

laws, no labor standards. Then the companies throw their hands up and say, "We have to move because our competitors do."

It is all part of the Bush economic plan, to do these trade agreements that lower wages, that force down wages, that weaken food safety standards, that weaken environmental laws; that really do pave the way, invite those companies, really invite those companies to go overseas, at forced slave labor wages for totalitarian governments.

These are not democratic governments. They are countries that suppress labor, that keep laborers from organizing, that keep workers docile. Then we are surprised they are "outcompeting" us. Of course they are.

Mr. STRICKLAND. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I am sometimes amazed and sometimes appalled at what I perceive to be the hypocrisy of this administration. Recently, with the approval of the Bush administration and this Congress, a decision was made that Cubans living in this country could only visit their relatives on the island once every 3 years. Why? Because Cuba is a Communist country. Fidel Castro is an authoritarian dictator. Yet, at the very same time, we continue to expand our efforts to accommodate China, to encourage Americans to invest in China, to encourage trade with China.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. If the gentleman will yield further, to encourage China to take our jobs, the best example, when the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STRICKLAND) and I came to this Congress in 1992, our trade deficit with China, meaning the number of dollars we bought from them more than we sold to them, was about \$1 billion. In those days, 1992, we bought from China about \$1 billion more than we sold to China. We had a trade deficit of about \$1 billion.

A year-and-a-half ago, that trade deficit passed \$100 billion. This year it will exceed \$120 billion. So we are buying from China every day about \$300 million more than we are selling to China. We have a daily trade deficit with China of between \$300 and \$400 million.

What does that translate to? According to the first President Bush, who really lost his job because he was out of touch with the workaday problems of American workers, but what President Bush I said is, \$1 billion in trade deficit translates into 18,000 jobs.

If we have a trade deficit every day of \$300 million, we are losing hundreds of thousands of jobs as a result of that trade deficit.

Mr. STRICKLAND. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman for pointing out those really outrageous facts. But can you imagine the American citizen is being told, you cannot voluntarily travel to Cuba. You cannot go down there and enjoy a few days vacation or interact with your friends or families except once every 3 years, because they are a bad Com-

munist country and Fidel Castro is a authoritarian dictator, and they persecute people of religious faith.

Does anyone in this Chamber or who serves in this Chamber or in this administration, are they unaware that China routinely persecutes people of religious faith, puts them in jail, in prison; uses slave labor; is an authoritarian country? And yet we encourage this free trade with China.

I think it is hypocritical. I do not think it is consistent. I think the American people should be asking, what kind of rationale or reason is behind such duplicitous policy and behavior?

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN).

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, when the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was talking about Timken and all the issues with China and how it really has tilted the playing field to benefit really the top 1 or 2 percent of the people who can benefit from the increase in stock prices and the increase in their own personal wages because they have to pay someone 50 cents an hour, as opposed to \$50 an hour with health care benefits and all that, I think what we are trying to say here, beginning to wrap up, is all we are trying to do here is to create a system where everybody gets to play along.

It is like there are only certain kids that can get into the sandbox, and if you are not born to the right gene pool or you are not born in the right hospital or in the right neighborhood or belong to the right church, somehow you do not get to play.

All we are saying is, there are ways that the government throughout the history of this country has played a role in moving these people along.

We mentioned earlier with the Title I funding, which deals with at-risk youths who need help, Title I funding, the 2005 President's budget underfunded it by \$7.2 billion. \$7.2 billion.

So we could talk about China, and we are getting our clock cleaned, and the top 1 percent is really benefiting. The question the American people are asking and the people in my district are asking is, how do we help those people who are not able to play along? And the answer that we always have come up with in this country is to make sure everybody is educated, that everybody has health care, that everybody has a shot. You may not finish the same, but you should start the same at the beginning.

All I am saying is, we are trying to argue that if the system does not help everybody, the system is not working; and this system is not working. The threat when people do not move along with everyone else is, the whole system collapses.

Mr. STRICKLAND. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I want to thank my friend.

Earlier this evening I had the privilege of meeting with a group of Ohioans who are involved with projects and

agencies that try to help the homeless. They were from Cincinnati and Cleveland and Portsmouth and all of the areas throughout Ohio.

I said to them, "You are the people who are really doing God's work, because you believe in community. You understand that none of us really gets through this life as individuals. All of us need help and receive help. It may be from our parents, our relatives, our neighbors, our church, our schools."

But I think what the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN) is trying to describe is the fact that we are a large national family, and we have differences. We have ethnic and religious and racial, philosophical differences. We have different skills and abilities, different educational levels. The fact is, we are not all the same, but we are all a part of the same great Nation.

What we have been describing tonight is a nation that is out of balance, that has great unfairness, has inconsistencies, and quite frankly, I believe, a nation that is lacking in leadership.

What we need is a Congress that will come together and work for the real benefit of the American people, and we need a President who is aware of the real problems. I think what we have described tonight is a government administration that is out of touch.

I want to thank my friend, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN), the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN), earlier our colleague, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. JONES), and our colleague, the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY) for participating in this discussion tonight.

NEUTRALIZING THE IRAQI THREAT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HENSARLING). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I want to follow my good colleagues who just talked about what they consider to be the free trade debacle of the 1990s with a gentle reminder that that debacle commenced with the 1994 NAFTA vote under the Clinton administration, strongly supported by President Clinton, and I think, strongly supported by then Senator KERRY. At the time when we started that, I think we had a \$3 billion trade surplus with Mexico. Shortly thereafter, we had a \$15 billion annual trade loss.

I am reminded with respect to China that one of Mr. Clinton's strongest contributors, who happened to be the chief executive officer of the Loral Corporation, found that he had, after he had seriously violated the rules of transferring technology, had transferred technology to the Chinese with respect to their launch capability, because in their satellite launches they use these Long March rockets to do their satellite launches, and they use that same

rocketry to aim nuclear warheads at their adversary cities, several of which are in the United States of America.

