

portable energy that is easy to put on a ship and bring it here, because by the time you compress it and liquify it, bring it here and convert it back to gas it costs money and costs time to do that, and we have got limited capacity.

We are looking to build a couple more liquefied natural gas plants refining plants to convert from liquid into gas again. It takes time to do that. But we have a tremendous supply of natural gas on the Outer Continental Shelf in the United States. And God bless Ronald Reagan for drawing that dotted line out there at 200 miles offshore in the United States. I believe that was in about 1983. When he did that he opened up a tremendous amount for energy resources for the United States, not just natural gas, other minerals out there too that we have not even found yet, plus a lot of crude oil in the same areas where you will find natural gas in many cases. But that 200-mile limit that Reagan defined for us is a limit that lets us have an almost unlimited supply of natural gas.

Now, I will give you some examples here on how that works. The North Slope of Alaska, where we went up there in 1972 to open that area up and drill for oil on the North Slope of Alaska, where we had to build the pipeline from up there down to Valdez in order to put that oil on tankers to get it down here to the lower 48 States so we could market it.

But the provision was not in place at that time to build a natural gas pipeline because why would you pipe natural gas down to Valdez to compress it into liquid, put it on a ship, send it down to California, turn it back into a gas when you had a countryside that had all this natural gas in it, natural gas that was probably less than 2 bucks back there in 1972.

So we did not develop the natural gas, but it is there. The wells are drilled. It is available. There is 38 trillion cubic feet of natural gas on the North Slope of Alaska sitting up there right now. It needs a pipeline down to the Lower 48. It is over 4,700 miles from Prudhoe Bay, mile post zero on the Alaska pipeline on down to Kansas City if you want to pick a place in the middle of the country, over 4,700 miles.

If you go the other way and go south, where is there a lot of gas south? Well, we know offshore in Louisiana, offshore on the entire gulf coast.

Go a little farther. Venezuela, there is gas that we are paying \$14.50 for is \$1.60 there. You know that is only 2,700 miles from the coast of Venezuela up to Kansas City and it is 4,700 miles from Kansas City to Prudhoe Bay and the North Slope of Alaska.

But it is not just a measure of a pipeline from Alaska to Kansas City which, I do support that because I want more energy into the Lower 48 States for a lot of different ways. But it is not the measure then of 4,700 miles from Alaska to Kansas City versus Kansas City to Venezuela.

It is because there is another measure, and that is the measure of 406

cubic feet of natural gas that is on the Outer Continental Shelf that is right there next to already processing plants, pipelines, drill rigs. We have the network all there. All we need to do is expand that drilling.

This country needs it. And these Americans deserve it. We need to drive this \$14.50 price down. We have got to cut it by half at least. We can do it if we can open 406 trillion cubic feet of natural gas.

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I guess I want to conclude with the following, that there is no one who has a good argument that we do not need to open a supply of natural gas. There are those who think there are other ways to do it, that LNG is the big answer. I do not think that is the big answer. It can be a help. But we what we really need to do, the natural gas supply that is the most readily available to population centers of this country is the Outer Continental Shelf.

All leading nations produce there, and they have clean beaches. They have great tourism. It does not have to be a detriment. And I urge those from Florida and California who keep decrying that this is going to be the demise of their beaches and their tourism to show me the facts. Do not give me rhetoric. Do not make brash statements. Give me the facts of where a natural gas producing well has polluted a beach.

I am asking Florida and California, who are huge consumers of natural gas, to join with us and be a part of the solution. This is a problem facing America. We cannot afford to have two States holding up the energy policy of this country who are the largest consumers of natural gas in enormous amounts per capita compared to other States, who use most of their electricity that is made with natural gas. And I urge them to come to the table as part of the solution. Show me where natural gas wells have polluted the beach, and I will be there.

I have had no one take me up on that offer. Natural gas wells or natural gas flowing out of steel pipe into a collection system into our homes, into our factories. Natural gas will depend on whether America remains a competitive nation. It is so entwined in our economy and our lives that we cannot continue to have government curtail the production and expand the use.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 3146

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 3146.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WESTMORELAND). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

□ 1745

NEWS YOU WILL NOT HEAR ABOUT

(Mr. PRICE of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, while watching the nightly news last night, I was shocked by the stories being reported or, more accurately, by those stories that were not being reported.

What, you say. Well, during the month of October we added over 50,000 jobs to our economy. Hurricanes Katrina, Rita, and Wilma wreaked havoc in cities across our gulf coast, displacing hundreds of thousands of people from their homes and jobs.

During this time, our economy was still able to continue to grow in the face of these tragic events. Our Republican policies worked to stimulate the economy. Job creation averaged 194,000 per month for the year prior to Hurricane Katrina. Third quarter GDP increased by 3.8 percent, capping 10 quarters of growth in a row. Yet you would not know it unless you searched deep past the front pages of your local papers. There have been increases in new and existing home sales, declines in unemployment, and increases in business investment. All good news.

Mr. Speaker, an examination of the facts makes it quite clear. Republicans have a plan to reform the Federal Government and increase savings for all the American people.

30-SOMETHING WORKING GROUP

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WESTMORELAND). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MEEK) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to address the House once again, and we would like to thank the Democratic leadership for allowing us to have one more hour on the 30-something Working Group tonight. We have been coming to the floor daily and mainly speaking recently about the budget and what effects it is going to have on the American people throughout this country.

We have asked our colleagues within the working group to come to the floor, share some of their concerns, talk about our Democratic alternative, which failed in committee, not because it was not an alternative of merit and of commitment and making sure that we place ourselves in heading in the direction towards the balanced budget by 2012, but it failed because we were in the minority. One Republican on the opposite side of the aisle did vote against the proposal that will be coming to the floor in the coming days, seeing it in a way that fiscal responsibility is important but making sure that we do not leave Americans behind who sent us up here to represent them.

