

if you have a record that shows you stop, you start, you let some people go home, you do not know where you want to go in the future, that you not pay your bills?

□ 1630

My God. The bank will say, "What kind of a risk is that? We're not going to deal with this individual."

Mr. DOGGETT. And how truly ironic that this is happening at a time when Vice President GORE has done such a wonderful job with the reinventing Government initiative, when this administration has actually brought down the size of the Federal work force, when we have some really creative efforts underway to try to ensure that the American taxpayer gets a full dollar's worth from Government, that Government works more efficiently, that we search out those departments that are not doing their job and change things there. Instead of working to see that our Government that is essential works better, we end up with this hurry up and stop kind of government that cannot help but destroy employee morale, make for greater inefficiency.

I am sure that your office, like mine, is frequently involved with working with citizens that have a problem on a Social Security check or a veteran's benefit or a problem with some other Federal agency where we are trying to assist the citizen in working with their Government, and it is difficult to get timely responses for citizens from agencies that are closed one day and starting up the next and not knowing whether they are going to be there the following month.

Ms. DELAURO. That is precisely it, because people are almost—I find this, I know you do—losing confidence in what Government is about. That is the tragedy of all of this, when you can have a conversation about a role of Government and what role that it does play, but every single day that these kinds of things occur here, there is less and less confidence in what the Government is able to do, and in terms of trying to assist people to do what they want to do, not to do it for them. That is not what it is about, but to assist people, whether it is, as I said, in retirement or education.

One of the other pieces of this, which I do not know if it was mentioned in this discussion, is that come March 1 there are billions of dollars in Social Security payments that are supposed to go out, veterans' benefits, including the payments to our young men and women who are serving in Bosnia. If the Government defaults, as the current strategy is, none of those payments will go out.

Mr. DOGGETT. The gentlewoman will remember that in December we got within hours of a delay or stoppage in benefits for our veterans, and only because the gentlewoman and others of us took to the floor to emphasize the disaster that would occur if this shut-down continued were we able to get

legislation enacted within less than a day of the time that, had it not been enacted, those benefits would not have been there when the people needed them.

Ms. DELAURO. I would just like to thank my colleague for taking this time to have us have a conversation and discussion. I think once again it comes down to why people do send us here, why they put their faith and their trust in all of us. They give us a tremendous amount of responsibility and of power and of leeway to work on their behalf.

I think that it is this kind of abdication of leadership by the Republican majority in this House and the Gingrich leadership that makes people feel that why should they bother, why should they participate in Government, why should they trust a Government that will be willing to put them in economic difficulty, jeopardize them and their families. That is not what this is all about. But what the Gingrich leadership in this House wants to do is precisely that, is to put the United States in jeopardy as Nation but, more importantly, to put the people of this country and their families in economic harm.

Mr. DOGGETT. Very well put. I thank the gentlewoman for participating. Let us address the question of this Nation's creditworthiness this week and not jeopardize it further.

ABERCROMBIE APPEARS ON SPEAKER'S LIST

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. YOUNG of Florida). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. ABERCROMBIE] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, I come here today in a rather interesting position, having recently been the recipient of what might be regarded, and I do regard it as a compliment.

You may recall that in years past there was a so-called enemies list that President Nixon ostensibly had, the Nixon enemies list, and people after awhile were quite pleased to have been on it, and those who were not on it were a little bit disappointed. Well, I take it similarly as a compliment to be on Mr. GINGRICH's target list.

Mr. Speaker, I notice that one of our colleagues has come to the floor. I take it that he is maybe making an inquiry whether he might have been able to take some of the time from one of the previous speakers from the Republican side.

Have I guessed correctly on that?

Mr. SHAYS. If the gentleman would yield.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Yes, I will.

Mr. SHAYS. I would love to have some time. You have an hour, we have an hour afterwards. Just curious how long you might be going.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. I just started because you folks missed your time.

Mr. SHAYS. You can have it.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. But I tell you what. No, I understand that running-down-the-aisle situation.

Mr. Speaker, if it is all right with you, I would cede a half-hour of time right now to my good friend.

