

In the end, we have made a promise—a sacred promise, as Representative TAKANO said—to the people of this country that as we take their money, their Social Security, through their earned benefit they have paid into—we have put up a social insurance program to ensure that when they retire or become disabled or, God forbid, lose their parents and become an orphan, they will continue to have an ability to live in this country. It's not those people that created our financial woes that this country has. There are real ways to deal with the deficit. There are real ways to deal with Social Security. But those real ways are not the ways that are proposed through the chained CPI.

In fact, another thing that was said, I believe it was by Ms. LEE from California, was she talked about, on this floor, we have other people trying to fix Social Security. We had 104 Members of the other side of the aisle vote for a version of the budget that raised the Social Security retirement age to 70. I'll tell you, I don't know many construction workers or nurses or teachers who could necessarily still be able to do that job as well as they would like to between 67 and 70. The construction field, there is not the ability to do that job. As a nurse, when you have to lift bodies and help move people, you just can't do that job for those additional years. So, to me, to raise the Social Security retirement age is, again, part of breaking that promise.

There is a way we can continue the promise, and that is to lift the cap on Social Security. Right now, no matter how much you make, we tax for Social Security up to \$113,700; but as soon as you make a dollar more, you don't get taxed for Social Security. Now, we tax in every other way in a progressive way, as you make more, you pay more in taxes, but we don't tax a dime more at \$113,700. If we were simply to lift that cap or raise that amount, you would extend Social Security for decades. In fact, if you lift the cap entirely, it is estimated at least 75 years of life would go into the Social Security program. Wouldn't that make a lot more sense than instead nickel-and-diming those who can least afford to, to preserve the program?

So that is the hope of this Progressive Caucus that we have. You've heard from a number of leaders, both freshmen and people who have been here for a long time. You've heard from people from different parts of the country. It is an important promise that we have to the public.

We are the party that has been there to protect seniors. The fact that the President has it included in his budget, we all know—and the President has been very clear—it is not his idea. This was an idea from the Republican Speaker and other Republicans, and he put it in his budget proposal to try to get them to come and finally have a budget for this country, to make them come to the table.

Right now, we have very different documents. We have the Democratic

document in the Senate and the President's document that invests in the economy so we can create jobs and grow the economy right now. And we have a Republican version of the budget that focuses almost exclusively on getting rid of the deficit. The holy grail is the deficit; it will cost us millions of jobs. Just in the next year it is estimated 2 million jobs will be lost. But you can't have those diverse documents and still fund Congress. So what does Congress do? We continue to have continuing resolutions that get us by for months at a time.

I have heard on this floor so many times where people will talk about a wasteful program—and there are wasteful programs in the Federal Government we should address. There is a GAO report that specifically outlines about 45 areas of duplication, where we are doing the same thing across different agencies. We have a focus on the Oversight and Government Reform Committee to find waste, fraud, and abuse wherever we can. We are working on that. The problem is when you don't have a budget that says we're going to cut these programs so we can fund these programs, we punt. And as a government, we have punted far too many times. We have not had a serious budget in place.

So the President's goal is indeed sincere, that he wants people to come to the table. I, perhaps, would have waited to compromise until we got to the table, but the President in this case put their request right in his budget and put it on the table. The problem is, that is a bad compromise. There are so many other things that we can do that will better serve the public than to cut the benefits from our seniors and our veterans and our disabled and the children and orphans who rely on Social Security.

So, Mr. Speaker, our Progressive Caucus has been here for close to the last hour to make sure that we are talking about an important program that the public, I'm sure, is concerned about. I know I'm getting the calls in my office. But we really plead with the President to make sure that as we move forward and try to bring the Republicans to the table to try to have a national budget—as we all need to—do not balance that budget on the backs of those who can least afford it.

Mr. Speaker, with that, I yield back the balance of my time.

ADMINISTRATION IN REVIEW

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. STEWART). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I know the intention of my friends on the other side of the aisle. We all want the country to run at maximum peak performance so that people have jobs. But it's interesting the ways we have going about trying to see that that happens.

