

Benishek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Billarakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Buohon
Burgess
Bustos
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Carney
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Cicilline
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
Delaney
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Doggett
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Enyart
Esty
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy

Granger
Graves (GA)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hall
Hanna
Harris
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly
Kilmer
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Loeb sack
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Lummis
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee

Olson
Owens
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Radel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Scalise
Schneider
Schock
Schradler
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Veasey
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (IN)

Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeGette
Deutch
Dingell
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Farr
Forbes
Fudge
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Himes
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Kaptur
Keating
Kennedy
Kildee
Kind
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)

Levin
Lewis
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowe
Lujan, Ben Ray (NM)
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McKeon
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Moore
Moran
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Polis
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Rogers (AL)
Roybal-Allard

Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sires
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Vargas
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—23

Aderholt
Amodei
Collins (GA)
DeLauro
Engel
Eshoo
Fattah
Fortenberry

Gohmert
Graves (MO)
Harper
Hinojosa
Langevin
Lipinski
Lynch
Miller, George

Nadler
Pelosi
Sanchez, Loretta
Smith (NJ)
Wolf
Yarmuth
Young (FL)

□ 1630

Mrs. BEATTY and Mr. CONYERS changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Messrs. ROE of Tennessee, PASTOR of Arizona, QUIGLEY, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Messrs. COLE and LOEB SACK changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, today I was unavoidably detained and missed rollcall vote 82, on consideration of H. Res. 115, a resolution providing for the expenses of certain committees of the House of Representatives for the 113th Congress, because I was questioning the Director the Federal Bureau of Investigation in my capacity as chairman of the House Appropriations subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, and Science. Had I been present, I would have voted “aye.”

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I missed a rollcall vote today. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on No. 82.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2014

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their re-

marks and include extraneous material on H. Con. Res. 25, currently under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 122 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 25.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1614

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. Con. Res. 25) establishing the budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023, with Mr. HASTINGS of Washington in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the concurrent resolution is considered read the first time.

General debate shall not exceed 4 hours, with 3 hours confined to the congressional budget, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget, and 1 hour on the subject of economic goals and policies, equally divided by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY) and the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) or their designees.

The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) each will control 90 minutes of debate on the congressional budget.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, today I rise to bring forward and present the budget resolution for fiscal year 2014. We believe that we owe the American people a responsible, balanced budget, and that is precisely what we are bringing to the floor today. Our budget balances the budget within 10 years, and it does so without raising taxes. Balancing the budget will help us foster a healthier economy, and it will help us create jobs.

In fact, two leading economists at Stanford University today released a study analyzing our budget and its positive effects on the economy and jobs. In the first year, they said it would, “boost the economy immediately,” increasing growth of our economy by a whole percentage point, which translates into about 500,000 jobs right away. That’s about \$1,500 in extra

NAYS—136

Andrews
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bishop (NY)
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)

Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)

Chu
Clarke
Clay
Clever
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers

take-home pay for families who are struggling to get by today.

By the end of the budget window, according to these economists at Stanford University, it would add 3 percent of economic growth to the economy. That's 1.7 million jobs in 1 year alone and about \$4,000 more in take-home pay because of higher economic growth. More take-home pay means more control, more freedom, and more prosperity for families.

We are not simply here to balance the budget because we like looking at clean spreadsheets. It is not even an accounting exercise. The reason we are balancing the budget is to improve people's lives. It is to bring needed health to the economy and to bring certainty to families and businesses so they can get ahead.

We know that a debt crisis is coming, Mr. Chairman. We know that it's coming because we've watched what other countries have done when they continue to kick the can down the road and ignore the tough choices they need to make to get our fiscal house in order. We're doing that.

Now, what are we trying to do specifically in our budget? We want to restore opportunity. We want to repair our broken safety nets so that they're designed to get people out of poverty on to lives of self-sufficiency by reforming our welfare programs. We want to make sure that the seniors who are relying on programs as important as Medicare actually get the benefits they organized their lives around. We want to make sure that the next generation, those of us who follow our parents into retirement, actually have a Medicare program we can count on. And we have those bipartisan reforms here.

Everybody needs to pitch in, and everybody needs to propose a solution to our problem because, Mr. Chairman, if we don't tackle this fiscal problem in America, it will tackle us.

Now, to their credit, the Democrats on the Budget Committee are bringing a budget to the floor. To their credit, the Progressive Caucus is bringing a budget to the floor. To their credit, the Black Caucus is bringing a budget to the floor. To their credit, the Senate, finally, for the first time in 4 years, is bringing up a budget.

Budgets are about choices. The problem we have is not now that they're doing a budget—that's good news; that's great—it's what's in their budget. If you take a look at our budget—as I mentioned, our budget balances the budget. We believe a balanced plan is one that actually balances the budget. There is not another budget that's being offered here other than the Study Committee budget that actually balances the budget, other points notwithstanding.

Now, why do we balance the budget? Because we don't want our children to be drowning in debt. We want to make sure that this sea of red ink that the CBO is telling us is coming, we pay off our debt and give our kids a debt-free nation. That's what we do.

Take a look at the other budgets that are being offered. Let's take a look at the Senate Democrats'. That has a tax increase that's about \$1.5 trillion; that has a spending increase of about \$4.8 trillion off of our budget. If you take a look at the House Democrats', that's a \$1.2 trillion tax increase, with a spending increase of about \$4.896 trillion off of this budget. If you take a look at the Black Caucus budget, the CBC budget, that's a tax increase of \$2.8 trillion, with a spending increase of \$5.7 trillion, only to be outdone by the Progressive Caucus budget. That is a \$5.683 trillion tax increase with an \$8.698 trillion spending increase in their budget.

□ 1620

Taking more money from hard-working families to fuel more spending in Washington is not going to solve our budget crisis, is not going to balance our budget. It's more of the same. And more of the same means we have a debt crisis. When we have a debt crisis, everybody gets hurt. The people who are on the safety net, the seniors who have already retired, they're the ones who get hurt the first and the worst in a debt crisis.

This is a responsible plan. It's a plan for economic growth. It's a plan for tax reform. It's a plan to open up our energy stores that we have here so that we can be energy independent. We have vast amounts of energy reserves that we need to tap so we can put people to work, bring down gas prices, and stretch paychecks further.

We've got to control our spending appetite. We've got to reform programs like Medicare so they're solvent. We've got to reform our safety net so that it works to get people on their feet. That's what this budget does.

In a nutshell, instead of spending \$46 trillion over the next 10 years as we are currently poised to spend, we spend \$41 trillion. Instead of growing spending on average at 5 percent a year, we grow it at 3.4 percent a year.

So for all of the predictions of doom and gloom and how evil and terrible and horrible our budget is, it increases spending every year by 3.4 percent a year instead of 5 percent a year. The difference is we balance the budget. The difference is we let families keep more of their own take-home pay. The difference is we make sure our kids inherit a debt-free future. The difference is we do what's necessary to create a healthy economy, more take-home pay, faster economic growth, and better jobs. That's why we are here, to balance the budget.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Last fall throughout this country, we had a vigorous debate. President Obama laid out his vision of how we deal with some of our big challenges with respect to the economy and the

budget, and Governor Romney did the same thing. Both of them said the American people face a very important and fundamental choice, and the American people chose.

They chose to support President Obama's vision of accelerating economic growth, putting more people to work, taking a shared-responsibility approach to our long-term deficits so we bring them down in a balanced and smart way, and they rejected the idea that we're going to move the economy forward by giving windfall tax cuts to the very wealthiest in the country and that somehow the benefits of that would trickle down and lift everybody up. They rejected that lopsided approach that balanced the budgets on the backs of everybody but the folks at the very top. It balanced the budget on the backs of our kids' education by slashing important investments.

In that category of spending that we make these important investments for our country and our future, they doubled the cut from the sequester. Those are investments in our kids' education. Those are investments in science and research to help power our economy. Those are investments to help modernize our infrastructure. They cut transportation by 15 percent when we have 15 percent unemployment in the construction industry.

Mr. Chairman, the American people rejected the kind of uncompromising, lopsided approach that we see once again presented here in the House. It is the same thing we've seen for the last 3 years, as if we hadn't even had a debate last fall.

In the Democratic alternative, we focus on the main issue right now and in the future. We don't only want strong economic growth in the future; we want to see accelerated job growth right now. We've seen some momentum in the jobs market in the last couple of months, but the Republican budget will put the brakes on that growth.

The chairman of the Budget Committee can quote economists all he wants. There are economists that say it will do this or it won't do this or it will do that. But we have an umpire here in the Congress. We have a referee. It's called the Congressional Budget Office. They're nonpartisan. They're independent.

They tell us if you follow the approach of the Republican budget and keep the sequester in place through the end of this year, that by the end of this year we will have 750,000 fewer Americans working than otherwise. Why would we want to do that?

They tell us that if you take the approach followed by the Republican budget, that economic growth this calendar year will be cut by one-third. Why would we want to do that?

The Congressional Budget Office also tell us that a full half of our deficit this year is as a result of the fact that there are still lots of people looking for work who haven't found a job, and they project that three-quarters of the deficit next year in 2014 is as a result of

the fact that you have too many people who are unemployed. So let's attack the root of the problem right now and help put people back to work rather than put the brakes on the economy. That's what our budget will do.

This calendar year, in addition to preventing the 750,000 lost, we will generate another 450,000 jobs by investing in the economy. Next year, the difference between our plan and our colleagues' plan is 2 million more jobs under our budget proposal.

We believe that you've got to deal with the budget deficit, and at the same time you also need to focus on the jobs deficit to help deal with the budget deficit.

We also reduce the deficit in a steady, sustained way. We do it with balance. We do it with targeted cuts. But we also do it, Mr. Chairman, by eliminating some of the tax breaks and tax expenditures for very high-income individuals.

We heard from Governor Romney and we heard from the chairman of the Budget Committee last fall and this year that there are trillions of dollars of tax expenditures that disproportionately benefit very wealthy people. Under the Republican plan, they say we're going to get rid of some of your tax expenditures for high-income people, but we're going to bring down your top rate. So in the end, the folks at the very top actually get a big windfall.

We say let's eliminate some of those tax breaks for very wealthy people in order to help reduce our deficit so when you combine that savings with targeted cuts, you can reduce it in a balanced way rather than increasing the tax burden on the middle class, which is what their budget will do.

We also want to make sure we keep our commitments to our seniors and not transfer the risk and cost of rising health care costs onto the backs of seniors as the Republican budget does.

We don't reopen the prescription drug doughnut hole, as the Republican budget does, which means that seniors with high prescription drug costs will end up paying thousands more out of pocket over the period of this budget.

In our budget, we make sure that student loan interest rates, which are set to double in July from 3.4 percent to 6.8 percent, we make sure they don't double. The Republican budget makes sure that they do. That will make college less affordable to millions of students.

Mr. Chairman, let me conclude by talking about the deficit impacts because the Republican budget does hit this—they say they're going to hit this political target of balance in 10 years. But it's a hoax because they say at the same time that their budget balances, that they're repealing all of ObamaCare, all of the Affordable Care Act.

The reality, Mr. Chairman, is they get rid of all the benefits of the Affordable Care Act. So the millions of Americans who would have had more affordable coverage, they won't get it; and

the people who will no longer be excluded from getting coverage because of preexisting conditions, they'll make sure that they're denied coverage because of preexisting conditions because they take away the benefits.

But the dirty little secret, Mr. Chairman, is they keep the savings from the Affordable Care Act, from ObamaCare. Without those savings, that budget doesn't balance.

So if we did what our Republican colleagues here say they want to do, which is this instant—repeal ObamaCare—they wouldn't have a budget that was in balance. You don't have to take my word for it. The Heritage Foundation, a very conservative think tank, just issued this statement: "Perhaps the biggest shortcoming of this budget"—meaning the Republican budget—"is that it keeps the tax increases associated with ObamaCare." It keeps those.

It keeps all the savings in Medicare that were achieved as part of the Affordable Care Act where we achieved them by reducing the overpayments to the private insurance companies by changing the incentive structure to focus more on the quality of care rather than the quantity of care.

□ 1630

Do you remember all those Medicare savings that we heard our colleagues demagog in the last election last fall? They keep all those savings, and their balance wouldn't balance without them.

Our budget dramatically cuts the deficit and makes sure that our deficits are not growing faster than the economy, down to 2.4 percent by the end of the window. We stabilize the debt below where the CBO projects today, we stabilize 70 percent GDP. And, yes, we also will balance our budget in the same year that the Republican budget from last year balanced.

If this were just a race to balance the budget first, then people should vote for the Republican study group proposal—4 years. But if your priority is jobs and economic growth, as it should be as part of a measured and balanced approach to reducing the deficit, then you need to support the Democratic alternative.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds to say the gentleman from Maryland is right: yes, we do balance the budget. Guilty, and proud to be guilty of that. We think balancing the budget is important.

More to the point, in the revenues we are saying we don't like this current Tax Code, so we can raise the same amount of revenue as the government with a better tax system, one that is pro-growth, one that creates jobs. That is precisely what the Ways and Means Committee is doing. That does not include the ObamaCare taxes, but it includes replacing the current revenue

code that hurts jobs and hurts economic growth.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I would like to yield 3 minutes to a senior member of the Budget Committee, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT).

Mr. GARRETT. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, today I rise because today's budget is the budget that helps American families. I rise today to support a budget that recognizes that the status quo is not only unacceptable to American families, but it is also unsustainable to the economy.

This budget that is before us now will finally restore much needed certainty, certainly to the economy, promote fairness, and provide those American families with the opportunity they are looking for to prosper. Importantly, this budget stops spending money that we simply do not have. At the same time, it advances commonsense changes in proposals to strengthen our Nation's safety net programs. We do that for American families.

So the Path to Prosperity takes us the first step towards reversing the path to debt and decline that the President and his fellow Democrats have laid out for the American people. To say that President Obama and the Democrats over in the Senate have failed to lead this Nation in what is probably the most predictable economic crisis in our Nation's history would be a drastic understatement.

Why is that? On February 4, the President's budget was due. On March 19, the American people are still waiting. It was over four times in 5 years that this President has failed to basically follow the law of the land and to submit a budget on time.

It is interesting that the President's brackets are always on time. His budgets, not so much.

The Senate Democrats are not any better. It took them almost 4 years to produce a budget that increases government spending by \$265 billion, raises taxes on this country by almost \$1 trillion; and, at the same time, it has cut health care providers by almost \$300 billion.

Over the period covered by the budget, deficits under the Senate plan are going to be nearly \$4 trillion—yes, \$4 trillion larger than those under the House Republican budget that we are talking about right now.

Every family, every family in the country, every family in America, they understand the necessity of having a balanced budget. The President and Senate Democrats could surely learn by going back to their districts and learning from the example of American families across the country in how to set a budget. Families don't have the luxury of waiting for the next election. They don't have the luxury, if you will, of going through yet another cycle. Quite frankly, as we stand here today in Washington, neither does Washington.

Let's stop the spending insanity, if you will. Let's start putting the country back on track, and let's do this for the American family.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ), the ranking member of the Small Business Committee, who recognizes how important it is to keep our economy moving forward, not backwards.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this ill-conceived budget. For working families this project could mean a tax hit of \$2,000, making it harder for families to afford rent and put food on the table.

The GOP plan also shortchanges seniors, ending Medicare in 10 years. Equally problematic, the Affordable Care Act would be repealed, reducing health care assistance to 176,000 families in my district and preventing 68,000 young people in my part of New York from staying on their parents' insurance.

We can also expect our economy to take a hit with 2 million jobs vanishing next year alone. Is this what we need to get this economy growing again? And for small businesses, this budget will mean losses. Sixteen thousand small firms in my district will lose tax assistance when purchasing health care, and thousands of would-be entrepreneurs around the country will see technical assistance and other services dry up, preventing the creation of new startups and blocking job creation.

Mr. Chairman, budgets should be about priorities. The American people rejected these flawed priorities last year when they voted to reelect President Obama. I urge my colleagues to vote "no" so we can approve a budget that is balanced, that is fair, that will create jobs, and that will move our Nation forward, together.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, at this time, I would like to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON).

Mr. COTTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this budget resolution.

I just want to take a moment, too, to applaud the chairman and the members of his committee, and especially the hardworking staff of his committee for producing this document—a mere little band of less than 30 staffers.

By contrast, the President, with all the vast resources at his disposal in the executive branch, is now, I think, into the sixth week beyond his deadline in which he cannot pass his own budget. I assume that he will one day submit something. I hope that we will have a chance to vote on it. I will be curious to see if our colleagues on the other side of the aisle can produce more than the zero budgets that his budget produced last year.

The Senate, however, is even worse. They haven't produced a budget in 4 years. After seeing the budget that

they will vote on, I now know, perhaps, why they did not produce such a document. It has over \$1.5 trillion in new taxes, almost \$1 trillion that are recognized, almost \$500 billion to replace sequestration in unspecified closures of so-called loopholes, and another \$100 billion in unspecified closures for new and ultimately failed stimulus spending.

And it never reaches balance—ever. The only thing we hear from balance on the Senate or the President is as a euphemism for new tax increases.

Finally, I want to point out that the last time the Senate passed a budget 4 years ago, I was a captain in the United States Army sitting at forward operating base Mehtar Lam in north-east Afghanistan. And I want to specifically single out the defense measures in this budget and to applaud, again, the leadership of the chairman and the Budget Committee for protecting our military, for giving it funding that it otherwise would not have and the flexibility it needs to help protect and keep this country safe. The Defense Department is the one area in government where the strategy should drive the budget, not the budget drive the strategy.

And the second way that it protects our military is from a debt crisis. This budget, as we have heard, is designed to postpone and ultimately prevent a debt crisis caused by out-of-control reckless spending in anemic economic growth of the kind you have seen in countries in Europe already.

If that were to happen, not only would it impact families all across the country when their interest rates for mortgages and farms and small businesses and education increase, but it also would crowd out all other kinds of priorities in our Federal budget. So it would immediately impact, as well, our troops, their families, and our veterans.

□ 1640

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, actually the Republican budget does follow some of our European friends, but follows them in the wrong way.

The strategy places like the U.K. have followed is an austerity approach—immediate deep cuts. And guess what that did? That sent them back into a recession. And again, the umpire around this place, the non-partisan Congressional Budget Office, said that if you take the approach in our Republican colleagues' budget, you'll have 750,000 fewer jobs by the end of this year. That is not a growth strategy. We cannot afford, here in the United States, the European-style austerity plan that is hurting those economies.

With that, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from California (Ms. WATERS), the ranking member on the Financial Services Committee.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, I thank Mr. VAN HOLLEN for yielding me this time.

Today I rise in strong opposition to the Republican budget, a budget that makes absurd claims to reducing the deficit by repealing crucial government authority to protect our economy. Lest we forget, the Lehman Brothers disorderly bankruptcy sparked the worst financial crisis since the Great Depression.

Should a megabank fail in the future, the Dodd-Frank Act specifically authorizes regulators to dissolve the failing firm, fire its executives, wipe out shareholders, and deny the claims of creditors. The gentleman from Wisconsin calls this a bailout—erroneously—concluding that the Dodd-Frank Act enshrines "too big to fail" when, in fact, it provides all of the necessary tools to end it. If Dodd-Frank actually did what the Republicans say, why does no large firm want to be designated as "systematically significant"?

The Republican proposal also deceptively suggests that a repeal of the liquidation authority generates real savings to the American taxpayer. The Dodd-Frank legislation designed this authority to pay for itself over time, with any initial up-front costs being completely recouped by selling assets and imposing an assessment, after the resolution, on financial institutions with more than \$50 billion in assets. The law specifically states that taxpayers shall bear no losses from the exercise of any authority under the liquidation title.

Once again, the Republican budget is misleading and dishonest. The National Journal has called the Republican proposal a "budget gimmick," and even The Wall Street Journal dismissed it as mere "budget quirks."

If the authority to wind down a megafirm is repealed, the American taxpayer would be called on again to bear the risk of another financial crisis like in 2008, which the GAO found cost the U.S. economy \$13 trillion.

Mr. Chairman, I urge all of my colleagues to reject this Republican budget.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute to respond to my friend from Maryland.

He keeps saying that the CBO says this plan is going to cost 750,000 jobs. That's an analysis done on the sequester starting with looking at calendar year January through calendar year December. Well, where are we? This budget doesn't deal with fiscal year 2013. It starts in October. So he's using a comparison of a statistic that they use, the same kind of economic short-term analysis they used to say that the stimulus would create millions of new jobs. They're using the same kind of analysis and say the sequester will cost these jobs, and it's a cut that isn't even in this budget.

More to the point, the Senate Democratic budget has the same appropriations number we have in our budget for fiscal year 2014. The point is what the CBO does say over the long term, if you

achieve this kind of deficit reduction that we are, a million new jobs a year by the end of the budget window—a 1.7 percent faster economic growth. CBO says that about this budget, about achieving this kind of deficit reduction. Stanford economists. You can create a million jobs a year. So you're seeing a consistent theme here: cutting spending and growing the economy and creating jobs.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL), a senior member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, I don't know if you've been to Spain or not, but I have, just once. It's a beautiful country—nice people, great food, and at one time a large, vibrant, and growing economy, but not today. Today in Spain, over half of the people under 25 years old can't find work. The unemployment amongst all ages in Spain is about what we had during the Great Depression—not the Great Recession, the Great Depression of the thirties. And people on government medical care there can't get it. They can't get it when they want it because they've had to close a lot of their medical clinics in order to save money.

