

terror, Operation Enduring Freedom in Afghanistan, and our coalition efforts in Iraq.

Why did the administration do this? Poland cooperates closely with American diplomacy on such issues as democratization, nuclear proliferation, human rights, regional cooperation in Central and Eastern Europe, and U.N. reform. Now is definitely the moment for this Congress and the administration to restore a level of credible relationship with Poland in order to continue an abiding friendship that should not be smeared by this really tactless decision to announce this consequential defense decision on September 17, a date which harkens back to some of the worst memories that Poland has as part of her history.

I besiege this Congress and the administration to correct a great mistake.

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

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### MORE VETERINARIANS ARE NEEDED IN RURAL AMERICA

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

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss an issue not at the forefront of debate here in Washington but which will impact many areas of our country and many aspects of our lives. I am referring to the need for skilled veterinarians in many communities across America. This may not be a topic which makes its way to the House floor very often, but I assure you, it is an issue for many areas of our country.

Our food animal veterinary workforce is on the front lines of food safety, public health and animal health. This vital profession, however, is facing a critical shortage in the public, private, industrial and academic sectors. To make matters worse, the problem is on the rise. Large animal veterinarians, in particular, are integral to small rural communities. But in many of these communities, communities with few people but large numbers of animals, we are seeing a very distressing trend.

Let me show you. This map is a geographic display of total food animals by county in the United States. The dark gold areas have particularly high concentrations of animals per county, more than 250,000. As you can see, States such as Iowa, Nebraska, Colorado, Texas and California all have extremely high concentrations of counties with 250,000 or more food animals.

Now let's take a look at a map showing total food animal veterinarians by

county. The areas of dark green indicate counties with 35 or more food animal veterinarians by county, certainly quite a difference.

Finally, let's take a look at a map showing food animal concentration per veterinarian. I want to draw your attention to the red flags that dot the map. We all know that red flags mean danger or a hazard ahead. The red flags on this map indicate counties without one single food animal veterinarian but which have more than 25,000 food animals, several counties across the country.

According to the most recent data from the USDA, Cherry County, one county in my district, has 145,000 food animals per veterinarian. Fillmore County, also in Nebraska, has 112,000 food animals but not one food animal veterinarian. It's absolutely necessary for the farmers, ranchers, hobbyists—not lobbyists but hobbyists—and even animal lovers to have access to qualified local veterinary clinics.

To this end, Mr. Speaker, I have introduced H.R. 3519, the Veterinarian Services Investment Act. The legislation authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to award competitive grants to help develop, implement and sustain veterinary services, especially in underserved areas. These grants may be used to support a wide array of activities based on the needs of an area, such as veterinarian and veterinary technician recruitment; expanding and establishing practices in high-need areas; surveillance of food animal disease and the utilization of veterinary services; establishing mobile/portable clinics and tele-vet services; and accredited veterinary education programs, including continuing education, distance education and faculty recruitment.

Under my bill, eligible applicants must carry out programs or activities which will substantially relieve the veterinary shortages throughout our country, as indicated on a geographical basis. These include entities such as veterinary clinics located in underserved or rural areas; veterinary practices which meet food animal protection needs; State, national, allied or regional veterinary organizations and specialty boards; colleges or schools of veterinary medicine; and State, local or tribal veterinary agencies.

I am proud to say that more than 30 of my colleagues, Democrat and Republican, have joined me as cosponsors of H.R. 3519. It has been endorsed by, among others, the American Veterinary Medical Association, the South Dakota Veterinary Medical Association, the Iowa Veterinary Medical Association, Nebraska and Minnesota as well, the Farm Bureau, the Animal Health Institute, the National Association of Federal Veterinarians and the National Cattlemen's Beef Association.

Veterinarians make a difference every day. They understand animals and are integral parts of our rural communities. Unfortunately, too many rural communities don't have this nec-

essary support. The Veterinary Services Investment Act will go a long way in this direction.

#### SOCIAL SECURITY RECIPIENTS NEED A COST OF LIVING ADJUSTMENT NEXT YEAR

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, earlier today the House passed a bill that will give relief to about a quarter of the Nation's seniors on Social Security by not having them experience a Medicare premium increase this year. That's all well and good and meritorious. Times are tough. But it doesn't go to the other three-quarters of the Nation's Social Security recipients, and it doesn't get to the bottom line that there is, for the first time since we had a regularly adjusted Social Security COLA—it used to be into the fifties and early sixties before we put in place a regular COLA, a cost of living adjustment for seniors on Social Security. They would get one in election years, strangely enough. The Congress would wake up, notice that seniors were out there and give them some sort of an increase.

We fixed that problem many years ago by saying, Well, Social Security benefits would be automatically adjusted. But the measure that is used is incredibly flawed, and it was not only flawed to begin with. The cost of living index is calculated on a lot of things that seniors don't buy, things that have gotten cheaper in this bad economy, actually, like giant flat screen televisions, computers and cell phones and other things that are not consumed to any great extent by our Nation's seniors.

But if anybody has checked the price of pharmaceuticals or medical care or basic utilities or many other must-have expenses, they haven't gone down. In fact, they've gone up. But seniors, some of whom are living only on a Social Security check, many who are principally dependent upon a Social Security check, are not going to get a cost of living adjustment this year because the formula that is used is faulty. It's not only faulty; it was actually tampered with by the Republicans and Alan Greenspan, that great guru, the guy who helped almost destroy the world's economy recently through his deregulationist philosophy which became so embedded that Wall Street ran wild.

Alan Greenspan has always hated Social Security since he was on a commission many years ago and tried to find ways to go after it. A number of years ago he convinced a Republican Congress that the cost of living index actually overestimated inflation and that you should take away one point before you give a COLA to seniors on Social Security. The Republican Congress did that.

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<br>2009 | Fiscal Year<br>2010 | Fiscal Years<br>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<br/>Premium Fairness<br/>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.