□ 2100

And when Loral violated the restrictions on transferring this weapons technology, which puts all Americans at risk, he was allowed to continue to make those sales; and Loral was allowed to continue to make those sales, prematurely, in my judgment, and there was, I think, a very strong link to the Clinton administration manifested in a \$300,000-plus contribution to President Clinton.

So I remember the free trade, the threshold free trade vote well, which a lot of my Republican colleagues do not agree with me on, and a number of Democrats do not agree with me on; but I do remember that it was done by President Clinton, and I wanted to add that little historic footnote.

I wanted to engage in a little dialogue with my good friend, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA), who has been to Iraq a number of times, four times, I believe, and is one of the Members who has really focused on Iraq. I would just start off by saying, Mr. Speaker, that it is a long, hard road in Iraq. We understand that. It has been tough for our soldiers. It is a difficult environment. It is full of sweat and dust and high temperatures, and sometimes blood. But we are undertaking and are now well on our way to making this hand-off, both politically and militarily, to the Iraqi people in Iraq, and giving them the best running start at freedom that country has ever had. And, in doing so, we are on our way to neutralizing Iraq as a potential springboard for terrorism in the years to come, which will accrue to the benefit of many, many generations of Americans.

So the cause is right. It is a just cause. We are standing up that military right now. We have General David Petraeus, one of our best military leaders, former commander of the 101st Airborne in Iraq, as a leader of that stand-up and training of the Iraqi forces. He has put together the schools for officers, for noncoms, for enlisted personnel; and those forces are starting to pick up that weight a little bit now and carry it in various battles and clashes that they have had around Iraq with the insurgents.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would simply want to report that while this is not an easy task, it is a very difficult task, the United States is carrying the ball and the folks who wear the uniform of the United States are doing a wonderful job for us.

Having said that, I would like to yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA) for his observations on this very important issue.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding. He, like myself, has been to Iraq a number of different times. And as chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, I

just want to congratulate the gentleman on the tremendous work that the gentleman and his committee have done to demonstrate to our armed services, our men and women in uniform, that we stand with them, that we are providing them with all of the resources necessary to conduct this war effectively, and that our presence in Iraq is a testament to the courage that we witness from them each and every day.

I was over there on Father's Day, really, just to go over there and to say thank you. We have 130,000 men and women over there who are giving up their time with their families, who are over there on Father's Day, they are over there on Christmas, they are over there on Easter, all of the important holidays for our families. It was really meaningful to be there and to have lunch and dinner with some of our troops.

As we talked with them, we found out the effectiveness of the Committee on Armed Services. We found out that this is a little different type of a war than what we expected, a little bit different than an occupation. The gentleman and his committee have done just a tremendous job in altering the procurement process and the types of things that we are buying to get them what they need in Iraq to be successful and to be safe. I know that they appreciate all of the work that the gentleman and his committee have done. I know there are lots of other things.

The gentleman may want to respond to some of the things that the gentleman's committee has done in terms of getting armored Humvees and these types of things to our troops, to enable them to be successful to go after these insurgents.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. I will tell him that I am just one of many, many great folks on that committee, I am just part of the group there, because we have really wonderful people on both sides of the aisle on the Committee on Armed Services. The committee has been working hard. Our members have been working very hard. This has been a challenge. The IEDs, these Improvised Explosive Devices that are detonated remotely now, are an enormous challenge; and the deadliness of those is manifested and can be illustrated as you walk the halls of the hospital there in Ramstein, Germany, or over here in Bethesda at Walter Reed when they come back.

So we moved out smartly and the services moved out very quickly to armor up some 8,000-plus Humvee vehicles, basically our follow-on utility vehicle, and we are also working hard on other means of trying to stop these very deadly systems.

But in the end, if we look at the combat that took place in Iraq, it is interesting, with this high-tech world, a lot of it is just great, great people. So we have done a few good things; but we have had some really, really wonderful people wearing the uniform of the United States.

The last citation I picked up before I went over there was for a Marco Martinez, who was a sergeant in the Marine Corps who won the Navy cross for taking an enemy position, taking on and taking out four insurgents with grenades and rifle fire. That is one of hundreds of high awards for valor and literally thousands of lesser awards. We have issued some 16,000 Bronze Stars in that theater and over 127 Silver Stars. Mr. Speaker, those people, the television this year and the movie screens were filled with the invasion of Normandy, but the kids that wear the uniform of the United States, and they are kids, because a lot of them are teenagers, a few of them just in their early 20s, are every bit as courageous and dedicated as that great generation that hit the beaches in Normandy and hit the beaches in the South Pacific.

So I want to thank the gentleman for all the great work that he has done, all the intelligence work that he has done along with his colleagues.

Saddam Hussein really rattled on when he was there in the court, and I do not know if that is an equivalent to a preliminary hearing or a time in which one enters their plea; but he said as he rattled on, he said one thing that was true. He said, in essence, if it was not for George Bush and those Americans, this would not be taking place, and that was true. He would not be there if it was not for George Bush and about 300,000 great Marines and soldiers and sailors and airmen.

And I think of all of those great units, the First Marine Division, 101st Airborne, the Third Army, the Fourth Infantry Division, now taken over by the Big Red One, the first infantry division up there in Tikrit, and the First Cav and the First Armored Division, which has been centered there in Baghdad for so long, right in the heart of the tough operations, and now the First Striker Brigade up in the north, if it was not for the Americans, the people of Iraq would have no chance at freedom and we, the Free World, would have no chance at neutralizing Iraq as a potential springboard for terrorism.

So I want to thank the gentleman. I also want to thank the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. BRADLEY) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER) for coming on down here. We have spent a lot of time working this issue and going over to theater, and all of the great work that they have done.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I just want to put some of that in context of what our men and women are doing in Iraq as to the shameful event that was outlined yesterday here in the United States, last night. This war on terrorism has evolved through the 1990s. It was not brand-new on September 11, 2001. It started when the World Trade Centers were bombed the first time in the early 1990s, when the Khobar Towers in Saudi were attacked, when our embassies in Africa were attacked, when the USS

Cole was attacked. We know that during much of the 1990s, the Clinton administration did not appear to take this war on terror very seriously. Mr. Speaker, it was not identified.