Mr. SHAYS. I would be happy to come back in a half-hour, if the gentleman would like to speak, and I will come back in a half-hour.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. All right.

Mr. SHAYS. Thank you very much.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Of the 60 minutes, I would like to cede 30 minutes to my good friends.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Hawaii is recognized for 30 minutes minus the 2 that he has already used.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

I think that was a good example, Mr. Speaker, of the fact that we do have comity on this floor. Some of our colleagues might think we are spelling that "comedy" rather than "comity" but I think that you and I both are committed to this institution.

I have been the beneficiary of your wisdom, Mr. Speaker, and your leadership in this House, and I would hope that I could make a similar contribution in whatever role I find myself on this floor or in any committee, in any post. I think we both view this as a privilege that has been given to us, an honor bestowed by the voters in our districts. But as I indicated, nonetheless, this is an institution in which the politics of this country are played out in a setting which I think is most appropriate for coming to those decisions.

In the process of engaging in political debate, inevitably sides are taken. I think perhaps that is one of the reasons why for some individuals they fail to understand that, the proposition, well, why can they not all get along? Why is there what is called bickering?

I would hope, Mr. Speaker, you and I have never been in a position of bickering with one another. I think we have probably had a division of thought and philosophy and possibly policy at one time or another, and other times we were not only able to agree but to work in concert with one another toward a common goal, seeking to achieve it. Nonetheless, there are different political philosophies that are put forward by individuals who put themselves up for public office, and people make a decision on those philosophies.

So as a result, we often find ourselves in opposition to one another, not necessarily personally, Mr. Speaker, but in terms of political parties and policies that might or might not be pursued.

I say all of this by way of preliminary remarks because, as I indicated before my friend from Connecticut came to the floor, there was this list that was put together. I suppose it had a bit of drama attached to it because of the press, journalists categorizing it a certain way, but it was called the enemies list and it was associated with

then-President Nixon. Some people were wont to even brag a little bit after that list became known, that they were on that list, and it was a source of some disappointment to some people that they were not on the list.

Well, for the 1990's, we have a list, too. The Speaker of the House, Mr. GINGRICH, has put together a list, a target list, for next year—I should say for this year, rather—for the congressional elections this year, some 20 to 30 Members of the Congress who are being targeted by Mr. GINGRICH for defeat in November for one reason and another, I presume perhaps because of opposition on policies, perhaps, I would hope, effective refutation of the Speaker's positions.

In any event, I find myself on that list. I am one of the Speaker's targets this year. I am on the Gingrich target list. I do take that as a compliment. I am very pleased to be on it. I trust and hope that perhaps some of the commentary that I have been making on the budget, and on what I see as the lack of solid policy on Mr. GINGRICH's part and his leadership with respect to the budget, I hope that some of the things I have had to say have led him to designate me as a target in this upcoming election.

I am very pleased to be recognized. It is not always those of us from some of the smaller States at such great distance, particularly being out in Hawaii, where we would certainly welcome the Speaker after the election in November, hopefully as the ex-Speaker. We will be happy to have him come out and take a little rest with us out there, and I will be happy to provide some hospitality for him, and I certainly hope to be in the victors column when that election takes place despite being a target.

But I bring this up about being a target because I do not want to deceive any one of our colleagues who may be tuned in, or others who may have access to our deliberations here, that I am anything other than partisan when it comes to defending what I believe are the interests of the people of the United States, the public interest of the United States with respect to the budget and with respect to the other issues that I have a difference with the Speaker on, and apparently have contributed to me being this target.

As the target, I invite the Speaker yet once again to come to the floor. I have done this in the past and do it now.

I recall at one point being in the chair, even as the Speaker is now, and had the opportunity to listen to with great interest, Mr. GINGRICH's recitation on various subject matters having to do with policy. He has indicated that as Speaker that he does not deal with the day-to-day floor activity here. He has entrusted that to Mr. ARMEY and his whip structure.

He says now that the deal, the supposed deal or the possibility of a deal on the budget has broken down with

the White House. So he does not have anyplace to go, I guess, in the afternoons now that he is not speaking with Mr. Clinton, so he should have the time to come down here.