They had to do that because they waited too long to fix their fiscal problems. They waited until they had a debt crisis, and then they had to do what my friend from Maryland said: they had to impose an austerity program. They raised taxes and cut spending very quickly in a matter of just a year or so because that's what they had to do to continue being able to sell their debt.

That, Mr. Chairman, is exactly what we don't want to do. This is not speculation. This is not something we have to think about. It's there for us to see, and not just in Spain and Greece and Cyprus—in Japan, in a different form. It's there in other parts of the world. When you borrow so much money that people won't lend you any more, then you put in this austerity which causes these problems.

Unfortunately, that is what my friends on the other side of the aisle, their budgets will lead us to. More debts, more deficits, kind of a sugar high. They'll say: Oh, yeah, we're going to spend all this money; we'll create all these government jobs. For awhile we'll feel good, until the debt crisis comes, and then all that goes away.

What the Republican budget does is balance in 10 years, and not so that CPAs like me can achieve some symmetry that makes us feel good. It's because when you balance the budget, you set this balance up. It frees up the economy. People know that we're on that track to balance in 10 years. We won't have a debt crisis. People will know we won't have a debt crisis. The economy is freed up from the burden of too much debt, of knowing that there's a problem with no solution. There will now be a problem with a solution.

The economy will be freed up, both on the government side and on the pri-

vate sector, and there will be more jobs and more jobs. That's what the Republican budget promises: an economy that grows and sustainable job creation, not a 1- or 2-year sugar high followed by a collapse. We've seen what not to do. We know the path not to take.

This Republican budget is the path we should take. I hope everyone will support it.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

First, I want to point out again that our Republican colleagues cannot have it both ways. You can't claim you're going to balance in 10 years and claim that you got rid of all of the ObamaCare provisions, because if you look at this chart, you'll see in the year 2023, 10 years from now, they claim a balance of about \$7 billion, right there. And yet if you look at this blue section here and the red section, you've got the revenues from the Affordable Care Act, from ObamaCare, and the savings from Medicare that our colleagues campaigned against last fall, but they kept them right in their budget. Without those items, they don't come close to balance. In fact, they're about \$400 billion short, in the 10th year, from balance.

We believe you've got to focus on getting the economy moving right now. That's why we call in our budget for getting rid of and replacing the sequester now, so you achieve the same deficit reduction over a longer, more measured, targeted period of time and don't do damage to the economy. And we reduce the deficit in a steady way so that it's way down below the growth in the economy by the 10-year window; and we do it in a way that is balanced, meaning we ask for shared responsibility. So we do it through a combination of cuts, but also we do say, for folks at the very high end of the income ladder, we can get rid of some of those tax expenditures, tax expenditures that our Republican colleagues have talked about, but not simply to reduce the rates for high-income individuals, but to help reduce the deficit as part of a balanced approach.

□ 1650

Now, if you look at the math on the Republicans' tax reform plan, it drops the top rate for folks at the very top from 39 percent all the way to 25 percent. We know that's going to cost about \$4 trillion. They say they're going to make all that money up by taking tax expenditures away just from high-income people. The math doesn't work that way. You're going to have to increase taxes on middle-income taxpayers, or you're not going to hit your deficit target, one or the other.

So in the Budget Committee, we Democrats said, look, let's say to the Ways and Means Committee, when you do tax reform, don't raise taxes on middle-income taxpayers. And we had an amendment—I've got it right here—

Protect the American Middle Class from Tax Increase. We said, if you're going to do tax reform, at least make the commitment that you're not going to increase taxes on middle-income families in order to finance tax breaks for the folks at the very top. Every one of our Republican colleagues on the committee voted "no" on that amendment. The committee's got lots of policy instructions on other stuff, but a policy request statement about not increasing taxes on the middle class, they all voted "no."

So we believe we have to reduce our deficits in a smart and vigorous but also balanced way, asking for shared responsibility going forward, not violating our commitments to seniors by reopening the doughnut hole, not by shredding Medicaid, which they cut by over \$810 billion, and which would be one-third less in 2023 than it would otherwise be.

And, by the way, Mr. Chairman, I just want to remind people that two-thirds of Medicaid spending goes to seniors and individuals with disabilities.

So it's not a question of whether we reduce our long-term deficits, it's how we do it, and we do it in a balanced way. If this was just a race to be the first to balance, then you should support not the chairman's budget. Support the Republican Study Group, that other budget. But if your priority is to grow jobs and the economy, then you should support the Democratic alternative budget.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume to quickly respond.

So here's what my friend is saying, and I have three problems with what my friend from Maryland said. I have a problem with what he said in the beginning, in the middle, and in the end of what he said about all of what is happening here.

Here's his plan for economic growth: borrow more money and go and spend that money. Remember the stimulus? They're saying do it again. Then raise taxes. That's going to help the economy. Oh, and it's a balanced plan.

Here's the problem: their balanced plan doesn't balance the budget. We actually asked the CBO—they're claiming they will balance the budget in 2040. The CBO doesn't verify that. They're having to make assumptions that the CBO won't even back up to claim that they can somehow balance the budget.

But when I look at their deficits in their budget, yeah, they get the deficits going down in the first few years, and then it starts going back up. How on Earth do you tax \$1.2 trillion, net increase spending, and claim you're balancing the budget?

Look, we've been trying this economic program for a while. We tried the borrowing and the spending. That didn't work. We just hit the economy with a \$1.6 trillion tax increase. The

economy's not roaring right now. And what they're saying is let's do that all over again.

We are saying, fix the Tax Code. Replace it with a pro-growth tax system that helps small businesses, that helps job creators, that helps families. Get government spending appetite under control. The government is supposed to be spending 5 percent a year, on average, over the next 10 years. That's too much. That's more than the family budget gets. We say bring it down to 3.4 percent a year.

And so when you take a look at all of the smoke and mirrors, all of the claims, none of the Democratic budgets that are being brought to the floor here ever, ever balance the budget. How is that a balanced plan?

Balancing the budget is what every family does. Balancing the budget is what every business does. Balancing the budget is what every local government does. Surely our Federal Government can do this.

And one of the key ingredients to growing this economy, to making American businesses, big and small, competitive so that they can create jobs and give people more take-home pay, is to reform our tax system.

With that, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP), the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, who is in charge of reforming our tax system.

Mr. CAMP. I thank the gentleman for yielding and for his leadership on this issue.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of a Federal budget that balances so we can strengthen our economy, create more jobs, and allow American workers to start seeing an increase in their paychecks again.

I know we can do it. I was a part of a team, a Republican Congress and a Democrat President, that balanced the budget for the first time in a generation. We focused on areas where we agreed and we made some tough choices, and we should do that again.

Balancing the budget is not just about the economy. It's about critical programs like Medicare and Social Security and the benefits they provide to millions of Americans. Social Security is already spending more money than it brings in, and the Medicare trust fund is going broke fast.

What does that mean?

Well, if Congress and the President don't act, America's seniors will face significant benefit cuts. That means smaller Social Security checks, up to 25 percent less, and fewer doctors willing to take Medicare.

So what should we do?

First, we pass a budget that balances, and that's what Republicans are doing. The Democrat substitute continues a policy of borrowing and spending and raising taxes and never gets to balance. Our budget, with pro-growth tax reform, has been scored by outside experts to create a million jobs in the first year alone.

Second, we need to look at the areas where we agree with the President and start making the reforms necessary to save programs like Social Security and Medicare.

The President said he's willing to use a different formula, chained CPI, to determine Social Security benefit increases. I know that policy will be included in the RSC budget. It's an area of agreement between the parties. Well, Mr. President, if we agree, then let's do it.

The same goes for reducing Medicare subsidies.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield the gentleman an extra minute.

The CHAIR. The gentleman's time has yet to expire, but the gentleman has 1 more minute.

Mr. CAMP. The same goes for reducing Medicare subsidies for wealthier seniors.

The American people expect us to make progress where we can. Let's not let our differences stand in the way. And if we agree on a policy, let's come together to start protecting and preserving critical programs like Social Security and Medicare.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, we actually have a kind of a yardstick that we can use to measure whether these budget approaches have a balanced approach, meaning that they ask for shared responsibility. You have the bipartisan Simpson-Bowles commission report, and they said we should reduce our deficits in a steady way through a combination of revenue, but also targeted cuts.

This Republican budget is totally lopsided. It provides tax windfalls to folks at the very top, and balances the budget at the expense of everybody else.

What we've proposed, actually, when you take into account the \$1.5 trillion in cuts we made over the last couple of years and the \$700 billion in revenue from January, and what we have in this budget, we actually have a higher ratio of cuts to revenue than that bipartisan Simpson-Bowles plan when you look at everything that's embedded in it. So that's measured against a bipartisan approach, and that gets us to where we need to be without hitting all the other priorities we have in our country.

With that, let me yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN), the distinguished ranking member of the Ways and Means Committee, who has looked at these numbers backwards and forwards, and I look forward to his comments.

(Mr. LEVIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LEVIN. This Republican budget is tone deaf, the result of blind ideology. But, you know, I've been listening to what's been said so far today, and the Republicans say, but they don't say how. We've just heard, we know we can do it, but you don't say how.

□ 1700

So what we come up with on the Republican side is a mirage—and, I think, a dangerous one.

Let me give you have an example, talking about their proposals on taxes. Under their budget, the top rate is to be reduced from 39.6 percent to 25 percent. The AMT will be repealed. The corporate tax rate will be cut from 35 to 25 percent. But you won't find one syllable in the Republican budget on how all these tax cuts will be paid for. They don't identify a single tax policy that will end.

The Republican budget would mean a huge tax cut for the very wealthy—several hundred thousand dollars a year—and leave a nearly \$6 trillion hole in the deficit that would lead to tax increases for middle-income families. That isn't balance. That's total imbalance. At the same time, Republicans propose cutting \$3.3 trillion from programs for people with low or moderate incomes, including hundreds of billions of dollars from food nutrition and Medicaid programs.

So I want to end by asking when the Republicans come and talk about their tax proposals, name a specific that they would address. It's not in the Republican budget. Name one, name two, name three. Otherwise, it's worse than empty.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield 3 minutes to a distinguished member of the Budget Committee, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROKITA).

Mr. ROKITA. I thank Chairman RYAN for his distinguished leadership in bringing this budget to the floor. I rise in high support of it. I also am very proud. It's one of the highest honors I have had in my short time here to serve on this committee, not because of chairman RYAN only, but because of the members. By members, I mean Republican members and Democrat members. I note for the Record that Mr. LEVIN is not a member of the Budget Committee. But there are great people who are. That's why it's perhaps because of some of that pride that I'm disappointed to hear the ranking member characterize the accomplishment—because that's what it is—the accomplishment of balancing within 10 years as some sort of political goal.

Families who are trying to put food on the table, neighborhood associations, nonprofits, and for-profit businesses, for that matter, that have to make a budget balance every day, every month, ever year, I think should be offended by that characterization. It's not a political goal.

You know what's political, Mr. Chair? It's never balancing. You know what's political is the immoral idea that we are going to put more on our plate now, add up deficit after deficit, create a bigger and bigger debt, and then make people who don't even exist yet pay for it. Why is that political? Because, Mr. Chair, the people in the here and now can vote. Generations in the future, our grandkids who don't yet

exist, can't vote. And that's what makes the other approaches we've heard about immoral, wrong, political. We balance. We balance within 10 years.

Now let's contrast that a bit—our responsible approach—to what the Senate Democrats have done, for example. Next year alone, the Senate Democrats' budget increases spending by \$162 billion above what we're spending today. Over 10 years it increases our debt by \$7.3 trillion from today's levels, despite a massive tax hike that they have. And that tax hike adds \$1.5 trillion in new taxes. So even after that, they still add to the debt—our kids' debt, our grandkids' debt—by \$7.3 trillion.

Again, Mr. Chair, it never balances. After 4 years and \$6 trillion in debt since a budget was even last passed, the Senate Democrats' vague proposal leaves America with even more debt and government that never stops growing. Amazingly, after 4 years, the Democrats were unable to identify any real reforms—no tax reform and no entitlement reform. It's simply not a serious proposal.

I stand, again, in support of the House budget because it's responsible, it's real, it balances in 10 years, and it's the last thing from political.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Do you know what's wrong, Mr. Chairman? What's wrong is to pretend to the American people that you can have it all ways. What's wrong is to pretend that you've got a budget that's in balance in 10 years and pretend that you're getting rid of all of the Affordable Care Act, all of ObamaCare. What's wrong is going around the country demagoguing \$715 billion in Medicare savings, which we achieve by ending overpayments to private insurance companies and Medicare, and then using it to balance your budget and then saying, We didn't use it to balance our budget. That's what people don't like, is people trying to have it all ways.

We have taken an approach to steadily and rapidly reduce our deficits in a way that doesn't interfere and hurt economic and job growth right now. And we do it in a balanced way. And what I find astounding is to hear our Republican colleagues talk about the deficit and debt in one breath and then talk about all those tax breaks and expenditures that disproportionately benefit very wealthy people in the other breath and then say they won't close one single tax loophole for wealthy people for the purpose of reducing the deficit—not one dime in their budget for that purpose. And yet they're willing to hit Medicaid to the tune of \$110 billion. They're willing to hit the food and nutrition program by over \$100 billion. They're ready to hit transportation funding by over 15 percent in this budget window. And yet they're not willing to close one of those more than \$4 trillion in tax loopholes to reduce the deficit. I think that's wrong.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from Pennsylvania, a member of the Budget Committee (Ms. SCHWARTZ).

Ms. SCHWARTZ. The Federal budget is a statement of our priorities and our values as a Nation. The budget should be fiscally responsible and reduce the deficit, it should make investments to grow our economy, and it should meet our obligations to our seniors, to our families, and to our future. And the Republican budget fails all three. The Republican budget threatens our Nation by undermining our economic growth and by shifting the financial burden for the deficit and for deficit reduction to our seniors and the middle class.

Republicans have made their choices clear: end Medicare as we know it, adding costs to seniors today and ending the Medicare guarantee tomorrow; slash investments for economic competitiveness; and give millionaires an average of \$400,000 in tax breaks. The Republican budget eliminates protections for millions of our sickest, frailest seniors who depend on nursing home and home health services. And the Republican budget will increase taxes for average middle class families by \$3,000. Their choices will cost 2 million jobs next year alone and decrease economic growth by 1.7 percent.

In contrast, the Democratic alternative preserves the Medicare guarantee; makes key investments in education, innovation, and infrastructure necessary for job creation and economic growth; and protects the middle class from large tax increases. The Democratic alternative reduces the deficit in a fiscally responsible and balanced way, without causing harm today and without threatening our economic competitiveness for the future. It reduces the deficit while meeting our commitments to our seniors, our frailest elderly, and our children.

I urge my colleagues to reject the Republican budget that threatens our seniors, our middle class, and our economic growth, and to vote for the Democratic alternative that builds on our great strengths as a Nation—an innovative, entrepreneurial business sector with a skilled, hardworking middle class. Vote for the Democratic alternative that builds on hope, opportunity, and security for all Americans.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

The gentlelady from Pennsylvania said that we're ending Medicare as we know it. I've got news for you: ObamaCare ended Medicare as we know it.

And what our budget does is it takes those statements from Medicare and makes sure it stays in Medicare, that it doesn't go fund another program. Stop the raid of Medicare, make sure that those savings, as the gentleman says, are necessary and worthwhile, and stay with Medicare to make it more solvent, to extend the life of the trust fund and not double-count it, to raid it to spend on ObamaCare.

□ 1710

Loopholes. I enjoy this conversation, because what we keep hearing is: close loopholes for the purpose of deficit reduction. What it really means is: take more money and spend it in Washington. We're saying: close loopholes to lower tax rates for everybody.

The problem with our Tax Code is it's not fair. If you have access, if you have good clout, you can get a loophole in the Code and pay lower taxes. If you're a family sitting home in Janesville, Wisconsin, you're paying whatever tax rate. We are saying the person or the business that has the same amount of income should pay the same kind of tax rate.

With that, I'd like to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WILLIAMS), a member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, every business, every family, and every person in America eventually has to balance a budget. I am a small business owner; I still own a business. I have owned and operated my business for 41 years, and I balance my budget every month—and in many cases every day. The government should be no different.

Now, until we balance our budget, we don't know the true fiscal condition of our country, or our company, or our family. Just like a business that is overleveraged or a family that has overborrowed, deficit spending can obscure the real picture; but eventually the truth comes out. Once the numbers line up, you get an exact view of your fiscal condition. We've gone far too long without knowing our country's financial condition.

In the last 4 years, we've had trillion-dollar deficits. In 2011, our Nation's credit rating was downgraded. This year, our publicly held debt is on track to exceed 76 percent of GDP in 2013. Yet we still spend more money that we don't have, pushing the country towards a debt-driven financial crisis. If the Federal Government didn't have the ability to print money, we'd have a negative net worth, and we'd be in a weak financial position.

A budget is a blueprint. A budget is a roadmap; it's a plan. Our Nation's budget doesn't need to have balance as its end goal; it needs to be our starting point. It's the only way to guarantee that the public debt will not outgrow the economy, which would certainly crowd out private investment, raise interest rates, and increase inflation.

Now, I'm proud to stand in support of the Path to Prosperity. It's a responsible, balanced budget that is right for America. This budget balances, cuts wasteful spending, and fixes our broken Tax Code—all without raising taxes.

I applaud Chairman RYAN and my colleagues on the House Budget Committee for their tremendous work in presenting the American people with what they want—a budget that works. With this plan, we will apply the same principles that families and businesses use every day.

I predict our country's best financial days will surely be ahead of us, because unlike our Democratic friends, we balance. It means jobs, it means prosperity, and it means opportunity. Small business and the people of America are begging for this budget.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I would just point out to my colleagues that the Affordable Care Act, with the reforms it made to Medicare, we extended the life of the Medicare trust fund as part of that effort going forward.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Does that mean that money is not going to fund ObamaCare, and does that mean there's a \$716 billion hole in the funding of ObamaCare?

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. That means, as in your budget, that we will help reduce the deficit by whatever amount it was. But what we do not do in our budget is fund tax breaks for folks at the very top by raising them on folks in the middle.

Listen, let me say just one other thing here, Mr. Chairman. We've had four balanced budgets in this country in the last 40 years. It wasn't under President Reagan. It wasn't under the first President Bush. It wasn't under the second President Bush. It was 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001. It was under President Clinton. And then President Bush came in and did a big tax cut in 2001, putting us out of balance for a long period of time.

During the period of time when the budget was in balance the last four times out of 40 years, the revenue that was coming in was higher than it is in any year in the Republican budget that's before us now. What that tells you is that their budget approach is trying to seek balance on the backs of everybody else by really cutting into those important investments that have helped power our economy by violating important commitments to seniors and, in the end, by raising taxes on middle-income people. Why else would they not have joined Democrats in sending a policy statement to the Ways and Means Committee that says: When you go about eliminating tax preferences, don't hit middle-income taxpayers in the process.

In fact, Mr. Chairman, if you look at the mortgage interest deduction, for example, the mortgage interest deduction really helps middle-income people—homeowners. So in addition to saying: Ways and Means Committee, when you do tax reform, don't hit middle-income taxpayers, we specifically said: Don't take away the mortgage interest deduction for middle-income taxpayers. Again, all our Republican colleagues voted against that.

They've been talking about tax reform for 3 years now. We've never seen a piece of paper from them as to how they would do it, which is why we

wanted to make sure that they don't do it in certain ways that help middle-income people. But no, can't do that.

So let's make sure that as we address our deficit issues, we do it in a way that calls for shared responsibilities, not another round of tax breaks for the wealthy on the backs of everybody else.

I now yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE), one of our distinguished members of the Budget Committee.

(Ms. MOORE asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. MOORE. Well, this is an austerity plan and an inequality plan, this Republican budget. I want people to behold the plunder of suckling babes—the young, elderly, the infirm, women, communities of color—by \$810 billion cuts in Medicaid and \$135 billion in SNAP. It is not humorous to me. I want you to beware of the claims that we're going to grow our economy by ending 750,000 jobs, by pillaring Pell Grants, and cutting off educational opportunity to students.

This is not a balanced budget. This is a budget blunder which plunders us into double-dip recession. I'll tell you, Ben Bernanke, our Fed chair, warns against these kinds of severe austerity cuts. If you don't believe him, take the word of Plato. He said: In a state which is desirous of being saved from the greatest of plagues, there should exist among the citizens neither extreme poverty, nor, again, excessive wealth, for both are productive of great evil.

So we plunge poor people into poverty and give \$245,000 tax breaks to the wealthiest. I think that qualifies for not only an austerity plan that can harm us, but it is the greatest inequality plan that this body has seen.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I think the reference to Plato reveals a mindset that the country ought to be run by a handful of philosopher kings instead of the people.

I yield myself 10 seconds to simply say this budget, this plundering, evil, cutting budget increases spending, on average, 3.4 percent a year instead of 5 percent a year.

With that, I'd like to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished member of the Budget Committee, the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK).

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. I thank the gentleman for yielding and for his leadership on this issue.

Mr. Chairman, this debate over the budget reflects a great struggle between American families and their government over whether they or the government can best spend the money that they have earned. This budget bends that struggle slowly back in favor of those families by returning to them a little of the freedom to spend more of their own money and make more of their own decisions once again.