What we found out last night was we may never know the decision-making process that the Clinton administration went through as it developed its policies. Because after 9/11, we have had a joint inquiry between the House and the Senate as to what happened, what went wrong, and what went right; and there has been talk about the failure in decision-making, both in the executive branch and in Congress, and in other areas. And we now have a 9/11 Commission report coming out.

What we found out last night, what America learned last night, is that JOHN KERRY's foreign policy adviser, Sandy Berger, who was the National Security Adviser to President Clinton, removed highly classified documents from a secure area; and these documents, we are not quite sure what they are anymore, because they are gone. But we do know that he went into a secure area, and the gentleman and I have gone into these rooms ourselves. You go in with maybe a couple of pieces of paper, a pen, they bring in the documents, you have the opportunity to review the documents, to read them, to study them, to take notes on them, to organize your thoughts. But when you leave that room, you leave all of the paper and you leave all of your notes in the room. Nothing comes out with you, because these are secret documents.

Sandy Berger, the National Security Adviser, last night revealed, and he has been under investigation by the FBI I guess now for over a year, last night publicly admitted that he inadvertently took documents from the National Archives that outlined Clinton administration decision-making policies, practices, whatever, in relationship at least to the millennium threat; he removed those documents inadvertently. We do not know exactly how many. We do not know what was in them. But he inadvertently removed them; and then, some time later, when he was home or in his office, he inadvertently destroyed these documents.

I think some of the news media said, Berger said he deeply regretted the sloppiness involved. Well, to American citizens, to the folks that are involved in the 9/11 Commission, and to our troops who are fighting in Iraq, and for the troops that may be fighting sometime in the future, I am sorry, America deserves better than that. Our troops deserve better than that, and taking highly classified, secret documents out of a secure room inadvertently and then destroying them inadvertently means that the 9/11 Commission, this Congress, and others will probably never really know what we knew in the 1990s, what we could and maybe should have acted on in the 1990s, and how we could have improved this process so that it would not happen again.

Critical documents were taken out and they were destroyed, and we have a

National Security Adviser who was involved in this for years. He knows, the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) and I know the rules going into that room. How is it characterized? I think the sloppiness is characterized as somebody stuffing papers into their coat and into their pants. Excuse me. This is a National Security Adviser with top secret documents who takes them out of there, and the only question that one can really ask is, because I believe that he probably knew that somewhere along the line someone would discover that these documents were missing; why was he willing to risk taking these documents out of this security facility and taking them home and destroying them? What was in those documents that he probably did not want the American people to see?

I yield back to the chairman, because it is an unbelievable assertion from Sandy Berger that he inadvertently took documents. I mean, when the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) and I go into these rooms, do we walk in with a binder of our own notes and our own documents and then put the classified stuff next to it and kind of put it through each other and then walk out with a binder and say, oh, man, I just happened to take a few extra documents? Is that the process that we go through? I yield back to the chairman.

□ 2115

Mr. HUNTER. Well, I would just say to my friend that, at worst, we do not put documents in our socks; and I have not seen the definitive statement on this, but one, at least according to the news reports, and I think that is why we need to get more information on this, one of the staff members at the Archives said he put some of them into his socks.

Now, I think that they keep the temperature fairly temperate in that room, and you do not need to warm your feet. And just the idea of a national security adviser putting documents into his socks, I think raises a few questions.

There are more questions here than there are answers, and I think we all want to believe the best of our fellow man, our fellow government servant, who, as you said, was national security adviser. But another thing that I think the American people have to ponder on is that he did not, according to the news reports, say, Yes, I have got them until he was called by the archivists, who said, "You have got secure documents." And at that point he said, "Yes, I believe I do."

So you are right. These are not documents that are mixed up.

It is a standard procedure to divest yourself of any notes that you have written, but also divest yourself of the documents, as it is to turn your car off when you pull your car into the parking garage. You turn it off. And the idea that you left the car running, and then you did not go down and turn the car off until somebody called you and

told you the car was still running and that that was all done unintentionally is, I think, something that Mr. Berger needs to continue to explain.

Because one thing about the 9/11 Commission, the reports are out, one they were afraid of, and I need to yield to my friend from Florida, is that bits and pieces, little bitty statements out of that report, two and three words, will be used for news triggers, little statements that people made. And they will be plucked out and they will be used politically on one side or the other and they will be used by the news media, and so just a couple of words, one sentence, can have enormous effect, enormous effect.

I know the more liberal members of the media have pointed to one sentence that somebody used in one of the weapons of mass destruction analyses, where said it does not matter what we find, because this war is going to happen. Now, that was not a statement of policy. That was a statement by some guy who did not control policy, but it was plucked out and used and probably put in front of 50 million people. So little bitty words and little bitty sentences and little bitty phrases can be pulled out. And so the idea that we now have an incomplete reservoir of facts is, I think, disturbing to the American people.

If you lined up all the people in the United States and said, who would take those documents out, the President's former national security adviser would be the last gentleman that you would suspect. And on the other hand, apparently truth is stranger than fiction. It has happened. I think there is some explaining to do.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield for a second, I think we need to put this in context to the American people.

He removed those documents as he was preparing his testimony for the 9/11 commission. It just does not feel right. The context of going into a secure room, reviewing documents, knowing that these documents are going to be scrutinized by the 9/11 Commission, and as the chairman said, word for word for word, and then perhaps stuffing them into his coat, into his pants and perhaps even into his socks as he is preparing that testimony, and the disappointing thing is, now the American people will probably never know what was in those documents.

Those were original documents. They were not copies of documents, at least the evidence that we have or the information we have today said that those were original documents, they were not copies. There are not multiple versions of this available. He had the originals.

And the other thing we have to know about Sandy Berger, very different than the current President in the way that he operates, Sandy Berger was the gatekeeper to the President, meaning that George Tenet, John Deutsch and the CIA and other folks who wanted to

get to the President and brief the President had to go through Sandy Berger, and Sandy Berger was the gatekeeper.

