

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 11, noes 412, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 272]

AYES—11

Bartlett	Filner	Huelskamp
Clay	Garamendi	Johnson (OH)
Critz	Grijalva	Speier
Ellison	Heinrich	

NOES—412

Ackerman	Courtney	Heck
Adams	Cravaack	Heller
Aderholt	Crawford	Hensarling
Akin	Crenshaw	Herger
Alexander	Crowley	Herrera Beutler
Altmire	Cuellar	Higgins
Amash	Culberson	Himes
Austria	Cummings	Hinchey
Baca	Davis (CA)	Hinojosa
Bachmann	Davis (IL)	Hirono
Bachus	Davis (KY)	Holden
Baldwin	DeGette	Holt
Barletta	DeLauro	Honda
Barrow	Denham	Hoyer
Barton (TX)	Dent	Huizenga (MI)
Bass (CA)	DesJarlais	Hultgren
Bass (NH)	Deutch	Hunter
Becerra	Diaz-Balart	Hurt
Benishkeh	Dicks	Inslee
Berg	Dingell	Israel
Berkley	Doggett	Issa
Berman	Dold	Jackson (IL)
Biggert	Donnelly (IN)	Jackson Lee
Bilbray	Doyle	(TX)
Bilirakis	Dreier	Jenkins
Bishop (GA)	Duffy	Johnson (GA)
Bishop (NY)	Duncan (SC)	Johnson (IL)
Bishop (UT)	Duncan (TN)	Johnson, E. B.
Black	Edwards	Johnson, Sam
Blackburn	Ellmers	Jones
Blumenauer	Emerson	Jordan
Bonner	Engel	Kaptur
Bono Mack	Eshoo	Keating
Boren	Farenthold	Kelly
Boswell	Farr	Kildee
Boustany	Fattah	Kind
Brady (PA)	Fincher	King (IA)
Brady (TX)	Fitzpatrick	King (NY)
Braley (IA)	Flake	Kingston
Brooks	Fleischmann	Kinzinger (IL)
Broun (GA)	Fleming	Kissell
Brown (FL)	Flores	Kline
Buchanan	Forbes	Kucinich
Buechson	Fortenberry	Labrador
Buerkle	Fox	Lamborn
Burgess	Frank (MA)	Lance
Burton (IN)	Franks (AZ)	Landry
Butterfield	Frelinghuysen	Langevin
Calvert	Fudge	Lankford
Camp	Galleghy	Larsen (WA)
Campbell	Gardner	Larson (CT)
Canseco	Garrett	Latham
Capito	Gerlach	LaTourette
Capps	Gibbs	Latta
Capuano	Gibson	Lee (CA)
Cardoza	Gingrey (GA)	Levin
Carnahan	Gohmert	Lewis (CA)
Carney	Gonzalez	Lewis (GA)
Carson (IN)	Goodlatte	Lipinski
Carter	Gosar	LoBiondo
Cassidy	Gowdy	Loebsack
Castor (FL)	Granger	Lofgren, Zoe
Chabot	Graves (GA)	Long
Chaffetz	Graves (MO)	Lowey
Chandler	Green, Al	Lucas
Chu	Green, Gene	Luetkemeyer
Cicilline	Griffin (AR)	Lujan
Clarke (MI)	Griffith (VA)	Lummis
Clarke (NY)	Grimm	Lungren, Daniel
Cleaver	Guinta	E.
Clyburn	Guthrie	Lynch
Coble	Gutierrez	Mack
Coffman (CO)	Hall	Maloney
Cohen	Hanabusa	Manzullo
Cole	Hanna	Marchant
Conaway	Harper	Marino
Connolly (VA)	Harris	Markey
Conyers	Hartzler	Matheson
Cooper	Hastings (FL)	Hastings
Costa	Hastings (WA)	Matsui
Costello	Hayworth	McCarthy (CA)
		McCarthy (NY)

McCaul	Price (GA)	Shuler
McClintock	Price (NC)	Shuster
McCollum	Quayle	Sires
McCotter	Quigley	Slaughter
McDermott	Rahall	Smith (NE)
McGovern	Rangel	Smith (NJ)
McHenry	Reed	Smith (TX)
McIntyre	Rehberg	Smith (WA)
McKeon	Renacci	Southerland
McKinley	Reyes	Stark
McMorris	Ribble	Stearns
Rodgers	Richardson	Stivers
McNerney	Richmond	Stutzman
Meehan	Rigell	Sullivan
Mica	Rivera	Sutton
Michaud	Roby	Terry
Miller (FL)	Roe (TN)	Thompson (CA)
Miller (MI)	Rogers (AL)	Thompson (MS)
Miller (NC)	Rogers (KY)	Thompson (PA)
Miller, Gary	Rogers (MI)	Thornberry
Miller, George	Rohrabacher	Tiberi
Moore	Rokita	Tierney
Moran	Rooney	Tipton
Mulvaney	Ros-Lehtinen	Tonko
Murphy (CT)	Roskam	Towns
Murphy (PA)	Ross (AR)	Tsongas
Myrick	Ross (FL)	Turner
Nadler	Rothman (NJ)	Upton
Napolitano	Roybal-Allard	Van Hollen
Neal	Royce	Velázquez
Neugebauer	Runyan	Visclosky
Noem	Ruppersberger	Walberg
Nugent	Rush	Walden
Nunes	Ryan (OH)	Walsh (IL)
Nunnelee	Ryan (WI)	Walz (MN)
Hunter	Sánchez, Linda	Wasserman
Olson	T.	Schultz
Owens	Sanchez, Loretta	Watt
Palazzo	Sarbanes	Waxman
Pallone	Scalise	Webster
Pascrell	Schakowsky	Weiner
Pastor (AZ)	Schiff	Welch
Paul	Schilling	West
Paulsen	Schmidt	Westmoreland
Payne	Schock	Whitfield
Pearce	Schrader	Wilson (FL)
Pelosi	Schwartz	Wilson (SC)
Pence	Schweikert	Wittman
Perlmutter	Scott (CA)	Wolf
Peters	Scott (VA)	Womack
Peterson	Scott, Austin	Woodall
Petri	Scott, David	Woolsey
Pingree (ME)	Sensenbrenner	Wu
Pitts	Serrano	Yarmuth
Platts	Sessions	Yoder
Poe (TX)	Sewell	Young (AK)
Polis	Sherman	Young (FL)
Pompeo	Shimkus	Young (IN)
Posey		

NOT VOTING—9

Andrews	Giffords	Reichert
Cantor	Meeks	Simpson
DeFazio	Olver	Waters

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members have 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1655

So the motion to adjourn was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H. Con. Res. 34.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2012

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 223 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. 34.