The prosperity of American families is directly affected by government spending. Government cannot put a

dollar into the economy that it first hasn't taken out of the economy.

□ 1720

It's true we see the government job that's created when government puts that dollar back in. What we don't see as clearly is the job that's destroyed when government first pulls that dollar out. We see those lost jobs as chronic unemployment and a stagnating economy.

Every billion dollars spent in Washington means taking \$9 from an average family, either in direct taxes or in tax-driven price increases as businesses pass along their costs to consumers. That means that \$1 trillion of new taxes that the Senate has proposed means \$9,000 per family. Now we're told, don't worry, that's all paid by businesses. But businesses don't pay business taxes, they only collect them. They pass them on to us as consumers through higher prices, to us as employees through lower wages, or to us as investors through lower earnings, usually on our 401(k)s. A trillion dollars of deficit, as we ran up last year, really means \$9,000 of future taxes for every family, robbing our children of their futures.

It's about time we started thinking about these numbers in family-sized terms, because ultimately these numbers have a very real impact on families who are struggling to balance their own budgets, to set their own priorities and to look after their own needs.

Now, these days, we've passed more than one-third of the cost of government on to our children, and we financed the remainder through a tax system in which politicians pick winners and losers through an appallingly unfair and distorted Tax Code.

This budget calls for doing away with these tax distortions that reward some and punish others, distortions that shift capital away from economic expansion and into the service of political interests. This budget calls for flattening and lowering tax rates to assure that no American family pays more than one-quarter of its earnings to the Federal Government.

Those nations that have adopted similar reforms have been rewarded with explosive economic growth. That means fairness for every American taxpayer and an economy unshackled from the burdens and political favoritism of our current system.

In short, freedom works, and it's time that we put it back to work.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, just to be very clear on what the Senate Democratic plan does and what the House Democratic plan does with respect to revenue, again, we heard from Governor Romney and others last year that there are about \$4 trillion in these distortions and preferences in the Tax Code that help very wealthy people. What we say is, we should get out some of that clutter, some of those preferences, and use some of that to help reduce the deficit. And we say at the

same time when you do tax reform, don't touch middle-income taxpayers, and when we asked our Republican colleagues to give us that assurance in the form of an amendment in the Budget Committee, they all voted "no."

So, yes, we think that you can eliminate some of the tax breaks and preferences that Mr. McCLINTOCK just talked about, and you can use some of them to reduce the deficit. But the Republican budget won't use one dime of those to help reduce the deficit.

I now yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington State who is both on the Budget Committee and on the Ways and Means Committee, Mr. McDERMOTT.

(Mr. McDERMOTT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Chairman, you've got to ask yourself what we're doing here today. We're fearmongering again. We spent last week, we spent the last campaign, we spent the last number of years really presenting to Americans that we're in imminent doom, and gloom is coming to America. We're going to be the next Spain, we're going to be the next Italy, the next Greece and probably tomorrow the next Cyprus.

Our debt is so bad, we're told, that we have to take food out of the mouths of children through the nutrition program and send seniors out with vouchers to take care of their Medicare. And then this weekend, an epiphany occurred. Speaker BOEHNER came on television and told the American people, "we do not—we do not have an immediate debt crisis." And Mr. RYAN, the chairman, was asked, and he agreed.

They finally told the truth. This is not about debt. If the Speaker and Mr. RYAN are right, why are they feeding us this Austerity Kool-Aid all the time? Why are they sabotaging the economy by throwing hundreds of thousands of jobs away in the sequestration? Why are they stunting our future by cutting the legs off our R&D programs and the National Institutes of Health? Why are they asking seniors, kids, the sick and the poor to go without health care and food security to pay for a fantasy crisis?

Why? Because they have needed an excuse to do what they've been attempting for generations to do, and that is disable the safety net; to get rid of Social Security, to get rid of Medicare, to get rid of unemployment, and to get rid of everything that makes a social safety net in a civil society. This charade is built on the fundamental deception that we are on the brink of an economic apocalypse so that politicians can wipe out the programs that people need so that they can give tax breaks to the people at the top.

The Speaker knows it, Mr. RYAN knows it, and it's about time the American people know it. You need not be afraid. Vote "no."

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds to say

that was pretty good scaremongering if I ever heard any.

Like I said, the whole purpose of balancing the budget is to prevent a crisis from happening in the first place. What happened to Europe? They kicked the can down the road. They spent more than they could take in. They borrowed until they couldn't borrow at affordable rates, and then a crisis hit. We know that's where we're headed.

Look, the federal budget is growing at about 5 percent a year, and the family budget is growing at about 2½ percent a year. We want to get the family budget on course with the federal budget or vice versa.

With that, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Tennessee, a member of the Budget Committee and the Ways and Means Committee, Mrs. BLACK.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, nearly 23 million Americans are still struggling to find work, and millions more low- and middle-income Americans are struggling with the reality of depressed wages, higher food and gas prices, and rising health care costs.

It is clear that the President's tax-and-spend policies are putting the American Dream further and further out of reach of more and more Americans. It's hard to get ahead in America when you can barely get by—paying your rent, putting food on the table and getting to and from work.

I believe the status quo is not working, and I believe that the American people deserve better than the chronically high unemployment, record levels of debt, unrealized dreams and a diminished future.

That is why I stand here today to urge my colleagues to support the House Republicans' Path to Prosperity budget. The Path to Prosperity budget funds America's priorities. It protects important entitlement programs, it saves our social net, it repeals the President's budget-busting health care law, reforms our broken code and balances within a decade.

President Obama and the congressional Democrats say that they want to get America back to work and support a "balanced approach" to our fiscal problems. But they also support record deficits and budgets that never ever balance. Instead of government living within its means, the Democrats' budgets raise taxes to fuel more spending, and in turn, millions of Americans remain out of work. The only place that these failed policies will lead is to higher unemployment, depressed wages and a crushing debt crisis.

The majority of Americans are not satisfied with the current state of our economy, and they're not hopeful about the future. And who can blame them? I believe the American people deserve better than the status quo, and I believe the American people deserve leaders here in Washington who are honest with themselves and their constituents about the challenges facing

our Nation and what it's going to take to get this Nation back on track.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds.

Mrs. BLACK. I urge the House to pass the Path to Prosperity budget and for the President to work with the congressional Republicans to balance the budget so that we can start to create the conditions for economic growth, job creation and more opportunities for current and future generations of Americans.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

We heard earlier about the United States becoming Spain and others have compared it to Greece. The reality is that right now the danger is that we follow the European austerity measures that we've seen do damage to economies like that in the U.K., and that's what our Republican colleagues are calling for in their budget.

□ 1730

Yes, we need to reduce our long-term deficits, but we also need to make sure we keep the facts straight. And in the Republican budget pamphlet this year, they show this big tidal wave of red ink, which I believe the chairman showed earlier today, that's based on an outdated Congressional Budget Office analysis that doesn't take into account much of the deficit reduction we've done over the last couple of years, including the revenue in the fiscal cliff agreement. That's why the organization FactCheck.org said that the Republican budget proposal exaggerates future growth of the Federal debt in a chart contained in their newly released budget plan.

So we need to keep this in perspective, and that's what we do in our budget: we focus on economic growth now and economic growth in the future. And, yes, because of the reduction in the rate of increase in health care costs and using, actually, an assumption that the discretionary parts of our budget and mandatory we assume grow faster than the chairman asked the CBO to project, our budget comes into balance the same year as the Republican budget last year came into balance, but we do it without balancing it on the backs of other essential priorities that are important to the American people.

With that, I yield 2 minutes to a terrific new member of the Budget Committee, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. POCAN).

Mr. POCAN. I rise today to join my Democratic colleagues on the House Budget Committee to staunchly oppose the budget proposal we have considered last week in committee.

Mr. Chairman, I was not in Congress last year when the budget was considered in the House, but it sure seems like my Republican colleagues want to make sure I didn't miss a thing since

the proposal before us today represents little more than the same recycled, unrealistic policies that have been rejected by both the Congress and the American people.

This is a budget based on bad math and unrealistic assumptions. It keeps the savings and revenue from the Affordable Care Act, but it repeals its benefits to the people. It cuts taxes for the wealthiest without identifying how they'll pay for the trillions, and it takes almost a trillion dollars in unspecified cuts that will likely target programs for the needy and disadvantaged. With all those unrealistic assumptions, I am surprised there's not a provision that requires leprechauns to steal the pots of gold at the end of rainbows and then to count that as revenue. Mr. Chairman, that could have been a trillion dollars and you'd have a surplus now.

Mr. Chairman, while the math may be bogus, the budget will have real and serious effects on the people of Wisconsin. It keeps the sequester in place, which costs the people of Wisconsin 36,000 jobs; and across America, that's 2 million jobs. It will turn Medicare into a voucher program, forcing 850,000 Wisconsin seniors out of traditional Medicare, eventually, people like my mother. And it will raise taxes on middle class families by more than \$3,000 while giving the richest a \$245,000 tax break.

We need to balance the budget responsibly by getting people back to work. That's the best way to reduce our deficit. We need to create jobs. Economists of both stripes say we should do it and the CBO says we should do it. We need to get it done.

I urge my colleagues to reject the backward-looking plan from our friends on the other side of the aisle and, instead, embrace a forward-looking plan on job growth.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute to say I simply dispute my friend from Wisconsin's interpretation.

This is the chart the gentleman from Maryland was talking about. Guess where we got this chart from? The Congressional Budget Office. It's the most recent numbers they've given us. Will they give us new numbers this summer? Yes. And guess what? It's still going to show a whole bunch of red ink. We can't wish away this debt problem. One year of spending and \$3 for every \$2 that you're taking in, you've got a problem. We've got to deal with that.

We know we're giving the next generation an inferior standard of living. If we keep down this path, we will have a crisis, yes. That's not fearmongering. The gentleman was talking about the fiscal commission. Erskine Bowles, President Clinton's chief of staff, says this debt is a cancer on society, that we will have a crisis. The problem is: there are Democrats who agree with the facts; it's not the Democrats who are writing these budgets, though. That's our problem.

Mr. Chairman, we're going to have to come together sooner or later to deal

with this. That's why I want to yield 4 minutes to the vice chair of the Budget Committee, a gentleman who's offered lots of wisdom on this committee, the doctor from Georgia (Mr. PRICE).

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank Mr. RYAN for his remarkable leadership on this and many other areas.

Mr. Chairman, it is no wonder that folks are confused out there. I tell you, there is so much misinformation that is coming, and the fearmongering that is coming from the other side is truly remarkable. So let's try to set the record and the motive straight.

Republicans care about seniors starting at devastating reductions in Medicare under current law. Republicans care about workers and middle class folks fighting to make ends meet with increased gas prices and increased food prices and on and on. Republicans care about young people struggling to get started in careers and being crushed by government rules and regulations. Republicans care about students getting out of school and not being able to get a job in their field. Because we care about seniors and workers and single moms and young people and students, because we care about all Americans, we present this responsible, balanced budget.

Budgets, Mr. Chairman, are about priorities. Priorities that the American people overwhelmingly support include getting Federal spending under control—poll after poll tells you that—getting our economy moving again so we can get folks back to work, and getting our debt crisis under control so that we may preserve the American Dream for future generations. These are precisely the priorities of our House Republican budget, the Path to Prosperity.

This Path to Prosperity is the way to responsibly balance our budget. American families all across this great land know that the Federal Government shouldn't spend more than we take in, and we agree.

Let's look at a couple of specific items.

Our friends talked on the other side about loopholes. We're interested in closing loopholes, you bet. The gentleman from Maryland says not one dime of closing loopholes will go to reduce the deficit on our side. He's absolutely wrong, Mr. Chairman. He's just wrong. I've had this discussion with him. He is simply wrong. It's really sad that he perpetuates that misinformation.

Second, taxes. The gentlelady from Pennsylvania said that we were interested in raising taxes by some remarkable amount. I can't even remember what it was. In fact, we don't. We actually balance the budget without raising taxes.

Mr. Chairman, they can't have it both ways. They can't say that our plan is not specific enough on taxes and then say it's so specific that we increase taxes by a specific amount. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Chairman, as

you know and our friends on the other side of the aisle know, it's the Ways and Means Committee that develops the tax plan. That's why the Budget Committee doesn't address it.

As a physician, I can tell you, Mr. Chairman, that taking \$716 billion from Medicare and spending it on something else means that seniors are not going to have the kind of quality health care that they need, and that's why we go get that \$716 billion. We'll bring it right back to the Medicare program. It's imperative to do that to keep quality health care in this country.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Then, finally, they talk about slashing and severe cuts to spending. Mr. Chairman, our budget increases spending by 3.4 percent every single year, on average, and we do that because that's the number that you need in order to bend the curve down so that we do indeed get to balance.

Mr. Chairman, the Path to Prosperity ensures that we're honoring America's most important priorities. Our budget saves and strengthens and secures Medicare. We protect national security. It cares for the poor and the sick by repairing America's safety net programs. And we expand economic opportunities for all.

We believe in the industriousness and the ingenuity and the dreams of the American people. It's time that we have a government that is worthy of the people that we represent.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Let's start with taxes. What the Republican budget does is provide a windfall tax break for folks at the very top. People listening can do the math. You're dropping the top tax rate from 39 percent to 25 percent right off the bat. That's about a cut of one-third in the top rate for millionaires. That's a huge loss of revenue.

How do they make up that revenue? Well, if you're going to really make sure you don't increase the deficit, math tells you you're going to increase taxes on middle-income people to help pay for those tax breaks, which is exactly why we offered an amendment in committee saying, okay, Ways and Means Committee, when you do tax reform, don't raise taxes on middle income folks. They voted against that. There are lots of other provisions in the Republican budget that provide guidance to other committees, but they didn't want to provide them that guidance.

□ 1740

So the point is that they provide tax breaks to the folks at the very top while leaving middle-income folks vulnerable; but on net, they do not close one tax loophole out of those four trillions to reduce the deficit. Do you

know how we know that, Mr. Chairman? Because their revenue line is constant with the baseline. So Mr. PRICE is just dead wrong when he says they close tax loopholes to increase revenue for the purpose of reducing the deficit. It's not in there. It's just dead wrong.

Now let's get the record straight about what the Republican budget does to different groups that Mr. PRICE referenced:

Seniors. Here is what the AARP, the largest organization representing seniors, says about what the Republican plan will do:

The chairman's proposal fails to address the high costs of health care and, instead, shifts costs on to seniors and future retirees. Removing the Medicare guarantee of affordable coverage seniors have contributed to through a lifetime of hard work is not the answer.

That's the AARP.

The Medicaid cuts. There are \$810 billion in cuts. Again, I'll remind people that two-thirds of that goes to seniors and people with disabilities. Here is what the nonpartisan, independent Congressional Budget Office said would be the impact of those kinds of cuts:

It means, because they block-grant the program to States with a lot less money, States would need to increase their spending on these programs, make considerable cutbacks in them or both. Cutbacks might involve the reduced eligibility for Medicaid and CHIP—that's children's health—the coverage of fewer services, lower payments to providers, or increased cost sharing by beneficiaries, all of which would reduce access to care.

So whether it's in Medicare or in Medicaid, we violate commitments to seniors in this budget.

He talked about kids and education. Their budget would allow in July the doubling of the student loan interest rate from 3.4 percent to 6.8 percent, making college less affordable. Our budget makes sure there is not that doubling.

Also, we had an earlier conversation with Ms. MOORE about the impact of people in poverty. I'll just give you one example:

In the category of the budget that helps with the Women, Infants, and Children program—this is the program that helps pregnant women and women with very young children get nutrition assistance—they double the sequester cut. Then they tell us it's not going to have any impact—not on that and not on doubling the sequester cut on the National Institutes of Health and the research they do. Somehow, magically, all that will be funded even though you double the sequester cut—more than double it—in that category of the budget.

So their budget, while providing these windfall tax breaks to the folks at the very top, and their budget, while slowing down economic growth in the economy right now, also means we undermine other important priorities in our country.

I would now like to yield 2 minutes to a new, distinguished member of the

Budget Committee, the gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN).

Mr. HUFFMAN. I rise to oppose the Republican budget for a very fundamental reason: it would be devastating to the health and well-being of America's seniors.

This budget raises seniors' costs for preventive services; it reduces access to nursing home care; and it reopens the Medicare prescription drug doughnut hole, which means that, for seniors with high prescription drug costs, they could end up paying on average \$13,000 more over the next 10 years. The Republican budget also tries, once again, to end the guarantee of affordable coverage under Medicare by converting that program into a private sector voucher that will not keep up with costs; and that's going to leave seniors, who are on fixed incomes, holding the bag.

The Republican study group budget is even worse. It forces chained CPI on Social Security. What "chained CPI" means is, quite simply, reduced benefits for seniors who've paid into the system, earned those benefits, need them, and are counting on them.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot vote for a budget that protects billions of dollars in special interest tax breaks for the wealthy and for the most powerful corporate interests while reducing benefits for seniors and shredding the social safety net.

My 83-year-old mom is like millions of seniors around this country. She did her part by working hard all her life, paying into the system, paying her taxes; and when she retired, she counted on a guarantee that her government would honor its end of the bargain. I intend to make sure that it does. We can reduce the deficit without forcing extra costs on the middle class, seniors and the most vulnerable in our society, and that's why I'm supporting the Democratic budget alternatives, which do four essential things:

One, they honor our commitment to seniors; two, they focus on jobs and economic growth, which is a far better way to balance our budget; three, they maintain our safety net; finally, fourth, they keep us on the path of health care reform, which is going to bend the costs that are creating these problems.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, another chart. The red line shows where spending is going. These are Congressional Budget Office numbers. The green line shows our historic revenues. The blue line shows the additional revenues that President Obama has called for. He has already gotten a big chunk of this—he just got \$617 billion—but even if we got all the tax increases that President Obama and his allies in Congress are calling for, it wouldn't even pay for a fifth of all the deficit spending that's coming.

This is where spending is going. We are spending ourselves into a debt crisis. We will never, ever balance the

budget if we keep spending growing at the pace it's growing right now. We have to do something about this because, if we don't, our families will receive a bankrupt country; economic growth will slow; and our kids will be guaranteed a diminished future. We owe it to our countrymen, to our economy, to our kids to get this under control.

With that, I would like to yield 3 minutes to a member of the Budget Committee, also a member of the Appropriations Committee, the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. NUNNELEE).

Mr. NUNNELEE. I do want to thank Mr. RYAN for his leadership on this budget.

Mr. Chairman, we've talked a lot about the big picture. I want to make it personal.

In the early 1990s, I lost my job in a corporate merger. For about 48 hours, I moped around, feeling sorry for myself; but then, one morning, my wife and I got up. We made a pot of coffee, and we got out a sheet of notebook paper, and right down the middle of the page we drew a line. On one side, we wrote down: this is what we have coming in. On the other side, we wrote down: this is how we're going to spend it. We shed some tears that morning as we made difficult decisions. The reason I tell that very personal story is that there is no question in my mind that, today, there are Americans sitting at their kitchen tables—with that same piece of paper, shedding those same tears.

Before I got here, I served in the State senate. I chaired the Appropriations Committee, and I worked with the Democrat chairman in the State house as we made difficult decisions in balancing our State budget. Families, State legislatures, small businesses around this Nation are making those difficult decisions. They have every reason to expect their policymakers in Washington to do the same thing.

I support this budget proposal because it does make tough decisions and balances our budget. I support this proposal on behalf of my mom and dad, who worked all of their lives and paid into a system, and their government made them a promise that said when you get to age 65, we're going to provide you with health care. Yet the actuaries for that system say that their government is in danger of not being able to honor its promise.

I support this budget on behalf of my parents because this budget says we repeal a system of unelected bureaucrats that will make health care decisions for them. I support this budget on behalf of my children and their peers who are entering the workforce, yet are facing job creators with an uncertainty of what's coming out of Washington. I support this budget on behalf of my two grandchildren, to whom I will not be part of passing on a debt that will jeopardize their future.

We hear our friends on the other side of the aisle say, Well, what we need to

do is raise taxes so that we can spend more. We're going to tax this current generation \$1.5 trillion more. We're going to tax future generations so that we can spend more.

That is not the right approach. That's why I support this budget.

□ 1750

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, just to be clear in terms of the Democratic proposals, if you take our budget proposal here together with the work that we have done over the last couple of years, which reduces spending by over \$1.5 trillion, \$700 billion in revenue, take that all together, means \$4 trillion in deficit reduction over that amount, over the period of the window, and we do it in a balanced way. We don't do it the same time we are providing windfall tax breaks to folks at the very top. We don't do it on the backs of other important priorities. We do it by growing the economy and asking for shared responsibility, so we have shared prosperity in this country.

I now yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Georgia, a member of the Judiciary Committee, Mr. JOHNSON.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Thank you, Mr. Ranking Member.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the so-called Ryan budget Path to Prosperity, which really should be called the Ryan budget "Mainline to Misery for the Middle Class." Budgets are a reflection of our Nation's values, and it is clear that the House Republicans chose to favor the ultrawealthy over the weak, the sick, the poor, and the elderly.

Mr. Chairman, this is just more of the same old, same old: more tax breaks for the wealthy, an end to Medicare as we know it—they don't care anything about Medicare—broken promises to our seniors, and higher taxes on the middle class.