Inasmuch as I am going to be a target, I would like to deal with the issues that apparently have upset him, particularly with regard to the budget or any other issue that has caused me to be put into this position by Mr. GINGRICH. I invite him to do so. I would like to think that our academic backgrounds, perhaps, might be an inducement to lecture. I suppose some people might see what we are doing here in special orders as lectures, but that is all right. I think it is good to have the opportunity to lay out, in a detailed and comprehensive way, one's position.

So I invite him once again and would be happy to see him and yield him time, any time that he wishes to take advantage of it.

□ 1645

In the meantime, let me then state a couple of propositions with respect to the budget process and build upon the commentary that I have made to this point. Mr. Speaker, perhaps you recall a bit of my discussion with the gentleman from Texas, Mr. DOGGETT, in the hour just passed in which I indicated that I thought perhaps, I will not say the Speaker, Speaker GINGRICH, misspoke himself, but perhaps I would characterize it as being a bid disingenuous in indicating to the public that he thought that it was not possible to have a balanced budget agreement with the President this year.

Now, I am sure you will agree, Mr. Speaker, that I have been very reluctant to endorse the bona fides, if you will, of a 7-year balanced budget agreement, whether it was certified by the Congressional Budget Office or by the Office of Management and Budget which is the Executive accountants, if you will, the scorekeeper. The Congressional Budget Office is our; the Congress', the Legislative scorekeepers. I am reluctant to believe that this could be done without causing a great deal of pain regardless of whether it is a Democratic budget, Republican budget or anybody else's budget. But nonetheless, the indications from the Republican side of the aisle, from the office of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH], was that if the President would only present to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH] a 7-year balanced budget as certified by the Congressional Budget Office, that that would be sufficient unto the day, that would involve the kinds of savings the Speaker was looking for, et cetera. Over and over again, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH] and other Members of the majority would come to the floor and state with no equivocation, "Just give us a 7-year balanced budget as certified by the Congressional Budget Office, and have got a deal."

Well, Mr. Clinton did that. I have my reservations about the bookkeeping, as

I indicated, in that just as I do with the Republican proposal. I think I have gone over that in detail before. There are all kinds of gimmicks associated with it. There are all kinds of bookkeeping maneuvers and tricks, all kinds of accounting gambits that put such a budget together.

For example, what is called backloading or a look-back provision; in other words, you do not really make the savings until 3, 4, 5, 6 years from now when you have already gone through a presidential election, when you are going to go through two, possible three, congressional elections, when you cannot quite be sure what the economic stability or instability of the country might be.

Mr. Speaker, I noticed my good friend from American Samoa is here. I noticed that you had called his name previously, and he is only able to arrive right now.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from American Samoa.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I just want to, if I could, have a dialogue with the gentleman on the topic he is just taking up. I will ask for my own time at a later point in time.

I thank the gentleman for bringing the issue up and his interest. He wanted to conduct a dialog with our Speaker, and given the fact that we have had some very serious problems with our budget, and I noticed earlier that the gentleman mentioned about the 7-year cycle that our Republican friends have advocated so strongly for the past several months, that it is as if we have got to have the 7-year balanced budget.

Can I ask the gentleman, to his knowledge, where do we come up with this number 7? Is it so much that it has to be 7 years? Are there assurances without 7 years we will never have had a balanced budget? Why can we not do it in 5 or 10 or 8 or 9?

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. The answer to that question comes from the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH], and he said that he felt that the 7-year was intuitive on his part. Now, if intuitive is taken to mean generally or generically a kind of sense that this was the right time, a kind of emotional and mental guesswork, that might be the correct phrase, but I think he intuited, I would project, that this was the number of years in which the kind of accounting gymnastics that I have mentioned would allow him to say that the budget was balanced even only for the briefest of bookkeeping moments.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Is it the gentleman's understanding also that our Republican friends did make a request to our President, come up with a 7-year budget plan and we will consider it, and did not the President issue a 7-year budget plan?

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. That request was made of the President over and over and over again, and obviously a brief reading and overview of the general press will show that he did, in fact, do exactly that.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. What were the objections that our Republican friends now have with the President's proposed 7-year budget plan?