Interesting, in fact, we got the President's budget yesterday—of course it took 2 months or so beyond what the law says that the President must do. We also know that when it comes to people being in the country illegally, the President decided that he didn't like the laws that were passed by Congresses of the past, both Democrat and Republican, signed into law by Presidents, both Democrat and Republican, and so President Obama got up and did what you don't normally find in a country with representative government, he just announced: I don't like the law the way it is, so here's the new law, and basically pronounced new law into being with regard to who will be allowed to have amnesty in the country, and that program has already started.

In the past, the Founders' intent was well carried out because I've been advised by people who worked here in Democratic majorities as Democratic leaders and Republican leaders of the past who said, yes, in the past, if you had a President stand up and say, I'm choosing to ignore the law that has been passed by prior Congresses, signed into being by their Presidents; I'm going to ignore those and just pronounce new law: So as I say it, so shall it be—if you had a President that acted like that, then both Democratic and Republican leaders would get together and they would head down Pennsylvania Avenue, that way. They would announce themselves and let the President know that either he would begin to comply with the law and stop doing what is solely the responsibility of Congress, or they would cut off all funding to everything he cared about. And that would take care of it.

□ 1630

Unfortunately, these days the President, those in power in the White House and executive branch, have noted that since the Democratic Party is the majority in the Senate, then even when there are enough people in the Republican Party in the House who have the nerve to stand up and say we will no longer allow violations of the law or creations of law out of whole cloth without following the Constitution, the Senate would stop those actions because they're not going to let anything like that pass the Senate. And, therefore, we have bureaucrats who begin to announce to elected Members of this government that they really don't care what we have to say, that we're not going to stop them from doing whatever they want, because the Senate will block anything we try to do here at the House.

Because this is a divided Capitol building with the Senate in the majority of Democratic hands and the House in Republican majority control, it is very important that we note what the other branch, the Presidency, is pronouncing. Under the President's proposed budget, there is an article here dated April 10 from CNS News that says:

The OMB's historical tables also reveal that the White House does not expect this administration to ever run an annual deficit as low as \$458.5 billion, which was the deficit the government ran in fiscal 2008, the last fiscal year completed before Obama took office.

It's also important to note that in 2006, the last year Republicans were in control of the House, we were properly ridiculed by Democrats on this side of the aisle because we ran \$160 billion-or-so budget spending over the amount that was coming in, that we had \$160 billion in deficit spending. And the Democrats were correct: we should not have had \$160 billion in deficit spending.

Having no idea that the promises from the friends on this side of the aisle who said, If you will just put us in the majority, we'll cut that \$160 billion deficit spending the Republicans have done and we will get a balanced budget, we won't deficit spend, who would have believed that when they took over as a majority, that within 2 years they would have tripled—basically tripled—the amount of deficit spending. So much for the promise that we're going to cut deficit spending. So the \$160 billion or so went to \$458.5 billion, about tripled the deficit.

And then who could have possibly imagined that during President Obama's first year in office, when Democratic control was both the House and the Senate, that they would have the nerve to not run \$160 billion deficit, as they said they would never do, or the \$458 billion deficit, nearly three times as much as 2008, but that they would go 10 times that amount of \$160 billion and hit about \$1.6 trillion in deficit spending.

There are several markers being laid down in this country that make it very clear that this country is on a crash course. There are no seat belts, there are no harnesses, there are no air bags. We are barreling down this road to a definite end unless we get this thing under control.

And for the President to propose for the first time in American history that before he leaves office in 2017, under the President's proposed budget he will preside over the spending of \$4.0898 trillion in fiscal year 2016, it's unbelievable. We've got somewhere between \$2.3 trillion and \$2.5 trillion that is expected to be coming in to the Treasury this year, and the President is proposing \$3.8 trillion in spending. It is outrageous.

And at the same time, the President has closed down tours. There's no indication that there has actually been even \$18,000 or \$74,000 or \$78,000 in savings from not having White House tours. So you begin to wonder, now, wait a minute, you said it was to save all this money is the reason you cut out White House tours, that it wasn't just a temper tantrum to make people suffer. So, let's see, where is the savings? If there are no Secret Service being furloughed, there are no Secret Service being laid off, it would appear there's no savings.

So what then could have possibly been the purpose for saying no more White House tours? Some have said, well, Congress is just mad because it complicates their job. People saying those types of things really have no clue what's going on in Washington, because the fact is a Member of Congress' life, be it Democrat or Republican, is actually less complicated when you don't have to arrange for White House tours.