I am honored tonight to be joined by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms.

WASSERMAN SCHULTZ) and also my good friend, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. DAVIS), who has been a part of this in making sure that we put American priorities forward. But I must say that there is a lot of work that needs to be done.

Tonight we are going to make sure that the Members know and also the American people know exactly what they are going to be voting on coming the next couple of days. There will be a bill in the Committee on Rules, and we will have debate here on the floor; but Members need to know exactly what they are voting for because as we, Mr. Speaker, look at this bill as written, veterans are going to have longer lines, they are going to pay higher co-payments, they are going to pay higher premiums. And those individuals that are coming out of theater, some 130,000, now we have 150-something thousand in theater of war, when they come back and they find themselves waiting in longer lines for what we promised them as it relates to health care, as it relates to benefits and not leaving out their families and children, I think it is something we need to pay very close attention to.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ).

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, it is again a pleasure to be here with you to talk about the issues that are important to the American people. I think the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. DAVIS) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MEEK) would both agree that this week really everything is going to come to a head. The choices that Members in this Chamber are going to be asked to make, more than any other week that I have been here, I think, are going to be emblematic of where our priorities are.

The choices that we are going to have to make on this budget reconciliation bill, which is Washington-speak for budget cuts, is going to show who is for the American people in making sure that they can sustain a decent quality of life and who is against that concept and is more supportive of making sure that the wealthy can stay wealthy. That is really what it boils down to.

Just to give you, Mr. Speaker, an idea, as well as anyone who can hear our conversation, of exactly what we are going to be asked to choose between this week, the Republican leadership and the Republican Members have been making a lot of hay about the spending cuts that they are going to ask us to vote for, that they are needed reductions because we have to do something about this deficit. And we agree. We agree that there needs to be something done about the deficit.

But the difference between our approach and the Republican approach is that our approach would actually reduce the deficit, and their approach actually adds to it. If you have a little less than \$55 billion in budget cuts, yet

still have 70-some-odd-billion dollars in tax cuts, the difference between that is \$20 billion more added on to the deficit.

Now, I can tell you honestly that I was not very good at math when I was younger and struggled with it a little bit, but that is pretty simple math. That is not complex. It is not calculus. It does not require an advanced degree. Seventy minus 50 is 20. And it is not a negative number. It is a positive number added on to the deficit.

Let us demonstrate that while we are still providing \$70 billion to tax cuts for the wealthy we are cutting the following things: for the sake of more tax cuts in this budget reconciliation bill, students can expect to pay as much as \$5,800 more for college. For the sake of more tax cuts, 300,000 of America's neediest will be left without food stamps. For the sake of more tax cuts, we will fail in our obligation to bring hurricane victims lasting relief. For the sake of more tax cuts, \$10 billion, \$10 billion with a B, will be slashed from Medicaid. One in four children in America get their health care from Medicaid.

For the sake of more tax cuts, we will ensure that the deficit remains high and the burden of creating more debt and paying that debt by our selfishness in choosing to help the wealthy at the expense of the people who are the most in need and the people who are just working every day to make ends meet, that is the debt we are passing on to our children and our children's children. And it is just mind-boggling to me. I know I am a freshman. The two gentlemen have been here longer than me. Maybe I am naive. Maybe the gentleman can provide some clarity because to me it is simple math.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ) for yielding.

I am honored as always to be here with my colleague from Florida and my colleague from Ohio to talk about what is an enormously important vote on the floor of the House this week. I thank the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ) at the outset for exposing one of the great myths behind this vote. As you know, there is a requirement that when we introduce bills in the House that we label the legislation, that we give it a title that is supposed to be roughly descriptive of the purpose of the bill. So we are told, well, this is a deficit reduction act, and I thank the gentlewoman for laying bare that myth.

□ 1800

When we finish with the tax cuts that are still being contemplated, dividend tax cuts, for example, in the next several weeks, and we do the simple math, our deficit will be worse than it is today.

This is not a Deficit Reduction Act. Something very different is at stake.

This is not about cutting spending, it is not about saving the government money; it is about a different set of values being in the saddle.

All of us who are here have been in the Congress fairly recently. Mr. RYAN, Mr. MEEK and I came here in 2003, and you joined us this year. We all came with this notion that we stood for a particular set of values about government. One of the values that we most deeply believe in is the idea of obligation, of strong people to weak people, of people who are in one place in society, being related and connected to people in a very different place in society.

A lot of us ran on that, a lot of us talked about that. As strongly as we believe in our party, we hope that those just aren't partisan values. We hope that those are values that are shared all across this aisle, in the center, left and the right, the Democratic and the Republican side.

But what is sad about this week is that a very different set of values are now in the saddle. You touched on some of them, but they are very much worth underscoring: 300,000 families in this country who are getting food stamps. If the majority has its way, those 300,000 people will lose their food stamps, not because they have committed fraud, not because their income status has changed in the last several years, not because they have been shown to not need food stamps but simply because a different set of values are in the saddle.

You talked about, or you touched upon the question of child support. If the majority has its way, the Federal Government will walk away from a bipartisan commitment to help States go out and find deadbeat dads and enforce the laws that require people who have children to be responsible for them. We will see a party that styles itself as the party of family values walk away from that commitment. Again, it is not because of saving money, it is because a different set of values are in the saddle.

You talked about Medicaid. For the first time, if the majority has its way, working-class and poor families will have to pay a premium and a copay for their children, who are very poor, to go to the doctor. When we came here, both parties believed that if you are very poor in this society, then your kids are entitled to health care, and, yes, that is a social obligation that we owe to people who are struggling. Now a different set of values are in the saddle, and we are told they have to make a copay.

