

Science estimates that the Ryan budget would cut civilian research and development by \$92 billion from the current baseline and \$112 billion below the President's budget request.

These are striking reductions. Please keep in mind that the National Science Foundation's total annual budget is just over \$7 billion. The Republican budget cuts more research and development funding every year than the entire annual budget of the National Science Foundation.

This is insanity. My colleagues on the other side of the aisle have truly divorced themselves from reality if they think these cuts to research and development won't cripple our country for decades to come.

Let's talk about what the Republicans want to cut.

It is estimated that technological innovation has led to the majority of America's economic growth since World War II. Much of this innovation has been funded by the Federal Government.

Think back to the first grants that NASA gave Robert Noyce's upstart company in the 1960s. Of course, he went on to be the founder of Intel, the largest computer chip maker in the world. Or think of the NSF research grant that led to the creation of Google. The very Internet itself was initially funded as a research project by the Department of Defense and rolled out by the National Science Foundation.

You can look at virtually every aspect of our high-tech industry and the economy and find a connection to Federal research and development funding. To make dramatic and drastic cuts to R&D funding in the name of deficit reduction is truly shortsighted.

My friend and former CEO of Lockheed Martin, Norm Augustine, frequently gives the following analogy. When an airplane is overloaded and too heavy to fly, you don't cut weight by chopping off the engines. I think that is a great analogy, because that is exactly what this budget does. It cuts off the engine of American innovation.

It would be bad enough if these deep cuts only affected research and development, but the Ryan budget will also painfully cut education funding. Indexed for inflation, that budget would cut hundreds of billions of dollars from precollege and college education programs.

Let's put these education cuts in context.

In the last international student assessment, U.S. students ranked 26th in mathematics and 21st in science. We are falling behind our economic competitors in STEM education. The Republican solution to this problem is to throw in the towel. These educational cuts sell our children out, plain and simple.

Taken together, the cuts to research and education in this Ryan budget paint a dark picture of America's future. It is a picture where America no

longer leads the world in innovation. It is a picture where our children are not prepared for the rigors of a competitive 21st century global marketplace. It is a picture of America in decline.

I reject this future. I call upon my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to reject the Ryan Republican budget that sells America short and, instead, show support for robust education and research funding and a strong American future.

CONGRESSIONAL BLACK CAUCUS BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. JEFFRIES) for 5 minutes.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the Ryan Republican budget and in support of the alternative budget plan that has been submitted by the Congressional Black Caucus.

The CBC budget is an effort to take a balanced approach to deficit reduction; the GOP budget balances itself on the backs of children, college students, working families, middle class folks, senior citizens, the poor, the sick, and the afflicted.

The CBC budget would move America forward; the GOP budget would take us backward.

The CBC budget is designed to create progress for the greatest number of Americans possible; the GOP budget is designed to promote prosperity for the few.

As we engage in this budget debate, we should be here on the floor of the House of Representatives trying to find ways to promote the American Dream for the middle class and for those who aspire to be part of it. Instead, the Ryan Republican budget is a nightmare for far too many Americans.

My good friends on the other side of the aisle, Mr. Speaker, may suggest that when we use language such as that, it is hyperbole. Let's examine what the Ryan Republican budget actually does, because I believe, when you put it to an evidence-based analysis, one can come to no other conclusion than it will result in a nightmare for far too many Americans.

The Ryan Republican budget would cut more than \$125 billion in food and nutritional assistance for food-insecure Americans. In this great country of ours, the richest in the world, there are more than 50 million Americans every day who wake up hungry and food insecure. Approximately 16 million of those hungry Americans are children. Yet the Ryan Republican budget would cut \$125 billion in assistance to these Americans. That is a nightmare.

The Ryan Republican budget would also cut approximately \$260 billion in funding for higher education, essentially robbing the capacity of so many younger Americans to pursue the American Dream of getting a college education.

