

美国总统奥巴马关于美国财政状况的讲话 PDF转换可能丢失图片或格式，建议阅读原文

https://www.100test.com/kao_ti2020/646/2021_2022__E7_BE_8E_E5_9B_BD_E6_80_BB_E7_c95_646598.htm US President Obama

's Address to Nation on U.S. Economy 25 July 2011 美国总统奥巴马向全国发表有关美国财政状况的讲话 2011年7月25日

Good evening. Tonight, I want to talk about the debate we 've been having in Washington over the national debt -- a debate that directly affects the lives of all Americans. 晚上好。今晚，我想和你们谈谈我们在华盛顿就国家的债务问题所展开的辩论一场直接影响到所有美国人生活的辩论。 For the last decade, we 've spent more money than we take in. In the year 2000, the government had a budget surplus. But instead of using it to pay off our debt, the money was spent on trillions of dollars in new tax cuts, while two wars and an expensive prescription drug program were simply added to our nation 's credit card. 10年来，我们的支出一直高于我们的收入。政府在2000年曾有过预算盈余，但这笔钱没有被用来偿还国债，而被用于数万亿美元的新的减税计划，此外，两场战争和一项昂贵的处方药计划又增加了我国的超前支出。 As a result, the deficit was on track to top \$1 trillion the year I took office. To make matters worse, the recession meant that there was less money coming in, and it required us to spend even more on tax cuts for middle-class families to spur the economy. on unemployment insurance. on aid to states so we could prevent more teachers and firefighters and police officers from being laid off. These emergency steps also added to the deficit. 因此，在我就任总统那年，财政

赤字已接近突破一万亿美元。更糟糕的是，经济衰退意味着收入减少，同时却要求我们进一步增加开支为中产阶级减税以刺激经济；发放失业保险金；资助州政府以避免更多的教师、消防队员和警察被裁员。这些紧急措施也增加了财政赤字。 Now, every family knows that a little credit card debt is manageable. But if we stay on the current path, our growing debt could cost us jobs and do serious damage to the economy. More of our tax dollars will go toward paying off the interest on our loans. Businesses will be less likely to open up shop and hire workers in a country that can ' t balance its books. Interest rates could climb for everyone who borrows money -- the homeowner with a mortgage, the student with a college loan, the corner store that wants to expand. And we won ' t have enough money to make job-creating investments in things like education and infrastructure, or pay for vital programs like Medicare and Medicaid. 每个家庭都知道，持有少量的信用卡债务不会有问题。但如果我们再这样继续下去，日益增长的债务就会导致工作机会减少并严重损害经济。越来越多的纳税人的钱将用于偿还国债利息。公司企业将不太愿意到一个不能做到收支平衡的国家开展业务和雇佣员工。利率可能上涨，危及每个贷款的人有房屋抵押贷款的房主、有大学学费贷款的学生、想扩大经营的街角小店。而且，我们将不会有足够的资金投资于能够创造就业机会的教育和基础建设部门，也不能为联邦老年医保和联邦贫困医保等重要项目提供资金。 Because neither party is blameless for the decisions that led to this problem, both parties have a responsibility to solve it. And over the last several months, that ' s what we ' ve

been trying to do. I won't bore you with the details of every plan or proposal, but basically, the debate has centered around two different approaches. 由于两党对导致这个问题的种种决策都不是无可挑剔，因此两党也都有责任来解决这个问题。几个月来，我们一直在努力这样做。我不想赘述每项计划或提案的具体细节，但这场辩论基本上围绕着两种不同的方式展开。 The first approach says, let's live within our means by making serious, historic cuts in government spending. Let's cut domestic spending to the lowest level it's been since Dwight Eisenhower was President. Let's cut defense spending at the Pentagon by hundreds of billions of dollars. Let's cut out waste and fraud in health care programs like Medicare -- and at the same time, let's make modest adjustments so that Medicare is still there for future generations. Finally, let's ask the wealthiest Americans and biggest corporations to give up some of their breaks in the tax code and special deductions. 第一种方式主张量入为出，对政府开支进行严肃的、历史性的削减。让我们把国内开支削减到自德怀特艾森豪威尔总统任期以来的最低水平。让我们将五角大楼的国防开支削减数千亿美元。让我们砍掉联邦老年医保等医保计划中存在浪费和造成欺诈的部分同时稍作调整，使联邦老年医保计划能继续为子孙后代提供保障。最后，让我们要求最富裕的美国人和最大的公司企业放弃一些他们所享受的税收优惠和特殊减免。 This balanced approach asks everyone to give a little without requiring anyone to sacrifice too much. It would reduce the deficit by around \$4 trillion and put us on a path to pay down our debt. And the cuts wouldn't happen so abruptly that they'd