It is not like this President, who gets briefed by a wide variety of people on a pretty regular basis. Sandy Berger was the gatekeeper. He had all of the information. These were documents that he prepared. Most likely, these are documents that are now missing. We will never know what is in them.

As those of us here on Capitol Hill are involved in the process of trying to improve the Intelligence Community, improve the intelligence capability and the analysis, we will never have the benefit of reviewing how these documents influence decision-making, and that will impair our ability to come up with the right recommendations to try to make sure or to minimize the possibility that a 9/11 will ever happen again.

I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, and I think he has raised probably the most important question for the next several weeks.

One other question we might ask is when Mr. Berger took these documents home, he obviously took them home for a purpose, and presumably he reviewed them at home, he looked at them. That would be another opportunity to say, I have got classified documents; they should go back. And it would certainly be a time when you would not scrunch one of them up and destroy it, because you realize you have got something that the Archives needs.

And so it is a very, very strange situation, and I think the gentleman has posited the most important questions. And maybe in the next 5 or 6 or 7 days we are going to have some answers.

I hope the gentleman would stay around and we will talk about Iraq, because the gentleman, along with the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER) and the gentleman from New Hampshire have a wealth of experience with respect to the Iraq theatre.

I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from Florida, a great member of the committee.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman very much.

We all intended to come down to the floor tonight and speak about Iraq and the successes that are taking place in that region, having been there myself, planning to go back there in August again on behalf of the committee.

But I do think attention needs to be drawn, as my good friend, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA) and the chairman have already alluded to, the fact that the information that was provided to most of us today and some last night that Sandy Berger has in fact admitted that he did take information out of a secure area.

It has already been alluded to that we can take notes while we are in an area looking at specific Top Secret information, but we by no means are al-

lowed to take any of that information out, much less the notes that we make to take out, and the facts that are coming to light now that he apparently used his jackets, his pants and possibly his socks. And I would tell my good friend that I understand today that while they all were original documents, there may, in fact, have been three different drafts of a single document that were there. And apparently, Mr. Berger went back and got all three drafts of that particular document. For what reason, I do not know.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Florida. I would certainly yield to my good friend.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. I think this is another critical point. Again, the information that we have to date is that this was not a single occurrence, but this was a pattern on a series of visits that he on multiple occasions inadvertently took documents. Again, that is what some of the press reports are indicating, which makes it even more suspect that by accident you took documents on a number of occasions.

I thank my colleague for yielding.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Exactly, and I think that the additional question that needs to be asked, and apparently now the presumed Democratic nominee, Mr. KERRY has accepted Mr. Berger's resignation as his national security adviser in regards to his political campaign.

Interestingly enough, I think it should have been the reverse. I think that the good Senator probably should have immediately, once he found out what was going on, should in fact asked Mr. Berger to step aside instead of waiting for Mr. Berger to make that decision. Again, I think it shows a lack of leadership on the Senator's side in regards to how he would handle an issue in regards to Top Secret information.

I would be glad to yield to our chairman.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding at this point, because I think that it does reflect on the judgment of Senator KERRY, but I think more reflective of his judgment with respect to intelligence is the fact that Senator KERRY voted to cut intelligence all during the 1990s.

Now what we have discovered is that we cut intelligence, we cut our operatives, our operating officers by more than 20 percent during the 1990s, during the Clinton administration; and that meant that we cut all of the people that gave us information because each of those operating officers has stables of people who talk to them, whether they are taxicab drivers or people in a bureaucracy in some foreign country or just people that have a certain insight into knowledge, people who are in the room when somebody bad makes a decision to hurt Americans. We lost 40 percent of our assets, of our intelligence assets.

So we had all this information coming in, and we cut out 40 percent of it. So we are like Ford Motor Company cutting out 40 percent of its dealerships and then wondering why the number of Fords sold has dropped dramatically.

Well, while we were doing that during the Clinton administration in the 1990s, Senator KERRY tried to cut it more, and in 1994 he offered a massive cut that received from fellow Democrats extreme criticism, one of them saying this was going to cut the eyes and ears out of our Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, and another one saying that this was going to be a disservice to our troops.

And then in 1996, Senator KERRY offered a bill, and I understand that he did not get a single cosponsor. There was not anybody in the Senate, Democrat or Republican, who was liberal enough to sign up to this one, because this cut \$1.5 billion out of the intelligence budget. This is in 1996 when we really needed it, when we needed to rebuild intelligence; and he cut what would have been \$300 million per year for 1996, 1997, 1998, 1999 and the year 2000. Luckily, not a single Senator was liberal enough to join him in that.

And it goes back to a statement that he made that was reported in one of the Harvard newspapers when he was first running for office, and he said that for practical purposes, he was going to for practical purposes defund the CIA, just take away the money.

I think that Senator KERRY always looked at the CIA in the same way as people look at it when they go into these movies and the movie is made through the prism of some left-winger in Hollywood; and in these Hollywood movies the CIA is always out there moving drugs and hurting people and being basically a bad influence. In reality, the people that serve in the CIA and our other intelligence agencies are wonderful people who serve this country, get no kudos, get no parades down Main Street, put themselves in dangerous positions for our country and often die in small, isolated places around the world for the United States of America.

But the problem in judgment is not Sandy Berger, the image of Sandy Berger stuffing stuff into his clothes and leaving the classified intel room, as JOHN KERRY's adviser. The real crisis in judgment, I think, is when JOHN KERRY got up and tried to cut an already debilitated CIA, one where the Clinton administration had sliced the top right off of it, cut out 40 percent of our assets, and he came in with further cuts. And he called our programs, the intelligence programs, silly programs.

Nobody calls them silly programs today. We wish we had had more. We wish we had had people sitting in those meetings when decisions were made to hurt Americans.

I would be happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. And I appreciate the chairman's remarks, and in

fact, President Bush has been working diligently, as the chairman knows, for months and months trying to rebuild that Intelligence Community that has been decimated so terribly.