You touched on another basic matter. People who are legal immigrants, not illegal, not people who violate some immigration law to come here, but all those people who come here, played by the rules and have been naturalized as U.S. citizens, but have not yet shared in the bounty and prosperity of this country. Right now, most of them are allowed to receive food stamps.

If the majority has its way, 20- to 30,000 of those people who are eligible will lose that eligibility, again, not to save money, but because a different set of values are in the saddle.

To make a basic point about the food stamps provision in this reconciliation bill, \$800,000, the 300,000 families will be shaved off the food stamp rolls, that adds up to about \$844 million. \$840 million in a \$3.7 trillion discretionary budget is about one-sixteenth of 1 percent. That is worth almost nothing to the U.S. Treasury, but it is the margin of survival that means almost everything to these families.

We could go on, issue after issue. The value of the money that will be saved will be offset by tax cuts or is altogether insignificant. But the impact of those cuts is devastating to people who are watching us right now.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, this is the moral argument of our generation. I agree with you 100 percent, but I think there is an economic component of this, too. If we are going to be a great nation economically, we need to have healthy children, who are going to be able to go to school and learn so that they can become scientists and engineers, so that we can drive this economy through the 21st century.

As much as it is a moral imperative, it is an economic imperative that will continue to make the United States of America a strong country economically and militarily.

Mr. DAVIS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I absolutely concur with that point. There are two points that we will have to make constantly over the next 48 hours. This is not just about altruism. I wish that we could convince our friends and colleagues on the other side of the aisle just by saying it is wrong to single out the children of poor people for sacrifice. I wish we could convince them that this budget just has the wrong set of priorities on moral grounds.

The reality is there is another equally compelling set of arguments we will have to appeal to, and it is the notion of our own economic self-interest. We already are a country where the gap between skilled and unskilled workers is a high one. We are already a country where the gap between children who are successful and children who are underperforming is a high one.

We are already a country that builds all kinds of walls between our own people, and that is not good for our economy. It makes us less productive than we ought to be. It makes us less prosperous than we ought to be as a nation. But we can only close these gaps if we empower more of our people.

That is very much what is at stake as we contemplate this vote in the next several days, two different visions.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I wonder, and we have asked this question before here, I wonder where the religious right organizations are that during the election were so engaged

and involved in the Christian Coalition and promoting Christian values on a couple of issues. I cannot think of any more pronounced Christian values than taking care of those among you who cannot take care of themselves, for whatever reason.

It is stunning to me, growing up Catholic and spending 12 years in Catholic schools with nuns and priests and brothers, that the issue of poverty that you see more in the Bible than probably any other social issue, that somehow the silence is deafening here on these issues of us trying to help poor people and the majority actually causing harm to them. All these organizations that help put these folks in office are lost and cannot find their way.

I do not want to say that their membership is lost, because the people I go to church with, the people who represent Christian social organizations in my community, are very, very, very concerned about this.

I would hope that in the course of the next 48 hours we are able to bring this to their attention so that maybe we can put a stop to this before it actually harms young children.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. The gentleman's bringing up faith as it relates to this budget document is incredibly important, because our friends on the other side of the aisle throw around family values as a term and as part of their make-up and try to contrast us, as if that is not part of ours.

Let us just look at what the faith community is saying about this budget, and what they have been saying about this budget. This week, this past week, we had a number of members of the organized religious community come to Washington and urge the Republican leadership not to pursue this budget reconciliation document.

You had Reverend Jim Wallis, the founder of Sojourners and Convener of Call to Renewal. You had Rabbi David Saperstein, who is the director of the Religious Action Center for Reform Judaism. You had Reverend Elenora Giddings Ivory, who is the Director of the Washington Office of the Presbyterian Church.

What Reverend Ivory said when she was here, she said, "I am here today to express concern for the Federal budget reconciliation packages under consideration in the House and the Senate. Our Nation is about to balance its budget on the backs of the poor. Is that a moral thing to do? The Federal budget is a reflection of what we see as important and primary. Does the spending package under consideration reflect a caring and a compassionate society? Does it reflect you as a citizen of faith?"

I think that each of us, if we ask and look inside our own hearts, Republicans and Democrats alike, would have to answer each of those questions, absolutely not.

Mr. DAVIS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, let me touch on the point the gentle-

woman just made about faith. All of us were told different things and were given dictates by our faith. But one very universal view across all denominations that we know is this idea that you do not start sacrifices with the most vulnerable of our people. You do not ask the weakest of our people to be the first to give. You try to bring some moral foundation of equity to all that you do.

Those are notions that ring across every denomination, and indeed non-denominations that still have ethical values in this world. What is striking about this budget reconciliation is that it is the first major government document that I have seen that says, let us ask the first people to sacrifice to be what Matthew would call "the least of these." Let us ask the first people to sacrifice to be the weakest of our people.

This is something that is fundamentally wrong and, again, it is at the heart of this debate. A lot of us in this Chamber would be open to a discussion about fiscal discipline. We would be open to a discussion about budget cuts. We would be open to a discussion about shared responsibility, but only if it ran across all lines. This is as powerful a point as I think we can make in the next several days.

We are not asking our children to sacrifice. We are not asking the children of the people who go to our fund-raisers to sacrifice. We are asking the children of the people who cannot get in our fund-raisers because they cannot give \$250 or \$1,000 a head. We are asking the children of people who will never walk inside this Chamber or be able to spend a million dollars every 2 years to find a way to get here.

We are asking the people who are doing the work in our country, the people who are waiting on the tables, the people who are driving the trucks, the people who are bearing a lot of the labor. We are saying to them, yes, your children may be on Medicaid, but we can save some money if we pare back our responsibility to them. Yes, your kid may need a student loan, but we can pare back some money. We can save some money if we cut and limit our responsibility to them.

I think that this is wrong.