□ 1655

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 concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 34) establishing the budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2012 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2013 through 2021, with Mr. TERRY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

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 and controlled by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY) 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. I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, earlier today we passed a continuing resolution that will ultimately save billions of dollars of taxpayer money. Today we are converting and switching this debate to now saving trillions of dollars.

Mr. Chairman, let me just begin by saying this: The spending spree is over. We cannot keep spending money we don't have.

The American people deserve the truth. They deserve an honest, fact-based conversation about this budget. We have got to get on to the days of no more budget gimmicks, timing shifts, accounting tricks. And we've got to get on to fixing our country's fiscal problems while we still can and while they're still within our control.

Mr. Chairman, specifically what our budget does is it cuts \$6.2 trillion in spending from the President's budget. It brings the government's spending as a share of our economy back down to where it historically has been, contrary to where the President is taking it.

Mr. Chairman, we do not have a revenue problem in Washington. The problem here today is not that people don't

pay enough taxes; the problem is Washington borrows and spends too much money.

This shows you where Washington is headed, where the President's budget goes, the path we are on.

Mr. Chairman, I am 41 years old. My wife and I have three beautiful kids who are 6, 7, and 9 years old. By the time our children are my age, the government will be twice the size it is today. When they're my age, double the government, double the taxes just to keep this current government afloat.

What we are really trying to do, Mr. Chairman, at the end of the day is fulfill the legacy that we have been given by our parents and by our predecessors in Congress. We're going to have a vigorous debate about how to do this. We're going to have a vigorous debate of our priorities and processes, and it's going to be emotional.

At the end of the day, this is what we are trying to do: We know, according to every fiscal expert out there, that we are giving the next generation a mountain of debt. So we have a choice of two futures, Mr. Chairman. Which future do you want your children to have? One, where the debt gets so large, it crushes the economy and it gives them a diminished future, a stagnant economy; or, two, this budget, using CBO numbers, that literally not only gets us on the way to balancing the budget but pays off our debt, gets our debt manageable, preempts and prevents a debt crisis, and fixes this so we can preserve this great legacy of giving the next generation a higher standard of living.

□ 1700

Now, Mr. Chairman, we had a speech yesterday from the President—not a plan, so to speak, but a speech. And unfortunately, I think the speech, which was a framework with no details, was really not about solutions but about partisanship.

I'm concerned, Mr. Chairman, that leaders here in town are more concerned about the next election than the next generation. I hope that that's not the case. I hope that leaders in this town change their tune so we can fix this problem, but it's going to require them to change their tune. We don't need good politicians; we don't need clever politics.

We need real leadership and real solutions to fix this country's problem because, Mr. Chairman, if we don't make some tough decisions today, our children are going to have to face much, much tougher decisions tomorrow.

I want to talk about one particular program, and I will yield myself 2 additional minutes to do that.

Medicare. Medicare is one of the most important programs we have; it's one of the most successful programs we have. Medicare is in trouble. Medicare is going broke. CBO tells us that in 9 years it has exhausted its trust fund.

We need to save Medicare. This budget doesn't change anything for anybody on Medicare now and within 10 years of retiring, and it saves the system for the next generation.

Contrary to what the President proposed yesterday, he wants to delegate more authority to 15 people on a bureaucracy that was created in his new health care law to do price controlling and rationing of Medicare for current seniors. He wants these 15 people—without a consent of Congress, just to do it directly—to impose more price controls and more limitations on providers, which will end up cutting services to current seniors.

We repeal this agency. We don't think Congress should be delegating this kind of power and authority to unelected people to make unilateral decisions on senior health care. So we preserve, protect, and save Medicare for current seniors and those 10 years away from retiring, and then I'll get into the details about how we save it for future generations.

Mr. Chairman, at the end of the day, this budget is about choices. We do four things. We want to grow the economy so we create jobs and have a climate for job creation with tax reform. We want to save the mission and preserve the mission of health and retirement security. We do that. We want to preserve our social safety net and make it more sustainable, more reliable, more adaptive, and more conducive to the 21st century and geared not toward keeping people on welfare, but getting people back on their feet and into jobs and careers to have flourishing lives. At the end of the day, Mr. Chairman, what it's really about is giving our children a debt-free Nation.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, everyone in this Chamber loves America and everybody in this Chamber wants to preserve the dynamism of this country and American exceptionalism. We also all agree that we have to reduce our deficits in a steady and predictable way. The question is how we do that, and we have very different views of how we should do that.

Later this evening and tomorrow, we will debate a Democratic alternative budget which will strengthen our economy, promote job growth, and decrease the deficit in a steady, predictable and responsible way, but the Republican budget is the wrong choice for America. I urge every American to read this budget because if you do, no amount of spin can hide the fact that this is a wrong turn for America. It is a yellow brick road for the already prosperous, but it's a dead end for the rest.

Just today, we had an analysis come out from the former economic adviser to JOHN MCCAIN when he was running for President, Mark Zandi, the chief economist at Moody's Analytics, who said that the Republican plan will cost

Americans 1.7 million jobs by the year 2014, with 900,000 jobs lost next year. And the Republican budget violates the warning from the bipartisan commission that we need to do the cuts and the deficit reduction in a responsible way.

The cochairs of the President's fiscal commission stated that the Republican budget "falls short of the balanced, comprehensive approach that we need for a responsible plan." They are absolutely right. It is not balanced; it is a totally one-sided approach to deficit reduction. Because when you sweep away all the soothing, sweet-sounding talk of reform, at its core this Republican budget is not bold. In fact, it's the same old formula of increasing tax breaks to the very wealthy in this country and to the special interests, like Big Oil, at the expense of the good of the rest of the country, except this time it's the same old plan on steroids.