Looking for that great peace dividend that was out there and slashing the intelligence budget was a foolish thing to do, and we now see, and in fact people are telling us, that it will take 1, 2, 3, maybe 5 years, in order to rebuild that human intelligence. You do not just rely on all of the whiz-bang things that we have now and the great ways that we have to gather intelligence, but you certainly have to take the opportunity to get the human intelligence.

But what bothers me even more is the fact that it appears that the information that Mr. Berger took out of that Top Secret room in that area where he should not have taken anything out of that room possibly dealt with very credible information in regards to our vulnerability at airports and seaports and what was going on in those general areas; and I think it is very coincidental, at best, that Mr. KERRY, Senator KERRY's advertisements, as he has been running for the Democratic nomination and has in fact been beating on our President time and time again, have in fact been homed in on our vulnerability at our airports and our seaports. And I am just concerned as to what Mr. Berger did with the information once he removed it from that Top Secret classified room and took it supposedly to his home, who may have seen it, who gained from the information that was there; and in fact, is there any type of tie that can be made to the campaign of Mr. KERRY, because it is beginning to appear we have a very convoluted web at this point in regards to some of the issues that the Senator has been raising.

□ 2130

Mr. HUNTER. I thank the gentleman. Another question I think is a common-sense question that the average American would ask is, well, if you took this stuff home that was highly classified, very sensitive, it is against the law to take it home, and you took it home. And you are reading it and you are a former security advisor, you know that it is highly classified, well, if you wad it up and throw it in the garbage, which is almost unthinkable, almost unthinkable, would you not, when you get called up by the people who have run the collection of that information, would you not then go try to retrieve it?

Would you not go out to your garbage and dig through it and say, why did I just lose it and throw it away?

Mr. MILLER of Florida. I understand that it was not just papers that were taken, but there possibly were bound books or folders of some type that you, in fact, could not just crunch up as a bunch of papers. You would know, in fact, that you were disposing of them; and you had to do it deliberately, if, in fact, you did dispose of it.

So to say that it was sloppy and inadvertent kind of stretches the imagination. But, of course, a lot of this has been done in this House over recent months, unfortunately; and it is being done out on the campaign trail, so it is certainly to be expected.

Mr. HUNTER. I agree with that and I want to thank, also, the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. BRADLEY) for his great work on the committee and especially his focus on making sure our troops have everything that they need. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire. I thank the chairman.

I first want to take this opportunity to salute his leadership, the way that he works on the Committee on Armed Services in a bipartisan fashion to strengthen our Nation's military and to make sure our troops have what they need. Certainly your leadership is commendable.

The one point that your comments brought to mind from some in the Defense authorization bill that we recently just passed out of the Committee on Armed Services, when we were talking about intelligence, one of the other cut backs that was made in the 1990s was the overall troop level. And we are seeing the unfortunate consequences of that when we have gone from 18 Army divisions down to 10 today. And we have our troops, our brave, loyal troops that are being asked by all of us as Americans to win the war on terrorism and fighting in over 100 different countries. It is not just Iraq and Afghanistan. It is Bosnia, it is Kosovo, it is many different places. And we are by virtue of having made these cut backs, stressing our troops rather to a high degree.

The point that I am trying to make, and perhaps the gentleman would want to elaborate on this, is that in the Defense authorization bill which we passed as I recall unanimously out of the committee in the final vote, we upped the number of troops over the next 3 years by 30,000, 10,000 for each of the next 3 years, active members of the Army and 9,000 additional Marines over the next 3 years. And this is certainly a first step in addressing the fact that we have gone from 18 Army divisions to 10 divisions.

And certainly something that all of us have to look at to make sure that not only, like intelligence, but in terms of personnel that we have the troop strength that is necessary to win the war on terror, it is not just the numbers. It is ample pay. It is the appropriate level of benefits for veterans, housing allowances, all of those things that the gentleman has shown such remarkable leadership on in his tenure as a chairman to make those improvements for our troops.

Mr. HUNTER. Let me thank the gentleman for his great initiative because I am just a cog in this wheel and both gentlemen, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER), has been a leader and put together, drafted the provisions that

we all got behind that gave these great survivor benefits which heretofore had not been coming. And the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER) is to be congratulated on that.

The gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. BRADLEY) has been a real leader in making sure that we have this momentum to rebuild the military; and not only do we have the 30,000 increase in Army end strength in our bill, but we also have an increase of some 9,000 Marines. I think that is important also. The Marines are out there deployed a great deal of the time. They are kind of a 911 for us. It always has one MEU or one larger unit. A MEU is a Marine Expeditionary Unit, a little bit bigger than a battalion, out on patrol, so to speak, in the world's oceans, ready to move in quickly if there is a problem.

The interesting thing is this all reflects on the people. If you have a family sitting around the breakfast table trying to decide whether to re-up or not, the fact that the dad has not been home for two or three Christmases is going to have an effect on whether he stays in. This is a corporate decision that is made by the family. So having enough people is a very, very important thing.

It is also standing military that is not committed that is an insurance policy for our country. It makes sense to have an insurance policy.

I want to thank the gentleman for his great work and just ask the gentleman, he has been to Iraq, and I would like to ask both gentlemen what their take is now. We all know it is a tough, hard road; but our troops are walking down that road. We are starting to make this hand-off. We have handed off the government of Iraq to Iraqis, and we are starting to hand off the military. What do you think?

Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire. As the chairman knows, I had the opportunity to visit Iraq several months ago. While there is no question what we saw there, there were six of us Members of Congress with other military personnel attached to us. We saw a war zone. There was no question about that. But we also saw the rebuilding of the country; and that is something that, unfortunately, people only see the pictures from the war zone, but they do not see the fact that the electricity is coming on, that the water is being restored, that there is adequate supplies of petroleum products in the country.

We saw a lot of traffic on the street. For instance, in northern Iraq, in Kirkuk where we were, we even saw some new construction. We were told there was plenty of food available in the country. As we flew around the country, not only in the C-130 transport planes at 18,000 feet but in Black Hawk helicopters at 150 feet, we flew over a lot of agricultural areas of the country that were starting the winter planting.