It's something that Members of Congress had taken on voluntarily in order to help the White House. So we would make the arrangements, people would call and come through our office, then we would have to write requests, beg the White House, can you find enough tickets for these individuals to allow them to go through the White House, and then we would get word back. There for a while it was unpleasant when the President first started, because we had trouble getting tickets for anybody the first year or so, which meant that the President got to have people furious with Members of Congress because they blamed Members of Congress for not being able to go through the White House on a tour, when actually we would just get notice and only be able to pass that on.

So it actually makes Members of Congress' life far less complicated when we don't have to arrange for White House tours. But the Members of Congress I know, on both the Democratic side and the Republican side, really want to enhance visits for their constituents to Washington, D.C., and so we are willing to spend part of our budget to have somebody help arrange those tours for constituents coming to Washington. We help the White House by doing that.

Even though our offices, every congressional budget has been cut about 20 percent over the last 3 years, we haven't cut out those constituent services. We have one person less in my office we just didn't replace by attrition. We've had to make adjustments. And I'm grateful to have a staff that is willing to work hard and long hours. They don't get paid overtime, but they're willing to do that because they realize this is a servant's job. I am a servant. People who work in my office are servants. We serve the public and serve at their will.

Apparently, that is not something that all bureaucrats have been able to understand and take to heart. Then we also see big news today that a gun bill has cleared the Senate hurdle as the filibuster falls short. This is a FoxNews.com story that was released today.

□ 1640

There is another story here that indicates Senator LEE says, "Background Checks Could Allow Holder"—the attorney general—"to Create Gun Registry Using Regulations."

In fact, "On Wednesday," it says, "Senator MIKE LEE, Republican from

Utah"—the fantastic Senator that he is; that's a parenthetical insertion—"took to the Senate floor and warned that universal background checks could lead to a national registry system for guns."

A quote from my friend, Senator LEE, is:

"Some of the proposals, like, for example, universal background checks, would allow the Federal Government to surveil law-abiding citizens who exercise their constitutional rights. One of the provisions we expect to see in the bill, based on what we saw in the Judiciary Committee on which I sit, would allow the attorney general of the United States, Eric Holder, to promulgate regulations that could lead to a national registry system for guns, something my constituents in Utah are very concerned about, and understandably so."

LEE also said that the government had no place monitoring the legal exercise of any constitutional right a citizen chooses to exercise:

"You see, the Federal Government has no business monitoring when or how often you go to church, what books and newspapers you read, who you vote for, your health conditions—"

And actually, I have to differ with Senator LEE on health conditions. ObamaCare means the government gets to monitor all your health conditions and actually will have all of your health care records, as well.

Senator LEE goes on:

—"what you eat for breakfast and the details of your private life, including the lawful exercise of your rights protected by the Second Amendment and other provisions of the Bill of Rights."

Important quotes by Senator MIKE LEE.

With regard to the gun bill that's been rushed through the Senate, it is worth noting again that when bills are rushed through without being given proper scrutiny, we create bad laws, we make mistakes, and the country and the Constitution suffer. It's part of our oath that we will protect and defend the Constitution of the United States; and I would humbly submit we don't do that job when we rush through bills that people have not had a chance to read, to participate in.

As my friends know, I have, on this very floor, read quotes from Minority Leader JOHN BOEHNER who, in essence, told Major Garrett that:

If we get back the majority, a Speaker JOHN BOEHNER will bring bills through regular order. I'm not going to rush them to the floor like Speaker PELOSI has done.

And I've had to remind my own leadership of those promises because we keep rushing through bills as Republicans that people do not have enough time to read. And I'm hoping and praying and arguing and cajoling to try to make sure we stop that process and that we return to regular order.

There are some bad bills that come out of regular order to be sure; but when we have full debate at a subcommittee level over a proposed bill and any member of that subcommittee—this is called regular

order—any member of that subcommittee can bring an amendment to any provision in that bill, you get some scrutiny of the bill in its entirety.

Then when we have a markup at the full committee level and any member—Republican or Democrat. It doesn't matter. It doesn't matter if they're on or not on any of the subcommittees. At the full committee, any member of the full committee can bring an amendment to that bill.