We all know that to govern is to choose, and the choices made in the Republican budget are wrong for America. It is not bold to give tax giveaways to the oil companies and executive board rooms while slashing investments in our kids' classrooms, in scientific research, and in critical infrastructure for this country.

It is not courageous to provide additional tax breaks for millionaires while ending the Medicare guarantee for seniors and sticking seniors with the cost of the rising health care. It is not visionary to reward corporations that ship American jobs instead of products overseas while we terminate health care for tens of millions of Americans here at home. It is not brave to give Governors a blank check of Federal taxpayer money and a license to cut support for seniors and nursing homes, individuals with disabilities, and low-income kids on Medicaid. And it's not fair to give yet another tax break to the very wealthy and ask middle-income Americans to pay for it. Yet, if you read the Republican budget, those are the choices they make.

We ask, where is the shared sacrifice? We have American men and women putting their lives on the line as we speak in Iraq and Afghanistan while others hide their income in the Cayman Islands and Switzerland and refuse to pay their fair share to support our Nation. That is not right.

The pattern is clear: first you cut taxes for special interests and the very wealthy, and then mathematically what happens? Yeah, when you do that, the deficits go up. You drive up the deficit, and then you say, well, we've got to handle this—not by going back and asking the folks at the very top to do more, but by cutting investments for working families and violating our commitments to seniors and others.

Let me turn to the Republican plan for Medicare because what the Republican plan does is it ends the Medicare guarantee. It forces seniors to go into the private insurance market and have to deal with the rising costs of health

care that they face there, and the seniors have to eat that cost. And since the chairman raised this specifically in his opening statement, I would like to just take a look at this chart based on the numbers from the Congressional Budget Office—and the President did mention this in his speech yesterday.

What this shows is what happens to Medicare under the Republican budget versus current Medicare and how much of the increased cost will now be shifted to seniors instead of Medicare. As you can see, compared to current Medicare, senior citizens are going to have to pay more than \$6,000 on top of what they would have had to pay in the year 2022. And the problem gets worse and worse over time so that by the time you're out in the year 2030, you're talking about in the range of \$11,000 more paid by seniors.

□ 1710

Now, let me say this. One of the talking points we've heard from our colleagues on the other side of the aisle is, Don't worry, seniors, we're just giving you the same health care deal Members of Congress have.

That's not true. What Members of Congress have is what's called a fair share deal agreement, just as other Federal employees do and as many employees around the country do where the risk of rising premiums is shared.

So for every dollar increase in premiums, the Federal Government puts in 72 cents, thereabouts, and the Member of Congress or the Federal employee puts in the rest. But the point is, no matter how fast the costs go up, you share that risk equally. That's not what happens in the Republican plan.

There's much more to talk about, but let me just say that we welcome this debate. Fundamentally, this is a debate about choices for our country, and as the bipartisan fiscal commission said, the choice made in the Republican budget is not balanced and it is not comprehensive. We agree, and we should reject this budget.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds simply to say the gentleman is talking about Medicare. If he had read that CBO letter a little later, he would see it says that Medicare is on such an unsustainable path that there's no way it can sustain itself where it is.

So we're making comparisons to fiscal myths. We're making comparisons to futures that aren't going to exist. The greatest threat to Medicare is the status quo and those who cling to it.

I would also simply say the President yesterday said he wants this unelected board of bureaucrats to cut a trillion dollars out of Medicare. We don't want to see that happen.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS).

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I rise today to commend Chairman RYAN in

this effort to craft a sustainable and responsible budget proposal.

This budget represents a valiant effort to effect real change in the way Washington spends taxpayer dollars. This plan couples tangible spending cuts with the entitlement reform necessary to get our budget back into balance starting now and continuing into the long term.

This Republican majority understands that we must end the skyrocketing budgets of the last several years, and this budget reiterates our commitment to smart but limited government spending.

The resolution includes an annual discretionary spending level of \$1.019 trillion for next year, bringing us back to the fiscal year 2006 funding levels for non-security programs. This is a reduction of an additional \$31 billion from the level that we just passed in the CR.

Based on the experience we've just had in bringing the fiscal year 2011 budget to a close, this will present significant challenges to the Appropriations Committee and the body in the weeks and months ahead. It will not be an easy task, but I know that with the support of House Members, we will rise to that challenge.

In addition, while I commend the budget resolution for making such significant strides to rein in spending and address long-term budget challenges, I do have some concerns over various budget process changes that may have unintended consequences.

For example, the Appropriations Committee may be faced with challenges related to our emergency authority after May 31, the beginning of the hurricane season, due to limitations on the committee's ability to respond to natural disasters and other emergencies.

Along these same lines, there may be challenges related to the committee's flexibility to provide for additional funding—beyond expected needs—for the global war on terror and our military efforts overseas.

I look forward to working with Chairman RYAN and the leadership to address these as well as other process concerns as we go forward.

These matters aside, I applaud this budget proposal. It will help put us back on a path of sustainable spending, allow for job creation and economic growth, and help us make the right fiscal decisions for our Nation's future.

I thank the chairman for the time.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, the chairman of the committee mentioned the IPAB, and it is true that the President indicated yesterday that that is a mechanism for trying to reduce the rise in Medicare costs. The chairman said they repeal the IPAB, which we believe will result in higher Medicare costs, which will mean that seniors have to absorb an even greater amount of the increase.

With that, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the minority whip.

Mr. HOYER. I think at the beginning of this debate we need to put it in context. I know that I must bore my friends on the majority side of the aisle, but during my 30 years in this body, there have been essentially three economic programs adopted: One was in 1981 when we adopted what is referred to as Reaganomics. The second was in 1993 when we adopted the Clinton economic program. The third, of course, was in 2001 and 2003 when we adopted what was the Bush economic program.

During the first economic program, we ran up \$2.4 trillion of deficits. During the second, the Clinton economic program, which lasted for 8 years, we had \$62.9 billion of surplus over 96 months. \$2.4 trillion during the 12 years of the Reagan/Bush administrations, \$62.9 billion surplus during the Clinton administration, and then another \$2.8 trillion of deficits during the Bush economic program.

