

Rep. Paul Ryan (WI-01) Top Hits

Bad For Seniors

2014: Ryan Said He Wanted To Let Americans Invest “A Generous Portion Of Their Social Security In The Stock Market” And Criticized President Bush’s Privatization Plan For Having “Much Smaller Personal Retirement Accounts” Than His Own Plan

2014: Ryan Said He Wanted To Reform Social Security So Americans Could Invest “A Generous Portion Of Their Social Security” In The Stock Market. “I wanted to reform Social Security in ways that would give young people the same opportunity. Instead of inheriting a stack of IOUs, Americans would be able to place a generous portion of their Social Security taxes into a personal retirement account that Social Security would invest in the market.” [Paul Ryan, The Way Forward, published [8/19/14](#)]

2014: Suggested He Was Disappointed That The Bush Administration’s Social Security Plan Didn’t Go Far Enough, Writing That It Included “Much Smaller Personal Retirement Accounts Than The Ones John Sununu And I Had Proposed.” “I wrote a big Social Security reform bill with Senator John Sununu of New Hampshire. When people tried to discourage me, I told them, ‘It’s too late. I’m hugging the third rail like a koala bear.’ The Ryan-Sununu bill didn’t get much traction until after the 2004 campaign, when President Bush announced he would pursue Social Security reform in his second term. Ultimately, the Bush administration sought much smaller personal retirement accounts than the ones John Sununu and I had proposed. But, like the House version of the Medicare Part D bill, it was better than the alternative.” [Paul Ryan, The Way Forward, published [8/19/14](#)]

2005: Reintroduced Social Security Privatization Plan That Diverted A “Considerably Larger” Portion Of Social Security Tax To Private Accounts; Plan Was Criticized By Bush Official As “Irresponsible”

2005: Ryan Reintroduced A Bill Mirroring His 2004 Social Security Privatization Plan. “Wisconsin’s First District Rep. Paul Ryan is reintroducing legislation today to put Social Security on solid footing for the future and ensure that the program will help future generations achieve a more secure retirement, as it has for past and present retirees. This bill - the Social Security Personal Savings Guarantee and Prosperity Act - closely resembles Social Security reform legislation that Ryan introduced last year. Sen. Sununu of New Hampshire is introducing an identical measure in the U.S. Senate today.” [HR 1776, Introduced [4/21/05](#); Rep. Paul Ryan Press Release, [4/20/05](#)]

2004: Ryan Introduced Social Security Personal Savings Guarantee And Prosperity Act. “Wisconsin’s First District Rep. Paul Ryan today unveiled new legislation he introduced this week - H.R. 4851, the Social Security Personal Savings Guarantee and Prosperity Act of 2004 - to ensure that Social Security lives up to its promise for all Americans, now and in the future.” [Rep. Paul Ryan Press Release, [7/20/04](#)]

Washington Post: Ryan's Plan Diverted A "Considerably Larger" Percentage Of The Social Security Tax To Private Accounts Than President Bush's Plan. "The ultimate private-account plan belongs to Peter J. Ferrara, a longtime advocate of Social Security's partial privatization. Under Ferrara's approach, adopted by Sen. John E. Sununu (R-N.H.) and Rep. Paul Ryan (R-Wis.), and also by such activists as former House speaker Newt Gingrich and conservative organizer Grover Norquist, personal accounts would average 6.4 percentage points of the 12.4 percent Social Security tax, considerably larger than Bush's proposed 4 percentage-point diversion." [Washington Post, [2/24/05](#)]

George W. Bush's Director Of Strategic Initiatives Blasted Ryan's Social Security Privatization Plan As "Irresponsible" For Providing Personal Retirement Accounts In Lieu Of A More Comprehensive Fix. "In a leaked White House memo taking issues with Ryan's plan, Wehner blasted the plan as irresponsible for not providing a significant enough overhaul to fix the program, but merely provided 'personal retirement accounts' alone. 'You may know that there is a small number of conservatives who prefer to push only for investment accounts and make no effort to adjust benefits -- therefore making no effort to address this fundamental structural problem. In my judgment, that's a bad idea. We simply cannot solve the Social Security problem with Personal Retirement Accounts alone. If the goal is permanent solvency and sustainability -- as we believe it should be -- then Personal Retirements Accounts, for all their virtues, are insufficient to that task. And playing 'kick the can' is simply not the credo of this President. He wants to do what needs to be done for genuine repair of Social Security. If we duck our duty, it can have serious short-term economic consequences. Here's why. If we borrow \$1-2 trillion to cover transition costs for personal savings accounts and make no changes to wage indexing, we will have borrowed trillions and will still confront more than \$10 trillion in unfunded liabilities. This could easily cause an economic chain-reaction: the markets go south, interest rates go up, and the economy stalls out. To ignore the structural fiscal issues -- to wholly ignore the matter of the current system's benefit formula -- would be irresponsible.'" [BuzzFeed, [8/13/12](#)]

George W. Bush's Director Of Strategic Initiatives: "If We Borrow \$1-2 Trillion To Cover Transition Costs For Personal Savings Accounts And Make Changes To Wage Indexing... Would Be Irresponsible. "If we duck our duty, it can have serious short-term economic consequences. Here's why. If we borrow \$1-2 trillion to cover transition costs for personal savings accounts and make no changes to wage indexing, we will have borrowed trillions and will still confront more than \$10 trillion in unfunded liabilities. This could easily cause an economic chain-reaction: the markets go south, interest rates go up, and the economy stalls out. To ignore the structural fiscal issues -- to wholly ignore the matter of the current system's benefit formula -- would be irresponsible." [Peter Wehner, White House Social Security Memo, [1/05/05](#)]

BuzzFeed HEADLINE: "New Senior Romney Advisor Called Ryan Entitlement Reform Plans 'Irresponsible...A Bad Idea.'" [BuzzFeed, [8/13/12](#)]

Bad For Working Families

2014: Ryan Said He Wanted The Federal Reserve To Stop Focusing On “Promoting Maximum Employment.”

2014: Ryan Said He Wanted The Federal Reserve To Stop Focusing On “Promoting Maximum Employment.” “Over the years, Congress has expanded the Fed’s mission, bringing it further into the sphere of political and legislative activity. In the 1970s, the Fed was tasked with a new mission: promoting ‘maximum employment.’ Ever since then, it has had a dual mandate, and in attempting to fulfill both duties, it has adopted risky and costly monetary policies.” [Paul Ryan, The Way Forward, published [8/19/14](#)]

Ryan Gave Numerous Speeches In Which He Stated That “30 Percent” Of Americans Wanted The “Welfare State” While Only “70 Percent” Wanted The American Dream

Ryan: “70 Percent Of Americans Want The American Dream ... Only 30 Percent Want The Welfare State.” RYAN: “The good news is survey after survey, poll after poll, still shows we are a center-right, 70-30 country. 70 percent of Americans want the American Dream. They believe in the American idea. Only 30 percent want the welfare state. What that tells us is at least half of those people who are currently in that category are there not of their wish or their will. They believe in that horizon that they’re shooting for – they’re down on their luck, they’re out of their job, they’re back at school. They want the American idea and they want their kids to be better off. But slowly but surely if we don’t watch this, if we allow all this government that is being stacked up kick in, we will reach that moral tipping point.” [Ryan Remarks, American Spectator’s 2011 Robert L. Bartley Gala Dinner, 11/1/11]