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Well, they did not like the numbers. After all, it did not do to Medicare what they wanted to do.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. But it did provide a 7-year balanced budget?

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Oh, yes. It gave them exactly what they wanted. As you know, the old saying is be careful what you ask for, you might get it. That is exactly what happened. What they asked for was a game plan according to the rules that they said they wanted established. The President appeared on the field with that game plan, and I am sorry to say some of our poor Republican friends then turned around to their quarterback, but he had left the field after moving the goal posts and was now hiding in the locker room under the bench.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. So now what are our Republican friends trying to do to off-balance what the President set out? "Here is your 7-year balanced budget plan." What are they going to do now?

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Of course, they are claiming now a deal cannot be reached, that we cannot come to an agreement even through the American people in poll after poll and inquiry after inquiry are requesting, is the nicest way I can put it, the Government, that is to say, the Congress of the United States regardless of whether they are Democrats or Republicans, and the Executive in the person of President Clinton, to come to an agreement so that there can be some stability in our economy and in our political life.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Do you think, in my good friend's opinion, that our Republican friends have a high esteem for education as part of this proposed budget plan that they have in mind.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. I am sure many of our Republican friends, if not all of them, esteem education, including the Speaker. The problem is not esteem. The problem is paying for it. The problem is setting it as a priority. The problem is do you have education as a priority, or do you have a tax giveaway as a priority.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. That is basically the platform our side of the aisle has in conjunction with the President's proposal.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Yes. The proposal coming from the President, with all attendant difficulties associated with balancing the budget, nonetheless, has as its priorities the Medicare, Medicaid, environment and education. Those are priorities that the President has consistently stated from the very beginning as elements which he felt had to be protected in any budget proposal that came forward.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. I thank you very much.

That bit of Socratic dialog, Mr. Speaker, I think has stated the essence of it.

Now, obviously any of our colleagues who were tuned in can say, well this is just a partisan observation or series of partisan observations by myself and the gentleman from Samoa, and that is OK. It does not bother me any it would be seen as partisan.

The problem is, is it fair, is it accurate, is it factual? I will not say truthful. Truthful is always a matter of debate. What the truth is, is a matter of debate.

I do think that people nonetheless come to conclusions. They nonetheless reserve judgment, if they are prudent, and when they think that they have heard the facts and contemplated the factual basis for a judgment, they then make it.

Now let us take somebody outside the political system itself, the electoral system, and see what they have to say about it. I am referring now to Jodie Allen. I do not know Jodie Allen, if he is male or female. I have not met Mr. or Ms. Allen. All I know is Jodie Allen is editor of the Outlook section of the Washington Post where columnists are found of a Sunday.

I do not blame Jodie Allen one way or another for the headlines. I think, Mr. Speaker, you and I are sufficiently well versed in dealing with newspapers as elected officials to know that the person who writes the story does not necessarily write the headline, and the headline does not necessarily refer to what is in the story, and you can find yourself reeling from what it says, but these headlines over the Allen columns say, "Who won the budget battle?" The sub headline is: "Clinton's phony plan beats the GOP's phony plan." So I would guess that Jodie Allen has not got too much good to say about either. I will not say either of us, Mr. Speaker, but about either of these plans.

But the whole point of the headline, I think, is to try and summarize the position of the Allen editorial which nonetheless contains some very interesting material which I would like to quote very briefly in what will be a series of remarks from me in time to come with respect to the budget and its realities as well as the debt limit and its connection to the budget.

Just the opening commentary, and I am quoting now from Jodie Allen's editorial of January 28 in the Washington Post Outlook section, "To hear the President tell it in his masterfully ingratiating State of the Union message last week, the country came very close to solving its Federal budget problem once and for all."