The reason I raise that as we begin is because I want to tell my friends, and I know we will tell our constituents, that the message that we hear today from my good friend, Mr. RYAN—for whom I have a great deal of respect. We have a disagreement, but I do not believe that he speaks with a forked tongue, if you will. He speaks what he believes—he first of all says, correctly, that we have a deficit problem that must be dealt with by us all, those of us who serve here and with those whom we represent. We must with courage, with honesty, and, yes, with discipline address this deficit. In order to do so, we must address all items of expenditures and revenues. Revenues, of course, are what we use to pay for things we buy.

Why did we run up deficits during the Reagan administration when one person could have stopped spending in its tracks, Ronald Reagan; or the George Bush, I, administration when one person could have stopped spending in its tracks? Because we bought more than we paid for—\$2.4 trillion worth.

During the Clinton administration, what happened? Well, we had divided government, we constrained spending, and we constrained cutting revenues so that we were able to pay for what we bought.

During the second Bush administration, we spent some \$2.4 trillion more than we paid for. Every American knows that if you do that, you're going to run deficits. That's how we got to that \$4.8 trillion of deficit because, as the gentleman today will argue, if we only adopt this program, we will bring down deficits, we will grow employment.

Well, that's the argument used in 2001 and 2003. You didn't do either. In fact, employment disappeared—the worst employment record of any administration since Herbert Hoover—so that the arguments that you made in 2001 and 2003 that this would magnify employment did not prove to be the case.

You also made the argument when you inherited a \$5.6 trillion surplus, according to George Bush himself, you said that we could cut revenues, increase spending, and, by golly, we would have growing employment and a surplus. We had neither. We had lost employment, the worst economy of any administration since Herbert Hoover, an almost depression-like response that was called upon by President Bush in his last year, and an exploding deficit.

□ 1720

So now we will debate between two perspectives. We will have a number on our side; you will have a number on your side. Now, I think at least two on your side. But basically, we adopt the premise on our side first of all you've got to protect the most vulnerable. You've got to make sure that we apply the resources that we have to make sure that every American is in a place where we want them to be in the richest country on the face of the Earth. We want to grow the economy and we want to bring the deficit down.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. HOYER. That will be the proposition on our side. Very frankly, I tell my friend from Wisconsin the premise on your side, in my view, has been consistently for the 30 years that I have been here, if you simply reduce revenues somehow magically the economy will recover.

When we adopted the Clinton program in 1993, not a single Republican voted for it, unanimous in your conviction that it would have an adverse effect because we raised revenues, as you will recall, on the upper 1 percent. In fact, of course, what happened is exactly the opposite of what you argued in 1993.

So in that context, as we have this budget debate, I hope the American public understands that if you repeat the same mistakes of the past you will be condemned to live in the same problems that were created then by those mistakes.

I urge my colleagues to listen to this debate very carefully. Listen to the debate of the consequences of the actions that are proposed on both sides of the aisle, and remember what happened when that rhetoric was carried to fruition.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I will just simply say we choose to reduce spending. And we don't reduce revenue; we reform the tax system.

With that, I would like to yield 2 minutes to a member of the Budget Committee and the Appropriations Committee, the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT).

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of Chairman RYAN's FY 2012 budget. For the first time in several years, this budget tackles our

fiscal reality and stops burying our collective heads in the sand. Let's start where we all agree: We are in dire financial trouble. But if we make some adjustments now, we will set our country on a long-term path of fiscal solvency. That's exactly what the Republican budget does.

President Obama and my friends on the other side of the aisle lament the lack of tax increases in our budget. First, let's remember that we already have a deeply progressive tax structure. The top 5 percent of earners pay 60 percent of Federal income taxes collected. Yet our President and my friends on the left want to tax them even more.

There seems to be a trifecta of economic strangulation under President Obama: increased regulation without congressional consent, skyrocketing energy prices and the doubling of gas prices, and now an attempt to increase taxes. How can businesses survive in this environment? We're not just talking about a precipice of fiscal solvency in our country; we're talking about the death of the American entrepreneur as we know it if we go down the path outlined by the President.

Thankfully, there is a better way, the only way. The Republican budget recognizes that we must end the relentless drive to seize wealth and redistribute it. This is an alternative to the class warfare tactics of the left that pits one American against another. The Republican budget is a fair, pro-growth plan rather than a punitive tax plan. Make no mistake, the budget includes tax reforms to simplify our Tax Code, broaden the tax base, create a more fair and equitable system that will provide certainty.

The Ryan budget reflects the most basic American principles. It provides for the strong defense of our Nation, ensures the safety net for our most vulnerable citizens remains solvent, and it gets government out of the way of the American free enterprise system and makes sure that entrepreneurs can survive.

The budget demands that we as leaders step up and make a choice between what's popular and what's right. I choose right.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, yes, we do ask the big oil companies to give up their taxpayer subsidies. And yes, we do ask the very top 2 percent of income earners in the country to go back to the same tax rate they were paying during the Clinton years when the economy was roaring and 20 million jobs were created, instead of the dramatic job loss we saw between 2000 and 2008.

With that, I yield 2 minutes to a distinguished member of the Budget Committee, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. This budget is just not my cup of tea. When the Republicans use the terms "modernize" or "reform," what they really have in mind is a four letter word: less—less re-

tirement security, less health security, less economic security.

This budget does not share the sacrifice. It focuses the pain on the young, on the very old, on those who are trying to climb up the economic ladder, or just barely prevent themselves from slipping backward.

"Fair and balanced," that's a most inaccurate media logo, but it's a spot-on description of the budgetary path we ought to be on. Our budget should be balanced, but not unfairly on the backs of those least able to bear it, like our elderly in nursing homes. It's troubling enough that this Republican budget demands even more tax cuts for those at the top and our largest corporations. But what's truly outrageous is that they seek balance by cutting the opportunity for our young people to get all the education they are willing to work for.

How can our economy be second to none when Republicans again and again turn to education to cut first? Nor can you fix this budget or make up revenue lost by squeezing so much out of those on fixed incomes. We need to be creating jobs with job training and education and infrastructure investment.