The final point that I will make before I yield is this one. We have an obligation to talk about this debate in terms of right and wrong this week. This is not simply a matter of different political theories. It is not a matter of different economic theories. It is about a different value set. Some of us who have heard the word "value" used so freely in this Chamber, some of us who have heard the word "value" used so freely to label and to exclude and to stigmatize, well, this is about values. Even Abraham sacrificed his own children, not the children of others. So that is front and center for this vote.

Mr. Speaker, I will certainly yield to the gentleman from Ohio to discuss something that is on our minds this

week. How can we make this case to our colleagues, because I believe, as all of you believe that our colleagues that are in this Chamber are not hard-hearted, mean or evil people who just want to hurt folks? How do we find some way to make the case to them that what we are on the verge of doing violates every value that we have as Americans and violates every sense of connection that we have?

□ 1815

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I think we are not alone here, and I think there are some conservatives who are out there who agree with what we are saying here. We say it all the time during our Special Orders. This is not a Democrat or Republican thing. This is about putting the interests of the country before your own particular party. That is what we are trying to do here.

This is a quote from Cal Thomas, who is one of the most conservative columnists in the country, who says, "Here is a suggestion to the Republican majority. Don't start with the poor, start with the rich." That is Cal Thomas talking.

And let me just put this up here. This is the tax cut, my friends. This is the tax cut. This is what people who make over \$440,000 a year get, and this is what our brothers and sisters get who make \$20,000, \$35,000, and \$40,000. Why can we not ask these people? Why do our leaders not have the courage to ask these people? We know they contribute to their campaigns. We know they get corporate welfare. I bet many of these people are executives in the oil companies who got \$16 billion in corporate subsidies. We know that. We are sure that some of these people who make all this money and are getting the big tax cut represent the pharmaceutical industry that are getting \$100 million in corporate subsidies. We are confident that the executives of the big agribusinesses are receiving some of this tax cut, and they are also getting corporate subsidies for that.

Why can the Republican leadership in this Chamber, in the Senate, and in the White House not ask these folks to give up just a small little wee bit of this, just a little bit of this so that we can make sure that Medicaid, Medicare, which is on the table in the Senate version, \$80 billion over the next 10 years is proposed to be cut out of that. The Republican Study Committee wants to cut even more and push the prescription drug benefit back, not do anything to reduce the cost.

We are making decisions that are hurting these people because we do not have the courage to ask those people who have benefited most from society to give just a little bit back.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. If the gentleman will yield, there is a way we can make changes which take us in a new direction: it is election day. We do not have to continue down this road. We do not have to continue to prop up and add to the bottom line of the

wealthy. We can send the Republican leadership home, and we can start today.

What I think we would all like to see happen in the next couple of hours in Virginia, in Ohio, in New Jersey, in New York, in California, and anywhere else there is an election of significance, of course, all elections are significant, but where the more significant offices and contests are being held, we would like to urge all voters to go out to the polls tonight in those communities.

And just to help people know, there is still time left in Virginia. The polls close at 7 p.m. So there is about 45 minutes left. In Ohio, and these are all local times, in Ohio, the polls close at 7:30. In New Jersey, the polls close at 8:00 p.m. In New York, the polls close at 9 p.m. And in California, the polls close at 8 p.m. So we would urge all people who have an opportunity to make change in their State to cast their ballots today on election day. Make sure you get to your polling place and cast your vote to move this country in a new direction so we can continue to fight to make these changes.

Now, Mr. Speaker, just to transition our conversation from the tax cuts to the whole issue of where we are going in terms of the budget cuts, in addition to cuts that affect children, in addition to child support payments, in addition to Medicaid cuts, this budget will do more damage than we have ever done to people who are trying to expand their horizons and get access to higher education. What is unbelievable about these budget cuts is that in terms of higher education, this is the most significant cut in history being made in this budget document to financial aid than we have ever seen before.

Mr. Speaker, we are joined tonight by my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from the great State of Missouri (Mr. CARNAHAN), and he has been a champion on this issue in trying to raise people's awareness of just exactly what this Republican budget document would do to people who are struggling to get access to higher education. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CARNAHAN. I thank my colleague, Mr. Speaker, for yielding to me. It is great to join the gentlewoman from Florida and the gentleman from Florida and the gentleman from Ohio and this 30-Something Group that has really done a fantastic job to help educate Americans about the many challenges that are being faced here and the things we can do about it, the things my colleagues are taking the lead on in this Congress.

I wish I could join you in age, I am a 40-something, but I am not far away; and like many people, I had an opportunity to really benefit from the student loan program, as did my wife. Even though I worked my way through college and my family was able to help me some, I still could not have done it without the student loan program.

What I am sad to see and really concerned about is these Republican pro-

posals in this budget reconciliation, which is, for those listening, the equivalent of us balancing our checkbook at home to figure out what we can afford and what we cannot. They have proposed the largest cuts to the student loan program in history, in history, of \$14 billion. It is a big number. So to really bring it down to the individual student and family, already, even before those cuts, the average student typically has about \$17,500 in debt. That is already. Now, on top of that, these proposals would add an additional almost \$6,000.

Mr. Speaker, this comes at a time when we really need to be expanding opportunity and at a time when we really need to be opening up access to higher education. We all know in our country that is the road to opportunity.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Absolutely. And if we look at the number of engineers and scientists that a lot of these other countries are graduating, last year alone China graduated 600,000 engineers. We graduated 70,000, with most of them foreign born. So to put additional barriers up, an additional burden or two on someone who is trying to construct financially a way to go to school, it makes absolutely zero sense economically for our country.

Look at what the GI Bill did for this country, because we had educated people going out into the work force as doctors and lawyers and scientists and engineers. Look what the space program did. The goal of sending people to the Moon was to motivate and organize a country in math and science and physics and a variety of other areas that led to tremendous developments and discoveries that otherwise would not have been, and that led to great economic growth.

So the gentleman is exactly right.