We did not have, when we were there, the opportunity to visit a school or a hospital; but certainly we have been

told, as you know, about the progress in refurbishing those critical institutions for Iraqi education and health care. So these are things that show where progress is being made to this day and certainly it was when I was there in November.

The other thing I think is really important to stress, and I think you may want to add to this, Mr. Chairman, is the morale of our troops. I had the opportunity to talk to a number of New Hampshire troops at every stop that we made, as did all of the other Members of the delegation. You are right, we are asking them to do a dangerous and dirty job. It is difficult. It is life threatening. And these kids are so dedicated to their mission and that is probably the most compelling story that I came away with. And when I say "kids" that is really not right. They were young Americans. They are wonderful patriots. They are fine Americans. And they are so dedicated to restoring a sense of normalcy, a representative government in Iraq; and they felt, despite the difficulty of the job that we are asking them to do, they felt that they were making significant progress and the morale was high.

All I can say is God bless them, and I pray for their safe return. They are doing a fantastic job in very difficult circumstances.

Mr. HUNTER. I thank the gentleman for his comments. I would like to ask the same question of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER), who has been a great member of the committee and who has really worked this issue.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. I thank the Chairman. I would say that all indications, I think for most Members, they would say that Baghdad is returning to normal. Yes, there still are some problems. We see them on a daily basis, but the fact of the matter is children are attending new schools, new universities, playgrounds are up. Children are actually going there. Their parents feel comfortable to allow them to go. Where the statue of Saddam Hussein was pulled down some 15 months ago in Firdos Square, adults are sitting around playing games of bingo.

Now, that sounds pretty silly, but the fact of the matter is if you are comfortable enough to sit on the ground or under the shade of a tree and play bingo, things are getting back to normal.

At the northern end of Iraq in Mosul, security forces are in almost total control up there. It has been divided into sectors. They have been going house to house, neighborhood to neighborhood; and they have got a lot of insurgents out and a lot of weapons caches there in that area to make sure our troops and coalition forces remain safe. We have thwarted hundreds of different types of IED attacks on our troops. On the banks of the Tigris River I would say that nightlife is returning to normal as well.

You look in the background of all of these TV scenes that you see of some of

the car bombs that are exploded and burning. If you look in the very back, you will see that traffic is moving and progress is still going on. Commerce is taking place. People are walking in the streets.

Certainly the target is coalition forces. And recently we have seen where they have begun to target those members of the coalition that have the smallest numbers of troops because it makes them easy for them to pull out by going in and taking some of their people captive and holding them hostage and threatening to cut their heads off. Of course, the press might show that for maybe 1 or 2 days on television, but they are going to over and over and over again show the fact of our troops and the coalition forces that are being killed.

It goes back, I think, to the old adage, and I hate to be overly descriptive of this but I am a journalism major. And I can tell you that one of the things we learned, if it bleeds, it leads. That is exactly what the press want to do right now is to continue to try to turn the American situation or the American feelings and opinions against what is going on. Our opponents know that. They have been working it.

Saddam Hussein is not a dumb man. He had his people well prepared, and he thought that the American citizens and the coalition forces would be so afraid when these things started that we would pull out, and leave or we would be willing to give in to whatever demands that he may actually put out there. And that, in fact, is not what is happening.

President Bush has been very strong in his resolve. I will never forget, totally different subject, but I had an opportunity to travel to North Korea over a year ago. When we were in North Korea, the North Koreans absolutely could not understand why this American Commander in Chief would not negotiate with them. They were used to dealing with the Clinton administration who would give them whatever they asked for in order to keep the peace.

Now, the things that have been welling up inside and swelling up for so long have come to pass. We have had 9/11. We have had attacks on our soil. President Bush is doing whatever he can to make sure that does not happen in the United States again on our own soil, making sure that we take the war to the terrorists where they live and root them out, and it is not going to happen over night. I mean, Saddam Hussein ruled for over 25 years. Longer than Tojo was in Japan. Longer than Hitler was in power in his time in Germany.

So the fact of the matter is for years Saddam Hussein ruled. He killed the Kurds in the north and those in the south, and we are continuing to try to root out those people in whatever hole they may have climbed into.

Mr. HUNTER. The gentleman made a good point when he said that some-

times the news media follows the old adage, if it bleeds, it leads. Because that is what a TV station will use to get viewership for their news hour so they can sell Coca-Cola and whatever type of advertising they have got. And they know that violence does attract a certain core audience.

Now, the problem with running wall-to-wall car wrecks if you are a local TV station is that you give a misleading impression of the traffic situation in a given town. If you go in, if you are a new TV station in town and you say, because we do not have a lot of good substantial news, we will do wall-to-wall car wrecks, and your news guys may say, we only have two car wrecks a day; and you say, run them over and over again. If the average person watches that news station and sees wall-to-wall car wrecks on the news, he will be given the impression if he drives out on the freeway in that town, he has a 50 percent chance of being in an accident.

The car wrecks in isolation may be true. They are accurate pictures, but if you run them back-to-back, wall-to-wall, all the time, all car wrecks, you are going to give a misleading impression on the traffic situation on that town. Similarly, if you run wall-to-wall pictures of burning tankers. If there was one tanker blown up in a country that is as big as the State of California and has 25 million people, and you run one explosion over and over and over, you give the impression that the entire country is on fire. It is not.

That is not to say it is not dangerous, because it is dangerous; and that is not to say it is not tough.

I want to give a description of what I saw last time I was there. When we went into Balad, we were there in time for the daily mortaring, where a couple of mortar rounds are thrown in by the insurgents in this big former fighter base for Saddam Hussein, which is now one of our main logistics bases.

Well, we were out looking at the gun trucks at that time; and as these rounds came in about 1,000 yards away, all the GIs just walked, they did not panic or stampede. They just walked, did not even stop their conversations, to the shelters that were nearby.