The size of our deficit, the level of our taxes, those are important, but they are not the sole lens through which the strength of America should be viewed. We want an America where the young have educational opportunity, where the not so young have the dignity of their old age, and a bigger middle class shares in the success of our country. To secure our long-term future, every American can give a little. But this unfair proposal asks little from those with much, and so much from those who have so little.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield myself 10 seconds to simply say, yeah, less spending, less government, less debt; more jobs, more prosperity.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to a member of the Appropriations and Budget Committees, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE).

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, we've heard it all before. In the 1990s, when Republicans proposed welfare reform, we were told that it was going to lead to poverty and starvation. Instead, it was the most successful poverty reduction program in modern American history. And when we pushed through Medicare part D over the opposition of our opponents, we were told that drug prices would go up and it was an unsustainable program. The reality is it came in 40 percent under cost for both the individual and for the government, something no other health care program has done. The reason why those two programs were successful were flexibility for States, choice, and competition for individuals.

I am proud to support the Ryan budget, the only serious budget proposal that either party has offered. Frankly, it's quite a contrast to what we heard yesterday, which was long on political

rhetoric and partisanship by the President and very short on specifics and solutions.

In Medicare, my friends won't tell you that nobody on Medicare is going to have anything other than the programs that they already enjoy, that there is no reduction for seniors in the near term, and that we actually make the changes that are necessary to protect and save the program for the long term. If we stay on the course that they currently advocate, there will be no Medicare for people in their twenties and thirties and forties.

The same thing's true with Medicaid. My friends on the other side of the aisle, frankly, forget that we are not the laboratories for innovation; the States are. We'll provide them with block grants, more flexibilities, more opportunity for change and innovation. We'll end up with a better program that actually protects more people.

So I urge my colleagues to support this budget. We know we're on an unsustainable path. Mr. RYAN has offered us an alternative. Sadly, my friends on the other side of the aisle and the President of the United States have not.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, the Medicaid program is one where the costs of health care have actually grown much more slowly compared to the growth in health care costs elsewhere. Cutting \$1.4 trillion out of an already stretched program is not a recipe for helping more people. It will definitely hurt those who depend on Medicaid. You are just giving Governors a blank check with no accountability.

With that, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. YARMUTH).

□ 1730

Mr. YARMUTH. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, we know that budgets are about values. As the chairman of the Budget Committee has mentioned, they are about choices.

And we know that this reckless Republican budget makes a very disastrous choice. It chooses to sacrifice the safety net of millions and millions of Americans in favor of millionaires and billionaires.

Every time we mention that, the other side says, class warfare. Oh, the Democrats are engaged in class warfare. Guess what, Mr. Chairman? That war is over. The wealthy class has won.

The wealthy class has already declared victory. That's why the 1 percent of income earners, the top 1 percent, now has as much wealth in this country as the bottom 90 percent. So when we are talking about what we can do to try and get our fiscal house in order, the idea that we would ask that 1 percent that has accumulated enormous wealth, the greatest disparity of wealth in the history of this country, to pay a little bit more, the Republicans say "no," that's class warfare.

Instead, they would rather cut security for seniors, for our students, for our struggling families, because millionaires and billionaires, left to their own devices, will make everybody's boat rise.

We have been down that road before, Mr. Chairman. We have seen what has resulted when that choice was made. This budget, when we asked for millionaires, people making a million dollars or more to pay a little bit more, to pay that 39.6 percent, the highest rate under the Clinton administration, the Republicans all said "no."

We can't even ask people making a million dollars or more to pay a little extra to help balance this budget. This is unbalanced, this is unfair. It doesn't call for shared sacrifices. It ends Medicare. And while the Budget chairman says, and I know he believes this, that he is trying to preserve Medicare for the next generation, he does nothing. The Republicans do nothing in this budget to make sure that the people who are now in Medicare, or somebody who is 56 or 57, is going to have that program 30 years from now, not one reform measure to help save Medicare.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to a senior member of the Budget Committee, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. PRICE).

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I want to commend you and all of my colleagues for their tremendous work that has been done on this budget. It's a bold vision for our country and a remarkable accomplishment. It's inspiring to have the opportunity to participate in this reform.

As we have heard many times over the past couple of weeks, to govern is to choose. Last year, as the Nation well knows, the choice by our friends across the aisle was to do no budget at all. The Democrats failed in perhaps their most basic responsibility.

Now continuing in this line of inaction, the President gave a speech yesterday with much preceding hype, but again the defining aspect of the speech was no plan. Our rudderless President decided to take the two biggest drivers of our national debt, Medicare and Social Security, and take them off the table. His solution to addressing health care costs is further empowering the Independent Payment Advisory Board to ration health care instead of dealing with structural reforms.

What this all means is that we have a stark choice, a choice of two futures. One future is the President's plan, the one in red here, Mr. Chairman, the plan by the House Democrats that's a path to national bankruptcy. The other choice is a Path to Prosperity, the green, that gets us on a path to a balanced budget.

It's time to address the American people in an honest and a factual manner. Let's face it. The American people are sick and tired of Washington's gimmicks and empty promises, and the Path to Prosperity is a bold vision for

the future which relies upon facts, not dishonesty.

As a physician, I could tell you that ObamaCare is a threat to the affordability and accessibility and quality of health care, all the principles that we hold dear in American medicine.

The facts are that ObamaCare is a violation of these principles, and it takes away choices from patients and doctors while saddling workers and job creators and taxpayers with trillions of dollars in costs.

So, we completely repeal and defund ObamaCare. Further, we will save and preserve Medicare for future generations by providing commonsense solutions so that folks have essentially the same kinds of health care choices that Members of Congress have. It's imperative that people recognize that no changes are made that would affect those in or near retirement.

Now many folks on the other side of the aisle would rather bury their heads in the sand and ignore the reforms that need to be made to Medicare. The President has even decided to take it off the table, but the facts are that the current Medicare spending is growing at a rate twice as fast as the Nation's economy.

Ten thousand baby boomers are reaching retirement age every single day. As a physician, when I talk to Medicare patients in my district back home, they tell me that they can't even find a doctor who is taking new Medicare patients.

The system is broken and unsustainable. The status quo is unacceptable. By completely repealing and defunding ObamaCare and by saving Medicare, we advance this Nation in a positive direction, a Path to Prosperity.