Mr. CARNAHAN. We even heard in the Committee on Science, on which I serve, many leading CEOs from around the country came to testify before our committee talking about the need for innovation if we are going to be able to compete in this new global economy.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. There it is. That is not KENDRICK MEEK saying that or Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. These are CEOs.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Exactly. They are saying we have to really start to win the battle of young minds to get them into science and math education so that we can compete and innovate in this new global economy. This just takes us backwards.

The statistics are alarming. Studies have shown that financial barriers alone prevent 4½ million high school students from attending a 4-year public university.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. We actually have a chart that outlines some of the things my colleague is about to go over so we can make sure that people have it very clearly in front of them.

Mr. CARNAHAN. I would really appreciate my colleagues trying to get

that information out. Again, I think it is important as this debate proceeds over the next few days and weeks ahead, some believe a vote could come as early as Thursday, that people back home, families, students, leaders in education, contact their Members to let them know this is not the way to address the financial needs in our country.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. If my colleague wishes to go over the details he was beginning to talk about on the bottom of the chart.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Certainly.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. What we try to do in this 30-something time, we do a lot of talking, but we also want to show people with third-party validators and with the specifics blown up in poster-size form so that they have it both in graphical depiction as well as in description from us individually. So that was just showing my colleague that while he goes through just exactly what these cuts in student aid do, we have that up for the folks at home.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. We will also post this on our Web site and make it available.

Mr. CARNAHAN. And I have just been handed a copy so I can read along as well.

But as we mentioned, already, even before these cuts, the average student has \$17,500 in debt. Over the last 5 years, as if the debt were not bad enough, tuition is up 57 percent at public colleges, up 32 percent at private colleges and universities, and 41 percent of college grads average over \$3,000 in credit card debt. So, again, the statistics paint a very clear picture that this is not the way to go.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. The gentleman is exactly correct. This is great to have the gentleman here because, obviously, he brings in a new perspective from the Science Committee, which reinforces a lot of the things we have been saying. So we appreciate the gentleman being here.

One of the things we have to add onto this, as if this is not enough for a 22-year-old to have to overcome, \$17,500 of debt, \$3,000 in credit card debt, so you are already over \$20,000 in debt before you even get out of school, let alone if you want to get a law degree, a master's or a Ph.D., or whatever it may be, would be an additional burden. In a weak economy that is not growing the kinds of jobs necessary to move our country forward and to maintain our economic superiority, add to that the \$27,000 that every single citizen owes to pay the \$8 trillion in debt that we have in the United States of America.

Our friends on the other side, the Republican majority, had to raise the debt ceiling to over \$8 trillion, and each citizen owes \$27,000. So we try to put this in perspective for people who are having babies today, and our generation who have young kids, 2 or 3 years old. Run this number out 20 years. If you have a 2-year-old, run

that number out 20 years at a 57 percent increase every 5 years.

What does that number look like 22 years from now and what does the debt look like 22 years from now if we keep running these huge structural deficits, paying interest on the loan?

Pull it out. Get it. Get it right now. Let us get this thing up here.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Please.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Please. Show them. Go ahead. I yield to my friend.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Well, I want to thank my colleague from Ohio for yielding. The gentleman must have read it on my forehead when he started talking about how this Republican majority has led us into an area we have never been before as a country. And I am not talking about leading in a way that Americans will be proud of the situation we are in now or how other countries are now looking at the opportunity of owning a piece of the United States, which is basically what is happening financially.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Let us lay this out real quick before my colleague puts the cherry on top.

So we have \$17,500 in student loan debt and \$3,000 in credit card debt. Run that out 20-some years. A child born today owes \$27,000 to the debt that we have in the United States of America, the \$8 trillion. Every citizen owes \$27,000.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. And change.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. And some change. And we are continually running these structural deficits at over \$400 billion to \$500 billion, with a war and natural disasters. So we are borrowing money to pay for this.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. If the gentleman will yield, this feeds into the incompetence that we talk about. We talk about it, and we do not use the term loosely. We use it because it is well founded.

□ 1830

We take this chart out every night, and every time we get an opportunity to share with not only the Members on what they are doing. Members need to realize what they are voting on. I am not saying that some do not, but they have to realize what they are voting on.

Here is basically what President Bush has done in 4 years that other Presidents have managed not to do in 224 years, as it relates to foreign holdings of U.S. Treasury debt. This statistic is from the United States Department of Treasury, a third-party validator. This is not from me or Mr. RYAN or Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.

Let me say this, \$1 trillion in debt that was accumulated over 224 years, from 1776, borrowing money from foreign governments, President Bush, who did not do it by himself, and I have said this before, and I can guarantee he could not do it by himself, \$1.05 trillion in a period of 4 years. In a period of 4 years, he has accomplished something with the Republican majority that has

not been accomplished by 42 other Presidents, 224 years in this country of having the Democrats, Republicans, Whig Party; and this President and this administration and this majority have done the job that 42 other Presidents did not do as relates to putting this country in the posture it is in right now.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, all of what we are saying here tonight has caused me to look at the view of our generation and how we feel about the future and the direction that this leadership, this Republican leadership, is taking this country.

We did a little research in my office. President John F. Kennedy once implored Americans to ask not what their country could do for them, but what they could do for their country. Another important question that all of these issues raises is how all of this budget cutting and pulling the rug out from under college students' future leaves them feeling in terms of public service and what their government can do for people and whether they would want to be a part of that.

So we found some research that showed just exactly how our generation feels about this. A 2004 Hart Research Study for the Council of Excellence in Government found that 34 percent of young Americans said the idea of a government service career did not appeal to them.

What does that say about the confidence that this leadership is inspiring in our generation? Mr. Speaker, that is 34 percent. That is a huge number. It means they have no confidence in government's ability to improve people's lives.