Ryan Said That 30 Percent Of Americans “Want To Be Taken Care Of, Want To Have A Welfare State, Want To Be Dependent.” (55:00) RYAN: “Let me quantify it for you. Because believe me I think about this a lot. I just gave you some ugly statistics. 47 percent don’t pay income taxes, 60 percent get more from government than they contribute. So right there you think, ‘oh, we’re over with.’ No. Look at the Pew data. There’s a lot of survey data out there, and as you know I’m kind of a data-driven person. And just gut, living in southern Wisconsin, which is really politically bi-polar. This area goes both ways politically. You know, Russ and I shared a lot of votes in this town and southern Wisconsin together. And so it’s an area that can go one way or the other. I can just tell from talking to people here that there’s a big silent majority. But the data is something. What the Pew research data shows you, and they’ve been doing this since like the 50s, is we’re still a 70-30 country. And what I mean when I say that is, 70 percent of Americans still want the American idea. They still want to pull themselves up by the bootstraps to make and earn a good life for themselves and leave their kids better off. 30 percent, according to the Pew data, want to be taken care of, want to have a welfare state, want to be dependent.” [Janesville Rotary Club, 8/29/11]

2012: Defended Mitt Romney’s Infamous 47 Percent Remarks And Said People Should Not Be Offended By The Remarks

Asked About Romney’s Remarks Regarding 47 Percent Of Americans, Ryan Said “The Whole Point He Was Trying To Make Was That We’ve Got To Get People From Lives Of Dependency And Economic Stagnation.” MARKS: “Do you stand by Gov. Romney’s

statement about the 47 percent?” RYAN: “Yeah, the whole point he was trying to make was that we’ve got to get people from lives of dependency and economic stagnation that’s occurred in the Obama Administration from all of his failed policies back to lives of self-sufficiency.

Government dependence has gone up. Economic stagnation has persisted because of the Obama policies. The whole point he was trying to make is that we want to get people onto lives of self-sufficiency—economic growth, job creation. That’s what the Romney five-point plan for a stronger middle class is all about. It’s about getting people off of welfare to work. We should not be measuring programs like food stamps based on how many people go on food stamps. We should be measuring success of these programs by how many people we transition off of food stamps and into lives of self-sufficiency by having jobs. Better economic growth, more take home pay, more opportunities. That’s the American idea. That’s the point we’re trying to make.” [Ryan Interview, WAVY (Norfolk, VA), 9/18/12]

Asked Whether People Should Be Offended By Romney’s “47 Percent” Remarks, Ryan Said “Not At All.” SIMMONS: “So people should not be offended by that video?” RYAN: “Not at all. Look, he was very inarticulate in how he described it, he acknowledged that much. We believe in social mobility and the American dream, and economic growth and opportunity. That’s the whole premise of our argument.” [Ryan Interview, WTKR (Hampton Roads, VA), 9/18/12]

When Asked Whether He Would Apologize For Romney’s 47 Percent Comments, Ryan Said “No, We Want To Talk To People About Growth.” MARKS: “Do you plan to apologize today when you take the stage for those comments?” RYAN: “No, we want to talk to people about growth. We want to talk to people about opportunity. I want to talk to people about our five point plan for stronger economic growth to get people back to work.” [Ryan Interview, WAVY (Norfolk VA), 9/18/12]

When Asked What He Would Say To Military Members And Students Who Are Part Of The “47 Percent,” Ryan Said They Were “Victims Of The Obama Economy” And Attacked The President Over Defense Spending And Unemployment Among Recent College Graduates. MARKS: “You’re here at Christopher Newport, you’re in Hampton Roads, so you’ll be talking to military and students, many of them who are in the 47 percent. What are you going to say to them about this statement?” RYAN: “I think the president’s reckless defense cuts are compromising national security. We strongly believe in peace through strength. We’re also worried about the fact that 50 percent of college graduates are either not working in the field they studied in or working at all. That’s the victims of the Obama economy. The victims we’re talking about here are people who can’t get a job because of bad economic growth, because of the failure of the Obama administration. We do not want to produce more government dependency and stagnation, we want to produce independence, upward mobility – aspiration and growth is what we’re after, and that’s the point we’re trying to make.” [Ryan Interview, WAVY (Norfolk VA), 9/18/12]

2010: Voted Against Initial Version Of 9/11 First Responders Bill, Then Missed Final Vote, But Said He Would Have Voted Against Final Passage Had He Been Present; Called Bill “Deeply Flawed” And “A New Health Care Entitlement”

Ryan Voted Against Providing Health Care For 9/11 First-Responders. In 2010, Ryan voted against providing compensation funding for victims of the Sept. 11 terrorist attacks, establishing a medical program and reopening funding for individuals exposed to harmful debris. The bill, formally titled the James Zadroga 9/11 Health and Compensation Act, was named after a New York Police Department detective who participated in the ground zero effort and died on symptoms common to first responders. Under the measure, the Department of Health and Human Services would run a 10-year program to treat and monitor those with medical problems from the debris exposure. The program would also research conditions that may be related to the exposure, as well as diagnostic methods and treatment. Enrollment would be capped at 25,000 patients at any time. The Congressional Budget Office estimated that the health care and compensation programs would increase spending by \$7.4 billion and that New York would be required to cover 10 percent of the cost. Most Republicans opposed the bill over paying for it with revenue generated from placing limits on a tax rule that allows foreign-based companies to use tax treaties to shift income outside the United States and avoid higher tax rates. Texas Rep. Joe Barton referred to the program as a “brand new entitlement program.” The bill passed 268-160. [HR 847, [Vote #550](#), 9/29/10; CQ Today, 9/29/10]

Ryan Missed Final Vote On 9/11 First Responders Health Funding. In 2010, Ryan did not vote on a bill to provide health care and compensation to people exposed to toxic material after Sept. 11, 2001. The compromise bill provided less money over a shorter term to compensate victims than earlier versions of the bill. The bill provided \$1.5 billion over five years to treat and monitor individuals with medical conditions from exposure to the attacks. New York City would contribute 10 percent of the cost and the Victim Compensation Fund would reopen for five years for claims. Attorneys’ fees would be capped at 10 percent of the total award. The bill imposed a two percent fee on government procurement from foreign companies located in certain countries and a one year extension of fees outsourcing companies would have to pay for certain visas. “This should not be seen as a Democratic or Republican issue,” former New York City Mayor Rudy Giuliani said before the vote. “It shouldn’t even been seen as a fiscal issue. It’s a matter of morality, of obligation.” The bill passed 206-60. [HR 847, [Vote #664](#), 12/22/10; CQ Today, [12/22/10](#)]

... But Ryan Said He Would Have Opposed 9/11 First Responders Health Care Bill, Calling It “A New Health Care Entitlement.” “The vote I wish to discuss is the bill H.R. 847, the James Zadroga 9/11 Health and Compensation Act. Without a doubt, Republicans and Democrats can agree that both the victims of the attacks on September 11, 2001, and the first responders who bravely served following the attacks deserve to be fairly treated and compensated. However, this bill would create a new health care entitlement, the World Trade Center Health Program, while also extending eligibility for compensation under the September 11th Victim Compensation Fund of 2001. As a result, had I been present, I would have voted against passage of the bill.” [Floor statement by Rep. Ryan, Congressional Record, H8963, [12/22/10](#)]

Ryan Called 9/11 First Responders Health Care Bill “A Deeply Flawed Bill.” “Since the terrorist attacks occurred nearly nine years ago, I have supported legislation to ensure that these individuals are cared for and receive access to the services they deserve. However, rather than working with Republicans to craft a bill which truly addressed the shortcomings

in care provided to those directly impacted by the September 11th terrorist attacks, the Majority instead rushed this bill to the floor in the waning hours of the 111th Congress, refusing to allow an open debate or consider amendments. The result is a deeply flawed bill.” [Floor statement by Rep. Ryan, Congressional Record, H8963, [12/22/10](#)]

Ryan Repeatedly Referred To Low-Income Americans Who Rely On Government Assistance As “Takers” Who Live Lives Of “Deficiency”