□ 2145

Our general said, Quick, get into the nearest building. It happened to be a movie theater. We went in there, and he said, get away from the glass, go indoors. We went into the actual theater portion of this building. I opened up the door and went in. It was a big church service. It was on Sunday. There were 400 GIs there. They had a great preacher who was preaching. They had a 100 GI choir, a band, had a couple of steel guitars up there, and everybody had their combat gear sitting there.

Not only were the politicians forced to go into the church service because of mortaring, we were forced to stay there because of mortaring. We asked

when we could leave, and they said, You are going to have to wait till the service was over, and so we waited until the service was over and we left.

My point is, those folks are standing firm. Our people in uniform are standing firm. The American people should stand firm.

It was interesting to come back here and watch the talking heads on television whip themselves into a tizzy, and in my mind's eye I had those great folks in uniform who were doing their job very coolly, very professionally and with a sense of purpose; and with respect to a sense of purpose, that is an important thing.

Just saying, Well, I support the troops, but they are wasting their lives is not enough. If you tell people that what they are doing, whether they are a truck driver for a living or they are a soldier, is without value. Then you are really denigrating that person. You are really taking the value away from their occupation.

So those who say, Well, I would support the troops, but what they are doing is a waste, is not a support of the troops.

Now, you may say, Well, that is okay, I think my opinion outbalances whether or not I support the troops but I am not a supporter of the troops, and it does a disservice to the troops.

I want to let you know when we went over, and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. REYES), a great Member from El Paso, was over with us and the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT), we let the troops know that we valued their service and valued them.

I would be happy to continue to yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, one of the most telling periods of time when I was there was our visit to the Abu Ghraib prison, and while that prison has gotten a certain amount of notoriety because of the abuse by our troops, a very small number of people, of Iraqi detainees, the larger story that I took away from it is what I saw in that prison.

When you walk through the execution chamber, when you go through the torture chambers, and when you see the barbaric nature of those facilities, and the fact that in this one prison, 80,000 Iraqis were first tortured and then executed, it was a life-altering experience for me and, I think, the other Members of Congress who were there to have been in that room where so many souls were so cruelly murdered.

I left, from that experience, I think, a very changed person, having seen that kind of depraved behavior and the aftermath of it; and certainly when I have come home and had the opportunity throughout New Hampshire to talk to people about that, it has been a pretty telling experience.

I had a video camera with me and took an actual picture of the execution chamber and how it worked. We were shown the grizzly details. It is a very frightening experience, and people need

to know of the mass graves and the fact that Saddam Hussein started two wars; that he actually used chemical weapons against his own people, against the Iranians; that he was funding suicide bombers; that he did have a very significant weapons of mass destruction program that the United Nations was never able to account for at the end what happened to.

While there certainly have been intelligence questions, and we need to improve our intelligence as we talked about at the beginning of this hour, these are facts about what happened. Having been in that prison and having seen that execution chamber, it certainly changed the way I look at this entire situation.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I will tell the gentleman about another operation that took place.

For those folks who now have given the distorted view to the world that somehow the Americans are worse than Saddam Hussein, that we have tortured people and we are the emblems of torture because they have run these pictures back to back, including the picture where a person is pretending to shock a person. In the briefings I received, they never turned on the electricity, but they have given that picture out to literally millions of viewers with the clear impression that that person is being shocked with electricity.

When I was in the hospital there at Ramstein, one of the surgeons had a disk, and on the disk was a video of Saddam Hussein's people amputating the hands of people in one of the villages because they had not done enough for the economy. They were businessmen, and the growth rate of the economy had not been high enough. So he thought he would give a little example and amputate their hands.

So for people that want to see real torture, real inhumane treatment, it is there to see, but of course, if we give that disk to the news media, I am sure that nobody will. In fact, I think those people were in the capital. I think the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) brought them over for a reception, and as I recall, there were almost no stories about those people.

There was a story or two about the young kids, the 14-year-old kids who wrote anti-Saddam graffiti on their blackboard in high school. They were promptly taken out and hanged.

Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire. In that prison.

Mr. HUNTER. And the Kurdish mothers who died there by poison gas, with their babies in their arms, those were representations of real inhumane treatment.

I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I want to say I think a little perspective probably needs to be added to some of the discussions tonight, and I would imagine there is not a person that looks at that hollow Manhattan

skyline that does not think of the Twin Towers and where they stood. There are some that remember before the towers were ever built. Certainly, there are those that now know the towers were there and one day something will be built in its place, but I say this just to say that it is far easier to destroy something than it is to rebuild it. And rebuild is, in fact, what America and the coalition forces have been doing in Iraq and in Afghanistan as well, but tonight, we are mostly focused on Iraq.

Our military forces have been engaged in a very complex not only war on terror, but also the process of going through and rebuilding. They have been looking for weapons of mass destruction. We keep hearing people saying that it is a failure because the weapons of mass destruction have not been found.

I am more concerned because of the fact that they have not been found. Where are they? We know that they existed at one point. We know that Saddam Hussein used them on his own people. We have not found them yet. David Kay said, all we are looking for from a biological standpoint is a vial that is about this big and a two-car garage-size building that could hold 500 chemical warheads in a country, as you have already related, the size of California.

We are working on restoring basic public services: electricity, water, sewer. We hear some on the other side say, we went in and we broke it. We did not break it. It was already broken, but what is happening out of all of this is something that I think is truly revolutionary, and that is, the verge of democracy breaking out in an Arab region.

The fact of the matter is, Iraq now has a new government. They are preparing for election, but of course, the press does not want to tell the positive story that is there to be told. They want to continue to focus, as you have already said, on those car crashes in a loop over and over again, those burning cars. They want to focus on those lives that have been lost, and we are all focused on the lives that have been lost.

Not a single Member of this Congress does not mourn the loss of an American military man or woman, nor a Coalition force person; but the fact of the matter is, they are doing again, as the chairman has adequately stated tonight, very, very difficult work in a difficult region and in an area where people want to kill us. We are the enemy to them, and we understand that, and the soldiers that are there and the Marines that are there know they are there to do a job.

