiums to stay in traditional Medicare and keep their current choice of doctors. New Medicare beneficiaries would pay more than \$1,200 more by 2030 and more than 6,000 by 2050.

Before, more seniors would gradually shift to private health insurance plans over time, increasing privatization of Medicare. More than 47 million Americans would lose health care insurance over 10 years because they would get rid of ObamaCare.

Now, my friends in the Republican aisle, when they say "ObamaCare," they don't mean it in a nice way. It's an insult. But you know what? Obama does care, so I don't mind them saying "ObamaCare." I hope they keep saying it, because they're just reminding Americans that Obama cares about them and that the people the Republicans want to look out for apparently do not.

States, under the Republican plan, would be forced to slash Medicaid eligibility benefits and payments to health care providers. Their budget shreds the Medicaid safety net and shifts health care costs to States and beneficiaries, blocking Medicaid. This shifts all risks, including future recessions, health care cost increases, and disasters to States and beneficiaries.

So, here's the thing. This Ryan budget, this Republican Ryan budget, it helps and takes care of the rich. It ignores everyone else, and it hurts the middle class.

The Republican budget would weaken the middle class in important ways. First and foremost, their plan ends the Medicare guarantee of decent health insurance in retirement. It also slashes critical middle class investments such as education and infrastructure by 45 percent and 24 percent, respectively—education by 45 percent, infrastructure by 24 percent.

Now, look. The American Society of Civil Engineers, Mr. Speaker, has told us that we have crumbling infrastructure in this country to the tune of about \$2.2 to \$3 trillion, a lot of money. And if you are living in any city across this country, you can drive over 75-

year-old bridges. You can drive over potholes. Our sewage systems need upgrade.

I am from Minneapolis, Minnesota, a city I love so much; but back a few years ago, we had a bridge fall into the Mississippi River because the gusset plates, which are those plates that hold up the bridge, gave way because the adequate maintenance just wasn't maintained over time.

Now, it happened to us, but it could happen anywhere. There are many structurally deficient bridges across this Nation, literally thousands. We could put people back to work if we put the money into taking care of them. And not only would we have people working, we'd have to save bridges to go over. But the Republican majority, to use their phrase, kicks the can down the road and doesn't deal with this looming infrastructure crisis.

So let me just say this. I've talked a little bit about the so-called Ryan Republican budget. I don't want to spend all my time talking about it, but I do think it's important for Americans to know that this is a budget for the 1 percent. This is a budget for people who've got it well, who are doing fine.

Now, let me just tell you. I swear, I am a big fan of well-to-do people. I wish I were one of them. But my point is that you don't need to help people who already have a lot of help on their own, but you do need to help schoolkids, Head Start kids, pregnant moms, pregnant low-income moms, seniors. These people we should help. People who are doing fine, they don't need our help. They should do the helping, in my opinion. And yet the Ryan budget says we're just going to help the country club set, and I think that's not any way to have a budget.

I'm going to talk about the Progressive Caucus budget, but I just want you to know, first, that the Ryan Republican budget is no good budget for America. In fact, it's premised on the theory that rich people don't have enough money and poor people have too much. Really. That's the animating, organizing feature of their budget, that if we gave rich people more money, then they might invest it in plant and equipment, and then it'll trickle down to the rest of us. And poor people have too much stuff; we can't afford it. We can't afford Head Start, can't afford WIC, can't afford home heating oil for seniors, can't afford Medicare, can't afford Medicaid. The poor folks are just, they're getting treated too well.

And that's basically what the theory is of the Republican budget, and so that's fine. And I respect them for being real honest about what they believe in, because a budget is a reflection of our values.

So now that we've talked about what they're talking about, let's talk about a real budget, not for the 1 percent, but a budget for all.

The Progressive Caucus budget has a name. The name of the Progressive

Caucus budget is the Budget for All. That's the name of the Progressive Caucus budget because, unlike the Republicans' budget, which is a budget for the 1 percent, this is a budget for all.

Let me tell you what it does, Mr. Speaker. It creates 3.3 million jobs in the first 2 years. It cuts the deficit by nearly 7 trillion, \$6.8 trillion; no benefit cuts to Medicare, Medicaid and Social Security.