Ryan: “We’ve Become A Nation Of Net Takers Versus Makers.” RYAN: “At the end of the idea, though, here is what I worry about is we’re going to reach two tipping points. The debt tipping point, I just described. CBO shows you what that looks like. But I think there’s more in some of these moral tipping points. And I think the president accelerating this. I think the president’s health care law accelerates this dramatically. And that is, we’ve become a nation of net takers versus makers.” [Ryan speech at American Enterprise Institute, 3/20/12]

Ryan: “We Could Become A Society Where The Net Majority Of Americans Are Takers, Not Makers. ... 70 Percent Of Americans Get More Benefits From The Federal Government In Dollar Value Than They Pay Back In Taxes.” RYAN: “We are reaching a fiscal tipping point. The moral tipping point is even worse. And the moral tipping point is before too long we could become a society we were never ever intended to be. We could become a society where the net majority of Americans are takers, not makers. Another great think tank, The Tax Foundation, runs lots of good numbers. Those who don’t know me, I’m kind of a numbers guy. 20 percent of Americans, according to The Tax Foundation, get 75 percent of their income from the federal government – they’re dependent. Another 20 percent of Americans get 40 percent of their income from the federal government, so they’re reliant. Today, 70 percent of Americans get more benefits from the federal government in dollar value than they pay back in taxes. So you could argue we’re already past that tipping point.” [Ryan Remarks, American Spectator’s 2011 Robert L. Bartley Gala Dinner, 11/1/11]

Ryan Referred To Those On Public Assistance As Living Lives Of “Deficiency.” RYAN: “What we want to do is have welfare reform that gets people off of lives of deficiency and onto to lives of self sufficiency. That’s why we couple this with job training programs and work requirements. We think we ought to make sure that we get people out of the cycle of poverty and, unfortunately, I think the plan that we have in place, the president’s agenda creates more of a dependent culture, creates people that are stuck in poverty because it denies the idea of upward mobility.” [Ryan interview with Chris Wallace, “Fox News Sunday,” Fox News Channel, 3/25/12]

Ryan Repeatedly Referred To Safety Net As “A Hammock That Lulls Able-Bodied Citizens Into Lives Of Complacency And Dependency”

Ryan Warned Of Turning “Our Safety Net Into A Hammock That Lulls Able-Bodied People To Lives Of Dependency And Complacency, Which Drains Them Of Their Will And Incentive To Make The Most Of Their Lives.” RYAN: “And we risk hitting a tipping point in our society where we have more takers than makers in society. Where we will have turned our safety net into a hammock that lulls able-bodied people to lives of dependency and

complacency, which drains them of their will and incentive to make the most of their lives.” [Paul Ryan interview, MacIver Institute, [8/2/12](#)]

Ryan: “We Don’t Want To Turn This Safety Net Into A Hammock.” “We don’t want to turn this safety net into a hammock that ends up lulling people into dependency and complacency. That’s the big debate we’re having right now, and tax policy is a big part of this as well.” [Ryan interview with Charlie Rose, “The Charlie Rose Show,” PBS, 11/15/10]

Ryan Voted Against Raising The Minimum Wage At Least 10 Separate Times

Ryan Voted Against Increasing The Minimum Wage At Least 10 Separate Times. [HR 2206, [Vote #424](#), 5/24/07; HR 2206, [Vote #333](#), 5/10/07; HR 1591, [Vote #186](#), 3/23/07; HR 2, [Vote #18](#), 1/10/07; HR5970, [Vote #425](#), 7/29/06; HR5970, [Vote #424](#), 7/29/06; HR2389, [Vote #382](#), 7/19/06; HR2990, [Vote#364](#), 7/12/06; HR4411, [Vote #360](#), 7/11/06; HR5672, [Vote #319](#), 6/27/06]

2014: Advocated “Docking Assistance” For those Who Miss A Class With Their Welfare Case Manager

Ryan On The Case Manager Portion Of His Antipoverty Plan: “If A Client Doesn’t Show Up For Class Or Look For A Job, Then The Counselor Will Be Allowed To Dock Their Assistance – Just Like A Boss Would In The Workplace.” “Americans who are stuck in the cycle of poverty or who have fallen on tough times need a welfare system that can provide them with the tools and skills they need to escape the cycle and live their lives. That’s why we should empower states to try a different approach to creating upward mobility for the poor. The federal government would grant states the flexibility to collapse several means-tested programs into one overall payment that would be paired with personal case management to directly benefit the recipient. Rather than running around to a series of different offices to qualify for and collect benefits, individuals will get a dedicated case manager or counselor who will help them put together a plan for getting back on their feet with measurable goals, including ultimately graduating from the program and into self-sufficiency. Every recipient, except the disabled and the elderly, must be employed or looking for work, The counselor will help the client budget their money and find a job, and they will provide a measure of responsibility and accountability. If a client doesn’t show up for class or look for a job, then the counselor will be allowed to dock their assistance – just like a boss would in the workplace.” [Paul Ryan, The Way Forward, published [8/19/14](#)]

Bad For Women

Ryan Opposed Abortion In Cases Of Rape And Incest—Only Believed In Life Of The Woman Exception; When Asked About His Position On The Rape Exception, Ryan Said, “The Method Of Conception Doesn’t Change The Definition Of Life”

When Asked About His Stance On Abortion In Cases Of Rape, Ryan Said, “The Method Of Conception Doesn’t Change The Definition Of Life” But Subsequently Declared His Support For Romney’s Position, Which Included An Exception For Rape. In an interview

with WJHL-TV's Josh Smith, the following exchange occurred: "SMITH: Abortion, now. Something we're talking about. And I think our viewers would love to know exactly where you stand, specifically when—you're pro-life and Catholic... RYAN: Oh, yeah. Yeah. SMITH: ...but specifically where you stand when it comes to rape, and when it comes to the issue of should it be legal for a woman to be able to get an abortion if she's raped. RYAN: I'm very proud of my pro-life record, and I've always adopted the idea that—the position that—the method of conception doesn't change the definition of life. But let's remember; I'm joining the Romney-Ryan ticket. And the President makes policy. And the President—in this case—the future President Mitt Romney, has exceptions for rape, incest, and life of the mother, which is a vast improvement of where we are right now." [Ryan Interview, WJHL (Tri-Cities, TN/VA), 8/23/12]

When Asked To Respond To Criticism Of His Comment In Which He Said "The Method Of Conception Does Not Change The Definition Of Life," Ryan Said, "Rape Is Rape. Period, End Of Story. But If You Believe Life Begins At Conception, Then Life Is Life At Conception." JACOBS: "Last week you were quoted in a response about rape and abortion as saying you have always been proud of your pro-life record, you've always adopted the idea that the method of conception does not change the definition of life. Critics have basically charged that you are equating rape to a method of conception. Would you care to respond to that?" RYAN: "Well look, rape is rape. Period, end of story. But if you believe life begins at conception, which I do, then life is life at conception. But what's important to note is that in a Romney administration, Mitt Romney's policies are very clear. He will have exceptions for rape, incest and life of the mother. And that to me is as far – is an improvement upon the status quo. What we want to do is lift up life. What we want to do is surround women who have had these kinds of tragedies in their lives. And so I think the Romney policy is very clear on this issue and I'm very proud of my pro-life record at that as well." [Ryan Interview, WTMJ (Milwaukee, WI), 8/29/12]

When Asked Whether Rape Was A Form Of Conception, Ryan Said "Well Of Course It Is." JACOBS: "But is rape a form of conception in your mind?" RYAN: "Well of course it is. Tech – I mean look at the technologically – technically speaking it is. The point is if you believe life begins at conception, that's where life begins. But the Romney policy is that there will be exceptions for rape, incest and life of the mother, and that I think is what people want to know and I'm comfortable with that because I think that's a vast improvement on the status quo. Rape is a horrible thing. If you're talking about the comments that a guy in Missouri made they're completely outrageous and indefensible." [Ryan Interview, WTMJ (Milwaukee, WI), 8/29/12]