In this country, there is already more than \$1 trillion in collective stu-

dent loan debt. That is more than \$1 trillion. That reality, Mr. Speaker, means that so many younger Americans have an inability when they graduate from college to purchase a home, to start a family, to create small businesses. We are robbing these Americans of a viable future. And \$260 billion in cuts to higher education funding, it seems to me, is a nightmare for younger Americans.

The Ryan Republican budget would also cut \$732 billion from Medicaid. Almost two-thirds of the recipients of Medicaid are actually seniors, the sick, the disabled, and the afflicted. Don't believe this caricature that people like to create as it relates to Medicaid. Seniors, the sick, the afflicted, and the disabled benefit from Medicaid, and the Ryan Republican budget would cut \$732 billion over a 10-year period from this vital social safety net program? That is a nightmare for the American people.

□ 1045

So this is not hyperbole. Unfortunately, this is reality.

I would urge my colleagues to take a real close look at the Congressional Black Caucus alternative, a fair and balanced alternative, a budget that would invest in job training and education, invest in transportation and infrastructure, invest in research and development, invest in technology and innovation, invest in the American people and our future.

That is why I am urging a "no" vote on the Ryan Republican budget and a "yes" vote on the CBC alternative.

WHAT YOU DON'T KNOW CAN HURT YOU

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. AL GREEN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it is said that what you don't know won't hurt you. What you don't know won't hurt you. I disagree.

What you don't know about health care can hurt you. What you don't know about a treatable condition that can harm you, possibly kill you, what you don't know about it can hurt you.

I don't believe in the idiom, the adage, what you don't know won't hurt you. I believe you should know the truth because the truth can set you free.

So let us take a moment now and look at just one aspect of what is called the Ryan budget. Let's look at health care. The Ryan budget repeals the Affordable Care Act. It repeals it without replacing it.

What you don't know can hurt you. But if you know the truth, it can liberate you. We need to get the truth to the masses so that the masses can understand the impact of repealing without replacing.

Let's reflect upon 2009, when we embarked upon the task of developing an Affordable Care Act. In 2009, we were spending \$2.5 trillion per year on

health care. \$2.5 trillion is a very large number, and it is difficult to get your mind around it. However, \$2.5 trillion is \$79,000 a second. \$79,000 a second is what we were spending.

17.6 percent of the GDP, \$100 billion being spent on persons without insurance in various venues, emergency rooms, and other places. It was projected that by 2018 we would spend \$4.4 trillion per year.

Know the truth. It can liberate you.

\$4.4 trillion is \$139,000 per second; estimated that it would be about 20.3 percent of GDP.

In 2009 we had 40 to 50 million people uninsured, depending on who is counting and how you count. In 2009 we had 45,000 people per year dying because they didn't have insurance. This is per Harvard University. One person dying every 12 minutes.

In 2009, in the State of Texas we had 6 million people uninsured, and 20 percent of the children in the State of Texas uninsured.

We had to do something about health care if, for no other reason, to simply bend the cost curve. And the cost curve is bending. It is projected that, in the first 10 years, it would bend the cost curve about \$100 billion, and in the next 10 years, \$1 trillion.

Know the truth, and the truth can liberate you, my dear friends. The truth is this: if the Ryan budget repeals the Affordable Care Act and it is not replaced—and there is no replacement provision in that budget—seniors who are on Medicare are going to see the doughnut hole expand rather than close.

The doughnut hole is that point at which seniors have to pay more for prescription drugs, more than many can afford. What you don't know can hurt you, seniors, when the doughnut hole starts to expand.

The budget would cause those who are 26 years of age, under 26 years of age, who are on policies of their parents, to come off.

Young people are invincible until they have an accident and get hurt and need health care. They are invincible until they find out they have a condition that is curable and they need health care.

Young people, what you don't know can hurt you. But the truth can liberate you so that you can do the right thing as it relates to this budget and let people know that you are opposed to what can happen to you.