After 9/11, we were starting to change those statistics. You saw after 9/11 the incredible response of first responders and of volunteers. All of our hearts in America swelled after the response from 9/11. The polling that was done then showed that young people felt that the response to 9/11 made them more likely to pursue careers in government and the public sector. But recent events, the culture of corruption, cronyism, the lack of competence that has been evident since the inception of this administration has absolutely, in 3 years from 9/11, 2001, to 2004, totally turned that belief in government's ability to improve our lives on its head.

Just by way of example, some things that most likely did cause that, let us go under the category of corruption. When young people see politicians, leaders of our Nation, deliberately deceiving the American people, an example would be the recent indictment of Mr. Libby and the deceptive actions of Mr. Rove. You have people who spend their lives serving their country; and what happens, people in the administration, a person for the first time indicted in 130 years that served in the White House, people in the administration repay them that service by revealing a CIA's agent covert status, jeopardizing the lives of countless numbers

of government employees who are trying to do good work on behalf of the United States of America.

Example number two of corruption: We went to Iraq under questionable circumstances, under false pretenses, no question about it. We send American men and women into the battlefield, and more than 2,000 have given their lives. If you ask the average person, particularly in our generation, if they know for what those lives were given, I do not think that they feel confident that they would give an answer that anyone would be happy about.

Let us look at the cronyism that might have caused this shift in confidence in our generation. This generation of young people is extremely independent. They have a spirit of self-determination. They are less likely to identify with a political party. Most young people today are identifying themselves as Independents. They see political appointments based on friendships. The appointment of Michael Brown, "Brownie," because he was a college roommate with someone in the administration, with a friend of the President, being put in charge of one of the most important agencies in the country in terms of making sure that people's lives are protected as a disaster approaches and we can help them afterwards, we put someone in charge of that agency whose sum total of his experience was he was president of the Arabian Horse Association.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, that is what our generation is going to change when we take the country in another direction. It is time for us to start saying that we want the best and the brightest to come and work for our government. There used to be a day and age when government service, assisting your country, coming from the private sector for a few years and helping out and giving your time and talents to the government was a respected endeavor.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. The bottom line is we can do better. Together we can lock arms. Our generation can say to the generation in front of us that has been leading this country, give us the baton. It is our turn. We are not going there any more. We want to turn this country around. We want to make sure our children have health care, that mothers and fathers when their kids get sick do not have to wait until their kid is so sick they have to take them to the emergency room for their health care.

We do not want to cut the budget for abused and neglected children. We are going to continue to pursue deadbeat dads. State legislators have fought tooth and nail to ensure that we can continue to go after deadbeat dads; yet in this budget we will consider this week, that opportunity would be lost. We would be preventing that opportunity. The list goes on and on. It adds insult to injury. It cuts the school lunch program, which is a program that makes it so that some kids, the

only place they can get a meal, a decent meal, is from that free and reduced lunch, and the Republican leadership would cut that program.

Our generation can take the country in a new direction, and we are ready to.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, we are ready, and we have a game plan to find the money.

Why can we not go to the oil companies that we just gave \$16 billion in corporate welfare to, why can we not have the courage, why can the Republican leadership here not have the courage to ask the oil companies to give back their \$16 billion in corporate subsidies to help pay for some of these priorities?

Why can the President of the United States and the Republican leadership in the Senate and the Republican leadership in the House, why can they not go to the pharmaceutical companies and ask for reimportation for the Medicare program to help save our country billions of dollars?

Why can they not allow the Secretary of Health and Human Services to negotiate down drug prices with Merck and Pfizer on behalf of the Medicare recipients who are going to now be eligible for Medicare part B?

The Democratic Party has a plan to get that money back from the corporations instead of giving it to corporate welfare and investing it in the United States of America so we can have more scientists, more engineers, more investment in research and development.

Mr. Speaker, the average taxpayer gives us money and they trust us with it. They work hard. We see the top number at the top of the check and you see the number that you actually get to take home. There is a big difference whether you are on the bottom or top scale. You give us your money; and we need to honor that by making sure that when we spend it, we give that taxpayer the best value they could ever get. We need to assure them we are running an efficient, effective government here, not just wasting money and giving to our political friends, like the oil companies. Can you imagine with gas prices what they are now, we are giving oil companies \$16 billion in subsidies.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I have to jump in on that point and talk about the tale of two different numbers here. We mentioned earlier the number of \$14 billion that was being cut, proposed to be cut out of the student loan program where over \$14 billion has been given away in subsidies in these recent energy bills to the oil companies who have not just made record profits; they have made the largest profits in the history of the world.

To me, that is such a glaring and sad example of the priorities here in Washington. We can do better.

I think the American people are hungry for leaders that can inspire us and not divide us and talk about a future that lifts us all up. The gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN

SCHULTZ) talked about the attitudes of young people and how they did not have a good attitude about public service. I hate to see that.

There are also studies out there that for the first time in the history of these studies being done people believe that the generation after them will be worse off than they are now. To me that is just contrary to everything in our American values. We always want our kids and the next generation to be better off. So I think it is a matter of priorities. It is a matter of attitude, inspiration; and I think people are hungry for that. I think what you all are doing here in getting the word out is really important to give people hope that they can make a difference and that there are leaders here in Washington fighting for them.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is what we are all doing, making sure that not only the Members know exactly what they are doing when we come in and push the red and green button, and endorsing or not endorsing an idea or a plan. I think it is important for us to not only highlight the \$14 billion in cuts which mean higher fees for students because the States have to balance. When we make those cuts, they have to make cuts. This is not the end of the cuts to the average student.

When you look at higher education, college education, preparing the next generation, that is not just on that 20-something or 18-year-old. That is on the parents of that 18- or 19- or 20-year-old. That is another burden on their backs.