Co-sponsored At Least Three Bills And Voted For Amendment Redefining Rape As "Forcible Rape" For Purposes Of Limiting Abortion Funding

2011: Ryan Co-Sponsored The "No Taxpayer Funding For Abortion Act," Which Initially Redefined "Rape" As "Forcible Rape" For Purposed Of Limiting Federal Funding Of Abortion Services. In 2011, Ryan and Akin co-sponsored the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortions Act. According to the Washington Post, "[a] Republican bill seeking to permanently cut off federal funding for abortions has angered women's groups that say it alters the definition of rape, permitting coverage for the procedure only in cases in which the rape is considered

‘forcible.’ The bill, called the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortions Act, would make permanent several provisions that have been law for years but require annual renewal by Congress. It is a top priority of Republican leaders who took control of the House after the November elections. The most well-known provision that would become permanent under the bill is the Hyde Amendment, which prevents some federally funded health-care programs from covering abortions. For years, it has allowed exemptions in cases of rape and incest, and when the life of the woman is threatened. Under the proposed language, however, rape becomes ‘forcible rape.’ Critics say the modifier could distinguish it from other kinds of sexual assault that are typically recognized as rape, including statutory rape and attacks that occur because of drugs or verbal threats. ‘It speaks to a distinction between rape where there must be some element of force in order to rise to the standard, and rape where there is not,’ said Steph Sterling, director of government relations for the National Women's Law Center. ‘The concern here is that it takes us back to a time where just saying no was not enough.’” [HR 3, Co-Sponsored [1/20/11](#), [Vote #292](#); Washington Post, [2/01/11](#)]

Bloomberg: Ryan Co-sponsored The Legislation Before The Word “Forcible” Was Later Removed In Committee. “While the legislation didn’t explain the difference between rape and forcible rape, the word ‘forcible’ was removed from each bill in committee by amendments from Republicans following criticism from Democratic lawmakers and reproductive-rights groups. Ryan and Akin signed on to the bills before the language was changed.” [Bloomberg, [8/22/12](#)]

Washington Post: Changing The Definition Of Rape “Could Distinguish It From Other Kinds Of Sexual Assault That Are Typically Recognized As Rape, Including Statutory Rape And Attacks That Occurred Because Of Drugs Or Verbal Threats.” The most well-known provision that would become permanent under the bill is the Hyde Amendment, which prevents some federally funded health-care programs from covering abortions. For years, it has allowed exemptions in cases of rape and incest, and when the life of the woman is threatened. Under the proposed language, however, rape becomes ‘forcible rape.’ Critics say the modifier could distinguish it from other kinds of sexual assault that are typically recognized as rape, including statutory rape and attacks that occur because of drugs or verbal threats.” [Washington Post, [2/01/11](#)]

New York Times Editorial: Ryan Co-Sponsored A Bill With Rep. Todd Akin “That Would Have Narrowed The Definition Of Rape To Reduce The Number Of Poor Women Who Can Get An Abortion Through Medicaid.” “Mr. Ryan also co-sponsored, along with Representative Todd Akin of Missouri, a bill that would have narrowed the definition of rape to reduce the number of poor women who can get an abortion through Medicaid. Besides that, he has co-sponsored more than three dozen anti-abortion bills, including measures that would require women to get an ultrasound first, bar abortions after 20 weeks in the District of Columbia and end federal spending for family planning programs. Though he urged Mr. Akin to end his Senate race last week over an offensive remark about ‘legitimate rape,’ Mr. Ryan has actually co-sponsored more of these measures than Mr. Akin. ‘I’m as pro-life as a person gets,’ he said in 2010.” [Editorial, New York Times, [8/27/12](#)]

2010: Ryan Co-Sponsored The No Taxpayer Funding For Abortion Act, Which Redefined “Rape” As “Forcible Rape” In Order To Limit Federal Funding Of Abortion Procedures.

“SEC. 309. TREATMENT OF ABORTIONS RELATED TO RAPE, INCEST, OR PRESERVING THE LIFE OF THE MOTHER. ‘The limitations established in sections 301, 302, 303, and 304 shall not apply to an abortion--‘(1) if the pregnancy is the result of an act of forcible rape, or incest with a minor[.]’ [HR 5939, Co-sponsored [7/29/10](#)]

2009: Ryan Co-Sponsored A Bill That Prohibited Federal Funding For Foreign Organizations Who Provide Abortion Services Except Where The Mother’s Life Is Endangered Or In Cases Of “Forcible Rape” Or Incest.

“SECTION 1. RESTRICTION ON ASSISTANCE TO FOREIGN ORGANIZATIONS THAT PERFORM OR ACTIVELY PROMOTE ABORTIONS. ‘(g) Restriction on Assistance to Foreign Organizations That Perform or Actively Promote Abortions- ‘(1) PERFORMANCE OF ABORTIONS- (A) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no funds appropriated for population planning activities or other population assistance may be made available for any foreign private, nongovernmental, or multilateral organization until the organization certifies that it will not, during the period for which the funds are made available, perform abortions in any foreign country, except where the life of the mother would be endangered if the pregnancy were carried to term or in cases of forcible rape or incest.’ [HR 708, Co-sponsored [1/28/09](#)]

2009: Ryan Voted For An Amendment To America's Affordable Health Choices Act of 2009 That Prohibited Federal Funding For Abortion Services Except Where The Mother’s Life Is Endangered Or In Cases Of “Forcible Rape” Or Incest.

“OFFERED BY MR. SAM JOHNSON OF TEXAS Add at the end of subtitle C of title I of division A the following: SEC. II. LIMITATION ON ABORTION MANDATES. No provision of this Act (or an amendment made by this Act) shall impose, or shall be construed to impose, any requirement for coverage of abortion, or access to abortion, or to authorize or permit the recommendation for, or imposition of, any such requirement by or through the Health Benefits Advisory Committee, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, the Health Choices Commissioner, or any other government or quasi-government entity, except in the case of a woman who suffers from a physical disorder, physical injury, or physical illness that would, as certified by a physician, place the woman in danger of death unless an abortion is performed, including a life-endangering physical condition caused by or arising from the pregnancy itself, or unless the pregnancy is the result of an act of forcible rape or incest.” The amendment was defeated 23-18. [HR 3200, [Johnson Amendment 8](#), Ryan voted YEA on [7/16/09](#)]

In Addition To Voting For The Amendment, The Romney-Ryan Campaign Said, “Ryan Joined Johnson In [Initially] Offering The Amendment.”

“*** UPDATE *** The Romney-Ryan campaign points out that Ryan did not initiate the ‘Limitations on Abortion Mandates’ amendment that included the term ‘forcible rape.’ That amendment failed to get out of committee in July, 2009 during the health care debate. The amendment was proposed by and carried the name of a more senior Republican colleague, Rep. Sam Johnson of Texas. Ryan joined Johnson in offering the amendment. Ryan was identified in the earlier post as a ‘co-sponsor’ of the amendment, but that isn’t technically the correct term. That said, Ryan did vote in support of the amendment with all other Republicans on the committee.” [NBC News, [8/22/12](#)]

2012: Co-sponsored Bill Requiring Women Considering An Abortion To Have An Ultrasound

