House Rules for the 114th Congress Put Social Security, SSDI At Risk

What’s At Stake?

At stake is America’s promise to over 165 million workers who today pay into Social Security and may one day need Social Security Disability Insurance (SSDI), and nearly 11 million people with disabilities and their families who currently receive SSDI.

For about two decades, Congress has known that it will need to replenish Social Security’s Disability Insurance or DI fund in 2016 to account for long-term trends, such as an aging workforce now in its disability-prone years. Without Congressional action, in 2016 the DI fund’s reserves will be depleted, leaving only incoming payroll contributions to pay for benefits. Unless Congress acts, SSDI will face benefit cuts of 20% at the end of 2016.

“Reallocation” is the Common-Sense, Necessary Solution

Over the last 5 decades, Congress has repeatedly, on a bipartisan basis, used a simple, sensible solution to address shortfalls in either of Social Security’s two funds (the Old-Age and Survivors Insurance or OASI fund and the DI fund). A temporary shift of Social Security’s incoming revenues to the DI fund – called “reallocation” – will extend the DI fund’s solvency for almost two decades, without cutting coverage, eligibility, or benefits – and without increasing taxpayer contributions.

Congress has made similar shifts 11 times in the past, about equally increasing the percentage of Social Security revenues going into one fund or the other. Under reallocation, the solvency of the overall Social Security system stays the same, with the combined funds remaining fully solvent through 2033.

House Rules for the 114th Congress Create Barriers to Reallocation

On January 6, 2015 the House of Representatives adopted its rules of procedure for the 114th Congress (H. Res. 5, approved by a vote of 234 to 168). A provision added the night before the vote, with no public hearings or debate, creates requirements that bar the House from making a reallocation that would stabilize the DI fund through 2033 without accompanying cuts to Social Security coverage, eligibility or benefits.

The House added this unprecedented provision with no opportunities for input by SSDI beneficiaries or by workers who pay into Social Security and may need SSDI in the future.

Procedurally, the rules provision only affects the House – not the Senate – and the House can in the future vote to waive the provision’s requirements to allow a reallocation. However, it creates unnecessary procedural hurdles and sets a troubling tone for how the 114th Congress may deal with Social Security and SSDI.