Quoting further then the President within the column, "'There is now broad bipartisan agreement that permanent deficit spending must come to an end,' said President Clinton last Tuesday evening," again quoting, "'though differences remain among us

which are significant.' He also noted, 'The combined total of the proposed savings that are in common to both, that is to say, the White House and the congressional Republican plans, is more than enough using numbers from your Congressional Budget Office to balance the budget in 7 years and provide a modest tax cut. These cuts are real.'" Jodie Allen then goes on to say, "Are they? It is a question worth asking as the country, having clearly decided the President got the best of Congress in the blame affixing event tries to decide whether it should now care that the overall competition has been called on account of political rain. In fact, the details of the competing proposals suggest that at least as far as the cause of fiscal solvency is concerned, less has been lost than either side would care to admit. No doubt some elements in both plans are real enough. Both sides, for example, were and apparently still are, determined to give out a pre-election tax cut, deficit be damned. It is also a pretty safe bet the agreements Congress extracts from the President in return for allowing the Government to keep running and borrowing more money will make substantial cuts in the immediate operating budgets of the many Federal agencies. Beyond that," and I think this is the important point here, I say parenthetically, "Beyond that, things get a lot less real. For example, even had the White House embraced the GOP's harshest cuts, the deficit would still be upwards of \$150 billion this fiscal year and still higher in 1997. By the end of the century, it might or might not dip below \$100 billion. After that further progress against the deficit would likely be arrested and ultimately reversed under either plan" from the Jodie Allen column.

Mr. Speaker, that has been the essence of the observations that I have made from this podium again and again during this whole budget process. I have maintained from this podium, while all of the broader discussion is going on, about the balanced budget and all the posturing was taking place and all the puffed up rhetoric was being stated on this floor and in press conferences and covered by television cameras and radio microphones with breathless anticipation, nobody wanted to talk about the fact that regardless of what kind of balanced budget proposal was coming forward, it was actually increasing the deficit.

□ 1700

I will state without equivocation again: No one can come to this floor, at least no one has to this point, despite my invitations again and again and again, to refute the position that I am maintaining that there has not been a balanced budget proposal put forward by anybody of either party that will stand the scrutiny of an honest appraisal as to whether or not it is increasing the deficit.

It might be possible, Mr. Speaker, to achieve a balanced budget at some

point in the future. Going into debt is no sin and no crime. Anybody who has purchased a home over time or a major appliance, an automobile, et cetera, understands that. In fact, it is encouraged.

The question is, are you able to pay? Can you acquire debt in such a way and such a manner and for such a length of time that enables those or that institution doing the lending to be reasonably sure you are going to be able to make the payment, be able to sustain the debt, and sustain your life and its requirements monetarily.

That is all this is about. I do not think that can be done in 7 years, but I am in the minority. I have been in legislative life in a State legislature, in the house of representatives at the State level and the State senate, in a city council, and in the Congress of the United States. I have been part of the board of directors of nonprofit organizations in many venues, Mr. Speaker. In other words, just about every community and electoral venue there is, I have participated in a legislative function where you had to deal with budgets, where you had to deal with coming to grips in most of those instances with balancing the budget.

I have participated both as the chairman of an authorizing committee and as a member of an appropriations committee in balancing budgets in every legislative venue. So this is not something strange and new to me. I have better than two decades of experience in this area. So I am quite willing to come to grips with the idea that I am in the minority on this floor with the question of the number of years that should be reasonably made available to deal with the balanced budget.

But I am not required, Mr. Speaker, simply because I am in the minority at the moment with respect to the numbers of years that would be required to do this, I am not required in that context to keep quiet about the fact that those who are putting forward a proposal that they can balance in 7 years cannot do it, and that to delude the American people, deliberately or otherwise, I am not trying to at this juncture cast some sort of aspersions on those who say they want to attempt it at least. All well and good, if that is what the proposition is.

If someone wants to come to the floor and say no, I do not think it can be done, or on paper it cannot be done in 7 years if we are being honest about it, and the word "honesty" has been used over and over and over again on this floor, we want honest numbers. If that is the case, fine. You want to make an attempt over 7 years to do it, possibly it could be done. I think it would entail the kind of cuts that would cause incredible pain to people in all kinds of areas.

Part of the pain that would come would come after 2002, after the 7-year period, when I am maintaining, and I think the burden of the rest of the article by Jodie Allen is that once you pass

2002, to the degree that you are able to achieve anywhere near the kind of goal that has been set in 1996 over that period of time, that 7-year period of time, there will be an explosion of debt, an explosion of indebtedness, an explosion of deficit spending.