For the middle class, this Ryan budget is a road to ruin. For the middle class, this Ryan budget is a shortcut to suffering. Issuing vouchers for health care and gutting programs for low- and middle-income Americans at the expense of budget-busting tax cuts for the wealthy is not the best way forward for our Nation.

I look forward to supporting the Democratic budget, which reduces the deficit in a balanced way while strengthening the economy, bolstering the middle class, and investing in our future.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. There are too many points to refute, so I won't bother trying.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin, a member of the Budget Committee, Mr. RIBBLE.

Mr. RIBBLE. I thank the chairman for yielding.

It has been quite an afternoon already: slash, cut, tone deaf, burn, plunder, shred, eviscerate, end Medicare as we know it, balance the budget on the backs of our seniors, and then my fa-

vorite, austerity Kool-Aid. There has been enough hyperbole in this room today, I should have brought my boots.

Let's talk about austerity. We talk a lot about the least fortunate about us, the concern for seniors and for veterans and the most needy. This is what the budget actually does. These are the real numbers. I have read the real budget—not somebody's report on the budget, but the real budget.

This is what we do for veterans. We increase from \$145 billion to \$187 billion. That's a 20 percent increase, a 20 percent increase over a decade. That is a \$1.675 trillion commitment to our veterans.

Then I heard we are going to end Medicare as we know it. Well, \$509 billion to \$864 billion in Medicare over a decade, if this is austerity Kool-Aid, I don't know how you can define \$6.656 trillion as austerity Kool-Aid.

I have heard a lot of people say I'm concerned about my mom. My colleagues have said it on both sides of the aisle. I want you to know, moms, we have got your back to the tune of \$6.656 trillion. We are here for you.

Let's look at Social Security. We hear that Social Security is going to be in trouble. Well, this budget goes from \$854 billion to \$1.423 trillion. So what does that come out to? Well, it is just a meager \$11.15 trillion over the next decade on Social Security alone.

So what does that do for these three programs? Three programs, Mr. Chairman, this is our austerity Kool-Aid: \$19,481,692,000,000 on three programs, nearly \$3 billion more than the accumulated national debt in the last two centuries. If this is leaving our seniors behind, if this is leaving the most fortunate behind, I don't even know what we can do to make it right other than this.

Mr. Chairman, I am proud of the budget you have put together, and you achieve balance, including meeting these demands for the least fortunate in our society.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I think Mr. RIBBLE made some very, very important points for all of us in this debate, and that is: the reason you see spending rising in both budgets is primarily because we have so many more baby boomers becoming eligible for Medicare and Social Security. In fact, what this chart shows is that, over the 10-year window, you are going to see about a 33 percent increase in the number of people eligible for Medicare and about a 30 percent increase in the number of people who are eligible for Social Security.

So what we say in our budget is that, if we are going to meet our commitments to these seniors but also reduce our budget deficit, we have to do it in a balanced way. Because if we meet these commitments and at the same time are trying to reduce our deficit, one way to do it is the way the Republican budget does: to more than double

the sequester cut in all the areas that are important to growing our economy, our infrastructure investment, our kids' education, science and research. They also cut Medicaid, which affects a lot of those seniors on Medicare. About 20 percent of those seniors are also on Medicaid.

But it is at the end of that 10-year window that our Republican colleagues then move to their voucher plan, premium support—I don't care what you call it. The only way you are going to achieve any savings compared to the baseline number, CBO baseline that the chairman showed you, the only way you are going to do it is if you are capping the amount you are going to get so that seniors have to eat the costs and take the risks of rising health care.

There is a better way to address that issue, and that is the way we approach it in our budget. And that is to build on the kind of reforms that we made in the Affordable Care Act in ObamaCare, which have helped and contributed to reducing the rapid rise in per capita health care costs and which, as I pointed out earlier, our Republican colleagues included in their own budget.

So, yes, we have to deal with these drivers of costs, including health care. But the way we propose to do it is not by transferring or offloading those rising health care costs on the backs of the seniors, but by moving Medicare away from a strictly fee-for-service system toward one where we reward the value of care over the volume of care. And that has achieved significant savings, and it has done so without any negative impact to Medicare beneficiaries. So very different approaches to this issue.

Mr. RIBBLE pointed out there is spending going up that is to meet these commitments. But if you don't take a balanced approach like we do, you can only address those issues by undermining other very important national priorities, priorities that have always had bipartisan support in the past.

I now yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas, a member of the Financial Services Committee, Mr. GREEN.

□ 1800

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank the ranking member for the time.

Mr. Chairman, depending on your point of view, there is something in this budget for you to like and to love. If you like repealing the Affordable Care Act and replacing it with nothing, then you love this budget.

If you like having senior citizens pay more for their pharmaceuticals in the twilight of life, then you love this budget.

If you like having 26-year-olds and under come off of the insurance policies that they're currently on with their parents, then you love this budget.

If you like the notion that health care should become wealth care in the

richest country in the world, where one out of every 100 persons is a millionaire, then you love this budget.

If you like the whole concept of having voucher care, as opposed to Medicare, then you really love this budget.

My dear friends, I neither love it nor like it. I'm against it, and I won't vote for it.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. That was very entertaining.

Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

There are two ways to deal with Medicare essentially. And I think most people would agree, Medicare has a big problem. It's going bankrupt. And the gentleman from Maryland talked about demographics and health inflation.

ObamaCare changed Medicare as we know it. ObamaCare puts a board of 15 unelected bureaucrats in charge of Medicare. These bureaucrats, by law, are given the assignment to require Medicare cuts each and every year to hit the targets that will lead to denied care for current seniors.

We disagree with that. We think patients and their doctors should be in charge of their health care. We believe in choice and competition so that seniors have guaranteed coverage options to make sure that they can have a plan that best meets their needs.

Now, is this some pie in the sky theory?

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield myself an additional 1 minute.

Let me show you a chart.

By the way, a voucher is, you get a check and then you go buy something. No one's proposing that. It's a good poll-tested word.

Premium support is a bipartisan solution, the only bipartisan idea offered on how to save Medicare. It's how the prescription drug law works today.

When the prescription drug law was passed, it was expected to cost about \$100 billion when we began, on an annual basis. What happened to the actual cost?

It came down 41 percent below cost projections. Let me say that again. The prescription drug law came in 41 percent below cost projections. Name me a government program that comes in 41 percent below cost.

Why did this one do that?

I'll tell you why. Seniors got to choose the plan that meets their needs.

The plans, the drug-providing plans, had to compete against each other for the seniors' business. They compete, so they lowered their prices, they improved their quality. Customer satisfaction is at an all-time high. And lo and behold, costs went down.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I'll give myself 30 more seconds to say we believe in putting seniors in charge of their health care, not 15 bureaucrats. Our budget does not change the Medicare benefit for anybody in or near retirement.

But to guarantee that that promise can continue to be made for my mom and the other moms that we've been talking about, to guarantee that it's there for my generation and my kids' generation, you have to reform the program, and that's why we want this bipartisan idea that has proven to work, versus giving the control to 15 bureaucrats.

With that, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SALMON).

Mr. SALMON. Mr. Chairman, balancing our budget goes way beyond taxes and spending. It will define who we are as a Nation and ensure prosperity and opportunity for all Americans going forward.

According to two prominent Stanford University economists, John Cogan and John Taylor, the Ryan budget would raise gross domestic product by 1 percentage point by 2014.

Well, just what does that mean?

They explained it. It's equal to about \$1,500 for every household in the United States—\$1,500 for every household in the United States. By 2024, they estimated GDP would increase by 3 percentage points, to \$4,000 per household. That growth, that kind of growth can't be ignored.

Putting our budget, moreover, our economy, on a sustainable budget, is a moral imperative, and we owe it to the men and women retiring tomorrow, as well as my newest granddaughter, who will be born in April.

The Ryan budget also recognizes that our current tax structure is holding our Nation's prosperity back. I applaud the goal of collapsing our Tax Code to just two lower rates of 10 and 25 percent.

We need pro-growth policies that will grow our economy and create jobs. Tax reform is the answer. At the end of the day, we don't need more taxes; we need more taxpayers, and new jobs will do just that.

Containing the size, scope, and cost of government has got to be a priority here. The more money siphoned from the economy to support government programs means less money in the economy to support private investment, innovation, job creation and wealth for all Americans. We've done this before and we can do it again.

I listened with a little bit of incredulity as I listened to the gentleman from Maryland do a little bit of revisionist history. He talked about the late nineties, and gave the credit to the President for balancing the budget.

Well, I was here in the Republican House of Representatives, the first Republican House of Representatives in 40 years, and I like to take a little bit of credit for that too. I think that the Republican Congress got the ball rolling.

But at the end of the day, I don't care if the President takes the credit for that. In fact, after we passed welfare reform three times, finally, the President kind of came along, kicking and screaming, and he signed welfare reform into law. And 50 percent fewer

families in America have to rely on welfare. They have jobs.

I'd like to see us balance the budget, not just for my children, but for my grandchildren. And I'll tell you what: if President Obama's willing to do that with us, like President Clinton reached across the aisle to a Republican Congress, I will be happy to be the first in line to give him credit for that because I believe all America will benefit.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I just want to respond to a few of the comments from the chairman with respect to Medicare and health care costs.

As we indicated earlier, we've seen a dramatic slowing in the per capita interest in health care cost. That's a good thing. That's, in part, we believe, a result of changes in the Affordable Care Act and, as a result of that, the so-called Independent Advisory Board that our colleagues misleadingly refer to as a bunch of bureaucrats won't even have any job to do for at least 10 years, probably longer.

Now, if health care costs per capita start rising more quickly, then their task—and this is a group of health experts and others—their task is to propose a way to reduce those health care costs, and they're specifically instructed not to have a negative impact on beneficiaries.

And by the way, it specifically says, if Congress has a better way to do it, go for it. That's what the law says. We think that that's a better approach than handing everything over to insurance companies.

And the Republican plan to give seniors a voucher, premium support—I don't care what you call it, it's bad news because seniors will be getting this thing, but the value of that thing doesn't keep up with the rising health care costs.

Now, the chairman mentioned prescription drug part D. It came in under projected cost. One reason was you had more generic drugs on the entire market, not just the Medicare market. But the other, major reason was, guess what? There were 25 percent fewer people enrolled in part D. So you had fewer participants and so, obviously, it costs less. Twenty-five percent.

Now, it's simply wrong to say that the Republican voucher plan for Medicare is like part D prescription drug, or like the Federal Employee Health Benefit Plan, which we've heard about many times before, because the difference is, and it goes to the core of this issue, both those plans, part D and the Federal Employee Health Benefit Plan, have provisions that ensure that the premium that is provided by the government, or Medicare, keeps up on a percentage basis with rising health care costs. That's why it's called premium support, and that's why the Republican plan is not premium support because it does not keep up with rising health care costs, if they're going to claim the savings it makes.

And here's a chart that illustrates this. This is current Medicare. Seniors are putting in a certain amount, and they're guaranteed a certain percentage of support from Medicare.

□ 1810

Here's the plan for Federal employees and Members of Congress: Members of Congress and Federal employees put in around 25 percent and the program picks up the other 75 percent. And as costs go up, the Federal Government still picks up 75 percent. Here's what happens with a voucher program where the value of what you get doesn't keep up with the percentage rise in health care costs. You, the beneficiary, the senior, pay more and more. And that's the only way it can work if you're at the same time going to show that congressional budget chart that shows all that spending out into the future. The only way you can bring that down under the plan is to cap the value of premiums. And that's not premium support; that's a voucher. And that's the end of the Medicare guarantee.

I now yield 2 minutes to a great new member of the Budget Committee, the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE).

Mr. CICILLINE. I thank the ranking member for yielding and thank him for his extraordinary leadership.

Mr. Chairman, budgets should reflect our priorities and our values. It should protect American families by investing in education, infrastructure, science and research, clean energy, and housing. Budgets should be designed to grow our economy and get people back to work.

This Republican budget does not reflect the values of our great Nation. It will hurt our economy and it will hurt the American people. As Yogi Berra said, "It's déjà vu all over again." More of the same. More tax cuts for the richest Americans, billions in subsidies for Big Oil, tax policies that benefit companies that ship American jobs overseas at the expense of the middle class and the working poor.

As a reflection of our Nation's values, our Federal budget should honor the commitment we've made to our seniors; but this Republican proposal would end the guarantee as we know it, shifting rising health care costs to seniors. We should be educating our next generation of leaders to enter the workplace successfully, and we should be making meaningful and serious investments in rebuilding our Nation's crumbling infrastructure, our bridges, roads, and schools so it will put people back to work in well-paying middle class jobs that help support a family.

But this budget makes deep cuts in rebuilding America and in education. According to the Center for American Progress, the Republican budget proposal on the floor today would cut \$1.2 trillion from investments in education, science, and infrastructure, hurting our economy. And some have projected that it would result in the loss of 2 million jobs.

The budget before us today does not reflect our values as a Nation. I urge my colleagues to vote against it and to support the Democratic alternative. It's a budget that really speaks to the highest ideals of America—the kind of America that will provide the best education for our kids, that will discover new cures for disease, that will develop new, clean energy sources, that is committed to rebuilding our crumbling roads, bridges, and ports, and an America that honors our promise to our seniors and to our veterans.

I urge my colleagues to support the Democratic alternative and vote against the Republican Ryan budget.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield myself 1 minute.

I enjoy the back-and-forth on Medicare. Let's not forget that under our proposal there's no cap on Medicare growth for current seniors. We don't have the cap like ObamaCare does. ObamaCare caps Medicare and then has this board of 15 bureaucrats decide how to affect current seniors to make it live within its cap to its price controls. We don't do that. We say leave Medicare alone. People like my mom organized their lives around this program and retired on it. Don't change a thing. Don't put some cap with bureaucrats price-controlling it. The premium support we're talking about, that's for future seniors. And if you're poor, if you're sick, if you're middle income, you get a lot more subsidy—total coverage for poor people—than the wealthy.

I keep hearing all this talk about wealthy. We say the wealthy should pay more for their own premiums than everybody else. That helps us save Medicare for the next generation. These are ideas that actually have bipartisan support—the only bipartisan idea on how to save Medicare versus the rationing from the IPAB board.

With that, I would like to yield 3 minutes to the gentlelady from Tennessee, a member of the Budget Committee and a member of the Commerce Committee, Mrs. BLACKBURN.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin, our chairman, for the outstanding work that he has done, and to all of my colleagues on the House Budget Committee for how diligent we've been in bringing forward a budget that is responsible and is a credit to our citizens and to the American people.

I think it really is quite amazing when you listen to some of this rhetoric. Mr. Chairman, it is so evident from listening to this debate that we have friends across the aisle who just really believe that government can never get enough of the taxpayers' money. I don't think they can tell you how much is enough, because they're always going to find ways and reasons and new programs and new ventures or investments, as they like to call them, to spend that money on.

Every time we talk about accountability and responsibility of the House

to manage the people's money in an accountable and responsible way, they start to talk like that money is theirs, and that we're talking about taking that money away from them. But it's the people's money. And what the American people have said is they want to see this government on a spending plan that is going to be accountable and is going to be responsible. And they want a budget that is going to balance and they want us to get this deficit spending and our national debt under control. Now, the document that we're bringing forward is something that is going to do that. And it's going to do it in the appropriate way because we meet our obligations and we honor the commitments and the promises that have been made.

I heard someone talk about shredding the social safety net. Well, Mr. Chairman, quite frankly, when our friends across the aisle brought forward ObamaCare, they're the ones that took a whack into that social safety net by making those spending cuts in Medicare and pushing that money over to stand up a new program. We don't stand for that because what we will do is preserve Medicare, as the chairman has said, for today's seniors and give younger workers an option that is going to honor the work that they are doing now in paying into that system.

I think it's important that we look at how this is going to affect our children and our grandchildren. I have two grandsons, Jack and Chase. They're here this week. I'm delighted they're here in budget week because the decisions that we make this week are going to be decisions that they're going to bear the burden of. Money we spend is money they will pay back. It's imperative that we be responsible to our children, to our grandchildren, to future generations and meet the obligations we have today.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

It's extraordinary how many times we have to point out that the Republican budget before us today contains the Medicare savings that were first demagogued last fall during the Presidential campaign. We hear them attacked here on the floor of the House by our Republican colleagues, and yet they're in the Republican budget. In fact, they're in this Republican budget. And what's more, their budget wouldn't balance without them, which is why they cannot have it both ways and claim their budget is in balance and they're getting rid of ObamaCare.

Now, while they're keeping the savings, they are getting rid of all the important benefits in the Affordable Care Act that will provide more affordable health care, which will make sure people can't be denied coverage because of preexisting conditions, will make sure that kids can stay on their parents' insurance policy until they're age 26.

For 3 years in a row, we've had a bill from our Republican colleagues called

Repeal and Replace: repeal ObamaCare, but replace it with something else that provides affordable care. Three years. We've never seen replace. There is no replace. You can look through the Republican budget. There's no replace. Just like for 3 years they tell us they've got a tax reform plan that's going to magically provide these big tax cuts for people and not hit middle-income taxpayers. Not one piece of paper out of the Ways and Means Committee in 3 years.

So, Mr. Chairman, it's a little tiresome to continue to hear people criticize savings that we achieve without touching beneficiaries, which our colleagues include in their budget and which extended the life of the Medicare trust fund by more than 8 years.

I now yield 1½ minutes to somebody who knows a lot about the importance of Medicare and Social Security, the gentledady from Illinois, a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

□ 1820

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Chairman, the Ryan Republican budget reflects everything that the American people rejected in the last election: asking nothing from the wealthiest Americans and rich corporations that ship our jobs overseas, while turning Medicare into a voucher program and slashing investments that create real jobs.

Inequality is at its highest point since the Great Depression, and yet this budget would make it worse. Here's the top 1 percent. Since 1979, look at how their income has gone up—277.5 percent. This is the bottom 99 percent. You see a little bit of increase, but you see where the money has gone.

Well, households making more than \$3.3 million would get an average tax cut of \$1.2 million. Those who make less than \$22,000 would get \$40, and a third of them would get no tax cut at all. Meanwhile, critical support programs for seniors and the poor would be cut, including drastic cuts to Medicaid and the food stamp program.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the Ryan Republican budget. It's pure March madness, and not in a good way.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield myself 1 minute.

The gentleman is correct in saying that the savings that are in the Affordable Care Act for Medicare we apply back to Medicare. That's correct. We think that money should stay in Medicare to extend its solvency and not be raided from Medicare to spend on ObamaCare.

He says we keep the savings but we don't keep any of the benefits. President Obama said that premiums would go down by \$2,500 if we passed ObamaCare. They've gone up by \$3,000, on average. I don't call that a benefit.

The costs of the bill have gone from \$938 billion to \$1.88 trillion. It's a budget buster. It doesn't pay for itself. I don't think that's a benefit.

Next year, young people are expected to see their premiums go up by 145 per-

cent to 189 percent. I don't think that's a benefit either.

So, yes, we don't want these benefits. We don't think turning Medicare over to a board of 15 unelected bureaucrats to cut it in ways that will surely lead to denied care for current seniors is a benefit. That's why I want to yield 2 minutes—well, that's not why, but I also want to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. STUTZMAN), a former member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. STUTZMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support today of the balanced budget put forward by my friend and chairman, PAUL RYAN, and the reasonable and practical approach that this Budget Committee has taken while they budget hardworking taxpayer dollars.

Mr. Chairman, this budget debate goes deeper than spreadsheets and focuses on the longevity of the American Dream.

Today, we are considering a Republican budget that actually balances in 10 years, calls for pro-growth, pro-job tax reform, and strengthens Medicare for our seniors and future generations, while in the Senate, HARRY REID and PATTY MURRAY are considering a budget that never balances. It increases taxes by \$1 trillion and let's Medicare and Social Security race towards bankruptcy. And it turns Medicare into a program that rations benefits to seniors.

Make no mistake, Washington is approaching \$17 trillion of debt and more than 12 million Americans are unable to find work. The decisions we make will either sink us deeper into debt or put us on a path that encourages job creation and restores the belief that, if we work hard and make tough choices, our kids will inherit a stronger country.

Mr. Chairman, the choice is clear. If Hoosier families balance their budgets, Washington doesn't have an excuse. It's time the President and the Senate offer real solutions for hardworking Hoosier families.

I commend Chairman RYAN and the House Budget Committee for their hard work, and I urge my colleagues to support the resolution.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I now yield 2 minutes to another terrific new member of the Budget Committee, the gentledady from New Mexico (Ms. LUJAN GRISHAM).

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Republican budget plan. This misguided and cruel plan abandons the economic recovery. It is a path to greater disparity, and it protects the affluent while further squeezing the middle class.

We cannot afford this Republican budget. According to the Economic Policy Institute, it will cost us 2 million jobs in 2014. This is on top of the 750,000 jobs we will lose this year due to sequestration.

The Republican budget attacks the various industries where the largest

job growth should be occurring. We need to invest in critical infrastructure like the health care system as a key way to create jobs here at home and protect our most vulnerable.

According to a 2012 Bureau of Labor Statistics study, the health sector is going to be the leader in job growth throughout the rest of this decade. Unfortunately, the path once again chosen by Republicans in this Congress will put job growth in jeopardy.

The Center on Budget and Policy Priorities estimates that the budget plan under consideration cuts \$2.5 trillion from health care by 2023. How? It turns Medicare into a voucher program and it block grants Medicaid to States. This will force health care providers to cut jobs and to reduce services to their patients.