This budget will cause preexisting conditions to become an uninsurable circumstance in your life. There are people who are born with preexisting conditions. These people will not be insurable. The Affordable Care Act eliminates preexisting conditions as a reason not to ensure people.

We would go back to people being born with preexisting conditions, many of whom would have to wait until they can afford or get to Medicare before they could get insurance. Medicare is a type of insurance.

This budget would cause women to, again, have to go back to a circumstance wherein they, by virtue of their condition of being a woman, would have a preexisting condition.

Mr. Speaker, I will put a "to be continued" in this message. But what you don't know can hurt you. The truth can set you free.

God bless you.

PEARL S. BUCK INTERNATIONAL AND THE CHILDREN IN FAMILIES FIRST ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK) for 5 minutes.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, the Pulitzer Prize-winning novelist, noted humanitarian, and longtime Bucks County, Pennsylvania, resident, Pearl S. Buck, touched many lives during her lifetime.

Her books brought readers inside the worlds of those they might have never known, and her commitment to a global community devoid of prejudice and bias solidified her place in American history.

However, it was her dedication to children of all races for which I recognize her today. Pearl S. Buck pioneered a process for international adoption that brought down the walls of interracial adoption and grew loving families, where, before, there were no options.

Her work continues today, and it continues with the leaders at Pearl S. Buck International in my district. Through the "Welcome House program" and adoption assistance, the organization carries on her critical mission of connecting children worldwide with loving families here in the United States.

I was proud to join the leaders at Pearl S. Buck International last month to highlight our mutual support for the Children in Families First Act. This bipartisan legislation streamlines our Nation's international adoption process and increases America's diplomatic mission abroad to include the well-being of children around the globe.

As a member of the Congressional Adoption Coalition and a cosponsor of the bill, I am excited to advance the Children in Families First Act as a commonsense response to the needs of families and groups like Pearl S. Buck International.

By removing roadblocks, increasing USAID opportunities, and prioritizing adoption within the State Department, we can ensure that every child, no matter where they are born, has a home.

THE POWER OF THE INTERNET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to come to

the floor this morning and talk just a little bit about free speech and how we exercise that free speech in this country.

I think it is no secret that the Twitterverse and the Internet has been abuzz with a little bit of concern about what the President is planning to do about the Internet and control and governance of the Internet.

I think we all agree that the Internet has had a revolutionary impact on not only this Nation but on the world. You can take a look at what has happened with jobs, with innovation, with economic freedom, and, indeed, with social change.

You see it pronounced because the Internet allows people to participate from the bottom up, receiving information about what their governments are doing, about opportunities that are out there. They have the opportunity to get online and do a little bit of research.

So, with this open ecosystem and this decentralized nature of information, it is benefiting freedom. It is benefiting free people and free markets. We want to see that continue.

Now, like many of my colleagues, I do support a free market, multistakeholders model of Internet governance. And in a perfect world, ICANN, which is the organization with governance of domain names and of the Internet, and IANA would be fully privatized and free from any government influence or control.

However, realistically, we know that China and Russia have a very different view of what would be perfection. Their end goal is to have ICANN and IANA functions migrate to the U.N.'s ITU, which is the International Telecommunications Union. That solution is one that I do not support and one that I would never stand in favor of. I stand in opposition to it.

If the U.S. Department of Commerce is going to relinquish control of its contractual authority over the IANA contract and move control of DNS into a global, multistakeholder community, the timing and the architecture would just have to be absolutely perfect.

This is an area where you have only got one shot of getting it right, only one shot, and we have to make certain that it is a shot that is focused fully on freedom.

If this administration wants to prove to Congress and the international community that they are serious about this process, then they must immediately move to bring an end to the net neutrality movement that is alive and well at our Federal Communications Commission.

Telling Congress and the international community that they are serious about relinquishing control over the IANA contract while simultaneously having the FCC work to promote net neutrality is disingenuous.

While we know Russia has got a land grab going on, we also see the U.N. and the ITU trying to carry forth this space grab.