We took most of the day today marking up a pretty simple bill, I thought, on the issue of reining in overregulation and getting Congress to take a look at the tens of thousands of pages of regulations that come out so regularly from bureaucrats that never catch the eye of elected officials. It was a pretty simple bill. It took hours and hours to go through that because there were so many proposed amendments. And each amendment that gets made has a chance for the proponent to argue for at least 5 minutes in favor of his amendment; and then under the rules, any member of the committee can spend up to 5 minutes on each amendment. It's not a pretty process, it's not pleasant to sit through, but we get better bills when we go through that process.

Then it comes to the Rules Committee. And I prefer if the Rules Committee allows for a fully open debate. We have an open amendment process. It's not pretty either, but it gives people across America a chance to see who is advocating for what amendment, what language. And you have had all this time, from the subcommittee to the committee to the House floor; and every Member of the House, no matter who you are or no matter whether you're in disfavor with the leadership like some of us may be, you can bring amendments in an open process under regular order, and you have a chance to debate those and America has a chance to see who's standing for what positions. It gives them a chance at the next election to better select who they want better representing them by virtue of what positions they're taking.

But when it goes through the process it just did through the Senate, there's not proper scrutiny and things come to the floor and we're not sure what the impact is. It can get so ridiculous that you can even have a Speaker of the House say, "But we have to pass the bill so that you can find out what is in it." That's not the way we're supposed to govern. We have an obligation to do better than that.

Now, we've also gotten word that from the sequester that hit here just recently—this is an article by Elizabeth Harrington, dated April 9 of this week, "Safe from Sequester: \$704,198 for Gardening at NATO Ambassador's Home."

Well, that should be a nice garden. I like to work in the yard around our house. I don't have as much chance as I used to, nor does my wife, but I'm pretty sure that the gorgeous yard we

have didn't cost \$704,198 on our property. So you would have thought that perhaps if people were going to help the President that are in the President's administration, they'd go, Hey, I can make do on \$200,000 for my yard work this year. So you can get another half million back right there.

Gee, just think of all the White House tours that would fund, even though it doesn't look like the cutting of the tours actually saved anything.

Then we have some very salient points made by Investors.com, titled, "Six Ways Obama's Budget Is Worse Than Everyone Thinks." It's posted 4/10/2013:

Fiscal policy: Shorn of its accounting gimmicks, the President's budget isn't a balanced plan to get the debt crisis under control. It's a monument to fiscal irresponsibility.

With much fanfare and a lot of media hype, President Obama unveiled his latest budget plan—2 months late. An IBD review of Obama's budget finds that, among other things, it:

Boosts spending and deficits over the next 2 years. Obama's own budget numbers show that he wants to hike spending over the next 2 years by \$247 billion compared with the "baseline," which even after his proposed new tax hikes would mean \$157 billion in additional red ink.

And it's important to understand, and I insert this parenthetically here, when we talk about a baseline—yes, the bill I've been pushing for 8 years, a zero-baseline budget where no Federal department has automatic increases, did pass the House a year ago. And I'm very grateful to ROB WOODALL and PAUL RYAN and to the Speaker keeping his word and bringing it to the floor. We passed it in the House. But the Senate, under Senator REID, made clear, no, we want every department in the Federal bureaucracy having an automatic increase in their budget every year. We want their budgets going up every year.

□ 1650

Now, Social Security, they may not get an automatic increase. Medicare, they may be cut by \$700 billion as they were under ObamaCare; but when it comes to every Federal bureaucracy, Senator REID made clear they were not going to pass a zero-baseline budget, that they were not going to do away with the automatic increases. They were going to push forward and make sure the government bloat—the government obesity as a bureaucracy—would continue and that there would be automatic increases in every single Federal budget.

So, when this article points out that the President adds to the baseline, it means the President is already adding to what has been an automatic increase in their budgets for every department already. It may take another election to get people who are thinking correctly in the Senate, Democrat or Republican, who will finally stand up and say, You know what? There isn't an individual, there's not a family, there's not a charity, there's not a

business anywhere in America that has an automatic increase every year in their budget, so we're stopping it for the government. If an agency or a department wants an increase, they're going to have to come in and justify it.