Ryan Co-Sponsored A Bill “To Require Abortion Providers, Before A Woman Gives Informed Consent To Any Part Of An Abortion, To Perform An Obstetric Ultrasound On The Pregnant Woman.” According to a CRS summary, the Ultrasound Informed Consent Act “[a]mends the Public Health Service Act to require abortion providers, before a woman gives informed consent to any part of an abortion, to perform an obstetric ultrasound on the pregnant woman, provide a simultaneous explanation of what the ultrasound is depicting, display the ultrasound images so the woman may view them, and provide a complete medical description of the images, including the dimensions of the embryo or fetus, cardiac activity if present and visible, and the presence of external members and internal organs if present and viewable. Prohibits construing this Act to require a woman to view the images or penalizing the provider or the woman if she declines to look at the images. Exempts an abortion provider if the abortion is necessary to save the life of a mother whose life is endangered by a physical disorder, physical illness, or physical injury, including a life-endangering physical condition caused by or arising from the pregnancy itself. Requires the provider to include in the woman's medical file a truthful and accurate certification of the specific medical circumstances that support such determination. Authorizes the Attorney General to commence a civil action in federal court against any abortion provider who knowingly violates this Act. Prescribes penalties. Directs the Attorney General to notify the appropriate state medical licensing authority of penalties assessed. Authorizes a woman upon whom an abortion has been performed in violation of this Act to commence a civil action against the provider for actual and punitive damages.” [H.R.3805, Ultrasound Informed Consent Act, Introduced [1/23/12](#); [Co-Sponsors](#)]

1998: Ryan Did Not Oppose Allowing States To Decide Criminal Penalties For Abortions

Ryan Did Not Oppose Allowing States To Decide Criminal Penalties For Abortions. “Ryan, a 28-year-old first-time candidate, said he has consistently opposed legal abortion and makes only one exception cases in which a doctor deems an abortion necessary to save the mother’s life. He favors overturning the Supreme Court’s landmark Roe vs. Wade decision that made most abortions legal, Ryan said, and would let states decide what criminal penalties would be attached to abortions. Ryan said he’s never specifically advocated jailing women who have abortions or doctors who perform them, but added, ‘If it’s illegal, it’s illegal.’” [Milwaukee Journal Sentinel, 9/26/98]

2008: Ryan Supported Overturning Roe v. Wade And Compared Ruling To Infamous U.S. Supreme Court Decision In Which Court Ruled Black Slaves Were Not Legally People

Ryan Called For Overturning Roe V. Wade And Returning The Issue To The States, But Claimed “That This Would Not Outlaw Abortion In America.” Ryan wrote in a questionnaire, “The first step in protecting unborn children is overturning Roe v. Wade. It is important to note that this would not outlaw abortion in America; rather, it would return the matter to the States. This would return the matter to the people and allow the political process to work.” [Milwaukee Journal Sentinel, [10/31/08](#)]

Associated Press: In A 2010 Essay “Ryan Compared The U.S. Supreme Court Ruling That Legalized Abortion To The Infamous 1857 Dred Scott Decision, In Which The Court Ruled That Black Slaves Were Not Legally People.” “In a 2010 essay for a conservative think tank, Ryan compared the U.S. Supreme Court ruling that legalized abortion to the infamous 1857 Dred Scott decision, in which the court ruled that black slaves were not legally people. ‘After America has won the last century’s hard-fought struggles against unequal human rights in the forms of totalitarianism abroad and segregation at home, I cannot believe any official or citizen can still defend the notion that an unborn human being has no rights,’ Ryan wrote.” [Associated Press, [8/20/12](#)]

Ryan Co-sponsored At Least Six Personhood Bills

2011: Ryan Co-Sponsored The Sanctity Of Human Life Act, A Personhood Bill That Defines Life As Beginning At Conception. “On January 7, 2011, U.S. Representative Paul Broun (R-GA) introduced House Resolution (H.R.) 212, the Sanctity of Human Life Act. Co-sponsored by 62 representatives, including Paul Ryan of Wisconsin, the bill declares that: the right to life guaranteed by the Constitution is vested in each human being, and is the paramount and most fundamental right of a person; and the life of each human being begins with fertilization, cloning, or its functional equivalent, irrespective of sex, health, function or disability, defect, stage of biological development, or condition of dependency, at which time every human being shall have all the legal and constitutional attributes and privileges of personhood.” [Pro-Life Wisconsin website, [prolifewisconsin.org](#), accessed 6/21/12; HR 212, Co-sponsored [1/07/11](#)]

2009: Ryan Co-Sponsored The Sanctity Of Human Life Act. The bill provided that human life “shall be deemed to begin with fertilization.” [HR 227, Co-sponsored [1/07/09](#)]

2008: Ryan Co-Sponsored The Right To Life Act Of 2007. The bill implemented equal protection under the 14th Amendment of the U.S. Constitution for the right to life of each “preborn human person.” [HR 618, Co-sponsored [12/13/08](#)]

2006: Ryan Co-Sponsored The Right To Life Act Of 2005. The bill implemented equal protection under the 14th Amendment of the U.S. Constitution for the right to life of each “preborn human person from the moment of fertilization.” [HR 552, Co-sponsored [2/08/06](#)]

1999: Ryan Co-Sponsored The Right To Life Act Of 1999. The bill implemented equal protection under the 14th Amendment of the U.S. Constitution for the right to life of each “preborn human person from the moment of fertilization.” [HR 639, Co-sponsored [9/09/99](#)]

Ryan Repeatedly Voted To Defund Planned Parenthood

Ryan Co-Sponsored Bill Prohibiting Funding For Any Organization That Provides Abortion Services. In 2011, Ryan co-sponsored a bill that would ban any Title X funding from going to organizations that provide abortion services. The bill contained exceptions for

organizations that provide abortions in cases of rape or incest, or to save the life of the mother. [HR 217, [Co-Sponsors](#), introduced 1/7/11]

Mother Jones: “Last Year, Ryan Supported A Bill That Would Have Amended Title X To Prohibit Grants From Being Awarded To Groups Like Planned Parenthood That Provide Abortions.” “Despite those statistics, Title X has drawn fierce opposition from the two men at the top of the GOP ticket. Last year, Ryan supported a bill that would have amended Title X to prohibit grants from being awarded to groups like Planned Parenthood that provide abortions. (Such groups are already forbidden from spending federal money on the procedures.) Romney wrote in a USA Today op-ed that he would scrap the Title X program entirely to cut costs.” [Mother Jones, [8/17/12](#)]

Ryan Voted To Defund Planned Parenthood. In 2011, Ryan voted in favor of a bill which would insert a section in the FY11 Continuing Resolution which would prohibit Planned Parenthood and its affiliates from receiving federal funding. The resolution would order the Clerk of the House to change H.R. 1473, the FY11 Continuing Resolution, to bar the use of the federal funds to go to Planned Parenthood Federation of America, Inc., or any affiliate. The bill passed 241-185. [H Con Res 36, [Vote #271](#), 4/14/11; The Hill, [4/12/11](#)]

Ryan Voted To Eliminate Funding For Planned Parenthood. In 2007, Ryan voted in favor of an amendment to the fiscal year 2008 appropriations bill for the Department of Health and Human Services to eliminate federal funding for Planned Parenthood. The amendment would have barred the use of funds in the bill for Planned Parenthood. The amendment was defeated 189-231. [HR 3043, [Vote #684](#), 7/19/07; CQ Floor Votes, 7/19/07]

Ryan Co-Sponsored A Bill To “Prohibit Family Planning Grants From Being Awarded To Any Entity That Performs Abortions.” “Rep. Mike Pence, R-Ind., has introduced legislation (H.R. 217) to amend title X of the Public Health Service Act to ‘prohibit family planning grants from being awarded to any entity that performs abortions.’ The bill was introduced on Jan. 7 and has 121 co-sponsors.” Co-sponsors included Congress Paul Ryan and Congressman Todd Akin. “The legislation was referred to the House Energy and Commerce Committee.” [Targeted News Service, 1/9/11; H.R. 217, [Co-Sponsors](#)]