With an aging population that will require greater care, we should be investing in critical infrastructure like health care and other programs like disease and care management, which have and will continue to reduce spending in Medicare.

So let's be clear: this budget wrecks havoc on health care systems in this country, it hurts patients, and it devastates future job growth in the health sector.

Lastly, this plan also chooses to arbitrarily balance the budget in 10 years, which is harmful to our fragile economy and middle class families. The notion that 10 years is the magic number to balance the budget is ludicrous. It is similar to telling mortgage holders who are responsibly paying their mortgage that, instead of having 30 years to pay it off, now they have 10. Would they be able to? Many of them would end up losing the house. That is exactly what the Ryan budget does and why, to the Nation's budget and to our economy, it puts us under water.

Instead, I would encourage all of my colleagues to support the Van Hollen substitute, which is a balanced approach that leads to job creation and is the right way forward.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT), a member of the Budget Committee and also the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. CALVERT. Thank you, Mr. RYAN.

This is what principled, visionary, responsible leadership looks like. I commend Chairman RYAN and the entire team for this budget and for insisting on regular order. I also congratulate this body for finally forcing the Senate to do something—introduce a budget.

We owe it to our fellow Americans to be honest about the complex fiscal challenges and options before us. That's why today's debate is one of the most important we will have this year.

Nearly every day I hear from my hardworking constituents from southwestern Riverside County who have struggled tremendously over the last 5 years. Despite the challenges they face, they continue to make ends meet by

making tough fiscal decisions, whether it's for themselves, their families, or for their businesses.

Most Americans don't understand why their elected officials can't do the same. Instead, they see us jumping from one crisis to the next, putting their lives and their well-being on a constant roller coaster. Frankly, I don't understand it either.

You can't hide from the statistics. You don't have to be on the Budget Committee to understand our fiscal situation. A balanced budget is not a radical idea; it's a responsible one that the citizens of Riverside County and those around this country practice themselves.

Economists across the spectrum agree that our current path is leading us to a debt crisis should we fail to act. Make no mistake: we're on the warning track, and we should reverse course before we slam into the wall. All Americans should have real concern about what this means for the future prosperity of their own families and of our own Nation.

Under the Obama administration, U.S. public debt as a percentage of GDP is over 70 percent and growing.

□ 1830

As we've see with European nations, there appears to be a tipping point in the debt-to-GDP ratio, and at our current rate we are nearing dangerous territory. The reserve currency status of the dollar and our rank among world economies will only carry us for so long.

So what effect does this level of debt have on an economy and its citizens when things go south?

All you have to do is look at countries like Cyprus, Spain, and Greece. In the case of Greece, you see a depressed environment where the unemployment rate is over 26 percent; severe austerity cuts and overhauls have gutted worker benefits and the safety net system, harming seniors and the country's poorest populace; taxes on families and businesses have increased at a sharp rate; and divisive and violent social unrest has become commonplace. Most recently, we have seen a proposal to bail out Cyprus banks that would raid the savings accounts of its own population.

These are the realities of a debt-ridden country. These are the realities of liberal policies that tax too much, spend too much, borrow too much, and produce far too few jobs. We cannot afford the path that we're on.

Thankfully, we have time to change America's course, and the House Republican budget provides a 10-year plan. It puts the brakes on our unsustainable spending levels, lays out thoughtful program reforms to ensure essential government services are solvent for generations to come, prioritizes a comprehensive restructuring of our Tax Code to simplify the system, and improves our fiscal condition in a way that will allow our econ-

omy to grow providing opportunity to those that work hard no matter what station in life they start at.

Fortunately, after being prodded along, the Senate is joining the House in this conversation after a 4-year absence. I don't favor their approach to the task before us—a plan that never balances with more failed stimulus spending and additional tax hikes. I suspect the President's budget will be similar, once we finally we receive it. However, we welcome their proposals because we will have clear options laid before the American people, and we can have a comprehensive and honest discussion about future choices.

Vice President BIDEN famously said: Show me your budget and I'll tell you what you value. Well, with no budget submitted, we're all forced to conclude that the White House values delay and obfuscation.

Even given this nonfeasance, as an optimist I know this process will allow us to find common ground. Addressing issues of this magnitude is never easy or pretty, but it is a process worth taking. House Republicans continue to stand ready to work with the President and our Democratic colleagues in Congress to meet the complex challenges before us so that we can get our Nation back to a path to prosperity. Thankfully, the House Republican budget does exactly that.

With that, I urge a "yes" vote on H. Con. Res. 25.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Vermont, who's been very focused on these budget issues, Mr. WELCH.

Mr. WELCH. I thank the gentleman, and I thank Mr. RYAN.

The focus and goal of this budget, as I understand it, is to eliminate the debt. That's a worthy goal. In fact, we all share it. But this budget, in my view, lacks ambition for other challenges. What about stagnant wages? Middle class declining? Lack of jobs? These are all fundamental issues that face the American economy.

The middle class is shrinking. Wages now are what they were as a level of our economy as they were in 1966. Just a week ago, when we voted for the sequester, it was a day when American profits were at a record higher than they had been since the 1950s, but American wages were back at 1966 levels.

There is an assertion here that we lack credibility and that we're taxers and spenders. I reject that. But let me remind the folks on the other side that a lot of the policies got us to this debt: a war in Iraq on the credit card, Afghanistan on the credit card, two tax cuts for the wealthy promising benefits to everybody else never paid for, and Medicare part D on the credit card. Then we had the collapse of the economy. Those were not our policies. Those were the policies of a previous President who erased a record surplus.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. WELCH. These are credibility questions, but there's also an economic policy question. There are two assumptions in this budget. One is that austerity will lead to prosperity, that getting the debt down by any means possible and any cuts possible will get us to the Promised Land; it's the pot of gold at the end of the Tea Party rainbow. There is no evidence for that whatsoever.

The second is a faith-based conviction that if you give tax cuts to wealthy people that will trickle down to the rest of us. No experience has shown that that can be successful.

We should be cleaning up the Tax Code. We should be fighting waste, fraud, and abuse. Whether it's in the Pentagon or in the health care system, we should be doing that together. This budget does not give us that chance.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield myself just 30 seconds to say that austerity is what we're trying to prevent from happening. That's the irony of this debate.

Austerity is what happens after the debt crisis hits. Austerity is what is happening in Europe. Austerity is cranking up taxes, slowing down your economy and cutting benefits on senior citizens after they've retired. That's what austerity is. That's what they call it.

We're preventing that. We're preempting that. The goal of this budget is a reasonable plan to balance the budget, to grow the economy, and to create more take-home pay so families can prosper.

With that, I yield 3 minutes to a new member of the Budget Committee, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. RICE).

Mr. RICE of South Carolina. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'm honored to serve on the House Budget Committee. I'm honored to advocate on behalf of this budget.

There's one thing for sure: we can't keep going the way we are. If you look around the world, if you look at countries like Cyprus, Spain, Portugal and Greece, you will see the consequence of unrestrained spending.

The Republican plan balances in 10 years. The plan offered by the Senate never balances. And when we say "balance," we mean matching revenue to spending, not spending more than you take in. When our colleagues across the aisle talk about balance, they use it as a code word for a tax increase.

The Republican plan offers protections across the spectrum of American life. It offers our seniors the protection of making our promises good in Social Security and Medicare. No one will deny—OMB will tell you and the CBO will tell you—the Medicare trust fund is going broke. It will expire in 11 short years; and the longer we wait to deal with that, the worse the problem becomes.

It protects our middle class through tax reform and through repealing the

ObamaCare law with its onerous regulations and taxes. It will structure our system for economic growth. We will stop hemorrhaging American jobs overseas, and we will bring American jobs back to these shores. It's one thing if we lose jobs because of low wages overseas. We don't ever want to compete in that arena. It's another if we lose jobs because our government is inefficient, bloated, and expensive.

Finally, it protects our most vulnerable. It protects our young people. I agree with then-Senator Obama when he said it was immoral to continue to incur these massive debts. Of course, since he said it, our debt is multiples of what he was decrying at that time.

We are piling mountains and mountains of debt on our children and our grandchildren to fuel our addiction to spending. It's got to stop, and it's got to stop now.

I'm proud to stand for this Republican budget, and I urge its passage.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, under our budget proposal, the deficit is dropping rapidly, but we also address the jobs deficit so that we make sure more people get back to work. With respect to the Medicare trust fund, I would just point out the Affordable Care Act, ObamaCare, extended the life of the hospital trust fund by 8 years. And if Republicans did what they said they want to do, which is repeal it, they would shorten the life of the trust fund to 2016. But even though they don't want to tell us, they apparently have kept that in.

I now yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut who has worked so hard to make sure that college is affordable to students in this country, Mr. COURTNEY.

□ 1840

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Chairman, as we talk about the issue of young people and debt, one thing is very clear: for 7½ million young Americans who receive subsidized Stafford student loans, in 103 days the interest rate on those subsidized student loans is going to double from 3.4 percent to 6.8 percent.

We have before us now two budgets. One budget, the Democratic budget brought out by Mr. VAN HOLLEN, protects the lower rate. The other budget, by the majority party, allows that rate to double to 6.8 percent.

The Federal Reserve Bank of New York came out with a study just a few days ago which shows, in fact, that the student loan debt for young Americans has tripled over the last 8 years.

We have one budget which protects Pell Grants, which reduces the need to borrow money to pay for college, and we have the other budget from the majority party which freezes Pell Grants at \$5,665 a year. Any parent like myself who has kids in college, any student who is in college who believes that over the next 10 years that tuition is going to stay flat obviously has no understanding of what the trends are and have been over the last 20 years in

terms of State withdrawal for higher education support, and what's actually happening out there in the real world.

We have one budget which speaks to the monumental challenge of young people who are trying to improve themselves and get ready for the workplace of the future; we have another budget which is blind to those challenges and which will reduce college to a system of haves and have-nots.

We must invest in young people in the future. The Democratic budget, which protects the lower interest rate and the subsidized Stafford Student Loan program, understands that. The majority budget, which allows those rates to skyrocket, which freezes Pell Grants so that young families from poor backgrounds will not be able to afford the cost of college, again leaves this country basically behind in the competition for high-value jobs, for jobs that require skills, whether it's in science, technology, engineering and math or other areas of curriculum.

The fact of the matter is for young people, there is only one budget which speaks to them and addresses their needs—that's the Democratic budget that is brought out by Mr. VAN HOLLEN.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield myself 30 seconds to say the interest rate cliff in student loans was put in law by the Democrats in the first place.

If we bring legislation to the floor that is paid for to deal with it like we did last year, I would assume we have every reason to believe that we'll pass it.

With that, I yield 3 minutes to a new member of the Budget Committee, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. DUFFY).

Mr. DUFFY. Mr. Chairman, I'm happy to hear my friends across the aisle talk about investing in our future and investing in our economy. But when they talk about that, I think we have to be clear that that's code for borrowing and spending more money.

We should truly talk about the cost of this debt. We all know today that we owe \$17 trillion in debt, and if the Federal Reserve stopped printing money, the actual cost to service this debt, to pay the interest payments would be about \$500 billion.

You go out 10 years and our debt is going to be \$25 trillion. And minimally to service our interest payments on that debt 10 years from now, it's going to cost us \$750 billion a year, or \$7.5 trillion over 10 years.

If you talk about the cost of interest payments every year to service the debt, that's \$750 billion that isn't going into education, it's not going into health care, it's not going into roads or schools or helping our poor. It's \$750 billion that goes to interest payments.

When you talk about investing in our future, we're not doing that. We are mortgaging our children's future. But let's be clear. There is someone who is investing in their future—it's the Chinese. They're investing in their future

by buying American debt. So when my little girls, my little 2-year-old Mari Vi and my 4-year-old Paloma, when they get to be our age, they're going to have this weight of interest and debt around their neck and they're going to pay those payments back to those Chinese preschoolers.

This is not responsible. And to hear my colleagues across the aisle stand up and talk about a balanced approach that continues this course of massive red, this is what our children inherit and say this is what we want to give to them?

Listen, if you ask moms around America, Is this what you want for your children? Is this what you want them to inherit? Is this how you want them to invest their tax dollars? They would resoundingly stand up and say, Heck no. Be responsible. Pay off the debt. We don't want them to have their massive tax dollars go to interest payments.

My friends across the aisle, they talk again about borrowing and spending and investing in our economy. When they use that language, it sounds eerily familiar to the same language they used 4 years ago. This is the same argument that was used to borrow a trillion dollars to help us grow our economy, create massive new jobs.

The bottom line is that that trillion-dollar stimulus failed. We want a responsible approach, balance the budget, grow our economy and put our hard-working middle class families back to work. The Republican budget actually does that.

I ask all my colleagues to actually support the Republican budget.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume to respond to a couple of things that were just said.

The first is that when President Obama was sworn in—in fact, before he even put his hand on the Bible a little more than 4 years ago, we were losing over 700,000 jobs every month. The economy was actually spiraling downward at a faster rate than it was at the time of the Great Depression. And thanks to the resilience of the American people and the emergency actions taken by the President and others, we stopped the free fall, we turned the corner and there have been 36 consecutive months of private sector job growth, more than 6.4 million jobs created.

We didn't get any help from our Republican colleagues when we had to make tough decisions to prevent the total collapse of the economy. Now that we've seen some momentum in the job market, we have a Republican budget that's going to put the brakes on that growth. That's according to the Congressional Budget Office. By the way, their budget includes the assumption of those continued sequestration levels into the next year.

Let's talk about China for a minute. I got a letter the other day from the CEO of a major biotech company. Here's what he said. He said that over

the last couple of years because of the reduction in our national investment in science and research, he laid off 1,000 people. And because of the continuing sequester, they've imposed a hiring freeze right now. Those are jobs that now will not be created that would have been otherwise if we hadn't had the Republican approach to the sequester.

You know the real kick? I heard Mr. DUFFY talking about China. They're hiring people in China. Not because of lower Chinese wages, but because China has decided to make science and health care funding a national priority. In other words, the Chinese are copying the secrets to our success, things that help our economy grow, things that are slashed in the Republican budget. Did I say "slashed"? Yeah. Because they cut that portion of the budget by more than two times the sequester. That's a fact.

If we're talking about competing with the Chinese or the Indians or the Europeans or anybody else who is out there, one of our global competitors, let's not allow them to borrow the secrets of our success while we're ignoring them here at home.

I now yield 2 minutes to a terrific new Member of the Budget Committee, someone who has been focused on and leading a lot of our anti-poverty efforts, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Chairman, let me thank our ranking member for your tremendous leadership and for yielding. And I also thank Chairman RYAN for a very spirited markup.

I rise in strong opposition to the RYAN budget. And let me just say as a new member of the Budget Committee, I've had the opportunity now to really get into the weeds of the budget, which really is full of choices, but those choices would undermine our Nation's future for the continued benefit of special interests and the wealthy.

The bottom line: that's what this budget does. It would dismantle government, it would increase inequality and leave the most vulnerable people on their own.

We should reject this warped vision of America, and we should call this budget for what it is. Republicans call it a "path to prosperity," but it really is a path to poverty for the middle class, for working families, for children and for our seniors.

□ 1850

The fact of the matter is, you cannot pretend to fight poverty while you make brutal cuts to the very programs that lift millions of Americans out of poverty.

The Republican budget would make devastating cuts that will increase child hunger, cut off millions of seniors from access to health care, and throw struggling families off TANF during the middle of a jobs crisis. The Republican budget proposes yet another \$6 trillion tax cut for the top 1 percent in

our country while focusing 66 percent of their cuts on shredding our Nation's critical safety net for our children, our seniors, our disabled, and the poor. This budget would also cost 2 million jobs, and it would slash nutrition and food assistance programs for 8 million to 9 million people.

Mr. Chairman, block-granting Medicaid, turning Medicare into a voucher program, and gutting food assistance to our children and our seniors will not reduce poverty; it will make it much, much worse. Our Democratic budget will close special interest tax loopholes in order to raise the critical revenues that we need to invest in the American people.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I yield the gentlelady another 30 seconds.

Ms. LEE of California. Thank you very much.

Let me just conclude by saying that fully supporting our safety net programs, like Medicare, Medicaid, SNAP, and Social Security, will reduce poverty, grow the middle class, and renew economic prosperity for all Americans.

Unlike Republicans, Democrats simply do not believe that gutting the very programs that support poor and low-income families would reduce poverty, programs such as the child tax credit and the earned income tax credit. The Van Hollen Democratic alternative budget creates 1.2 million jobs this year; it reduces the deficit by 2.4 percent; and it makes huge key investments in our future.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, let me yield myself 1 minute.

Look, I very much appreciate the gentlelady from California and where she comes from on this issue. I believe her heart is in the right place. We, too, want to make sure that we get rid of poverty. We, too, want to make sure that people get on with their lives, get on that ladder of life so that they can get out of poverty and on to good lives. That's our aim here.

Now, here is what we see. We have spent trillions of dollars on this war on poverty. We're spending \$1 trillion a year at all levels of government to fight poverty, and what have we gotten for this? We have 46 million people in poverty. The poverty rates in America are at a generational high. So rather than measure our poverty-fighting efforts by how much money we throw at programs, by inputs, why don't we start thinking about measuring it by outputs, by how many people we are helping to get out of poverty? By any measurement, this isn't working.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield myself another minute to say that we need to rethink our premise here. Are we simply perpetuating poverty by treating its symptoms; or shouldn't we look at what has worked in the past—what communities are doing to make a difference—and get behind those ideas?

Let's fight poverty by taking the root causes of poverty in order to break the cycle of poverty and to get people out of poverty. Those are the ideas that we are talking about here. This is not a numbers thing. This is not a budget-cutting exercise. This is taking those ideas that were so successful in reducing child poverty in the welfare reform and applying them to the other programs that have not been reformed.

Giving States more flexibility, having work requirements and job-training requirements and block grants and time limits, what did that do? All the predictions of doom and gloom were there, but we lowered child poverty. We helped get single moms back to job-training programs so they could get back to work. This is why we reform job-training programs. This is why we call for reforming our safety net—because our goal, like her goal, is to get people on with their lives so they can reach their potential.

With that, I would like to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. STEWART).

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Chairman, I am honored—yea, I am thrilled—to stand and speak on this subject. It is the primary reason that I ran for Congress, and I think it is the defining issue and the most critical argument of our day.

We are at a crossroads in our history. I believe that this time is that important. What we do at this moment will determine the future of our Nation. It will determine the future of our children. It will determine the future or the death of the American Dream.

Stephen Covey, one of the great innovators and business leaders of our generation and a man who happens to be from my home State of Utah, popularized a time management concept called the "urgent-important matrix." The point of this was to help us focus on those things that are both urgent and important and to let the other things go.

Frankly, as a Congress, we do a terrible job at that. We often legislate based on the crisis of the moment, lurching from one manmade crisis to another, and the budget is a great example of that. For years, we have treated this as if it is neither urgent nor important, as if it could go on forever; but we know that that's not true.

We also know now what this President believes. He doesn't think it's important to balance our books. He doesn't think it's important to cut our debt. He has no intention of cutting any spending. Not only does he not intend to balance our budget, but he derides and dismisses those of us who think that it's important to our future; but Americans understand this, and it's not that hard.

Please listen to me on this because this is so important: a Nation that is bankrupt cannot provide for the security of its citizens. A Nation that is bankrupt cannot provide for the poor and the needy among them.

I speak now primarily to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle: if

you care about the poor—and I know that you do. By the way, I do as well—then care enough to help them in the long run, not just for the next few years. There is nothing compassionate about letting Medicaid or Medicare go into bankruptcy. There is nothing compassionate about letting Social Security fail, but that's what's going to happen if we don't have the courage to fix this thing. We have to fix it now. This is both important and urgent.

Many of us had hoped that the President would lead on this matter, but he has chosen not to. It's not in his nature; he is much more comfortable leading from behind. Since he won't lead, those of us in Congress will.

I admire Chairman RYAN. I thank him for his courage in tackling a challenge that has terrified Congress for years—reforming entitlements in a way that will save them for our children.

We have a window within which we can make a difference. We can save America. We can save the American Dream. Please, let us have the courage to do that. That is why I support Chairman RYAN's budget and urge my colleagues to do so as well.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The President has been crystal clear. His top priority is to grow the economy, to put more Americans back to work, to strengthen the middle class, to have rising middle class wages and upward mobility in this country. By attacking the jobs deficit, we can also bring down the budget deficit because we know from the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office that more than half of our deficit this year is due to the fact that you still have a lot of people out of work who are looking for work, which is why it's so counterproductive to adopt the approach that our Republican colleagues do.

By not replacing the sequester, the Congressional Budget Office tells us we will lose hundreds of thousands of jobs just by the end of this calendar year, and those jobs are the most important things to be available to help strengthen the middle class and lift people out of poverty. But in lifting people out of poverty, it's also important to provide a little bit of support that they can stand on as they climb that ladder of opportunity. Unfortunately, this budget cuts into a lot of those legs on that stool of support, and nobody understands this issue better than our colleague.

So she may respond, I yield 30 seconds to the gentlelady from California (Ms. LEE).

□ 1900

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Chairman, first, let me just say that I appreciate the chairman, Mr. RYAN, saying that he knows my heart is in the right place. But I also want him to know that the facts speak for themselves.