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

In the Republican budget, I want to make it clear, they took some of the savings that we gained through Medicare reform last year. We gained those savings by ending the overpayments to some of the Medicare Advantage insurance companies that were being overpaid compared to others. They demagogued it when we did it, but they kept that in their budget, but they got rid of our initiative to close the prescription drug doughnut hole for seniors.

So if you pass that budget, the moment it passes, there goes the big doughnut hole all opened up again because they took the money but didn't keep our effort to close the doughnut hole.

With that, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. HONDA).

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

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this Frankenstein monster of accounting that the Republicans call a budget. The Republican

budget, endorsed by every member of the Republican Conference, from JOHN BOEHNER down to the rank and file, has two goals: One, end Medicare, and, two, provide hundreds of billions in tax cuts to the rich.

A lot will be said about these two things by my colleagues, so I want to discuss some of the more dangerous cuts that may not make it to the front page of USA Today, but will still hurt every working family and their children. If you look at this chart beside me you will see that in the red that the Republicans provide the rich with \$800 billion, with a B, in tax cuts over the next 10 years.

How do they pay for this spending? On the backs of working families and children.

We will show you charts that are very explicit with details. You will see other charts that may not be very explicit. But right here we show you the cuts to vital services to our people. The column on our right shows the cuts to every American in this country that needs day-to-day services, things like roads, access to health care and, above all, great schools for all our children. The Republican budget is nothing short of a disaster for our children.

I am a classroom teacher, and I should know. The Republican budget cuts over a quarter of funding for education. This Republican budget cut means huge cuts for Head Start. This is the Republican budget paying for tax cuts for the rich on the backs of 1 million poor children. The Republican budget means huge cuts for K-12 education. This is how the Republican budget pays for tax cuts for the rich—on the backs of 20 million elementary and secondary students.

The Republican budget means huge cuts to Pell Grants to help working class kids pay for college and secure the American Dream. This is how the Republican budget pays for tax cuts for the rich—on the backs of 9 million college students.

In short, the Republican budget requires heavy sacrifices for everyone except the richest Americans and the richest corporations. It's like the billionaire CEO who cuts a thousand jobs and gives himself a bonus. This is not right.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. STUTZMAN).

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

Mr. STUTZMAN. Mr. Chairman, we are 1 day away from Tax Day, and I believe that this is an appropriate time to be talking about the budget for our country. Many folks back in Indiana and across this country are talking about how they are going to meet the demands of their budget.

I believe that this is a jobs bill. There is a lot of talk on this House floor about what are we doing about American jobs. I believe that this is the jobs bill of this Congress.

We hear a lot from the other side of the aisle that we are going to revise and reform Medicare as we know it. Well, folks, we are facing \$14.2 trillion of debt right now. We are facing a \$1.6 trillion deficit in the current budget. Just as many families in Indiana and across this country do with their family budget, when the bottom line hits red, they start to make changes.

□ 1740

We have to start controlling spending. I would encourage every American to read this budget. This budget bravely saves \$6.2 trillion over the next decade. It also calls to simplify the Tax Code and lower the rates for individuals and businesses. This budget not only stops the growth in government, it actually grows the economy and starts to create jobs.

Furthermore, we eliminate hundreds of duplicative programs, ban earmarks, and curb corporate welfare. In addition to the trillions in savings, this budget will put our Nation on a sustainable path, keep the sacred trust of our seniors, and presents to the American people real leadership in the absence of any from our executive branch. If you look at the President's budget, his budget proposes \$9.1 trillion of new debt over the next decade.

Let's talk about job creation. As a small business owner from Indiana, I don't need government to take more money away from the people that live in Indiana who are working hard. Let them keep that money so they can apply it to their businesses in order to grow jobs and grow the economy. There's no reason for more of our dollars to come to Washington, D.C., and be redistributed through our government.

Mr. Chairman, I ask the people of this Congress to support this budget.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, we agree that you've got to make cuts. We just think you need a balanced approach where you also deal with the revenue side. And because yours doesn't deal with that piece at all, that's why the fiscal commission said it was unbalanced and lacked the comprehensive solutions that we need.

With that, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from Pennsylvania (Ms. SCHWARTZ).

Ms. SCHWARTZ. For decades, Medicare has been a lifeline for older Americans, providing quality and affordable health coverage to all seniors in this country. The creation of the Medicare program in 1965 addressed the fundamental challenge of ensuring aging seniors access to essential health care. Before Medicare, almost half of all seniors over 65 had no insurance at all. Seniors were just not a good risk for private insurers, and they still aren't.

Medicare is a promise to American seniors that we would not abandon them even as they age, even as they need medical care—until now. The Republican budget will end Medicare as we know it, offering a limited voucher

and expecting seniors to find insurance no matter how sick they are or how expensive it is.

Every day, 48 million elderly and disabled Americans count on Medicare for their lifesaving medications, doctor visits, and hospital care. Seniors know that changing Medicare to a voucher program means they will no longer have access to a guaranteed set of health benefits. Seniors know that privatizing Medicare means limits on benefits; obstacles to care; and uncertain reimbursements, copayments for primary care and specialty care; exclusions for certain services; discrimination based on income, illness or age; and uncertainty if serious illness or need for long-term care occurs. Seniors know that privatizing and voucherizing Medicare will mean that they pay more in premiums or do without.

And it doesn't end there. The Republican budget also threatens Medicaid for nearly 6 million disabled and frail elderly who depend on it for their nursing home and home health services.

American seniors are not looking for handouts. They're looking for the security that they have earned and we have promised.

Budgets are about choices. In this very same budget where Republicans end Medicare as we know it, they protect billions of dollars in tax subsidies to the oil and gas industry. They protect billions in tax breaks to the wealthiest 2 percent of Americans.

Budgets are about our priorities and our values. Yes, we should get serious about our deficit. But let's get our priorities right and not threaten our obligation to our seniors, our children, and our future.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds simply to say the only part of this budget that mentions oil is that we want to drill for it in our own country so we can actually lower gas prices and get ourselves off foreign oil.

The second point I would simply say, Mr. Chairman, is this budget saves Medicare as we know it. The President is proposing to ration Medicare as we know it.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I would like to yield 2 minutes to the chairman of the Financial Services Committee, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS).

Mr. BACHUS. I thank the chairman.