Ryan Voted To Prohibit Any Government Funding For Planned Parenthood. In 2011, Ryan voted in favor of an amendment that would bar all funding for Planned Parenthood Federation of America or its affiliates. Conservatives had long targeted Planned Parenthood as a major abortion provider but the amendment would bar all federal funding. Planned Parenthood received some \$75 million received to provide family planning assistance, contraception, HIV counseling, cancer screenings and other medical services. According to Susan Cohen, director of governmental affairs at the Guttmacher Institute research organization, for every dollar spent on contraception for low-income women, the government saves four dollars in medical costs within the next year by averting unwanted pregnancies. A New York Times editorial pointed out that Republicans’ assault on women’s health would deny millions of women access to affordable contraception and life-saving cancer screening, as well as cut nutritional support for millions of newborn babies. The amendment passed 240-185. [HR 1, Pence amendment #11, [Vote #93](#), 2/18/11; New York Times, Editorial, 2/25/11; New York Times, 2/17/11]

Ryan Repeatedly Voted Against Fair And Equal Pay For Women, Calling The Lilly Ledbetter Act “Some Obscure Vote”

Ryan Opposed Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act To Prevent Wage Discrimination. In 2009, Ryan voted against the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act. The Senate measure was nearly identical to some provisions in the House passed version HR 11. The final bill allowed employees to sue employers for wage discrimination within 180 days of their last paycheck affected by the alleged discrimination. The measure was designed to overturn a 2007 Supreme Court decision (Ledbetter v. Goodyear Tire and Rubber Co.) that ruled a worker could not bring a wage discrimination suit more than 180 days after the initial discriminatory act. The Senate version of the bill did not include a provision from HR 12 that would have required employers seeking to justify unequal pay for male and female workers to prove that such disparities are job-related and required by a business necessity. The bill passed 250-177. [S 181, [Vote #37](#), 1/27/09; CQ House Action Reports Legislative Week, 1/26/09]

Ryan: “What Women Are Asking Me About Is Not Some Obscure Vote Or Something Like That.” REPORTER: “Why did you vote against the Lilly Ledbetter Act. Do you believe that women shouldn’t be...” RYAN: “Oh, no. I just...” REPORTER: “...paid the same for the same job as men.” ... RYAN: “What women are asking me about is not some obscure vote or something like that. What they’re asking me about, what are you going to do to create jobs so I can go back to work, feed my family, get a good education for my children and get back on the life ladder of prosperity. Of the American dream.” REPORTER: “So what was the deal there? It almost looked like he wanted to not let you have a follow-up question.” LAUREN ROWE: “Well I ran out of time. I was going to ask a follow-up question. You know women make 70 cents to the dollar as it relates to what men make and the question I was going to ask is, as women, more and more mothers become the breadwinners for their family, what would it do to the economy if those women went home with the same dollar that men went home with? And of course I ran out of time. It didn’t have the answer to that question.” [Paul Ryan, Interview, WKMG, Orlando, FL, 8/20/12]

2009: Ryan Voted Against The Paycheck Fairness Act. Paul Ryan, on January 9, 2009, voted against, H.R. 5, the Paycheck Fairness Act, a bill, that “would make it easier for women to prove violations of the Equal Pay Act of 1963, which generally requires equal pay for equal work.” The bill passed the House 256 to 163 with the support of some Republicans. [H.R. 5, Vote 8, [1/9/09](#) and New York Times, [1/10/09](#)]

2011: Ryan Voted Against The House Taking Up The Paycheck Fairness Act. Paul Ryan, on May 31, 2012 voted on “a procedural vote on whether to move forward with the Paycheck Fairness Act. The House voted 233-180 against taking up the bill.” Ryan voted against taking up the bill. [H.Res 667, Vote 297, [5/31/12](#) and National Women's Law Center, [6/1/12](#)]

2008: Ryan Voted Against Paycheck Equity. In 2008, Ryan voted against a bill that would lift the cap on compensatory and punitive damages that women may be awarded in wage discrimination cases. The bill would also require employers who contended that pay

discrepancies did not result from discrimination to give an actual business reason for why female employees were paid less than their male counterparts. Democrats argued that the bill would close some loopholes for pay discrimination. “The current system is rife with loopholes that allowed employers to avoid responsibility for discriminatory pay scales,” Representative Rosa DeLauro (D-CT) said. Republicans criticized the legislation, saying that it would be fodder for frivolous lawsuits. “This bill will make it easier for trial lawyers to cash in, and taxpayers should be outraged that their money is being put to such use,” Representative Virginia Foxx (R-NC) said. The bill passed 247-178. [HR 1338, [Vote #556](#), 7/31/08; CQ Today, 7/31/08]

2007: Ryan Opposed Legislation To Prevent Wage Discrimination. In 2007, Ryan voted against a bill to protect the victims of wage discrimination. The bill amended the 1964 Civil Rights Act to allow employees to file charges of pay discrimination within 180 days of the last received paycheck affected by the alleged discriminatory decision. It also clarified that an employee is entitled to up to two years of back-pay if it is determined that discrimination occurred. The legislation was introduced in response to a May 29, 2007 Supreme Court ruling, *Ledbetter v. Goodyear Tire and Rubber Co.*, a 5-4 ruling decried by civil rights activists. According to the ruling, workers filing suit for wage discrimination must do so within 180 days of the actual decision to discriminate against them. That blocked efforts to win redress for discrimination that unfolded in small steps over a period of years. The bill passed 225-199. [HR 2831, [Vote #768](#), 7/31/07; CQ Today, 7/31/07]

Bad For LGBT

1999: Ryan Voted For An Amending Prohibiting Adoptions By Same-Sex Couples In Washington, D.C.

1999: Ryan Voted For An Amendment That Prohibited Adoptions by Same-Sex Couples In Washington, DC.

Ryan voted for an amendment to bar joint adoptions in the District of Columbia by gays or other people who are not related by blood or marriage. The amendment was introduced by Rep. Steve Largent (OK-1) and failed to pass 213-215. [HR 2587, [Vote #346](#), CQ Floor Votes [7/29/99](#), CQ Today [7/28/99](#)]

Washington Post: “The Amendment Would Have Prevented Unmarried Couples From Adopting Any Of The 3,100 Children In Foster Care” In Washington, DC. “The House defeated by a vote of 215 to 213 the amendment by Rep. Steve Largent (R-Okla.) that would have prevented unmarried couples from adopting any of the 3,100 children in foster care in the District. The measure, which passed the House last year but was removed by a House-Senate panel, was opposed by gay activists and others who argued that it would slow the pace of adoptions in the city. ‘The best interest of the child and parenting skills must be the sole factors for placement in safe and loving homes--not marital status or sexual orientation,’ said Rep. Constance A. Morella (Md.), one of 36 Republicans to vote against Largent's amendment.” [Washington Post, [7/30/99](#)]

Ryan Repeatedly Voted For Constitutional Amendments Banning Same-Sex Marriage

2006: Ryan Voted For A Constitutional Amendment Defining Marriage As Consisting Only Of The Union Of A Man And A Woman. In 2006, Ryan voted in favor of a joint resolution to propose a constitutional amendment that defined marriage as consisting only of the union of a man and a woman. It would have provided that the U.S. Constitution or any state's constitution could not be construed to require that marriage or any other constructs of marriage be conferred to any other union. The amendment, which required a two-thirds majority to pass, was defeated 236-187. [HJR 88, [Vote #378](#), 7/18/06; CQ Floor Votes, 7/18/06]

2004: Ryan Voted For A Constitutional Amendment Banning Same-Sex Marriage. In 2004, Ryan voted in favor of a joint resolution to propose a constitutional amendment that defined marriage as consisting only of the union of a man and a woman. Under the proposed amendment, the U.S. Constitution or any state's constitution could not be construed to require that marriage or any other constructs of marriage be conferred to any other union. The amendment, which required a two-thirds majority vote of those present and voting to pass, was defeated 227-186. [HJR 106, [Vote #484](#), 9/30/04; CQ Floor Votes, 9/30/04]