We have this chart right here, and it demonstrates very clearly that 18 mil-

lion more people would be living in poverty had it not been for those initiatives in this budget that you completely cut out: SNAP, the refundable tax credits, and the broad selection of other programs. Eighteen million more people would be in poverty.

Also let me just say that a budget is a moral document. They reflect the values of who we are as Americans.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I yield an additional 15 seconds to the gentlelady.

Ms. LEE of California. I thank the gentleman.

Why would we want to impose 66 percent of the cuts in your budget on low-income individuals and the poor? That does not make any sense. That is just morally wrong.

Finally, I just have to say that the ranks of the poor began to grow under the Bush administration.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has again expired.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I yield an additional 15 seconds to the gentlelady.

Ms. LEE of California. In 2005, I formed the Out of Poverty Caucus because I saw the Bush economic policies and what, in fact, they were beginning to do. We had probably 42 or 43 Members who joined that caucus. And so I just have to say to you, Mr. Chairman, that this didn't just begin. The ranks of the poor began to grow as a direct result of the economic policies that this budget wants to return to.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, Federal spending rises each and every year by 3.4 percent under this budget instead of 5 percent.

With that, I would like to yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. HARTZLER), a member of the Budget Committee.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Mr. Chairman, thank you for your efforts to lead us to a Path to Prosperity. When I'm home in Missouri in the Fourth District, I hear people say things like:

I have to balance my budget, how come Washington doesn't?

And: It's time for our government to live within its means.

And they might say: At home, we're having to tighten our belts; Washington should, too.

Well, I have good news: I agree, and this budget reflects those concerns and those priorities.

As a member of the Budget Committee, I'm proud to support a responsible budget that promotes economic growth while reducing wasteful spending. Currently, the Federal Government borrows 36 cents out of every dollar that it spends, and that puts us at an astonishing \$16 trillion in debt. This creates anxiety and uncertainty at a time when unemployment is at 8 percent and a lot of families are hurting. We must end the government's reckless borrow, tax, and spend policies. Our budget balances in 10 years, and we do it without ever increasing taxes.

Senate Democrats released a budget that actually increases taxes by \$1 tril-

lion, and never, ever balances. This is worse than the status quo. Washington must stop spending money it doesn't have. We must target the real problem this country faces, and that's uncontrollable spending. Instead of continuously taxing hardworking Americans more, we must pursue meaningful reforms and pro-growth initiatives. Our budget does that.

The keys to this budget are growth initiatives to create jobs and proactive steps to preserve and protect Medicare and Medicaid for the future. Colleagues across the aisle like to claim that this is a voucher system, which is false. The Path to Prosperity reforms Medicare for future beneficiaries by offering them the same kind of health care as current Federal workers and Members of Congress. Future seniors are provided guaranteed issue health coverage where no one will be denied coverage based on health status or preexisting conditions. They will be able to choose from a wide range of options, one of which will include traditional Medicare, if they choose to do that. The government will pay all or part of their premium.

Our updated Medicare plan would also give substantial help to the poor, who would qualify for greater premium relief than the wealthy. This will save the program from bankruptcy while fulfilling our commitment to health care security for seniors. The Democrat plan is to kick the can down the road and jeopardize this important program for our seniors. Our plan is right for senior citizens, and it's right for our future.

Additionally, we take steps to preserve Medicaid, and we send it back to the States in the form of a block grant to allow local and State control over this very important program to provide flexibility to help low-income individuals, rather than forcing States to fit into one-size-fits-all programs. It's important that we get people back to work, and our budget does that as well by consolidating and enhancing job-training programs and endorsing pro-growth tax reform.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman.

Mrs. HARTZLER. But one of the best parts is it gets our priorities right, and it provides for the common defense. There are only a few things that we should be doing here, and it provides that. It replaces and repeals the President's sequester and makes sure that our men and women in uniform have what they need.

So I encourage my colleagues to support this bill that gets our economy growing, has our priorities right, protects and preserves those programs for our seniors, and provides for the common defense.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, let's be very clear. If you give States one-third of the amount of money that

they are currently getting from Medicaid and ask them to do the same job, which is what this budget would do just 10 years from now, and increasingly down that path, you will, as the non-partisan, independent Congressional Budget Office said “reduce access to care.” That’s the bottom line.

With respect to the voucher program, premium support, again, I don’t really care what label you attach to it; the impact is the same. If you want to achieve the out-year budget savings that our colleagues claim to achieve, you’ve got to put a cap on that amount, which is what their plan would do and which makes it entirely different than the plan we have for Members of Congress and Federal employees, and the plan that most people in the private sector have as well.

As this red line shows, the amount of support you would get would drop dramatically relative to rising health care costs, and that’s why we don’t call it premium support because it doesn’t provide support.

I now yield 1½ minutes to the gentlelady from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), a member of the Judiciary Committee.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I thank the gentleman for his leadership, and I certainly thank the Budget Committee for the work that they have done.

I’d make the argument that clearly we have a dilemma in focus and commitment and direction. I call the other budget the budget that has a sense of lacking of what people truly need. The Democratic budget is a budget that speaks to what people need, and it cares about people. It also cares about family economic security. Under the budget that Mr. RYAN is offering, the Republican budget, 3 million Texas seniors will see Medicare end as they know it, 50 million seniors across America.

But frankly, this is the real key on how the GOP budget really works: \$50 billion in their so-called balancing is taken from the Affordable Care Act in the fiscal cliff deal. That’s how they say they reached budget, so that means they’ll undermine millions of Americans who will not have health care. That’s the budget that does not concern itself with family economic security.

Then if we want to look again at the idea of safety net programs, rather than giving Americans an opportunity to stand on their own feet, the Republican budget literally cuts the programs that help reduce poverty. So it is not one that cares about economic security for our families.

Then, Mr. Chairman, if you want to really see what works, it really works when we talk to the top 2 percent.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlelady.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. When you look at the tax rate under President Clinton, that was 39.6 percent, and we created 20.8 million jobs. The Republican

budget is a jobs killer. Then you have where we had a 35 percent tax rate, and you lost 580,000 jobs under George Bush. Here’s the Democratic budget, the Van Hollen budget. We focus on creating jobs. We replace the sequester, 750,000 jobs, reduce the jobs deficit by 450,000, and our total net is 1.2 million net jobs. Family economic security is the Van Hollen budget. I ask my colleagues to vote for the Democratic budget.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CANTOR), the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin for his continued leadership on the issue of the fiscal outlook for our country, on the issue of the moral obligation that we have to our children. And next, to address the growing mountain of debt that unfortunately they’re facing.

Mr. Chairman, I would say that this debate that we’re having is a debate of contrasts. When you look at the two budgets, in this Chamber and you look at the budget that is underway across the Capitol, ours is a budget that balances.

□ 1910

Just as people at home around their kitchen table at the end of the month have to do with their checkbook every month, we believe the same is true. We balance this budget within 10 years.

The other side calls for more taxes. The other budget that is being discussed in the other body, in fact, creates \$1 trillion of new taxes.

And the question for the American people really is which budget do you think grows the economy, which budget do you think helps folks gain some certainty, helps folks get back to work, helps folks who are relying on some of the programs that this body knows, because its budget office is telling us are going to go away unless we act? It is clear, the choice is clear, and the contrast couldn’t be clearer.

I would like to respond, Mr. Chairman, to some of the suggestions by Members on the other side of the aisle that somehow our budget doesn’t address the needs of those who are most in need. In fact, the opposite is the truth. Our budget protects the social safety net programs. The other budget on the other side of the aisle does nothing to respond to the alarms that have been issued by our budget counters and CBO and others year in and year out. Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid—all are on life support if we don’t act.

Our budget, and the chairman of our Budget Committee, has been a champion to say, let’s be responsible, let’s help those who are in need, let’s preserve the social safety net, the programs that make America who she is. It is our budget that helps those in need, Mr. Chairman, not the other side of the aisle.

Let’s look at the question of tax reform. The people of this country have

spoken out on this issue. They want a fairer and simpler Code. What Chairman RYAN has done in this budget is provided a prescription for doing just that: a broadening of the base, a lowering of the rates, and, yes, Mr. Chairman, an insurance in our budget that we are going to get rid of the special interest loopholes that have put Washington in the business of choosing favorites.

I think all of our constituents know that is not what they elect us to do. They want to see an even playing field for all. They want everyone—everyone—in this country to have a fair shot.

If you compare tax reform in the position that we take in our budget to that which the other side is proposing in this body and in the one across the Capitol, I think it is very clear: higher taxes without the reforms necessary versus what we are trying to do, which is even the playing field, giving everybody a fair shot to go and earn success.

The choice is very clear, Mr. Chairman, that our budget provides some certainty for the future for the moms and dads out there who are desperate to know that we are doing our job in Washington on their behalf; that we are going to address this fiscal situation so that they can get on about their lives; so that they can see their kids have a better education; so that they can access the health care that they have come to know, and for those who don’t have the health care, can actually have a system that will lower costs and provide real prospects for quality health care, not the kind of health care designed by this Affordable Care Act that we are going to see come into effect.

So, again, I want to thank Chairman RYAN of the Budget Committee, the gentleman from Wisconsin, for his dogged attention to this very, very alarming question of how we are going to grow our economy and doing it in a way that is thoughtful, that is well put, and has the specifics to go and do the job.

Mr. Chairman, that is something that we have not seen from the other side. We have certainly not seen that from the White House. They haven’t even presented the budget yet. And that is unacceptable.

I urge my colleagues to support the budget coming out of our Budget Committee under the leadership of Chairman RYAN.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, let me just say a word about the health care provided in the Affordable Care Act. That means that you can stay on your parents’ policy until you are 26, so if you have a terrible accident the family is not bankrupted. That means that if you have preexisting conditions, you are not denied coverage by the insurance companies.

We keep hearing, “repeal all those benefits and some day we will get around replacing them.” We have heard that for 3 years. There is nothing in this budget about replacing.

I think the majority leader asked the right question: Which budget grows the economy? And I would just like to read from what the majority leader said on the floor of this House last year about the sequester. Here is what Mr. CANTOR said:

Under the sequester, unemployment would soar from its current level up to 9 percent, setting back any progress the economy has made.

Then he cites a study showing that 200,000 Virginian jobs are on the line.

Well, guess what? The Republican plan leaves in place the deep sequester cuts. That is why by the end of this year we will see 750,000 fewer jobs, including a lot fewer jobs in Virginia, as Mr. CANTOR acknowledged.

Why in the world we would want to do that when we have people struggling to find work, I don't know. Because in the Democratic budget, we replace the sequester so that we save those jobs. In fact, we invest more in jobs going forward.

On the tax issue—here is a headline from the other day in *The Washington Post*—a nonpartisan group did a study: “GOP Tax Cuts Would Benefit Very Wealthy.” And that is the bottom line. Tax breaks for the folks at the very top—all those loopholes we talked about closing—not one loophole closure to help reduce the deficit in a balanced way.

I would now like to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee, who has been working on these issues and working for working families, Mr. COHEN.

Mr. COHEN. Thank you, Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I appreciate the time.

The thing that disturbs me the most about this budget is its inability to understand what our priorities should be.

The Republican budget keeps the defense budget at \$550 billion. There is no question we need a Defense Department, but I don't think the other side understands what the real enemy is. The enemy to my constituents and each of us is not lurking overseas. It is disease. And to each American who will suffer from or has a family member suffering from Alzheimer's or AIDS or cancer or heart disease, diabetes, Parkinson's, post-polio, or whatever, they want cures and treatments.

The National Institutes of Health are cut in this budget by at least \$1.6 billion. It is a \$30 billion budget. The Defense Department is \$550 billion.

I submit to you, Mr. Chairman, our enemy is disease. The department of defense for the human being and the human body is the National Institutes of Health. It is someplace the two parties should be able to come together and agree that we need to fund research, which creates jobs and finds cures and treatments.

The other side talks about what this is going to do to children and grandchildren. I have heard people talk about their children and grandchildren and what their mothers would want. Their mothers want their children to

live long lives and not to suffer from cancer and to get cures and to get treatments.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I yield the gentleman another 30 seconds.

Mr. COHEN. The cures and the treatments are going to benefit the next generation and the generation after that more than this generation. This is a place where spending dollars creates jobs, saves lives, and benefits future generations. Most research that has been done in this country that has come up with cures and treatments has been funded by the government or at least helped by the government, and that continues to this day.

People say we should be different than Cyprus and Greece and Spain and Portugal; and we are, because we funded those researches and we have come up with the cures and the treatments. That is why this is the greatest country on the face of the Earth. We need to see that the National Institutes of Health are funded at a greater level and not diminished.

The CHAIR. The Chair would remind the Committee that the gentleman from Wisconsin has 11 minutes remaining and the gentleman from Maryland has 7½ minutes remaining.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I would just note for the record that funding on discretionary levels like that are set by the Appropriations Committee, not the Budget Committee, so those levels will be set later by the Appropriations Committee.

I would like to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY).

□ 1920

Mr. PERRY. Thank you for yielding, Mr. Chairman.

I deeply care about my mother, who's on Social Security and Medicare, and my two little girls, who are counting on their daddy to make sure that those programs are available when the time comes, and, of course, for the constituents that are counting on me to make sure that those programs are available for them. So I commend Chairman RYAN on his leadership in drafting a budget that responsibly addresses our national debt and ensures that my own children and all the residents of the Fourth District of Pennsylvania are not burdened with Washington's spending problem any longer.

This legislation balances our budget in 10 years. I know some folks are saying, Why 10 years? And I say, Why not ever in your budgets? Why not ever? It reduces spending and makes responsible reforms to mandatory spending programs.

For the past few weeks, I've heard from hundreds of constituents, including my very own mother, about how this budget will change Social Security for current beneficiaries, and I want to make clear that the Ryan budget does not do that. It does not cut Social Se-

curity. But I will remind everybody that the Social Security Disability Insurance fund will be insolvent by 2016. That's 3 years from now. So if you're 21 years old, when you're 24, it's insolvent. If you're 45 years old, when you're 48, it's insolvent.

The Medicare part A trust fund will be exhausted by 2024. This is not a long time away for young people or old people. I had to remind my mom that, if these programs were not reformed, there would be nothing left for her grandchildren, there would be nothing left for her son, and very likely there will be nothing left for her. This legislation makes those reforms responsible by allowing Medicare recipients the opportunity to choose options specific to their needs, and it repeals the President's plan to have a group of unelected, unaccountable bureaucrats to slash Medicare benefits for seniors, including my mom.

It also repeals the President's health care law, which has placed an undue burden on our job creators and their families. Penn Waste, a company in the district I represent, has told me that ObamaCare health care costs, the Affordable Health Care law, will cost their employees a minimum of \$68 a week more right now. That's a meal out with your family. That's an extra tank of gas in your car.

This budget also ensures our servicemen and -women are protected by providing \$560 billion for defense spending in fiscal year 2014, an amount consistent with America's military goals and strategies.

This budget is responsible. The Senate budget, the Democrat budget, each one starts at no less than a trillion dollars in new spending. I urge everybody to support the Ryan budget.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I now yield 2 minutes to a terrific new member of the Budget Committee, the gentleman from New York (Mr. JEFFRIES).

Mr. JEFFRIES. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Maryland for his leadership.

We are at a fork in the road and there are two stark choices. The Democratic plan promotes progress for the many; the Republican plan promotes prosperity for the few. The Democratic plan will put Americans back to work; the Republican plan will put Americans out of work. The Democratic plan takes a balanced approach to deficit reduction; the Republican plan will balance the budget on the backs of children and working families and seniors and the sick and the afflicted.

Whenever we make that observation, our friends on the other side say that we are trying to scare the American people by communicating misinformation. It's a very cute observation, but it has no factual basis. Let's just check the record.

The Republican plan cuts higher education spending by \$168 billion. That's not a scare tactic. That's reality.

The Republican plan embraces \$85 billion in random sequestration cuts

that will cost the economy 750,000 jobs. That's not a scare tactic. That's reality.

The Republican plan will cut spending on Medicaid by \$810 billion—a program, by the way, that disproportionately benefits poor children, seniors, and the disabled. That's not a scare tactic. That's reality.

The Republican plan will turn Medicare into a voucher program, but because that voucher will not keep up with the cost of health care inflation, it will deny beneficiaries what they are receiving today. That's not a scare tactic. That's reality.

And that is why the Republican plan is designed to balance the budget on the backs of the most vulnerable in our society, and it should be rejected. I urge a “no” vote.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, at this time I would like to yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from North Carolina (Mrs. ELLMERS).

Mrs. ELLMERS. I thank the chairman for the hard work that he and the House Budget Committee have done on this incredible effort for a new plan to balance the budget in 10 years.

This proposal invites our friends across the aisle, President Obama, and the Senate to commit to the same commonsense goal. The 2014 House Republican budget sets a responsible precedent by ensuring our government lives within its means, just like millions of Americans across this country and just like my constituents back in North Carolina. I hear from them every day and they ask me: Why can't the Federal budget be balanced? Why can't Washington get its spending under control?

This proposal sets real, practical goals that will stop spending money we don't have, fix our broken Tax Code, protect and strengthen important priorities like Medicare and national security, reforms welfare programs like Medicaid so that it can deliver on the promises to deliver to those who are in most need. It also does repeal the President's health care plan and allows us to put in place real, sensible, patient-centered reforms for health care.

The House Republican budget reduces the deficit by \$4.6 trillion over the next 10 years. This budget offers a plan to expand opportunity and creates jobs. While not sufficient by themselves, policy reforms at the Federal level can help foster an environment that promotes economic growth. This budget seeks to equip Americans with the skills to succeed in the 21st century economy and grow that economy.

Mr. Chairman, I support this bill and I believe the American people are looking for this leadership here in Washington, because they know that bureaucrats here in Washington do not know what they know back home.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to a new Member of Congress, who is on the Veterans' Committee, the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO).

Mr. TAKANO. Thank you, Mr. VAN HOLLEN.

I rise to address the so-called Path to Prosperity that this body is now debating.

I'm struck by the beltway media bubble that calls this plan bold and its creator, Mr. RYAN, a serious policymaker who isn't afraid to make the tough decisions. My Republican colleagues call this proposal brave and necessary, but I could not disagree more. I don't believe it's brave to break the promises we made to our seniors. I think it's dangerous. I don't believe it's necessary to cut funding for police, firefighters, and programs for low-income citizens. I think that's foolish. I don't believe that it's wise to provide tax credits for private jets and luxury yachts.

My colleague, Mr. RYAN, seems to be living in an alternate reality. He thinks that we can fund the Federal Government at 19 percent of GDP with an aging population whose health care costs are at 18 percent of GDP. Even conservative idol President Reagan funded the Federal Government at 22 percent of GDP when there was no retiring baby boom generation and health care costs only amounted to 1 percent of GDP. Would Mr. RYAN accuse President Reagan's administration of “wild government spending?” I don't think so.

The GOP budget boils down to three steps: phase one, cut spending; phase two, I'm not sure what their plans are; phase three, prosperity.

There's a gaping hole in Mr. RYAN's logic. His thinking is incomplete. How is cutting funding for infrastructure, education, and health care a Path to Prosperity?

Mr. Chairman, a century of evidence shows that austerity will not lead to prosperity. Democrats offer alternative proposals that deal with the real crisis in America—the jobs crisis.

□ 1930

A plan to reach full employment is the true path to prosperity. I urge a “no” vote on the Ryan budget.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. At this time, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. YODER), a member of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. YODER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this budget proposal.

Before I came to Washington, D.C., I was the Appropriations Committee chairman of the Kansas State Legislature, where we were required each year to balance our State's budget. We were like a lot of Kansas families; we couldn't spend more money than we bring in—quite a novel concept.

As a Member of Congress, I have stood in disbelief, much like most Americans, at the wanton disregard for balancing the Federal budget. Frankly, Mr. Chairman, it is astonishing. In the last 50 years, we've only balanced the budget six times. That's why I'm so happy that we finally have a budget be-

fore us that balances. Not only does it balance, it pays off the national debt down to zero.

Now, I support a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution to require Congress to do its job and make sure that we don't spend more than we take in. Opponents of that amendment often say we don't need the Constitution to require us to do our work, to balance the budget. We have all the tools to balance the budget now. Great. This is our opportunity to prove it. Let's come together and do our jobs.

Americans are sick and tired of the standard lame Washington excuses of why we couldn't do our jobs and balance the budget. How can you keep going home and blaming others, blaming the other side for the fiscal state of our Nation?

The facts are, Mr. Chairman, besides the RSC budget, this is the only budget being presented that balances and pays the debt down to zero. So we are hearing speech after speech today that criticizes this balanced budget without offering a balanced alternative.

Mr. Chairman, each day, hard-working Americans get up to do their jobs. They work long, hard hours. They put food on the table. They raise their families, and they pay lots of taxes. Is it too much for them to ask for us to balance our books, to spend their tax dollars wisely?

Let's chart a debt-free future for this country. Let's rebuild our economy. Let's honor the work and commitment of the American taxpayers, and let's stand together for a balanced budget.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time remains on each side?

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Maryland has 3½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Wisconsin has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

We've had a good and healthy debate today. I want to go back to the question that was posed by the Republican leader, Mr. CANTOR: Which of these budgets does more to help the economy? Which budget helps put more people back to work?