I just wanted to mention quickly, I was reading this letter as both of you were sharing good information with the Members and the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I am holding a letter dated November 8. It is from the president of AARP. AARP is the largest retirement organization here in the United States and also on the face of the Earth. This is from the CEO. What he is saying here, basically, is that they oppose the Medicaid cuts that are in the House bill. They are for reform, but they oppose the cuts.

I just want to make sure that the Members, and one Member came from the opposite side, the Republican side, and said I wish my friends on the Democratic side would join me in voting for this budget that we have put forth.

I said first you have to work on some of your own Members who have not come to grips on how they can vote for something that AARP is against.

Basically, this letter says that AARP opposes the 2006 reconciliation bill now awaiting consideration before the House.

□ 1845

"We strongly oppose the changes." Not that they oppose the changes. They strongly oppose it because they know what it will do. Basically, it goes on further. For example, they say: "The House package, in effect, would

prevent a stroke victim from entering a nursing home, even if there were no other alternatives, simply because she has helped a grandson with college tuition costs." This is basically where a bean counter would go in and evaluate the financial situation of the person that wants to go into a nursing home under Medicaid. They would go in and say, You wrote a \$500 check for your grandson to go to college. You can afford to pay for this nursing home. We will not.

This is not what I am saying. This is what the AARP is saying, which has thousands of members and is the largest retirement organization on the face of the Earth. It goes on to say that a private nursing home could evict a person, force a person out of a nursing home for a period of time, even after the assets were all exhausted, if they contributed to a hurricane recovery victim. Once again, the bean counters would go in under this budget. This is not fiction. This is fact. Under this budget, and then say they are denying them assistance in a nursing home. This is the reality of what is in the House budget right now.

We talk about Veterans Day, and I am going to mention this as many times as I can because I think it is important, many of us, Mr. Speaker, are going to leave here on Thursday and go to the things that we need to do. Some Members have already entered into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD recognizing Veterans Day observances throughout the country, the past contributions of our veterans. But at the same time, on the Democratic side what we have called for is we provided \$1.6 billion more than the Republican budget for veterans programs for 2006 and \$17 billion over the next 5 years.

The Democratic budget reverses what the Republican budget has put forth on the \$798 million over the next 5 years in Republican cuts that they have asked the Veterans' Affairs Committee to do, not even talking about what they have done as it relates to cutting \$14 billion over the next 5 years.

So, Mr. Speaker, what this really means is that when the veterans go to the VA in some rural areas that some of us in this room represent, there are some VA clinics that are only open once a week, not because that is all they can do, but because they have been cut so much, they cannot provide the health care for the veterans, that when they signed up, they held up their end of the deal. We are not holding up our end of the deal.

But meanwhile back at the ranch, we are giving breaks and tax cuts and some may call them incentives for companies that are making record profits in the history of the world. So when we start talking about these cuts, it is a reality. They are a true reality. And I just took the veterans out for a minute because I knew what we were talking about. But it is an irony that Veterans Day is Friday and Members are going to come here and they

are going to take their voting card out, and they are going to put it in the machine, and they are going to look up to see how the leadership is voting, nine times out of 10, and they are going to vote the way the Republican leadership has asked them to vote, and that is very unfortunate.

But I want to warn the Members to take this card, and let me tell them, there are some people who woke up one Tuesday morning at 7 a.m. to vote for some representation. The people that gave Members of Congress this card to vote and put into these machines, I mean, it is not like I have a Miss Mobil in my district or I have a Mister Special Interest in my district. They do not cast a vote. The people that I represent cast a vote. So it is important that we keep that in mind, and I want to make sure that the Members understand, because veterans will be prepared and the American people will be prepared. Why do I have to pay more for health care because they want to make room for the billionaires to receive tax cuts?

Mr. RYAN has that chart there that shows individuals that are making over \$500,000. Let us talk about these individuals just for a minute. They are Americans. I do not blame them for the tax cut that they are getting. I blame the individuals that are continuing to build on a tax cut that is already there for that group of people and there is very little that is for the individual that is even making \$91,000, a household that is making \$91,000 to \$179,000 a year. It is not fair.

So when we have people fighting in Iraq, we have three natural disasters here that we are trying to manage and trying to help Americans bounce back from, and then at the same time we want to build on even more incompetence and cronyism as it relates to giving to the special interests, it is just unconscionable; and I hope that Members really weigh heavy.

And I am just going to say this: I am from Florida, and what the Republican majority is asking the Florida delegation to do is to vote for oil drilling miles off the coast of Florida. Oil drilling miles off the coast of Florida. Everyone comes to Florida for what? Tourism. What else? They come to the beaches, from all over the world. It helps our Florida economy, and it helps our national economy. But yet Members of the Florida delegation are being asked to vote against one of the very principles where the Florida Everglades is located, where we have hundreds and thousands of miles of coastline so that when people come to Florida now they can step into a patch of oil and they can see a rig off the coast of Florida.

That is a high order to call a Floridian to do. Both of our Senators are against this, I must add. We have some Members in the House that are going to have to go see the wizard, get a little courage and go to the leadership and say it is not going to happen, bottom line.

I will tell my colleagues what I am prepared to do. As long as that language is in there and we are talking about drilling in the ANWR, let us just take our national parks, and let us just start drilling there. Forget about what we already know, that there is very little oil in many of these areas, that the oil companies just want to go out, not at their expense but at taxpayers' expense, and start to drill in those areas.

So, Mr. Speaker, I think it is important that we continue to come to the floor to not only share with the Members but with the American people by letting them know what is going on in this House and what is not going on in this House and that there are alternatives and we are putting forth those alternatives in a fiscally sound way that will place us on the road to balancing the budget but at the same time not hurting the very people that some folks come to the floor saying they want to help.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, the Florida delegation, and the gentleman makes a great point, has an obvious perspective on tourism; and they have got such natural beauty on their coastline that people from around the world come to visit. My family has been down to visit their great State. But the point beyond even that we believe it is the wrong thing to do in these pristine areas, the amount of oil that could potentially be produced is so small, they have to weigh what is the real cost; what are we really losing for generations to come in terms of our environment, and look at what we can do in our immediate future in terms of alternative energy.