One of the categories that would, I think, harm us the most would be in Social Security. The Allen article, again I am citing it because I wanted this to be an outside person. It justifies not NEIL ABERCROMBIE by standing up here and tossing out facts and figures as suit me and then could be dismissed as a result of simply being partisan, no matter how accurate it might be. I am citing these columns, and I am glad to see the Jodie Allens and some of the other people I am going to be citing are beginning to pick this commentary up. I will be going over that in greater detail in time to come.

Mr. Speaker, I believe my half hour is almost up. Let me conclude simply by saying that it is not a question of who wins the budget battle, it is a question of who loses. If the American people lose the budget battle, believe me, we all lose here politically. I hope in days to come to be able to shed a little more light on not only what the process is to this point, but what we can do about it in a practical way to bring a successful conclusion to this budget confrontation.

GETTING OUR FINANCIAL HOUSE IN ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS] is recognized for 30 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. SHAYS. I thank the gentleman from Hawaii, and I thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is unusual to have a special order with such a seasoned veteran at the helm as Speaker. I thank you for your willingness to take this time from your busy schedule to allow the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. UPTON], and myself to make a few comments about what we have been faced with and what we will be facing in the months to come.

I would start by saying a lot of good people are leaving Congress, a lot of people I have tremendous respect for. One of their comments is they are leaving because it is not a fun place anymore; that there is some animosity between parties and among chambers. I was thinking, you know, the reason goes far more than that, because there is some disagreement that is quite significant.

But I contend that some of my colleagues who are leaving are leaving when we need them the most and when the heavy lifting has really begun. In a way, they are escaping the responsibility for dealing with the crisis that has just been pushed for that next Congress to deal with.

For decades we knew that we were getting ourselves deeper in a hole. At

the end of the Vietnam war, if I went to 1974, the national debt was about \$430 billion. That is the debt, not the deficits. That national debt has grown to \$4.9 trillion, a tenfold increase since the last great war. We have a tenfold increase since the last great war in Vietnam. It was not called a war, but it clearly was a major expenditure on the part of the United States.

So we fought the Revolutionary War, we fought the War of 1812, we actually fought the war with the pirates and their taking some of our sailors in the Mediterranean. We fought the Civil War, we fought the war with the Indians throughout the course of our history, the Spanish American War, World War I, World War II, Vietnam war, the Korean war, and we have a debt of \$435 billion. Then what happened? That debt has just gone up almost exponentially in the last 22 years.

I contend it has gone that way because both Republicans and Democrats have, for whatever reason, agreed that they would not give in on what they did not want to give in on. Democrats did not want to give in on the growth of entitlements, and some of my Republican colleagues did not want to give in on defense spending. They both agreed to deficit spend in the process. We find ourselves in a tremendously difficult situation with a lot of large debt, and now the heavy lifting begins.

We are taking on a lot of special interests, because this Republican majority, candidly, wants to get our financial house in order. Ultimately we can only succeed if the President wants to be part of that effort. He should be an equal partner to it.

The bottom line is we need to do some heavy lifting. So yes, this is not a fun place anymore. It is not a fun place because we are having to do some very significant effort.

I will just make a few more comments before I yield to my colleague from Michigan. Prime Minister Rabin, before he died, made it very clear that he was elected by adults to represent the children. I think that is a good message for all of us, we are elected by adults to represent the children. If we are concerned about the children, we have to be concerned about the national debt and the kind of burden we are placing on our children and our children's children.

So we are setting about to accomplish three major tasks: One is to get our financial house in order and balance our Federal budget in 7 years or less; another is to save our trust funds, particularly Medicare, from bankruptcy. I know my colleague at the chair, representing Florida, is representing so many constituents who in fact are receiving Medicare. This fund is going insolvent, Medicare part B is going insolvent this year. More money is going out of the fund than coming in from the payroll tax. We want to save the trust fund from insolvency.

The third thing we are eager to do is to transform this caretaking social and