The Budget for All makes the American Dream a reality again for the vast majority of Americans. 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 protects Medicare and Medicaid, Social Security, invests in America's future, and asks those who have benefited the most from our economy to pay their fair share.

Now, as I said, you can't have a budget—you can have a budget that cuts taxes for rich people if you then cut services for poor people. And you can have a budget that pays for infrastructure and education, but the money has to come from somewhere. And we ask people who already have lots of it to do a little more for their fellow Americans.

□ 1630

We're not hiding that fact. Yes, we would raise taxes on the wealthiest Americans. Not to punish them, because we don't think taxes are punishment, but because it's necessary to meet the needs of the Nation and any self-respecting patriot would do so if they could.

In fact, there is a group out there—and I would urge you to check them out, Mr. Speaker—called Patriotic Millionaires who understand that they may need to pay higher taxes.

If you already are making a million dollars a year, would you pay a little extra just to make sure that low-income pregnant women got some food for their kids? If you are already making a million or more a year, would you pay a little extra to make sure that little kids had Head Start to go to? If you're already making a million dollars a year, Mr. Speaker, would you pay a little extra just to make sure that the Federal workers don't have their pensions cut to pay for your tax cut? That's just my thinking.

I don't want anybody to think the Republicans are mean. They do charitable work in their individual lives, and that's a fact and I think people ought to know that. But they don't think government has any role in helping people. I disagree with that and call on Americans, Mr. Speaker, to look carefully at the choices that they offer.

The Budget for All is not a budget for the 1 percent, it's not a budget for the 99 percent, but a budget for all because we care about the 1 percent too. We want even the 1 percent to live in a

good Nation with fairness, with economic opportunity, with economic mobility, with good roads, good bridges, good education, clean water, clean air. We want this for everyone.

The Budget for All 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 our economy moving again, including direct-hire programs that create School Improvement Corps, Park Improvement Corps, Student Jobs Corps, and others; targeted tax incentives that spur clean energy, manufacturing, cutting-edge technological investment in the private sector; widespread domestic investment, including an infrastructure bank; a \$556 billion surface transportation, unlike this thing that they tried to pass today, which is a 3-month extension.

By the way, Mr. Speaker, can you believe it, the Republican caucus is always going on and on about uncertainty. What did they do? They created uncertainty by passing some 3-month transportation bill. My goodness, it boggles the mind actually.

Back to the Budget for All. There is approximately \$1.7 trillion in widespread domestic investment.

Unlike the Republican budget, the Budget for All substantially reduces the deficit and does so in a way that does not devastate what Americans value. We achieve these notable benchmarks by focusing on the true drivers of our deficit: unsustainable tax policy, wars overseas, and the policies that helped cause the recent recession, rather than putting the middle class and the social safety net on the chopping block.

The budget creates a fairer America; it ends tax cuts for the wealthiest 2 percent of Americans on schedule at the year's end; extends tax relief for middle class households and the vast majority of Americans; creates new tax brackets for millionaires and billionaires in line with the Buffett Rule principle; eliminates Tax Code preferential treatment for capital gains and dividends; abolishes corporate welfare for oil, gas, and coal companies; eliminates loopholes that allow businesses to dodge their true tax liability; creates a publicly funded Federal election system that gets corporate money out of politics for good.

It responsibly and expeditiously ends our military presence in Afghanistan, leaving America more secure at home and abroad. It also adapts our military to address 21st century threats through modernization. The Department of Defense will spend less and stop contributing to the deficit, but they will have what they need to keep America strong, which is very important to all of us.

It provides a making-work-pay tax credit for families struggling with high gas and food costs; extends an earned income tax credit and child dependent

care credit; invests in programs to stave off further foreclosure; invests in children's education by increasing education, training, and social services.

The Budget for All is a budget for all. I know that sounds repetitive, but it's important to note that the name of our budget reflects the reality of our budget; and the reality of our budget is that we want to see rich, poor, and everybody in the middle do well in America. That means a budget for all.

As I begin to wind down, Mr. Speaker, I just want to say that it is an honor to come before you to talk about the Budget for All, but it's also an honor to talk about the Ryan Republican budget because the Ryan Republican budget offers a very different vision of America than the Budget for All. The Ryan vision says that if we just could get rich people more money, they might create some plants and equipment that will hire the rest of us.