A great number of individuals have chosen to travel to Iraq. Some have not been yet, but they want to go to Iraq, and they are working on scheduling trips over there. And when they sit down and they talk with the soldiers, bar none, every one of them will tell them they are there for the right reason. They have, in fact, been welcomed as liberators. They have had the arms

of young Iraqi children, men and women around their neck thanking them, hugging them for what they have done relieving them of the brutal regime of Saddam Hussein; and now we are helping, along with the Coalition forces, to rebuild their country.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. I thank the gentleman from New Hampshire also, and would ask if he has any closing words he would like to say.

Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire. Once again, it has been a pleasure to serve under the gentleman from California's (Mr. HUNTER) leadership, to have watched the Committee on Armed Services start the process of rebuilding our Nation's military, in particular, making sure that we have given a pay increase to members of the military for the last couple of years; that we have done a better job of providing the bulletproof vests and the retrofit kits for the Humvees and that type of thing. It is a process that needs to continue.

I thank you once again for your leadership and certainly look forward to continuing to work with you.

Mr. HUNTER. We will all continue to work together, and I thank all Members, Republican and Democrat, on our committee. We have got a great membership.

Let me just say one thing, if I could, with the indulgence of my colleagues.

A great gentleman, Cato Cedillo, who served as my assistant district administrator for 23 years passed away early this morning, and he was a real hero. He was a guy from San Angelo, Texas, who helped everybody, who had a heart as big as all outdoors; and I swear he could do more with a telephone, getting the problem solved, than the rest of us with a bank of computers.

Cato was a wonderful, wonderful person, and I was with him and with his family last night as we said good-bye to Cato. It is sad. He will be greatly missed around his hometown of San Angelo, Texas, and San Diego, California.

I thank the gentlemen for letting me mention him in the closing moments of our special order.

I want to thank the gentlemen for participating tonight, and again, the message from our troops was that they are staying steady and we in America should stay steady. We are making this handoff. We need to follow through with it and follow through with our mission.

I thank the gentlemen.

30-SOMETHING WORKING GROUP

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HENSARLING). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MEEK) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, once again, it is an honor to address the American people and also Members of the U.S. Congress, and there are so many issues to talk about tonight.

As many of the Members know and the American people know, once a week the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the Democratic leader, has allowed the 30-something Working Group to come to the floor to share with the American people issues that are facing not only young Americans but Americans in general. We have 14 Members in our working group, and we work throughout the week and here in the Congress to make sure that we give voice to issues that are facing Americans throughout our country.

I must say that being from Miami, Mr. Speaker, I just want to share with the Members and the American people, we are so glad that the people of Los Angeles allowed for the Miami Heat to be able to receive Shaq. We look forward to the Miami Heat going to the NBA not only finals, but championship this upcoming season. Shaq is going to bring a new flavor to Miami, and all Miamians are very proud to have him there and also his family; and we welcome them all. We look forward to a successful Eastern Conference playoff and even regular season, and I will tell you, not being a season ticketholder myself, I look forward to saving up my money to get an opportunity to see him in the Magic City.

□ 2200

Mr. Speaker, let me share for a moment with the American people that week after week the 30-something Working Group has had an opportunity to come to the floor to speak to the American people about the issues. This week we had a visit from the WWE, which is the World Wrestling Entertainment Association. These are wrestlers that came to the U.S. House of Representatives to talk about their initiative that they are working on throughout the country.

Everywhere the WWE is going, they are registering voters, and they are working with the democratic way of making sure that every vote counts in this upcoming election. We know that many Americans, many of them are young; a lot of issues facing Americans right now are issues that are working towards our future. It does not matter what age you are, but especially for young people. I commend WWE for the work they are doing. They were here Monday night at the MCI Center registering voters. Their number is up to a million voters who have already registered for the upcoming election.

I am very excited about Americans who have not had an opportunity to vote in the past that are taking an opportunity to vote this time; and wrestlers, entertainers are telling them it is important that they vote. There are issues facing the economy, the environment, the war in Iraq; and we are glad they are there.

I have a picture, if I may, of three of the WWE wrestlers that came to the Capitol on Monday. This fine gentleman is myself. I wanted to wrestle once upon a time, but I do not think I

can hang with these guys. We have Maven, who is an outstanding young man. We had an opportunity to hear his views on voter suppression.

This is Hurricane. We had an opportunity to see him Monday night. He is a very popular young man and has a bright future in the wrestling entertainment world. And then we have Chris Nowitski, who is a Harvard graduate. He graduated from Harvard and now wrestles in the WWE. They all have a voter consciousness. And here is our very own, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN), who wanted to have a lights-out cage match with these gentlemen. He said as long as he has his track shoes on, he will be okay.

Mr. Speaker, we want to commend these men for coming and helping to get out the word about democracy and making sure every voter takes their American right and has an opportunity to vote so their voices are heard. It was good. We had an hour-long meeting, and we opened it to the press to allow them to come in and hear these fine gentlemen. I am glad they have taken time out to share in a bipartisan and nonpartisan way the importance of voting.

Mr. Speaker, I must share the issue of voter suppression. This is going on throughout the country, and I must say to many of those students that are going to return to colleges and institutions and even to those parents that are sending their kids off for the first time to a college in a city that they have never been in before, many of those individuals have registered in high school through their social studies programs and government classes. We do it in Florida, and in many locations throughout the country the same thing happens. We want to make sure that these young people know they can register.

In November, November 2, they are going to be at the location where they are going to school. We started getting reports of young people going to register to vote before they recessed for the spring, and now in the middle of August they are going to return for the fall semester; but they were told they were not eligible to vote because they did not live in that particular city. Taken from my good friend, David Letterman, and hopefully I will get out of here in time to be able to catch the show, if you live in Sioux City, Iowa, and you are attending university in Akron, Ohio, you should have the opportunity to vote there. The Supreme Court said in 1979, if you are a registered student, going to school there, you have a right to vote in that location.

Mr. Speaker, there is also rhetoric that is being shared with many students that want to vote at their college campus, if they register, they will lose their out-of-state or in-state aid they will receive, or their scholarship will be in jeopardy because they were brought in as an out-of-state student.