

Now here we are today. We have a Democratic Congress. We're being told that there is no inflation; seniors won't get a COLA. The Obama administration says probably for 2 years they won't get a cost of living adjustment. That's not right. The things they are buying are going up in price, dramatically, and they're having tremendous difficulties making ends meet, living on that fixed income.

I have had a bill for many years that would put in place a new cost of living index for seniors called a CPIE—elderly—to look at the things they really buy and have to buy to live and get by. That hasn't gone anywhere, but I'm still pushing that idea.

But while we're working on developing a true index that would really look at the costs for seniors, we should pass a 1-year cost of living adjustment. And we can do that without borrowing the money, with no impact to the Social Security trust fund, very simply. We would just say that those who earn between \$250,000 a year and \$359,000, they would pay the same rate of Social Security tax as every normal wage-earning American who earns less than \$106,000 a year. If you earn less than \$106,000 a year, you pay Social Security tax on every penny of your income. If you earn \$250,000, well, no, you just pay on the first \$106,000. You don't pay after that. Your tax rate is lower.

Let's have a little bit of equity here. So we would simply have people earning between \$250,000 and \$359,000 pay the same rate of Social Security tax as every other American that would pay for a one-time COLA for seniors to help them make ends meet. We must act and act soon to get this done before this injustice happens next year.

#### AMERICA NEEDS TO STAND BY HER WORD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I wish to address the issue of credibility that is so critical. And I want to follow up on what my friend was just discussing with regard to Social Security. These seniors would be flush with cost of living increases; the money would be there if we did one thing, the one thing that has not been done in the entire history of Social Security and, that is, put the tax that provides for Social Security into the Social Security Trust Fund. It has never been done. It has always had IOUs go in. As the money comes in, it goes out the other door. That ought to stop.

And what it would create is the need to control the outrageous spending that's been going on, the \$770 million we passed for wild horses, the \$25 mil-

lion for rare dogs and cats in foreign countries, the \$25 million for rare cranes, 80 percent of which are in other countries. Those are the things that would need to stop.

When it comes to the issue of our Nation's credibility, you can go back historically to 1812. There were banks and merchants in England that had loaned the United States money. When we went to war with England in 1812 as a nation, we made the commitment that we will still stand good for our word because even though we'll be at war, our word, our credibility, is too important to do otherwise.

□ 1315

That opened the door for the United States to become an economic powerhouse because people around the world said this is a Nation that can be trusted; their word is good.

With the way Vietnam ended under President Nixon and the Carter years, our credibility around the world was devastated, as we went back on commitments we had made. And it took the years of President Reagan, former President Bush, former President Clinton, former President George W. Bush to build our credibility back among the other nations, that you may not like our position, but when we give our word, we're going to stand good for it.

Now in 9 months' time that is all in jeopardy again. We heard during the campaign the noble promises that we will not go it alone on anything. We will not be that arrogant. We will consult with the other nations. And we had an agreement with Eastern Europe with regard to missiles and a missile defense shield, and there are leaders in Eastern Europe that took great political risk, and it cost them politically in mighty ways to work an agreement with the United States. But they did it because they believed they could trust the United States at its word.

Whether you believe in the propriety of the missile defense shield in Eastern Europe, that's one thing, but to unilaterally go against the word that was provided that we will not do that, that we keep our agreements, and unilaterally announce we're going back on our word on the missile defense shield shatters credibility even to those who didn't care about the missile defense shield but who are thinking about reaching agreements with us.

After the U.N. speech yesterday, all of the promises that have been made by this administration, both before and after its election, that that was the critical war we could not afford to lose, we're going to stand with them, now after the speech yesterday people are wondering, wow, are they going to back out and go against this Nation's word yet again already in this 9-month period? It's not just the Afghans won-

dering. Can we trust these people when they say they're going to help us? This is our Nation's credibility at risk. That affects everything.

There were pledges made to Israel during the campaign by the people inhabiting this administration, and now we're telling them you're going to have to go back to the lines the way they existed before 1967 because you cannot occupy land that you achieved during warfare. My goodness, we're going to have to give back California. We're going to have to give back Utah, Nevada, Colorado, Wyoming.

This is ridiculous. We are hurting our credibility nationally. Regardless of whether you agree or disagree with the prior administration, please do no more damage to this Nation's credibility.

#### REVISIONS TO THE 302(a) ALLOCATIONS ESTABLISHED BY THE CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEARS 2010 THROUGH 2014

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SPRATT. Madam Speaker, under section 321 of S. Con. Res. 13, the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2010, I hereby submit a revision to the budget allocations and aggregates for certain House committees for fiscal year 2010 and the period of fiscal years 2010 through 2014. This adjustment responds to House consideration of the bill H.R. 3631, "To amend title XVIII to provide for the application of a consistent Medicare part B premium for all Medicare beneficiaries in a budget neutral manner." A corresponding table is attached.

This revision represents an adjustment for the purposes of sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as amended. For the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as amended, this revised allocation is to be considered as an allocation included in the budget resolution, pursuant to section 427(b) of S. Con. Res. 13.

BUDGET AGGREGATES  
(On-budget amounts, in millions of dollars)

	Fiscal Year 2009	Fiscal Year 2010	Fiscal Years 2010–2014
<b>Current Aggregates:<sup>1</sup></b>			
Budget Authority	3,668,601	2,882,149	n.a.
Outlays	3,357,164	3,002,606	n.a.
Revenues	1,532,579	1,653,728	10,500,149
<b>Change in the Medicare Premium Fairness Act (H.R. 3631):</b>			
Budget Authority	0	2,065	n.a.
Outlays	0	2,065	n.a.
Revenues	0	0	0
<b>Revised Aggregates:</b>			
Budget Authority	3,668,601	2,884,214	n.a.
Outlays	3,357,164	3,004,671	n.a.
Revenues	1,532,579	1,653,728	10,500,149

<sup>1</sup> Current aggregates do not include the disaster allowance assumed in the budget resolution, which if needed will be excluded from current level with an emergency designation (section 423(b)).

n.a. = Not applicable because annual appropriations Acts for fiscal years 2011 through 2014 will not be considered until future sessions of Congress.