The Budget for All says: No, we're in this together, and we're going to ask the wealthiest to pay more to invest in health, education, transportation, and infrastructure so that we can have a stronger, better, greater America.

Two visions of a Nation. One says austerity for the middle and working class and the poor, and one says investment. One says if you are out of luck, you're on your own; and one says as Americans, we're all in this together.

I want to thank you, Mr. Speaker, for allowing me to be here and offer these contrasts, these choices for Americans as we close out what I call Budget Week.

I yield back the balance of my time.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 38 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, March 30, 2012, at 11 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

5472. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting authorization of Colonels Jon S. Lehr and Burdett K. Thompson, United States Army, to wear the insignia of the grade of brigadier general; to the Committee on Armed Services.

5473. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Commercial Determination Approval (DFARS Case 2011-D041) (RIN: 0750-AH61) received March 12, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

5474. A letter from the Chairman, Occupational Safety and Health Review Commission, transmitting Buy American Act report for Fiscal Year 2011; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

5475. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's report required by the Omnibus Appropriation, Public Law 105-277, Section 2215 on "Overseas Surplus Property"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5476. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's report on the status of Data Mining Activities, pursuant to Implementing Recommendations of the 9/11 Commission Act, Section 804; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5477. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 19-333, "Targeted Retirement Distribution Withholding Temporary Act of 2012"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5478. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 19-321, "Car Wash Employee Overtime Amendment Act of 2012"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5479. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 19-322, "Lottery Amendment Repeal Amendment Act of 2012"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5480. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 19-323, "Moratorium on Establishments Which Permit Nude Dancing Temporary Act of 2012"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5481. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 19-327, "Workforce Job Development Grant-Making Authority Temporary Act of 2012"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5482. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 19-328, "Board of Elections and Ethics Electoral Process Improvement Amendment Act of 2012"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5483. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 19-329, "Unemployment Anti-Discrimination Act of 2012"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5484. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 19-330, "Civil Marriage Dissolution Equality Act of 2012"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5485. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 19-332, "Unemployment Compensation Funds Appropriation Authorization Act of 2012"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5486. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 19-331, "DDOT Omnibus Conforming Temporary Amendment Act of 2012"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5487. A letter from the Chief Acquisition Officer, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Federal Acquisition Regulation; Federal Acquisition Circular 2005-57; Introduction [Docket: FAR 2012-0080, Sequence 2] received March 7, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5488. A letter from the Chief Acquisition Officer, General Services Administration,

transmitting the Administration's final rule — Federal Acquisition Regulation; United States-Korea Free Trade Agreement [FAC 2005-57; FAR Case 2012-004; Docket 2012-0004, Sequence 1] (RIN: 9000-AM18) received March 7, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5489. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting seventh annual report on crime victims' rights; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5490. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone and Regulated Navigation Area, Chicago Sanitary and Ship Canal, Romeoville, IL [Docket No.: USCG-2011-1108] (RIN: 1625-AA11, 1624-AA00) received March 7, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5491. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Temporary Change for Recurring Fireworks Display within the Fifth Coast Guard District, Wrightsville Beach, NC [Docket No.: USCG-2011-0978] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received March 7, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5492. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special Local Regulations; Key West World Championship, Atlantic Ocean; Key West, FL [Docket No.: USCG-2011-0942] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received March 7, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5493. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Fourth Annual Chilloungue Night St. Petersburg Fireworks Display; Tampa Bay, St. Petersburg, FL [Docket No.: USCG-2011-0615] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received March 7, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5494. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Art Gallery Party St. Pete 2011 Fireworks Display, Tampa Bay, St. Petersburg, FL [Docket No.: USCG-2011-0774] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received March 7, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5495. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special Local Regulations; Seminole Hard Rock Winterfest Boat Parade, New River and Intracoastal Waterway, Fort Lauderdale, FL [Docket No.: USCG-2011-1011] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received March 7, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5496. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Fireworks Display, Potomac River, National Harbor Access Channel, MD [Docket No.: USCG-2011-0976] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received March 7, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5497. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Department of Defense Exercise, Hood Canal, Washington [Docket No.: USCG-2011-1017] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received March 7, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.