Now, some of us wouldn't mind starting every year with a zero sum, and you'd have to justify anything that you'd get at all; but all the zero baseline does is say we are willing to start where we were last year, and if you need an increase, we'll increase. That way, when those of us conservatives who advocate for a decrease in the increase are actually still allowing for an increase, we aren't vilified for making draconian cuts, because the increases are still there. If we can get to a zero baseline, then you will actually be able to have honest and accurate criticism because, at that point, a cut would actually be a cut; it would not be a decrease in the automatic increase. But President Obama, not content with the overspending and the waste, fraud, and abuse that's going on, is adding even above the automatic increases with his budget.

This article from Investors.com says:

Vastly exaggerates spending cuts: The press has widely reported that Obama's budget would cut spending a total of \$1.2 trillion over the next decade, but Obama's own budget shows that he actually cuts spending a mere \$186 billion. (The relevant tables can be found at <http://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/omb/budget/fy2014/assets/tables.pdf>.)

Obama inflates his claimed savings by first cancelling the automatic sequester spending cuts he previously signed into law, then reclaiming them as new savings, and by adding in cuts in interest payments on the debt.

I didn't realize that that went on, actually.

The article says:

Relies almost entirely on tax hikes: Obama's budget shows his plan would increase revenues by \$1.14 trillion over the next decade. That means his budget proposes \$6 in new taxes for every \$1 in spending cuts.

Cuts the deficit less than claimed: "My budget will reduce our deficits by nearly another \$2 trillion," Obama said Wednesday. But his budget shows total deficit reduction over the next decade would be just \$1.4 trillion. Plus, deficits start rising again after 2018.

It should be noted that CBO does not have a good grasp on reality. I've met with Director Elmendorf. I've talked to him more than once. I appreciate the job they're trying to do, but when they estimate the cost of ObamaCare at \$800 billion, and then after it passes say, Whoops, maybe \$1.1 trillion, and then after it's almost coming into effect say, You know what? It could be \$1.6 trillion or \$1.8 trillion, and then others more accurately say, You know what? It may be \$2.8 trillion, that means, if they originally estimate \$800 billion and it ends up being \$2.8 trillion, then they've got a margin of error rate of plus or minus, not 1, 2, 3, or 4 percent, but more like 300 to 400 percent.

Why are we even considering CBO projections when they're projecting costs with a margin of error of 300 to

400 percent? I think you'd have better luck just bringing somebody right out of college in here and saying, You give us your guess. Surely, your margin of error would be closer than 300 or 400 percent.

Anyway, Investors.com points out that Obama's budget "creates a new entitlement without a reliable means to pay for it."

Obama claims he can finance a new \$76 billion "preschool for all" program by raising tobacco taxes again; but after an initial spike, tobacco tax revenues will start trending downward year after year as more people quit smoking while the costs of this new program will keep climbing. The last time Obama hiked tobacco taxes—to pay for an expansion of Medicaid—revenues came in \$2.2 billion less than expected.

So, apparently, if the President wants more revenue from smoking, he's going to need to start doing a campaign to encourage people to smoke more so that he can get more taxes in and bring down the massive deficit that he is wanting to create.

This report points out from Investors.com:

The President boosts taxes on the middle class: Obama proposes to change the government's consumer price index in a way that will lower the official inflation rate. He's selling it as a way to cut Social Security annual cost of living adjustments, which are based on the CPI; but because his chained CPI would also apply to annual tax bracket adjustments, it will end up hiking taxes on the middle class \$124 billion.

The American people deserve better, and I hope and pray the Senate will wake up, come to their senses and stop trying to ram legislation through that America does not deserve.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

AGAINST THE CHAINED CPI AND SOCIAL SECURITY REDUCTIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) for 30 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to speak against any proposed reduction in earned Social Security benefits through the so-called chained CPI calculation. No issue better focuses the interests of the senior citizens of our country versus the top 1 percent greater than the debate over Social Security.

Earlier this year, over my objections, this Congress cut senior meals by \$823,000 in Ohio—or, roughly, 145,000 meals. Now some here in Washington are approaching the jugular for our seniors' Social Security benefit cuts.

The majority of seniors across our land depend on every single dollar they get from Social Security to put food on the table, to pay for utilities, to pay for housing. So many struggle with that every day. By slashing benefits in Social Security, while continuing to give tax havens to the richest people in this country, it proves that the prior-

ities in Washington lie with the 1 percent, not with those Americans who struggle every day.