Well, we know that the austerity approach taken in the Republican budget will result in 750,000 fewer Americans working by the end of this year and 2 million fewer Americans working next year, compared to the alternative that the Democrats are proposing, which would replace the sequester. So you achieve the same amount of deficit reduction, but you don't do it in a way that results in slowing down economic growth in this country this year, next year, or the year beyond. We tackle the budget deficit by dealing with the jobs deficit right now and then taking a balanced approach into the future.

Let's talk about taxes. The Republican budget will give another windfall tax break to the very wealthiest people in this country. In order to make up

the revenue lost, they will inevitably have to increase the tax burden on middle-income taxpayers unless they're going to put their budget out of balance. Now, just to safeguard against that, we offered an amendment that said, when you do tax reform, don't raise taxes on middle-income families. Every Republican on the Budget Committee voted against that.

We can address our priorities and reduce the deficit in a smart, consistent way without violating our commitments to seniors, without reopening the prescription drug doughnut hole so people with high drug costs will have to shell out lots more—thousands over the period of this budget. We can do it without making the interest rate on student loans double this July. We can do it without cutting our investment in transportation by 15 percent when we have all these unmet needs and 15 percent employment in the construction industry. We know we can do all those things and reduce our deficit the smart way because we do it in the House Democratic budget, which dramatically drops the deficit so that it's growing much slower than the economy, stabilizes the debt at 70 percent of GDP, and, yes, balances the budget the same time the Republican budget last year balanced. What a conversion to hit this political target this year after all the talk last year. And the reason—and the fundamental difference here—is that, by trying to drive to that political target, they end up balancing the budget on the backs of everybody else—commitments to seniors, investment in our economy, investment in the future.

At the end of the day—and we showed the numbers earlier, Mr. Chairman. They can't have it both ways. They can't say their budget balances in 10 years and at the same time they repeal ObamaCare, because the \$715 million in savings from the Affordable Care Act, from ObamaCare, is embedded right in their budget.

The trillion dollars in revenue from that they say they're going to pull out of the air. But if we repealed ObamaCare today, it would be out of balance by over \$500 billion. So let's focus on the task at hand, put people back to work. Let's have a Tax Code that makes sense for the middle class. And let's keep our commitment to seniors and grow this economy.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that people reject the lopsided Republican plan and adopt the balanced approach presented by the Democratic Caucus.

I yield back the balance of my time. The CHAIR. The gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I also want to thank my friend from Maryland for a lively debate. He and I have done this so much we can probably finish each other's sentences.

Washington is arrogant. There is an arrogance here in the Federal Govern-

ment. It's an arrogance that says we know how to run things better in Washington; we should run everything here. We reject that.

We believe in the principle of federalism, which is contained in our Constitution. We think that people who are closer to the problems can probably do a better job of fixing problems.

I have a letter from the Governor of Utah, a letter from the Governor and Lieutenant Governor of Iowa:

This budget will replace the rigid, one-size-fits-all Federal programs and instead offers the States the flexibility they need to make these programs work for the people they serve.

This budget gives States maximum flexibility in areas like Medicaid, food stamps, TANF so States can determine the optimal way to provide services to these unique populations.

We want to empower people closer to the problem to help solve these problems because you know what? We're not fixing these problems.

The other measure of arrogance in Washington is only in Washington is reducing the increase of spending a huge cut. Only in Washington is growing spending for the Federal Government at 3.4 percent a year instead of 5 percent a year a massive cut. You know what? Government's growing just fine. The Senate Democrat budget says let's grow spending at 4.7 percent a year instead of 5. That's supposed to be progress.

The family budget is growing at less than 2.5 percent for the next 10 years. That's the best projection we've got, the most generous one. If the family budget is only growing 2.5 percent and the Federal Government is growing about 5 percent, this is imbalance. This is arrogance. We should ask our Federal Government to do just what our families do and balance the budget. That's the responsible thing to do.

Now, let's take a look at what our friends on the other side of the aisle are doing. The one consistent theme of all of these budgets that are being offered by Mr. VAN HOLLEN, by the other Democrats, by the Senate Democrats is tax more and spend more.

The Senate Democrat budget, that comes in the cheapest one of them all. Increase net spending—remember, we have a trillion-dollar deficit, a debt crisis in the future. What do they say? Let's net increase spending above where we are and let's raise taxes \$923 billion.

The House Democratic budget, let's have a net spending increase of \$476 billion and let's raise taxes \$1.2 trillion.

□ 1940

The Congressional Black Caucus budget: let's raise spending \$1.99 trillion and have a tax increase of \$2.9 trillion. Or the Progressive Caucus budget—that one really takes the cake—let's have a \$4.65 trillion spending increase only to be slightly outdone by a \$5.683 trillion tax increase.

This is what they're saying: ignore the deficit, ignore the economy, all the

answers lie in Washington, take more from hardworking small businesses, take more from families, spend it in Washington, and, oh, by the way, we don't have a crisis. That's just scare-mongering.

Do you know what? Try telling that to our children and our grandchildren who are guaranteed to get a lower standard of living if we don't fix this mess. Try telling that to the struggling workers, the families, the people in poverty in America today who aren't cutting it in this economy.

Balancing the budget helps us promote a healthier economy to create jobs and get people back on their feet again, and that's exactly why we're proposing and passing this budget.

I yield back the balance of my time. The CHAIR. All time has expired.

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY) and the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY) each will control 30 minutes on the subject of economic goals and policies.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

During the annual debate on the budget resolution, the House assigns 1 hour to the Joint Economic Committee to assess current economic conditions and evaluate how the budget resolution, if implemented, would improve the outlook for America's economy. As chairman of the Joint Economic Committee during the 113th Congress, I'm pleased to lead this discussion.

For more than 2 years, the Joint Economic Committee has demonstrated that the current recovery we're in is the weakest of all recoveries lasting at least 1 year since World War II in terms of economic growth, in terms of jobs, and in personal income for families.

Let's examine the following three charts. In each, the red lines depict the current recovery where we're headed right now; the navy blue lines depict the average of all the other recoveries since World War II, and the sky-blue line depicts the average of these recoveries.

Since the recession ended 3½ years ago, our real economy, the real GDP, has grown by a mere 7.5 percent. That's this one. But during the comparable period, real economic growth averaged more than double that, 17.5 percent in other postwar recoveries. It is a huge gap between where we are today as a Nation and just the average, C-student, middle-of-the-road recovery of the past. We are lagging far behind. There is a serious growth gap.

President Obama often boasts that his recovery has generated 6.4 million jobs in the private sector since we hit a low in February 2010. But if you look at previous postwar recoveries, just apples to apples, the average increase in private jobs over the comparable time would have generated an equivalent of 10.4 million jobs. This is the comparison. These are the jobs of the current

recovery. This is just the average. And that blue-shaded area is the range between the very worst, the one we're in, and the very best, which is a lot more jobs. In fact, today, this recovery compared to the average, we're missing 4 million jobs in America. We're missing more than \$1 trillion out of our economy because of the current recovery in this growth gap.

In fact, if this recovery had been merely average, middle-of-the-road, instead of having fewer jobs on Main Street than when the recession began, which is where we're at right now, fewer jobs on Main Street, private payroll employment would have been at an all-time high if this would have just been an average recovery.

Sluggish economic growth and job creation have also slowed personal income growth, the money that you earn as a family. In recoveries since 1960, disposable income, real disposable income, apples to apples, per person, grew by \$3,500 over 43 months. But during the same period, this is where the average income for families has grown; but look where we are under the current recovery. During the same period, for the current recovery, personal income growth for a family, it isn't \$3,500, it's about \$416. So this current recovery is taking a real toll on families and taking a real toll on our economy and on jobs.

Now, think what is more worrisome than this economy's weak performance is the ability of our economy to grow and create private-sector jobs in the future. Economic evidence shows that it may have permanently fallen. In the most recent "Budget and Economic Outlook," the Congressional Budget Office lowered its estimate for our long-term growth rate as a Nation, the potential GDP, from its average since 1950 of 3.3 percent. They lowered it and our future to 2.3 percent.

Now, one percentage point may not sound like much, but it has a huge effect on our economy, on our jobs, and on the ability of the Federal Government to pay its bills.

Think about it like this: at America's traditional 3.3 percent growth rate of the past half a century, our real economy doubles every 22 years. But at this new normal, this new slower rate of 2.3 percent, it takes almost 32 years to double in size. That's a decade longer; that's a decade slower.

A permanent growth gap of 1 percent translates into one-third slower growth for our young people seeking to find their first job and for families hoping to reach their American Dream. A permanent growth gap of 1 percent means our economy will be \$20 trillion smaller in 2052. That's actually a growth gap for 1 year larger than the entire American economy today.

It also means it will be harder to balance the Federal budget since a permanent growth gap of 1 percent means the loss of a whopping \$93 trillion from our Federal coffers, again, over the next four decades. Think about \$93 trillion

today. The unfunded liability for Social Security, Medicare, and our Federal pensions in today's dollars is only \$87 billion. So the prospect of a "new normal" for America's economy in which our future growth permanently slows by one-third should be a red flag for all Americans.

We are told in school growing up that in Shakespeare's play, a soothsayer told Julius Caesar to beware the ides of March, the 15th. Ironically, this year, President Obama released his "Economic Report of the President" on that ominous date, and buried in this report are some startling admissions and some dire warnings for the American people. Unlike Caesar, this Congress should take heed.

First, the President's report acknowledges that the current recovery is indeed the weakest since World War II, as Republicans on the Joint Economic Committee have been saying now for more than 2 years. This growth gap is real, and it's widening. Second, our economy's ability to grow in the future, the growth rate of potential GDP, has decreased. The President admits that.

□ 1950

Unfortunately, President Obama then seeks to blame this new normal on everything other than his economic leadership. The report attributes two-thirds of the decrease to demographic factors, specifically an aging population and a slower rate of net immigration. The report attributes the remaining one-third to just about everything that's ever occurred in the last 5 years.

Demographic factors account for some of the new normal. But if you think about it, our potential economy for the future, it's a function of how many hours that are worked in America and the growth of the workers, how productive they are. In turn, what drives that productivity of the American worker is if businesses invest in new business, new equipment, new buildings, new software. That drives jobs along Main Street.

The policies of the Obama White House—higher taxes; the unwillingness to propose real solutions to save Social Security and Medicare for future generations; the prospects of higher costs and regulations due to the President's new ObamaCare law; how we regulate our local banks; global warming regulations; and suppression of energy production on Federal lands and waters, America's lands and waters—have generated so much uncertainty, and it's really squelched new business investment in America. Unlike real personal consumption, nonresidential investment from the business community still remains below what it was before the recession began.

Mr. Chairman, this new normal for America, the growth gap that we're in today, the prospect that America will grow slower in the future is unacceptable. Republican Members of this

House are working to accelerate growth. A big step we can take forward tonight is to pass the House budget. It is a responsible, balanced budget.

By estimations, it will raise our economic growth by 1 percent in the next year. That's significant. It will add \$1,500 in new purchasing power for households. And if you look over the long term, the next 10 years, the House budget could well add up to 3 percent to our economic growth and \$4,000 per household in real income people don't have today, real gains that they don't have today.

The truth of the matter is the roadblocks to America's future are still in place: the prospect of higher taxes; the failure to reform and save our entitlements; ObamaCare with all the new taxes, new regulations; higher costs for families; and the fact that we're not pursuing tax reform, at least from this White House, with the Ways and Means Committee and House Republicans in this budget to move toward a fairer, simpler tax code that closes tax loopholes and does it not to fuel spending but rather to fuel lower rates for families and small businesses and make us competitive again as a Nation.

This budget resolution, this responsible and balanced budget developed by the Budget Committee chaired by PAUL RYAN, is the first step toward a brighter economic future for our children and grandchildren.

I reserve the balance of my time, Mr. Chairman.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. I yield myself such time as I may consume as I'm pleased to represent the Democratic point of view in this budget.

We now have before this Congress the choice of two profoundly different paths forward for the American economy. One based on severe austerity for the many and deep cuts in programs for the vulnerable that is offered by Chairman RYAN and our friends from across the aisle. No new revenues are included in Mr. RYAN's plan.

The other proposal, offered by the Budget Committee Ranking Member CHRIS VAN HOLLEN and the Democrats, is based on a balance of targeted spending cuts, the closing of loopholes and the elimination of costly tax expenditures that benefit the very few. It uses a balance of spending cuts and new revenue.

This is perhaps the most important choice that Congress will make this year. It will determine what kind of country we're going to be, what kind of economy our children will inherit and what kind of place we will make for ourselves in the world.

But before we examine our differences, let's look at the things we can all agree on: the long-term structural deficit needs to be addressed. On that there is no question; there is agreement. We need to spur economic growth, which is vital. Without it, there's no hope. More jobs and opportunities need to be created. The recovery

is leaving too many people behind. And wasteful spending needs to be eliminated and costs need to be controlled. On these things we can all agree. All these things need doing. This is not our argument.

Our disagreement is over how to do it and how long it should take. It's also helpful to remember how we got here and how far we've come under progress under the Obama administration.

As you can see from this chart—and I call it the “V chart”—from December of 2007 through December of 2009, the economy lost a staggering 8.7 million jobs. That red section represents what was going on at the end of the Bush administration. The blue section shows what happened when President Obama took office. You can see there was quite a turnaround. Instead of going down, we started going up and gaining jobs. In fact, there have been 36 months of private jobs gained in 36 months.

During this last 3-year period here, the private sector has added nearly 6.4 million jobs. Just last month, the private sector added 246,000 jobs. So we've been moving in the right direction, from the deep red valley into the hope of moving forward, and that is where we are now.

The unemployment rate is down almost 2.5 percentage points from its peak in October of 2009. Our economy came very close to falling into the abyss, but since the depths of the Great Recession, as you can see from this chart, we are making progress.

As you can see from the next chart, the economy has recorded 14 consecutive quarters of GDP growth. Again, we are moving in the right direction. Key sectors such as manufacturing and construction have rebounded. In 2012, the Case-Shiller Home Price Indices rose by 7.3 percent. A recovery is clearly underway. But where do we go from here, and how do we speed things up?

Let's look first at the proposal from Representative RYAN and the Republicans. From what I see, there are only three things wrong with it: its priorities, its math, and its vision for America. The Ryan budget is based solely on massive cuts to domestic investments; cuts to programs that service and benefit the working millions and help the most vulnerable; and cuts in tax rates to benefit the fortunate few.

For many who are struggling now, the Ryan plan would lead to a slow economic death, death from a thousand cuts. It is absolutely impossible to cut your way to prosperity. The Ryan plan would make deep and painful cuts to vital domestic programs. It would change the food stamp program—a program that helps millions—into a block grant and cut its funding by \$135 billion.

Medicare, as we know it, would come to an end. The Ryan plan includes a voucher system that would increase out-of-pocket health care costs by over \$5,000 per senior. Here's what the AARP had to say about the Ryan budget and Medicare:

Chairman Paul Ryan's proposed budget fails to address the high cost of health care and instead shifts costs onto seniors and future retirees. Removing the Medicare guarantee of affordable health coverage seniors have contributed to through a lifetime of hard work is not the answer.

□ 2000

Cuts to Medicaid could affect as many as 60 million people annually. Half of these are children; and of the adults on Medicaid, more than two-thirds are women.

The Ryan plan repeals the Affordable Care Act, which would sharply cut the overall level of health care available to tens of millions. Yet, to make his budget balance, RYAN counts the \$716 billion in Medicare savings from the Affordable Care Act. It's a hoax of epic proportions. Repealing the Affordable Care Act would return us to a time when insurance companies could charge women more—it's called “gender rating”—just for being women. Repealing the Affordable Care Act would also eliminate the ban on discrimination against those with preexisting conditions, the ability to remain on parents' health plans until age 26, and the expansion of Medicaid. Then, while tens of millions of Americans would be struggling under the harsh new austerity measures, the Ryan plan would cut the tax bills for the most fortunate.

Last year, the Joint Economic Committee estimated that RYAN's tax plan would lower taxes for millionaires by about \$300,000 while raising taxes for individual taxpayers earning between \$50,000 and \$100,000 by over \$4,000. How fair is that?

At a time when income inequality is widely viewed as a very serious problem in our country, the Ryan plan would make it worse. The gap between the haves and the have-nots would grow larger under the Ryan plan. The Ryan plan would ask tens of millions to bear additional burdens—pay additional taxes—and face additional hardships while it cut taxes for the fortunate few and preserved loopholes for Big Oil and spent an additional half-trillion dollars on the military over the next 10 years.

Then, at the end of a decade of painful cuts, according to the nonpartisan Tax Policy Center, the Ryan budget would have managed to actually add \$5.7 trillion to the deficit. A close look at the math makes it clear that the Ryan budget can't recoup the revenue lost from its tax cuts without imposing large tax increases on middle class families. The Tax Policy Center was unwilling to speculate on where the lost revenue would come from. In addition, the Economic Policy Institute estimates that the Ryan budget would kill 750,000 jobs this year, 2 million next year, and would decrease the gross domestic product by 1.7 percentage points.

The priorities of this budget are all wrong. It kills jobs, stifles growth and adds to the deficit, all while making

life harder for seniors, women, children, and the most vulnerable in our society.

The math of the budget just does not add up. Simple arithmetic tells us that the only way to pay for Mr. RYAN's proposed tax cuts for the fortunate few is to eliminate many of the deductions that middle class families count on to pay for housing and health care and to save for their retirements. The Ryan tax plan would further burden those who are struggling by substantially lowering taxes for the most fortunate—and that's not spin. That's just plain math.

The vision this budget offers of America is totally at odds with who we claim to be. It's a vision of a country where the government is indifferent to the suffering of many while only paying attention to the demands of the few.

Then there is the other plan that is before us, the Democratic plan, with a balanced set of priorities—a better vision for the future found in the budget offered by House Budget Committee Ranking Member CHRIS VAN HOLLEN. It takes a balanced approach with targeted spending and new revenues. It would cut waste, add jobs, and spur the economic growth of the economy.

It would reduce the deficit by an additional \$1.8 trillion without jeopardizing the recovery or harming the middle class. It includes \$1.2 trillion in new revenue obtained, not by tax increases, but by closing loopholes and eliminating wasteful spending that benefits the wealthiest Americans and the largest corporations. It eliminates \$4 billion in annual tax breaks to the oil and gas industry, an industry that is making profits. They don't need a tax break. In fact, they are making enormous profits.

So why does the Ryan budget give them a government subsidy? The Democratic plan invests in infrastructure, education, job training, and innovation. It is designed, first and foremost, to help create jobs and to strengthen the economy. The House Democratic budget also makes critical investments in our future.

\$200 billion is invested in infrastructure, education, job training, and innovation, helping to create jobs and strengthen the economy. These investments include \$80 billion for an education jobs initiative, \$50 billion for transportation needs, and \$10 billion for an infrastructure jobs bank. As Federal Reserve Chairman Ben Bernanke has said many times over the past few years, simply pursuing deep cuts in the short term will slow the rate of economic growth, bring down revenues and lead to less deficit reduction.

We have two paths before us. We can choose a path of austerity and indifference that will limit economic growth and increase inequality; or we can choose one of inspiration and inclusion that invests in our country and creates opportunities for everyone.

I choose opportunity over austerity. I urge my colleagues to reject the Ryan budget and to support the budget offered by Mr. VAN HOLLEN and the House Democrats.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to a key member of the Joint Economic Committee, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. DUFFY).

Mr. DUFFY. I appreciate the gentleman for yielding.

I want to shed a little light on what has been discussed on the floor tonight, Mr. Chairman. We are hearing a lot of conversation about Medicare.

We have to be clear that, in ObamaCare, this was the largest health care reform bill this country had ever seen. It's going to spend \$2 trillion of deficit spending over the next 10 years. With that massive new health care reform bill, guess what? Medicare is going broke in 10 to 12 years. So with this great health care reform, they didn't have enough foresight to save our seniors' Medicare program, the program they've actually paid for over the course of their lifetimes. I think our seniors deserve better than what they've received in ObamaCare.

We hear a lot about what we've done with the \$716 billion in ObamaCare. Let's be clear between the two plans.

My friends across the aisle want to take \$716 billion of savings from Medicare—take that money out—and use it for a different set of people in ObamaCare. They want to use it for people who didn't pay for the program. On our side of the aisle, we want to take that savings and use it for our seniors—it's their money; they deserve to get it—and we use it to shore up the program. This makes sense.

You talk about facts and numbers, think back to what the President told us with regard to ObamaCare. He said, Listen, you're going to see your health care costs go down by \$2,500 a year per family of four. The truth? What happened? Health care costs went up by \$3,000 a year for a family of four. That's a \$5,500 turnaround for a family of four in his health care reform bill. Listen, that's a lot of money for hardworking American families.

Let's talk about what else has been discussed by my friends across the aisle.

□ 2010

If you recall the stimulus bill, a trillion dollars in spending, remember, we were supposed to spend a trillion dollars and get an unemployment rate by 2013 of 5.2 percent. Well, the reality is we're sitting at 7.7 percent. But if you add back in everybody who has stopped looking for work because they can't find it because this has been one of the longest and lamest recoveries since the Great Depression, it's actually up at 10 percent. Listen, these policies and these promises haven't worked for the American people.

Let's talk about taxes. We have a plan that will reform the Tax Code. It

will make it fairer, flatter, simpler, easier to use, and we root out the loopholes, take away the preferences and the exemptions. We get away from crony capitalism. A fairer code. You have a chance to vote for that kind of tax reform in our budget.