2012: Ryan Supported A Proposed Wisconsin Constitutional Amendment That Defined Marriage As Between A Man And A Woman. “[RYAN:] But I supported the Wisconsin amendment to define marriage between a man and a woman. Look, Bill Clinton signed into law the Defense of Marriage Act. If I recall from the last presidential campaign, President Obama, Vice President Biden said that they support marriage as being between a man and a woman. So you know, I don't know why we're spending all this time talking about this.” [Ryan interview with David Gregory, “Meet the Press,” NBC, 2/19/12]

2011: Ryan Voted To Uphold The Defense Of Marriage Act

Ryan Voted To Uphold The Defense Of Marriage Act. In 2011, Ryan voted to support the Defense of Marriage Act. The amendment to the Defense Appropriations bill banned the use of any funds to be used in violation of the Defense of Marriage Act. This vote was largely symbolic and was intended to show support for the Defense of Marriage Act according to the author of the amendment. The amendment passed 248-175. [HR 2219, [Vote #516](#), 7/7/11; Los Angeles Times, 7/9/11; The Hill, 7/7/11]

DOMA “Denies A Host Of Federal Benefits, Such As Filing Joint Tax Returns Or Receiving Survivor Benefits, To Same-Sex Couples Who Were Married In States That Allow Such Unions.” [Washington Post, [5/31/12](#)]

2010: Ryan Voted Against Repealing The Military's “Don't Ask, Don't Tell”

2010: Ryan Voted Against Repealing The Military's “Don't Ask, Don't Tell” Policy. Paul Ryan, on December 15, 2010, voted against H.R.2965, a vote “against repealing the military's ‘don't ask, don't tell’ policy, which barred gay men and lesbians from serving openly.” The bill passed the House 250 to 175, passed the Senate 65 to 31 and was signed into law by President Obama. [HR 2965, Vote #638, [12/15/10](#) and USA Today, [8/23/12](#)]

Ryan Repeatedly Voted Against Hate Crime Laws Covering Offenses Based On A Victim's Sexual Orientation

2009: Ryan Voted Against Expanding Federal Hate Crime Laws To Cover Offenses Based On A Victim's Sexual Orientation Or Gender Identity. In 2009, Ryan voted against expanding federal hate crime law to cover offenses based on a victim's sexual orientation or gender identity. In addition the bill would also cover crimes based on a victim's physical or mental disability. At the time of the bill passage, the law only covered the use of threat or force based on race, color, religion or national origin. The bill passed 249-175. [HR 1913, [Vote #223](#), 4/29/09; CQ Weekly, 5/4/09]

2007: Ryan Voted Against A Bill That Expanded Federal Hate Crime Laws To Cover Offenses Based On A Victim's Sexual Orientation Or Gender Identity And Would Have Authorized \$5 Million To Assist In Prosecution Of Hate Crimes. In 2007, Ryan voted against a bill that made certain violent crimes against an individual because of race, religion, national origin, gender, sexual orientation, gender identity, or disability, stand-alone hate crime offenses. It also authorized federal grants of \$5 million in fiscal 2008 and 2009 to assist state and local law enforcement agencies in prosecuting violent hate crimes. The bill passed 237-180. [HR 1592, [Vote #299](#), 5/3/07]

2000: Ryan Opposed Expanding Federal Hate Crime Laws To Cover Offenses Based On A Victim's Sexual Orientation. In 2000, Ryan voted in favor of a motion to instruct conferees to not agree to provisions which: fail to recognize that the 14th amendment to the Constitution guarantees all persons equal protection under the law; deny equal protection under the law by conditioning prosecution of certain offenses on the race, color, religion, national origin, gender, sexual orientation, or disability of the victim; and; preclude a person convicted of murder from being sentenced to death. The motion was defeated 196-227. [HR 4205, [Vote #470](#), 9/13/00]

Lyin' Ryan

Called The 2011 Budget Control Act's Sequester A "Victory" Upon Its Passage And "The Kind Of Thing We've Been Looking For For Years"

Ryan: The Debt Ceiling Agreement Was "The Kind Of Thing We've Been Looking For For Years. At a press conference on the debt ceiling deal, Ryan said the following: "This is the kind of thing we've been looking for for years. There are some who have just various concerns, whether it didn't go far enough or whether defense was too high. I think at the end of the day, this bill is going to prevail and it's going to prevail with the majority of Republicans. This gets us two-thirds of the cuts in discretionary spending we are looking for in our budget. Did we get a hundred percent of the discretionary cuts we were looking for? No, we got two-thirds. That's better than zero. I'll take two-thirds in my direction than anything else, and we're going in our direction. And that's why I think -- that's why I think most Republicans will support this." [Press Conference on The Debt Ceiling, 8/1/11]

Ryan Called The Budget Control Act “A Victory.” “Ryan voted for the Budget Control Act when it passed, calling it ‘a victory for those committed to controlling government spending and growing our economy.’” [CBS News, [8/23/12](#)]

Ryan Voted Against The Recovery Act, Calling It A “Monstrosity” Passed Through “Political Patronage,” But Later Sought Stimulus Funds For Projects In District, Including Millions For Local GM Plant

Ryan Voted Against The American Recovery And Reinvestment Act Of 2009. In 2009, Ryan opposed the conference report of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act. The bill was a \$787 billion spending package to provide aid to states and cities, funding for transportation and infrastructure projects and expansion of the Medicaid program to cover more unemployed workers. It included \$301.1 billion in personal and business tax breaks. [CQ Bill Analysis HR1; HR1, [Vote #70](#), 2/13/09]

Ryan Called The Stimulus “A Monstrosity,” Then Wrote Letters To The Secretary Of Energy Endorsing Wisconsin Stimulus Projects. “Mr. Ryan voted for the Troubled Asset Relief Program, the Bush-era Medicare prescription-drug benefit and an early, limited version of what became the auto-industry bailout. In addition, he voted against President Barack Obama’s stimulus and called the bill “a monstrosity,” then wrote letters to the secretary of energy endorsing stimulus projects in his home state.” [Wall Street Journal, [8/14/12](#)]

Ryan: “The Stimulus Was A Case Of Political Patronage, Corporate Welfare And Cronyism At Their Worst.” “The stimulus was a case of political patronage, corporate welfare, and cronyism at their worst.” [Ryan, Republican National Convention, 8/29/12]

The Same Year He “Was Railing Against The \$787 Billion Stimulus Package” Ryan “Wrote At Least Four Letters To Obama’s Secretary Of Energy Asking That Millions Of Dollars From The Program Be Granted To A Pair Of Wisconsin Conservation Groups.” “In 2009, as Rep. Paul D. Ryan was railing against President Obama’s \$787 billion stimulus package as a ‘wasteful spending spree,’ he wrote at least four letters to Obama’s secretary of energy asking that millions of dollars from the program be granted to a pair of Wisconsin conservation groups, according to documents obtained by the Globe. The advocacy appeared to pay off; both groups were awarded the economic recovery funds—one receiving a \$20 million grant to help thousands of local businesses and homes improve their energy efficiency, agency documents show.” [Boston Globe, [8/14/12](#)]

Boston Globe Headline: “In Paul Ryan’s District, He Supported US Energy Funds While Decrying Stimulus Program.” [Boston Globe, [8/14/12](#)]

Associated Press Headline: “Ryan Called Stimulus Wasteful, Then Sought Funds.” [Associated Press, [8/15/12](#)]

Los Angeles Times Headline: “Paul Ryan Opposed Stimulus Spending, Then Didn’t.” [Los Angeles Times, [8/15/12](#)]

Ryan's Aide Said Ryan Was "Not Aware" Of \$5 Million In Stimulus Money That Was Included In A \$400-Million Incentive Package Ryan Offered To GM To Keep Janesville Plant Open. "Six months after the plant closed, GM announced that Janesville could compete with two other cities for production of a small car that would be called the Sonic. This time, Wisconsin offered a \$400-million incentive package, including more than \$200 million in union concessions and \$100 million in state tax credits. The package ultimately included \$5 million in federal stimulus funds, although Ryan's aide said the congressman was not aware of that line item at the time. At a meeting in Washington, Ryan and other members of the delegation urged GM executives to accept the bid. They were unsuccessful. In late June, the automaker announced that Orion Township, Mich., would build the Sonic. Acknowledging the defeat on his website, Ryan vowed, 'I will continue to fight for pro-growth, common-sense economic reforms and serve as an advocate on your behalf.'" [Los Angeles Times, [8/19/12](#)]