The White House has chosen to include the so-called chained CPI method for calculating Social Security cost of living adjustments in its fiscal proposed 2014 budget, the one that we will be considering.

□ 1700

But I agree with Senator TOM HARKIN of Iowa, who said what a chained CPI really is is like being in a boat with a chain and a ball around your ankle, and they throw you in the water and you start to sink. That's exactly what a chained CPI is in Social Security.

Numerous government programs, including Social Security benefits, and income thresholds for tax brackets are indexed for inflation. That's what CPI is all about. Every year, seniors wait to see what their inflation adjustment will be in Social Security and in Medicare to see whether they'll get as much money as they got last year or less. The formula change that is being proposed would add up to a big cut for America's senior citizens who have earned their benefits.

Imagine, for example, a person born in 1935 who retired to full benefits at age 65 in the year 2000, and they paid into Social Security their entire working life. According to the Social Security Administration, people in that position under the current formula have an average monthly benefit of \$1,435, or about \$17,220 per year. Under the cost-of-living adjustment for 2012, that benefit would rise a bit to \$1,986 a month this year, or about \$23,832 a year. But under the chained CPI proposal, that sum would be less. It would be about \$1,880 a month, or \$22,560 a year. That's a cut of over 5 percent, or a \$106 a month cut, and more as you go further and further into future years. In other words, it gets worse and worse.

The other problem is that the people who rely most on their Social Security benefits—people who are older, people who have illness—are the ones who sadly the chained CPI does the worst job of accommodating. In fact, the group that gets the biggest FICA tax hike is families making between 30 and \$40,000 a year—dead center in our middle class. Their increase would be almost six times worse. It would affect them six times more than those who are in the millionaire tax bracket. That's because millionaires are already in the top tax bracket so they're not being pushed by the formula into higher marginal rates because of changing bracket thresholds. Isn't that convenient.

So because senior citizens spend more of their income on health care and housing, two areas where the formula is flawed and their true cost is under represented, the chained CPI proposal hurts seniors more.

Beyond the benefit inflation formula, we should not be supporting a plan that uses Social Security to pay for deficits

it didn't create. The Social Security trust fund is sound. Without anything being done, it would function well into 2038; and even after that time with no changes, we could pay 80 percent of the benefits that people have earned. Now, one of the reasons that Social Security looks over a long time horizon is because of economic downturns. When people get thrown out of work, they're not contributing into the Social Security trust fund. The answer to Social Security is to put people back to work. We have 12.5 million people unemployed in this country, and that creates a temporary blip that would affect people who will retire 20–25 years from now. We can fix that problem because Social Security is an efficient and effective program, but we shouldn't be using the American people's annuity for retirement that they earned and mix it up with the regular budget. It's two different things.

About 98 percent of Social Security benefits go out in the form of benefit checks which the beneficiaries spend on whatever they value most. Most of them spend the vast majority on food. But less than 2 percent of Social Security today is put on administrative expenses. The program is very efficiently run, and no private pension plan, no 401(k) that took so much of the people's money away, no private annuity, can claim that kind of efficient operation. Cuts in promised Social Security benefits, whether they occur because of the chained CPI, or some people here are talking about a higher retirement age or means testing, will shift more costs onto already struggling American families and our senior citizens. Frankly, I don't support that.

I applaud that the chained CPI proposal that was in the White House budget had a provision to protect the very oldest and disabled persons who receive supplemental security income and low-income veterans, but let me put on the record: these groups represent less than half of the seniors who have earned Social Security benefits. The formula doesn't really take care of others who are impacted by this proposed CPI change.

Frankly, this is not the time to cut earned benefits of millions of senior Americans who are already struggling financially. And I can guarantee you, the lowest-income citizens in this country are women over the age of 85, and I would never vote to take a penny away from them. This formula should be there in a form that allows them to live in dignity.

We have been unwilling as a Congress to close tax loopholes for the billionaires and millionaires of our country. This has been a Congress unwilling to prosecute Wall Street bankers for the damage they did, but it appears that some are willing to take money from our seniors who have earned and worked for Social Security benefits that are critical to their livelihoods and which they depend upon.

You know, I have a story to tell. Last weekend, I was doing grocery shopping