Imagine that you are on the bank of a river. It's deep in winter. It's a peaceful scene. You look out on the river, and it's frozen. There's a deep current of cold water under the ice. But then you see a small child, and he is walking out onto the ice. He doesn't fall, and he walks further out. You begin to warn the child, but he walks further out. As we know, the ice gets thinner the further out we go. And we are on that ice today as a country, and every day we take one step further out. And tragically, the young child falls through the ice and is swept away.

That's what we're here to talk about. We're here to talk about the repeated warnings that we've received.

Chairman Bernanke told us just last week that unless we act immediately in a long-term way, we will not have economic growth nor will we have financial stability.

The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Admiral Mullen, told us that the greatest threat to our economy and to our national security is our debt.

The IMF yesterday—this is unthinkable. They said of all the advanced countries in the world, our debt was growing the fastest, it was unsustainable, and it would lead to instability both here and across the world.

Now, imagine those pictures of countries where the children are in economic distress where there's no stability. Those could be our children. Those could be our grandchildren. So with the warning today is a vote for our children and our grandchildren. We've heard the warning. We're not children. Let's save our children and grandchildren from that fall through the ice.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, we share the gentleman's concern and view. As I said, the question is not whether we reduce the deficits but how we do it and the choices we make in the process.

With that, I yield 2 minutes to Mr. BLUMENAUER, the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. The chair of the Budget Committee is a friend of mine, a man of sunny disposition, but he has helped shepherd to the floor of the House the most profoundly negative view of America's future that I have heard in my 15 years in Congress. They cannot reform Medicare, so they dismantle it for 230 million Americans who will be shifted to higher costs and given a voucher to insurance companies.

It will, in fact, according to independent analysts, increase overall health care costs for all America while it reduces some of the burden for the Federal Government. It doesn't deal with the reform of the military. It turns an opportunity for tax reform to more tax benefits for those who need it the least.

Their America and their budget cannot afford to improve our fraying infrastructure, and, in fact, envisions a massive \$100 billion cut, according to the CBO. It will shortchange environmental protections and make college education more expensive for our young people.

The Democratic alternative that you will hear will provide progress with some hard decisions, but by having shared sacrifice, by not giving up on health reform but by moving forward with it, to provide infrastructure investment and educational support.

Mr. Chairman, this is an opportunity, and we welcome people looking at independent appraisals of the visions of America: one which basically gives up and forces the costs on middle income, elderly, poor and children; the alter-

native is to invest in our future in a responsible fashion, making some hard choices, to be sure, but with the opportunity to reform areas like the military, like health care, and like the tax system.

Things that America has done in the past we think America can do in the future.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER).

Mr. SHUSTER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Yesterday, President Obama had an opportunity to put forth a serious budget proposal, but instead, again, he called for higher taxes and trillions of dollars in spending we just can't afford.

□ 1750

The President offered nothing but lip service to serious spending cuts and real reform. We can't tax our way to prosperity or ignore the unsustainable future of Medicare and Medicaid. The President's plan fails to recognize that Washington has a spending problem, not a revenue problem. This is a time that demands leadership, and the President answered with a plan to nowhere.

Today, the House is debating a serious budget that will address our dangerous debt and deficit while strengthening Medicare and Medicaid. The President missed another opportunity to engage in this debate in a meaningful way. He chose, instead, to deliver a campaign speech, filled with class warfare and scare tactics, hoping the American people wouldn't know any better.

He was wrong.

Mr. Chairman, before I came to Congress, for 12 years, I was in business, and there were two things I learned in business: One, if you spend more than you take in, you're headed towards financial ruin. Second, if the government continues to take away more and more from small businesses, they won't create jobs; they will eliminate jobs. This budget deals with those two fundamental issues.

The American people are demanding real change and an honest budget with no gimmicks, and that is what Chairman RYAN has produced. This week, the House is going to deliver for future generations by putting our government on a path to fiscal responsibility and prosperity.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from Minnesota (Ms. MCCOLLUM).

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Thank you.

Mr. Chairman, contrary to what Republicans have said on the floor, the Republican budget will impose new cuts on today's seniors.

The Republican plan repeals the Affordable Care Act, which strengthens Medicare and reduces costs. For seniors on Medicare today, the Republican plan brings back the doughnut hole, forcing seniors to pay more for their

prescription drugs. It repeals seniors' free annual checkups and gets rid of reforms to better manage their chronic conditions. The Republican plan eliminates Medicare altogether and, instead, hands seniors vouchers and kicks them into the black hole of health insurance.

All Americans, pay attention. If you're 54 and younger, you've been put on notice. Start saving now. In addition to saving for your retirement, you'll need to save for the new out-of-pocket expenses your health care will incur.

The nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office estimates seniors will be forced to pay an additional \$6,000 a year on health care—that's \$12,000 for a couple—which is the best case scenario seniors can expect. The plan in front of us tonight begins to double out-of-pocket spending for seniors, and it's only going to increase from there.

When you dig a little deeper, you realize that more than half of the Medicare beneficiaries today have five or more chronic conditions. What awful choices will seniors be forced to make when their health care costs are greater than their vouchers? Will they be able to afford their diabetes care? Will they be able to afford to go to their doctors for colonoscopies or mammographies?

It seems to me that the only seniors who will benefit from the Republican proposal will be senior insurance executives.

Vote "no" on the Republican plan. Vote "no" in order to protect and save Medicare.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute to simply say, if the gentlelady had taken the time to read the CBO report, it's not a voucher program. In a voucher program, the money goes to the people, and then they go to the market. It's a premium support program.

What does this look like?

It looks just like the plan that you and I have as Members of Congress and that all Federal employees have. It works like the prescription drug benefit, which has come in 40 percent below cost. More to the point, it saves Medicare. It applies to people 54 and below, and it occurs in 2022. Guess what happens 2 years before that under the status quo? Medicare goes bankrupt.

We want to prevent Medicare from going bankrupt. We want a system that's sustainable. We want a system that's solvent and that people can rely upon: guaranteed coverage options just like we have in Congress. That's what we are proposing.

More to the point, what we are opposing is delegating to 15 people the ability and the power to ration over \$1 trillion of Medicare against current seniors. We repeal that. The President proposes that. That's the big difference between us.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER).