Ryan Lamented Downgrading Of U.S. Debt Widely Reported As Caused By Him And Other Tea Party Republicans

August 2011: S&P Lowered U.S. Credit Rating For The First Time, Dropping It One Notch From AAA To AA+. "Standard & Poor's announced Friday night that it has downgraded the U.S. credit rating for the first time, dealing a symbolic blow to the world's economic superpower in what was a sharply worded critique of the American political system. Lowering the nation's rating to one notch below AAA, the credit rating company said "political brinkmanship" in the debate over the debt had made the U.S. government's ability to manage its finances "less stable, less effective and less predictable." [Washington Post, [8/5/11](#)]

When Told By CBS's Scott Pelley That Standard & Poor's Said It Was The Republicans Fault For The Downgrade, Ryan Responded "That's Not True." PELLEY: "Final point on the speech last night, you also suggested that it was the president's fault that the nation's credit rating was downgraded." RYAN: "Yeah." PELLEY: "But when Standard & Poor's issued that credit rating downgrade, it said that it was the Republican Congress..." RYAN: "That's not true." PELLEY: "That was at fault." RYAN: "That's not correct." RYAN: "Standard and Poor's also said..." PELLEY: "I can read the quote to you." [Ryan Interview, CBS Nightly News, 8/30/12]

After CBS's Scott Pelley Read The Statement Of Standard & Poor's To Ryan That Said "We Have Changed Our Assumptions On This Because The Majority Of Republicans In Congress Continue To Resist Any Measure That Would Raise Revenues," Ryan Said "I See It A Different Way." PELLEY: "For the record, what Standard & Poor's said was quote 'we have changed our assumptions on this because the majority of republicans in congress continue to resist any measure that would raise revenues.'" RYAN: "That's not..." PELLEY: "They're saying you refused to raise taxes and they downgraded the American government debt. RYAN: "I see it a different way. That's not my understanding from talking to them." [Ryan Interview, CBS Nightly News, 8/30/12]

New York Times: Ryan "Lamented The Nation's Credit Rating -- Which Was Downgraded After A Debt-Ceiling Standoff That He And Other House Republicans Helped Instigate." "Representative Paul D. Ryan used his convention speech on Wednesday to fault President

Obama for failing to act on a deficit-reduction plan that he himself had helped kill. He chided Democrats for seeking \$716 billion in Medicare cuts that he too had sought. And he lamented the nation's credit rating -- which was downgraded after a debt-ceiling standoff that he and other House Republicans helped instigate.” [New York Times, [8/31/12](#)]

Tea Party Radical

Widely Reported As A Tea Party Candidate Hell-Bent Against Bipartisan Compromise

Associated Press **Headline:** “Tea Party Gets Its Man In Ryan For Vice President.”

[Associated Press, [8/13/12](#)]

Bloomberg **HEADLINE:** “Ryan Bipartisan Image Based More on Style Than Substance”

[Bloomberg, [8/17/12](#)]

Expressed Disappointment In “Small” Size Of Bush Tax Cuts For Which He Begrudgingly Voted

Ryan Co-Sponsored Both Bush Tax Cuts In 2001 And 2003. “The most substantive part of Ryan's record as a legislative co-sponsor is as a backer of deficit-exploding tax cuts during President Bush's first term. He was one of 32 co-sponsors of H.R. 3, the ‘Economic Growth and Tax Relief Act of 2001,’ some provisions of which became law as H.R. 1836, the first Bush tax cut, and was one of 51 co-sponsors on H.R. 2, the ‘Jobs and Growth Tax Relief Reconciliation Act of 2003,’ which enacted the second Bush tax cut. (Ryan voted for the final version of both bills.)” [The Atlantic, [8/14/12](#)]

2003: Ryan Voted \$350 Billion In Tax Breaks Over 11 Years. In 2003, Ryan voted for the bill that would provide \$350 billion in tax breaks over 11 years, including a new top tax rate of 15 percent on capital gains and dividends through 2007 and acceleration of income tax cuts enacted in 2001 and scheduled to take effect in 2006.[HR 2, Vote #225, 5/23/03]

2001: Ryan Supported Budget Busting Tax Cut For The Wealthy, Reducing Taxes By \$1.35 Trillion Through 2010 And Raided Billions From Social Security. In 2001, Ryan voted in favor of the Bush tax cut package that reduced taxes by \$1.35 trillion through 2010 through income tax cuts, relief of the marriage penalty, a phase-out of the federal estate tax doubling the child tax credit, and providing incentives for retirement savings. Critics of the bill warned that the tax cut was too large and would jeopardize future Social Security benefits. According to the Wall Street Journal, the entire Social Security Trust Fund will be used “to fund the government over the next two years,” while “well over \$100 billion of Social Security funds in each of the following three years” will be used for other purposes. Over the next ten years, more than \$1.8 trillion of the Social Security Trust Funds will be spent on other purposes. The bill passed 240-154. [HR 1836, [Vote #149](#), 5/26/01; Wall Street Journal, 2/5/02; Congressional Budget Office; Campaign for America’s Future]

Ryan Expressed Disappointment At “Small” Size Of Bush Tax Cut Package. “As Congress takes up the \$1.95 trillion federal budget resolution, some Wisconsin House members split along

party lines over the size of its proposed tax cut. At the heart of the debate is the resolution's 11-year, \$1.35 trillion tax-cut proposal, which represents a compromise from the original \$1.6 trillion cut President Bush had proposed. ... And Rep. Paul Ryan, R-Janesville, expressed disappointment at the compromised tax package. 'It gives people less of their money back than I would have hoped but it still is significant,' Ryan said.' [States News Service, 5/4/01]

2006: Ryan Voted For Law Overturning Child Safety Lock Requirement On Handguns

2006: Ryan Supported Overturning A Law Requiring Child Safety Locks on Handguns. In 2006, Ryan voted in favor of an amendment to overturn a recently enacted law requiring safety trigger locks on all handguns sold in the United States. In 2005, President Bush signed legislation giving gun makers broad protections from civil lawsuits, but that law contained the mandatory trigger lock provision. The amendment reversed the trigger lock provision. The amendment passed 230-191. [HR 5672, [Vote #343](#), 6/28/06; Reuters, 6/29/06]

2005: Ryan Voted For A Bill Characterized By *The Hill* As The “Most Outrageous Anti-Immigrant And Anti-Latino Legislation Of The Past Decade”

Ryan Voted For A Controversial Immigration Bill That Tightened Border Security, Increased The Enforcement Of Immigration Laws, And Designated Illegal Immigration As A Criminal Offense. In 2005, Ryan voted in favor of legislation to tighten border security and increase enforcement of immigration laws. It would designate unlawful presence, in addition to illegal migration as a criminal, rather than a civil, offense. It also would increase penalties for a variety of immigration-related crimes. It would create a mandatory program under which all employers would have to verify employees' work eligibility with the federal government. As amended, it would require the construction of security fencing, including lights and cameras, along certain ports of entry along the U.S.-Mexico border. The bill passed 239-182. [HR 4437, [Vote #661](#), 12/16/05; Washington Post, 12/17/05]

The Hill: The Border Security Bill, Which Was Sponsored By Rep. James Sensenbrenner Jr. (R-Wis.), Was Characterized By “Pro-Immigrant Advocates ... As The Most Outrageous Anti-Immigrant And Anti-Latino Legislation Of The Past Decade.” [The Hill, [5/10/12](#)]