be a drag on our economy, or prevent us from helping small businesses and middle-class families get back on their feet right now. 这种均衡的方式要求每个人都做出一点贡献，但并不要求任何人做出太大的牺牲。这将使财政赤字降低4万亿美元左右，并让我们步入偿清债务的轨道。这类削减不会太突然，以致拖累我国经济，或阻止我们帮助小企业和中产阶层家庭尽快重新站稳脚跟。 This approach is also bipartisan. While many in my own party aren't happy with the painful cuts it makes, enough will be willing to accept them if the burden is fairly shared. While Republicans might like to see deeper cuts and no revenue at all, there are many in the Senate who have said, " Yes, I'm willing to put politics aside and consider this approach because I care about solving the problem. " And to his credit, this is the kind of approach the Republican Speaker of the House, John Boehner, was working on with me over the last several weeks. 这种方式还是跨党派的。虽然我所在的党派的很多成员对痛苦的削减措施感到不满，但将有足够多的成员愿意接受削减措施，只要大家都公平地分担这一负担。尽管共和党人可能希望看到幅度更大的削减而不想增加任何税收，但参议院中也有很多人表示：“是的，我愿意将政治因素放在一边来考虑这个方式，因为我所关心的是解决这个问题。”值得肯定的是，共和党籍的众议院议长约翰博纳几周来曾就这一方式与我共同努力。 The only reason this balanced approach isn't on its way to becoming law right now is because a significant number of Republicans in Congress are insisting on a different approach -- a cuts-only approach -- an approach that doesn't ask the wealthiest Americans or biggest

corporations to contribute anything at all. And because nothing is asked of those at the top of the income scale, such an approach would close the deficit only with more severe cuts to programs we all care about -- cuts that place a greater burden on working families. 这种均衡的方式现在未能走上立法轨道的唯一原因在于国会中有相当一部分共和党议员坚持推行另外一种方式一种只削减开支的方式一种不要求最富裕的美国人或最大的公司企业做出任何贡献的方式。由于这种方式不要求那些收入最高的人做任何贡献，因而只能通过更严厉地削减我们都关心的项目来减少赤字这类削减措施将加重工薪家庭的负担。 So the debate right now isn't about whether we need to make tough choices. Democrats and Republicans agree on the amount of deficit reduction we need. The debate is about how it should be done. Most Americans, regardless of political party, don't understand how we can ask a senior citizen to pay more for her Medicare before we ask a corporate jet owner or the oil companies to give up tax breaks that other companies don't get. How can we ask a student to pay more for college before we ask hedge fund managers to stop paying taxes at a lower rate than their secretaries? How can we slash funding for education and clean energy before we ask people like me to give up tax breaks we don't need and didn't ask for? 因此，目前的辩论并非在于我们是否需要作出艰难的选择。民主党人和共和党人在我们需要减少赤字的数额方面有共识。辩论的焦点在于应如何达到这一目标。大多数美国人，不分党派，都不明白我们为什么要求老年公民为自己的老年医疗保险多付钱，却不要求为高层主管提供专用飞机的企业或石油公司放弃其他

公司并不享有的税收优惠；我们为什么要求学生为他们的大学教育承担更高的费用，却不要求对冲基金经理不再按低于他们秘书的税率纳税；我们为什么要大幅削减用于教育和清洁能源的资金，却不要求像我这种收入的人放弃我们并不需要也没有提出要求的税收减免。 That ' s not right. It ' s not fair. We all want a government that lives within its means, but there are still things we need to pay for as a country -- things like new roads and bridges. weather satellites and food inspection. services to veterans and medical research. 这样做是不对的，也是不公平的。我们大家都要求我们的政府量入为出，但作为一个国家，仍然有一些必须支出的费用，如道路和桥梁之类的工程、气象卫星和食品检查、以及退伍军人的服务项目和医学研究。

相关推荐：[克林顿在香港关于美国亚太地区政策的演讲](#) [姚明正式宣布退役 发表声明全文](#) [中国驻澳大利亚大使陈育明接受媒体采访](#) [商务部部长姚坚例行新闻发布会](#) [100Test 下载频道开通，各类考试题目直接下载。详细请访问 \[www.100test.com\]\(http://www.100test.com\)](#)