Again, I have to mention some of the things we hear before our Science Committee about the innovation and the science that has brought this technology. It is not something that is decades away. It is years away. We have already seen that with the growth of the hybrid vehicles, hydrogen cars, you name it. That technology is here today. Consumers want it, and within the decade we could have the goal to become energy independent, rather than investing in this older technology in pristine areas.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, we have a little administrative transfer to make here.

I yield to Mr. RYAN so he can give the Web site.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, it is 30somethingdems@mail.house.gov. People can send us an e-mail.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for giving out that Web site. That has been very useful; and we want to thank Democrats, Republicans, Independents, and even some Members for letting us know some of their thoughts.

With that, Mr. Speaker, we would like the Democratic leadership for allowing us to have this honor.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2862, SCIENCE, STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2006

Mr. GINGREY (during Special Order of Mr. MEEK of Florida), from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 109-277) on the resolution (H. Res. 538) waiving points of order against the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 2862) making appropriations for Science, the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2419, ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2006

Mr. GINGREY (during Special Order of Mr. MEEK of Florida), from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 109-278) on the resolution (H. Res. 539) waiving points of order against the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 2419) making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1751, SECURE ACCESS TO JUSTICE AND COURT PROTECTION ACT OF 2005

Mr. GINGREY (during Special Order of Mr. MEEK of Florida), from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 109-279) on the resolution (H. Res. 540) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1751) to amend title 18, United States Code, to protect judges, prosecutors, witnesses, victims, and their family members, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

THE 30-SOMETHING WORKING GROUP: DEMOCRATIC PROPOSALS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GOHMERT). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CARNAHAN) to continue his coherent and intelligent argument on behalf of research and development for alternative energy sources and alternative technologies to reduce our dependence on oil.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

We have that technology right here in our country. It is here today. So with the effort and the funding that we have put into some of these technologies that are hurting our environment; that have made us dependent and weaker as a country; that we are depending on resources for the Middle East instead of from the Midwest, that is the future. That is the direction. People are hungry to be led, to be able to get into that technology for their families. It is the right thing to do for the environment. It is the right thing to do not just for our economic security but for our national security interests. So that is the direction we have got to get to in this country.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I think the gentleman makes a tremendous point that we try to present here. The way our friends on the other side run the government is not with an understanding of, really, what day and age it is. It is 2005. We are an information technology age. Government needs to be integrated, and our policy on alternative energy sources will strengthen our position in foreign policy. They are not two separate smokestacks. They are one coherent policy that we are trying to integrate here and say they are all connected.

And I think this brings up a tremendous point about leadership, about the corruption and the cronyism, but directly to the incompetence. Here we have, directly after 9/11, a terrorist attack on the United States of America; and everyone in the country was looking to the President for leadership, and no one really knew what to do. It was this great moment in history, but every American citizen wanted to give something. They wanted to be a part of the solution.

And many people will remember, Mr. Speaker, that the American people were going to blood banks. They wanted to give blood. They wanted to do whatever they needed to do. They were donating money to organizations. And the Red Cross had to say, We have enough blood. Thank you, but we have enough blood for now. But the American people still wanted to give. And there were nonprofits and foundations and all kinds of organizations opening up so that the American people could donate money to help the families and the victims of 9/11 and the policemen and the firemen and the emergency responders.

The American people wanted to give. And the best challenge this administration can come up with, not walk to work or get a bike so we can reduce our dependence on foreign oil so we can reduce the chances of this happening again. Do my colleagues know what this administration asked the American people to do? The great challenge after September 11 from this administration was go shopping. If that is not

incompetent executive leadership at its best, I do not know what is.

And I get upset because I think that tragic situations like that, as painful as they are, there is a glimmer of possibility within that. And we could have made it a national commitment to search for and get to a point where we are no longer dependent on foreign oil. The American people could have been rallied to that cause, to conserve. And to have the Vice President say that conservation is just a personal virtue, but has no place in the public discourse is an outrage.

So why not, with all the political capital that this President had, why not say this country is going to have an Apollo project for alternative energy sources, for hybrid engines, for biodiesel, for wind and solar and everything else? We know we cannot do it today, but America is not about what we can do today. America is about what we can do tomorrow and next year and 10 years from now. And we could have laid out a long-term strategy of all the great possibilities that this country is so good at throwing out as a goal and then going after it. And it is a shame. It really is incompetent leadership.

And that is one of the reasons that we come here every night. We could be sitting in our offices. We could be going out to dinner. But we choose to come here because we want to ask, Mr. Speaker, the American people to give us an opportunity to take this country in a new direction, to change what we are doing, to get this Congress and make it independent of all the special interests, and to end this incompetence, this inability to govern.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, my good friend from Ohio and my good friend from Missouri, the "Show Me" State, they say, we are in a situation right now where we should not be acting like what we call here in Congress under regular order as though it is just another day in Congress, another day at the office, no big deal, everything is fine.

Mr. Speaker, I can tell my colleagues that we should be very alarmed. We should be very alarmed at the fiscal situation we are in. The highest deficit of the history of the Republic. We are borrowing more from foreign countries, breaking records. One administration breaks the record of 42 administrations before it. We have CIA agents being outed.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. We are not setting good records.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. We have CIA agents being pointed out by people in the White House who have the highest national security clearance to know what is going on throughout the world, getting daily briefings. We have a situation where we had Hurricane Katrina, which we have asked for an independent commission, not just for the affected area where Hurricane Katrina and Rita hit, and if we want to add