But let's compare that to what my friends across the aisle propose. Well, a trillion dollars in tax increases in ObamaCare, \$600 billion of tax increases in the fiscal cliff.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. I yield an additional 2 minutes to the gentleman.

Mr. DUFFY. And another \$1.2 trillion in this new proposal, for a total of \$2.8 trillion of new taxes. Mr. Chairman, we've seen this before. This is tax-and-spend liberalism at its finest.

I think the American people understand what has happened in this very slow recovery. This is a chart that the chairman showed earlier, but you see the growth rate and the red line of what we've seen in this recovery, and you see the average growth rate of other recoveries from other recessions. And the difference is 4 million jobs between this recovery and the average recovery. Well, that's 4 million families that don't have work, that aren't paying for food on the table and a roof over their head. These are real people and real families in places like central and northern Wisconsin that have been impacted by this economy.

As Chairman RYAN talks about, we have a choice of two futures, and my Democratic colleagues across the aisle want this massive debt and deficit to be the future for our children. We think there's a better way. We look at being responsible and paying off our debt in a way that's going to work, not just for this generation, but for future generations.

What are we doing? We owe \$17 trillion in debt. We borrow \$1 trillion every year, and there's no end in sight, and we're printing money to buy our debts. And you say keep going, keep printing, keep borrowing, keep spending. This is going to end well, you tell us, or you tell our American families. Give me an example of where printing, borrowing, and spending ends in economic growth, prosperity, wealth, or sustainable jobs.

Let's go back to fiscal responsibility. Let's live within our means in this country, pay down our debt, do what's responsible, and leave our children a brighter future.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, the Republican House budget merely shifts health care costs to families. It makes no attempt to bend the curve to lower health care costs, and the voucher program for Medicare will only mean that seniors will be paying more for health care, by some estimates as much as \$5,900 per person, and that's why the AARP and other independent organizations that track health care benefits for seniors are so opposed to it.

I now yield 7 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from the Great State of Maryland, ELIJAH CUMMINGS.

Mr. CUMMINGS. I want to thank the gentlelady for yielding.

Over the past 3 years, nearly 6 million new jobs have been added to the American economy, and the unemployment rate has fallen to 7.7 percent. Although this is real progress from where we were during the financial crisis inherited by President Obama, we can do far more to boost economic growth and continue to create jobs.

The American people deserve a budget that supports economic growth, responsibly reduces long-term deficits, and ensures equal opportunity for all. Chairman RYAN's recent budget does not satisfy any of these goals. Instead, it will slow economic growth, increase the unemployment rate, cut critical investments in our Nation's future, and harm our seniors, all while protecting the interests of the wealthiest Americans.

The Ryan budget would lower the top tax rate for the rich while hitting middle-class families with thousands of dollars in additional taxes every year. Nearly 30 million middle-income Americans would lose their health insurance because of the repeal of the Affordable Care Act, and tens of millions of the poorest would lose coverage because of Ryan's plan to gut Medicaid. We can do better.

It would destroy the commitments we've made to our Nation's seniors by turning Medicare into a voucher program. It would shift the rising costs of health care onto those very Americans who have already suffered deep financial shocks in the recent fiscal crisis. Many of them have lost their homes, lost their health insurance, lost their jobs, lost equity in their homes, lost their savings, and now the Ryan budget would break another promise to them.

In a fairly cynical move, the Ryan budget would repeal those provisions of the Affordable Care Act that would expand access to care, while keeping in place all the revenue generated by the act.

The Ryan budget also guts investments in science, education, infrastructure—all critical to job creation and economic growth, as well as to the future of our children. If you don't believe it, go talk to the doctors at NIH, the ones who worry about whether they'll be able to complete the research that they're doing. One that I talked to just a few days ago was telling me just a few years ago there were certain types of cancers that were deadly, and now because of the research at NIH, they're chronic. I don't know how you put a price tag on somebody's life.

This budget would reduce non-discretionary spending, including core social services that middle-class families rely on, by an additional \$700 billion over the next 10 years below the senseless cuts already required under the sequester.

And his plan, Mr. RYAN's plan, repeats past attacks on Federal employees by cutting the workforce by 10 percent over the next decade and requiring Federal workers to contribute an additional \$132 billion to their retirement plans.

To justify these proposals, the majority continues to argue that policies that support austerity, such as sequestration, will solve our fiscal problems and magically create prosperity for all. In fact, these stale theories will do nothing but harm hardworking Americans and our seniors, and that is why the American people resoundingly rejected this theory just this past November, not very long ago.

Last week, the Joint Economic Committee convened a hearing to examine constructive measures to stabilize our economy and decrease our long-term Federal debt. Testifying before our committee was Alice Rivlin, very well respected, who served as the founding Director of the Congressional Budget Office, Director of the Office of Management and Budget, and Federal Reserve Vice Chair. She explained that discretionary spending is not a driver of future deficits and that cutting discretionary spending would not slow projected increases in future Federal spending. Instead, Ms. Rivlin expressed concern that additional cuts at this time would have a restraining effect—those were her words—on our economic recovery, threatening to trigger a new recession. We can do better than that.

□ 2020

Similarly, the Federal Reserve Chairman, Ben Bernanke has warned many times over the past few years that pursuing deep cuts in the short-term will slow the rate of economic growth, bring down revenues, and actually lead to less deficit reduction overall. I didn't say that, Chairman Bernanke said that.

Certainly, I agree that Congress must act to put our fiscal house in order, but we must do this in a balanced manner that increases economic stability and certainty in the marketplace. To ensure economic growth, these policies must include a mixture of appropriate revenue increases and targeted spending cuts.

I don't think there's one Member of Congress that disagrees that we must cut spending, but we also must address our fiscal issues in a balanced way. And when we cut, we must cut as if we were the most skilled heart surgeon performing the most delicate operation on a critical patient so that the patient does not die.

To that end, Democrats have put forward a balanced approach to cut spending responsibly, increase revenues and create jobs, like Congressman VAN HOLLEN's plan and Senator MURRAY's plan, which achieve new significant savings by eliminating tax loopholes and cutting wasteful spending.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. I grant the gentleman as much time as he may consume.

Mr. CUMMINGS. At the same time, they continue critical investments in infrastructure, education, job training, innovation, all of which will help to strengthen long-term economic growth.

The fastest and most effective way to stabilize the economy and reduce deficits is to put Americans back to work. That is why we need to strengthen the fiscal policies that will support growth, rather than adopting policies that will destroy jobs.

Finally, the only path forward is for Democrats and Republicans to work together to draft a reasonable budget that offers hope and prosperity for all Americans, rather than tax cuts for the rich and crumbs to the rest.

I urge my colleagues to reject the Ryan budget so that we can craft a budget that works for all Americans.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

You know, we did have an interesting hearing in the Joint Economic Committee about the growth gap in America, about the thought and prospect that America's future growth could shrink by as much as a third, the damage it would do for families, to our economy, to our ability to pay our bills as a Nation.

And when we asked the four witnesses, all from different backgrounds and different philosophies, we asked them a simple question.

One, do you believe higher tax increases, more tax increases, would help the American economy today? Not one of them said it would.

And we asked them, what do we need to reassure our investors and put America back on a firm financial path? They all said, you need to act now on reforming Social Security and Medicare for the long haul.

And I said, so when is now? And they generally agreed by June or July. I mean, now.

The Republican budget does that. The Democrat budget ignores our problems, ignores the advice of four distinguished economists.

Earlier tonight a claim was made that some of the budgets are indifferent to the suffering of many. I want to address the suffering of many in today's America, under today's recovery.

Take a look at this. Since the bottom of the recession, the President often likes to boast that he has created over 6 million jobs along Main Street in America. But what he doesn't talk about much is that, in that same period, this Nation has forced over 8 million families on to food stamps, simply to have food on their table, simply to keep hunger from their door.

You are more likely, as a family under this recovery, to be forced to apply for food stamps than to actually walk into the door of a company that's offering you a job. That's not the sign

of a healthy recovery. That's the suffering that occurs under today's recovery that this President has led. That's the growth gap's impact on real people.

Let's take a look at families income, because that's so important to paying bills today, not just that you have a job, but, you know, are you getting ahead? Are you falling behind?

Look at this chart. This shows the growth gap and the impact on families. Up to this date, the worst economic recovery that we had since World War II, a family, by now, would have gained back almost \$2,000 in disposable income, real income they can spend. Under the best recovery, they would have almost \$5,000 in their pocket. Just average, middle-of-the-road, C-grade recovery, nothing to talk about, a family ought to have now over \$3,500 more gained back in their paycheck.

But look what they have—\$461, and that's all, in the last 3½ years. That's what they've gained back, \$10 a month. So more families are being forced to go on food stamps. Those who have jobs are going nowhere in this recovery.

Let's look at Wall Street. The Federal Reserve is printing money right and left, buying our own debt, buying up credit, allocating, picking winners and losers around this country, continuing to pour money into the system.

So what's happened?

Let's put that family income against the Wall Street income. In this economic recovery, look at Wall Street. Look at the Standard & Poor's total return, look how high it is. It continues to grow.

But look at Main Street. Look at a per-person income, where it's gone over the last 3½ years. Again, almost nowhere.

If you like this economic recovery, if you like the fact that, as Wall Street roars, Main Street families are left behind, then don't change anything. Continue higher taxes, more stimulus spending, borrowing every dollar it seems that we spend.

You'll leave the President's health care law in place, put new regulations on Main Street, and this is what we'll get more of, families that continue to fall further and further behind, families who are looking for a job, and they either drop out completely and give up working, or they're forced onto food stamps, families that watch Wall Street grow wealthier as they gain what, \$10 a month in their paycheck?

The Republican budget changes the course of not just our financial position as a country, it changes the course for our economy, adding immediately 1 percent growth, closing that growth gap here in this first year, adding more income, \$1,500 to a family, and over the next 10 years, doing dramatically more, both for families and the economy.

That's what the Republicans' budget is about. It's about changing the growth gap, closing it, and giving our families a fighting chance again.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY. I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from the

great State of Maryland, JOHN DELANEY, a new member of the Joint Economic Committee.

And may I inquire how much time remains on our side?

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman, prior to yielding the time, had 7½ minutes remaining.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank my friend and colleague from New York for yielding me this time. And I also want to thank my friend and colleague from Texas for his leadership on the committee.

Too often, Mr. Chairman, we talk about our budget in absolute terms, and we don't talk to the American people about what budgets really are, which are choices. As we go through each line item of revenues and each line item of spending, we tend to characterize these things in very dramatic terms, as if any change, up or down, on any line of revenue or any line of spending, would have catastrophic implications.

We don't have an honest dialogue with the American people about what budgets really are, which are choices and statements of priorities, which is why, in my opinion, this Congress, and the administration, have failed to recognize the two dominant themes facing our country and our world right now.

□ 2030

The first is the fundamental need to change the fiscal trajectory of this country across the long term, and the second is the need to invest in our future and our children to prepare them for a world that is fundamentally changed because of globalization and technology.

We cannot do these two things—we cannot change the fiscal trajectory of this country and we cannot make investments in our future and our children—unless we do two things: first, reform the entitlement programs in this country; and, second, take actions to raise revenues.

Last year, 13 percent of the American population was over 65. In 2030, 20 percent of the American population will be over 65. This singular fact dominates our whole discussion around our fiscal future.

Just to put this into perspective, if we don't change the trajectory of our entitlement programs, in 10 years they will consume 70 percent of our spending and literally crowd out every other priority we have as a country. And just to put this in a sharper focus, right now, as a country, if you add up all the spending at the Federal, State, and local level on Americans over 65, that number is \$27,000 a year. If you do the same math on Americans under 18, that number is \$11,000 a year. That is a 2½ to 1 ratio of statements of priorities that we are making in our budget.

Just to be clear, I don't come here thinking we should spend less on the elderly. I don't come here thinking that we should be cutting taxes. I actually think we should be raising taxes.

But we fundamentally have to change the trajectory of entitlement spending in this country if we want to invest in our future.

Prior to coming to Congress, I spent two decades in the private sector. I started and led two companies that became New York Stock Exchange listed companies and, in the process, created several thousand jobs. That experience taught me two important lessons: first, we have to look at the facts, always; and, second, we have to think about the future, and we have to plan for the future.

I have already talked about the facts. Now I want to talk a little bit about the future.

If we want to create good jobs and reverse some of the trends that the gentleman from Texas just talked about and demonstrated to us, we have to make investments in making this country more competitive. That is the fundamental issue facing our country right now, Mr. Chairman, is to make this country more competitive.

To do that we have to do several things:

First, we have to continue to invest and reform our educational system. There has never been a stronger correlation in our country's history between having a good education and getting a job.

Second, we need a national energy policy to ensure that we have clean and inexpensive energy across the long-term. If you look at the history of successful economies, the two most important numbers are the cost of money and the cost of energy.

Third, we have to reform our immigration system.

Fourth, we have to invest in our infrastructure.

To do these things requires investments. We will fundamentally not be able to make these investments unless we, as I said, reform our entitlement programs and raise revenues.

We are confronted with two choices in our budgets, and these are insufficient choices. The American people deserve better. On one hand, we have a choice where we don't recognize the reality of where the entitlement programs are going, and the other choice is we slash and cut the critical investments we need to make to have a future. We can do better.

Each party likes to take the high ground on a balanced approach, but what does that really mean? To me, a balanced approach means several things.

First, we need additional revenues through measures like the Buffett rule, by closing certain corporate tax loopholes while also lowering corporate tax rates. The Buffett rule levels the playing field, does not raise rates, but it makes sure that there is parity in terms of taxes that are paid; and it will do a significant amount towards closing the income inequality gap in this country, and it will produce more revenues. That is the first thing we have to do.

The second thing, we do need to reform on entitlement programs, and we should do four things. We should means test; we should raise the cap; we should change how the cost of living adjustment is calculated; and we should change the retirement age, not for people who do manual labor, but for everyone else. That is the second thing we need to do.

The third thing we need to do is we need to look at our discretionary spending and our defense spending, and we need to make these expressions of our priorities around our future. Some of that will require additions; some of that will require subtractions.

These are things we need to do to have a balanced approach. This is the choice that this Congress should have, an approach that invests in our future and changes the fundamental trajectory of our entitlement programs while taking care of those most vulnerable. That, to me, is a balanced approach.

I am proud to be a Democrat. I am proud to be a Democrat because of our historical fight for those left behind and because of our view that we have to invest in our future. I would like my party to lead on fundamental reform to these entitlement programs, and do it now, so we don't have to affect current beneficiaries or people who are close to being beneficiaries. I want to take those savings with additional tax revenues and invest it in our future, invest it in our children, invest it in making this country more competitive so that we can create jobs that have a good standard of living.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Chair, I am prepared to close, so I would be glad to reserve at this time so the former chairman of the Joint Economic Committee may close.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, the Democratic budget has its priorities in the right place. It puts people and jobs first. The Democratic budget makes the numbers work for everyone by taking a balanced approach that includes not only cuts, but badly needed revenue. And the Democratic budget has a vision for the future that aspires to have this country lead the world in education, energy, innovation, and quality of life. It makes investments, and that means it takes some risks. But it also is a budget that confidently proclaims we are still the country of big dreams, high ideals, and limitless opportunities for everyone who is willing to work hard, play by the rules, and do their fair share.

I support the Democratic budget, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to thank the former chairman of the Joint Economic Committee, Congresswoman MALONEY, for her leadership, and continue to enjoy working with you on these economic issues.

Tonight, we have talked a lot about the growth gap and about the prospect

that America's future could be much dimmer. The truth is fiscal challenges facing our Nation are great, but they are not insurmountable if we are willing to take the necessary steps, if we are willing to be less popular, willing to do the right thing. As I said in my opening statement, the single most important thing we can do for families for America to start paying its bills as a government is to take the restrictor plate off our economy.

This recovery is substandard, the weakest since World War II. The growth gap is large and growing. The private sector jobs gap is large and growing. The gap in personal income for families is large and growing. We are adding more people to food stamps than we are getting jobs since the bottom of this recession.

That is no way to build a strong middle class. It is a formula for making people more dependent on the Federal Government. That may be some people's vision of America's future, but not ours.

So, if we are to change the future economic growth of America upside, if we are to increase economic growth in jobs and income growth, we need to restore the promise of economic opportunity in optimism. That is what the Republican budget does. It shrinks the Federal Government where it is fat and wasteful, and it grows the economy in ways that Americans can prosper. That is why the Republican budget is pro-growth and includes pro-growth tax reform, and it is key to a new era of American prosperity. It is a responsible balanced budget, which I strongly support.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of the Budget Resolution, which balances the budget in 10 years.

We must get our fiscal house in order, and that starts with a plan to reduce spending responsibly—allowing to grow at 3.4 percent instead of 5 percent.

This budget cuts \$5.7 trillion in spending and reforms Medicare to save it for future generations while preserving the traditional model for those at or near retirement.

The Federal Government has to deal with the tough issues and make responsible decisions to restore balance.

I thank Chairman RYAN and the Budget Committee for supporting key transportation initiatives in the resolution.

Transportation specific provisions:

House Budget Resolution supports MAP-21 funding levels until it expires at the end of 2014. MAP-21 reformed our Federal transportation programs by eliminating unneeded programs, streamlining the project approval process, and putting the highway trust fund on sound financial footing through 2014.

The budget resolution acknowledges that maintaining the long term solvency of the Highway Trust Fund and the tradition of the fund being user fee supported is a priority for the Congress as it begins to work on reauthorizing MAP-21.

Budget also contains language supporting the innovative financing mechanisms for trans-

portation included in MAP-21 such as public private partnerships and the TIFIA program.

I look forward to working with Chairman RYAN and the Budget Committee, as we move the Nation toward fiscal responsibility and a growing economy.

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of the Path to Prosperity—our House plan to balance the budget in ten years, restore our economy and grow jobs. As Chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, I am particularly gratified to see this plan provide for our men and women in uniform and our national security by replacing deeply harmful sequestration cuts to our national defense with other commonsense reforms.

Since 9/11 our military has been operating at a very high operational tempo around the world keeping this country's citizens safe from those who seek to do us harm—from deadly attacks by al-Qaeda to the sabre rattling of Iran and nuclear provocations of North Korea. But back home as our economy slowed and our deficit rose, this Administration began to question our role in the world and called for substantial reductions to our national defense. While we agreed that everything should have been on the table in order to address this Nation's deficit spending, defense has represented only 18% of our national budget, while our military has absorbed 50% of the cuts to date.

Which is why it is so important today that House Republicans stand unified, both fiscal and national security conservatives, on the goal of replacing arbitrary, automatic across-the-board cuts to our military. This House Republican budget, as does its counterpart from the Republican Study Committee, provides \$560.2 billion in defense funding for fiscal year 2014. This is the amount my Committee called for in our views to Chairman RYAN, and an amount consistent with our military responsibilities. Over the next decade, we provide over \$6 trillion to fund our nation's defense. While this is significantly less than the levels in previous budget resolutions passed by the House, it is \$500 billion more than will be available under sequestration. It allows our military to execute the current national defense strategy and avoids the hollow force and unacceptable level of strategic and operational risk our commanders have warned us about in hearings before our Committee.

I want to thank Chairman RYAN for his unyielding dedication and belief in this country and in American exceptionalism. Absent his vision and absent this House budget, in just four short years, we will be paying more in interest on our debt than our national security. I urge members to support this budget and one of Congress's core constitutional responsibilities—to provide for our common defense.

The CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. DESANTIS) having assumed the chair, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 25) establishing the budg-

et for the United States Government for fiscal year 2014 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2015 through 2023, had come to no resolution thereon.

□ 2040

COMPETING BUDGETS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, thank you for the opportunity to address an empty House, but perhaps a few are watching C-SPAN.

We've just heard a fascinating 4-hour discussion on economic policy. A fundamental part of our work here in Congress is to set the economic policy for the United States. As we listened to that 4-hour debate and discussion, there were a lot of charts and a lot of economic theory on both sides: small government versus an active, investing government; the growth of taxes, or the lack thereof; a discussion about jobs and the like. I'd like to first start my discussion this evening on what we ought to be doing. That is the purpose of all of this.

I harken back to the 1930s, a period of time when the Nation was in a very serious Depression, unemployment was rampant, and there was a lot of pain and suffering throughout this Nation. Franklin Delano Roosevelt was the President at the time. Today, we are in a somewhat better situation, but still there's a lot of pain, a lot of unemployment, and a lot of families in desperate situations. Back in the thirties, Franklin Delano Roosevelt put forth his New Deal. He articulated—at least a part of it—with what I call "The Test." He said:

The test of our progress is not whether we add more to the abundance of those who have much; it is whether we provide enough for those who have little.

That's a value statement. That's a statement about how he saw the role of government, and I agree with him.

Our task here today, as we debate tomorrow and the next 2 days what the economic policy of America will be, we ought to harken back to what Franklin D. Roosevelt said in the 1930s: "The test of our progress." "The test of our progress."

What are we to do? Are we to follow policies that would enrich the wealthy even more? And we have one such proposal before us; it's the Ryan Republican budget. It would slash the top tax rate from 39 percent to 25 percent and add another quarter of a million dollars of income annually to those who are making over 400—or over \$1 million a year. I think that goes counter to what Franklin Roosevelt said:

The test of our progress is not whether we add more to the abundance of those who have much.