Mr. GARDNER. I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to support this fiscally responsible budget plan.

For the past few weeks, Congress has been occupied, arguing over a continuing resolution because the previous Congress failed to put in place a spending bill for this year. We cannot afford to make the same mistakes that they did in the last Congress. We are facing a record \$1.6 trillion deficit, a \$14 trillion debt, and we need a plan to get spending under control—a plan, not a campaign speech and not partisan bickering. We've taken positive steps in the right direction. However, we must move from saving billions to saving trillions, and this budget will let us do just that.

At the same time, we must fulfill our promises to our constituents and pass policies that will spur job creation and economic growth to strengthen and preserve Medicare and Medicaid. The proposed budget would create nearly 1 million new private sector jobs next year. Additionally, according to the studies, it would bring the unemployment rate down to 4 percent by 2015. It would spur economic growth by increasing the GDP by \$1.5 trillion over the next 10 years. It does this by creating a less burdensome Tax Code for families and small businesses and by incentivizing job growth and investment.

We will get out of debt only when we focus on pro-growth policies and budget-tightening plans. This plan will do that by reforming Medicare and Medicaid to ensure that those programs are still available for our children. It is the safety net that we have promised. Without reform, those programs are unsustainable and will cease. The plan we will vote on tomorrow represents a fundamental shift in how the government does business—a shift back to fiscal sanity. The budget proposal saves \$6.2 trillion compared to President Obama's plan. If a person spent \$1 million a day, every day, since the first day of year 1 A.D., he still would not have spent \$1 trillion by today. We will save six times that amount in 10 years.

Mr. Chairman, I was taught a valuable lesson as a kid. If you weren't responsible with your allowance, you didn't get it again. No taxes. Save money.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I just want to go back to the point that was raised again with respect to what Members of Congress have in terms of health insurance plans. We have what's called a "premium support plan." The idea behind a premium support plan is that the employer and employee share the premium, and the employer—in this case, the U.S. Government—pays a certain percent. I have right here the Federal Employees Health Benefits Program handbook, and it reads: The government's share of premiums paid is set by law.

So Members of Congress have protected themselves by law. For most employees, the government contribution equals the lesser of 72 percent or

75 percent of the total premium for the particular plan. In other words, the Member of Congress/Federal employee has 72 cents for every premium dollar paid for. Whenever premiums go up, 72 percent of the cost of that premium is picked up by the government.

The Republican plan gives seniors a raw deal. It does not give seniors the deal that Members of Congress give to themselves, and that should be put to rest right now. Just look at the Federal Employees Health Benefits Program handbook.

With that, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from Florida (Ms. CASTOR).

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Chairman, the vote on the Republican budget is one of the most important votes that I and my colleagues will cast as Members of Congress. The vote will tell the story of two distinct visions for America: how we reduce our debt, our economic future, and what we value as Americans.

The Republican plan to destroy Medicare, to replace it with a voucher system, and to saddle our older neighbors and hardworking families with nearly the entire burden of reducing the Federal deficit betrays our American values. Medicare has allowed our parents and grandparents and our older neighbors to live in dignity in their retirement years. Medicare has kept families out of poverty for decades. It has worked well. With the baby boomers coming, we need to be mindful of necessary reforms.

The Republicans should not use these difficult economic times as a reason to destroy Medicare. After all, the Republican plan will not save any money. It will simply shift the cost to older Americans and their families. The non-partisan Congressional Budget Office released an analysis, which reads: In 2022, with an increase of nearly \$7,000 per year, the Republicans would double the cost per person. Not \$1 of that increase in beneficiary cost goes to reducing the deficit. It all goes to cover the higher costs of private plans that the Republicans would force you to join.

□ 1800

The President said yesterday this debate over budgets and deficits is about more than just numbers on a page. It is about the kind of future that we want. It is about the kind of country that we believe in, and I agree. Each one of us deserves some basic measure of security and dignity. He said that we recognize no matter how responsibly we live our lives, hard times or bad luck or a crippling illness or a layoff may strike any one of us. There but for the grace of God go I.

And let me say, back home in Florida under this Republican plan to end Medicare, life will be very different. We need to reject this pessimistic Republican plan. On this most important vote, I urge my colleagues to save Medicare and keep the promise of health security and dignity for older Americans.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Let me say a couple of things. Let's look at current law that was passed here not too long ago, the President's health care law. We've all done town hall meetings where people have said: Why do you keep raiding the Social Security trust fund? Stop the raid of Social Security. We agree; that was wrong. We shouldn't have done it, and now we're out of surplus.

Well, guess what, the current health care law raids Medicare. The current President's health care law takes \$682 billion out of Medicare to spend on the ObamaCare entitlement. We're ending the raid of Medicare. We're making sure that those savings go to making Medicare solvent. It only gets it to 2021.

More to the point, Mr. Chairman, we believe that seniors should be in charge. We believe that the best way to make Medicare better is to give seniors more choices. Give them the ability to make choices and have providers compete against each other for their business.

Here's the difference: The President wants 15 people to make the choices in Medicare. We say let 40 million seniors have choice, have power, and have those providers compete against each other for their business so they're in charge of their Medicare.

The President's law, the law today, has him appoint 15 people to ration Medicare, and Congress can't even do a thing about it. Their decisions go right into law. That's the future of Medicare under the current law. The President said, let's throw another trillion on top. So here's what happens: When the President is coming up with a need for more savings, what does he do, he calls up his Medicare rationing board and says, go find another \$480 billion.

That is not the future we want for Medicare. There's a difference between us. We don't want to have government ration health care. We want people to be in charge of their own health care.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. YODER). The Committee will rise informally.

The Speaker pro tempore (Mr. TERRY) assumed the chair.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Secretary of the Senate is directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate failed to agree to the resolution of the House (H. Con. Res. 35) entitled "Concurrent Resolution directing the Clerk of the House of Representatives to make a correction in the enrollment of H.R. 1473."

The message also announced that the Secretary of the Senate is directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate failed to agree to the resolution of the House (H. Con. Res. 36) entitled "Concurrent Resolution directing the Clerk of the House of Representatives to make a correction in the enrollment of H.R. 1473."