

HOPE IN IRAQ

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

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, on September 29, an article in the *Centralia Sentinel* reads, "Former Centralia policeman finds hope in Iraq."

Joe Phoenix ended his 11-year career in February to join 1,000 other law enforcement officers from the U.S. hired by the Federal Government to train Iraqi police officers. In a brief visit home he states about the Iraqi people, "They are good people with good hearts and they love working with Americans," he said. "They consider it such an honor that we come over here and that we leave home and work with them. I have had nothing but cooperation from the people I am working with."

About the current challenges he states, "We are trying to get people trained and fortified so they can stand their ground. We need to get the Iraqi police in a better position to fight these guys."

And about the future, "Right now it is dangerous and it is probably going to get worse between now and January. They are going to try and stop the elections and show people we are not in control, but that is not going to happen. After the elections, I think things will slow down and get better."

Mr. Speaker, I thank Officer Phoenix for his service. God bless him, and God bless the United States of America.

AMERICA NEEDS COMMANDER IN CHIEF, NOT CHEERLEADER IN CHIEF

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

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, a former CIA official recently said "The best we can hope for in Iraq is a failed state hobbling along." The State Department's official travel warnings says, "Iraq remains very dangerous." The national intelligence estimate from July said the best case scenario for Iraq was merely "tenuous stability."

A Kroll Security International study shows the number of attacks has increased from 40 per day to around 70 per day. Republican Senator CHUCK HAGEL said, "I do not think we are winning. We are in deep trouble in Iraq." Secretary of State Colin Powell said, "It is getting worse."

I know that the President is proud of the fact that he does not read newspapers, but can somebody please brief the President of the United States?

Today in the *Washington Post*, with all of the horrific news, there is a report that the administration is embarking on a new propaganda campaign "designed to be uplifting, with good news messages about Iraq."

Mr. Speaker, the American people need the truth about Iraq. The American people can handle the truth; the question is, can the President?

MARRIAGE PROTECTION AMENDMENT

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

Mr. RYUN of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, much has been said about the need to protect the definition of marriage for the future. While I wholeheartedly agree, I would like to offer a perspective from the past on the importance of marriage in America.

Alexis de Tocqueville perhaps provided the most comprehensive analysis of American society in the 1830s. He observed that there is certainly no country in the world where the tie of marriage is more respected than in America.

In 1885 the United States Supreme Court added its opinion stating, "Certainly no legislation can be supposed more wholesome and necessary in the founding of a free, self-governing commonwealth than that which establishes it on the idea of the family, consisting of the union for life of one man and one woman in the holy estate of matrimony; the family is the sure foundation of all that is stable and noble in our civilization."

Historically, marriage between one man and one woman has been the cornerstone of stable families. The marriage protection amendment will ensure that the definition of marriage in America does not change based upon the whim of an activist judge. It will protect the rights of each State and the will of the people. I urge Members to support the marriage protection amendment. It is necessary for the preservation of the historic institution of the family.

RUBEN MARTINEZ AWARDED MACARTHUR FELLOWSHIP

(Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise this morning to congratulate a very good friend of mine, Ruben Martinez, owner of Libreria Martinez Books and Art Gallery in Santa Ana, California, for being named a 2004 MacArthur Fellow.

How appropriate that during Hispanic Heritage Month, I have the opportunity to recognize such a successful Hispanic from my own district on this great honor. For more than 30 years, Ruben has been getting the youth of Orange County engaged in books and politics. What began as a haircutting venture, accompanied by political discussions with his clients, turned into a lifelong passion for selling books in both Spanish and English.

Today Libreria Martinez is one of the largest commercial sellers of Spanish-language books in the Nation. Authors and community members, both young and old alike, have made this shop a home.

The MacArthur Fellowship has been dubbed the "genius award" by some, and I can think of no one more deserving than Ruben. I thank him for his tireless work and his dedication in promoting readings and education in my hometown.

MARRIAGE PROTECTION AMENDMENT

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

Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon we will debate and vote on the marriage protection amendment. Let us be clear, the debate today is not about denying anyone's rights. This is about ensuring the will of the people and protecting it. Forty-four States have already enacted laws defining marriage as the union between a man and a woman. South Carolina is one of these 44 States. The people of my State have already decided how they would like for marriage to be defined. So as a Representative I am wondering why the will of my constituents and that of over 70 percent of Americans nationwide should be tossed aside because of a few activist judges because they disagree.

Unfortunately, a handful of judges have already begun to amend our Constitution. They have circumvented the democratic process with their rulings. Therefore, the decision we are left with now is not whether the Constitution will be amended but who will amend it: activist judges or the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I hope my colleagues will join me today in supporting the marriage protection amendment. It is time we get the debate back where it belongs, with the American people.

GLOBAL WARMING

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, as the damage, pain, and suffering of the recent hurricanes slowly recede in the memories of most Americans, we would do well to remember that this is but a small taste of what is likely to occur given the increase in global warming.

A recent study by the Commerce Department's Geophysical Fluid Dynamic Lab in Princeton University, the most extensive to date, indicated that global warming is going to make it a lot worse. The typical hurricane is going to be one-half step greater on the 5-step scale, rainfall up to 60 miles away will be up to 20 percent more intense, and even if the number of storms remains the same, which is not at all

clear, there will be much increased potential for damage, and the rising sea levels will create more flooding from the storm surges.

It is time for the United States to work with other developed countries to recognize the threat of global climate warming, to cooperate on solutions to reduce greenhouse gases. Future generations will be grateful.

MARRIAGE PROTECTION AMENDMENT

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

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, today we will debate and vote on an issue of critical importance to our society: marriage.

The issue is whether we will stand idly by as a few unelected judges redefine the family for us, or if we will take a stand and say enough is enough. The best home for kids is with their mom and dad. Children cannot do better than that, and we should not try to redefine marriage.

Unfortunately, some claim that this is an issue for the States. Indeed, it is if that is what was happening. It is not. Activist courts are circumventing the States in order to make this happen. We would never debate it. The States would never debate it. The American people would never debate. That is how the activist groups and the activist judges want it. States rights are meaningless if judges ultimately make the decisions.

Mr. Speaker, this House should pass the marriage protection amendment and send it to the State legislatures for their ratification so the courts do not become the final maker of family policy. Kids do best with a mom and dad.

CHENEY HAD IT RIGHT FIRST TIME

(Mr. McDERMOTT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.)

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, the Vice President had it right on Iraq the first time, and now we know that because of the Seattle Post-Intelligencer newspaper columnist Joe Connelly.

The Vice President was Defense Secretary during the first Gulf War. Mr. CHENEY told a Seattle audience in 1992 that it was folly to spill American blood to try to get Saddam or try to govern Iraq. This column ought to be required reading before the Presidential debates.

These are DICK CHENEY's exact words in defending the first President Bush's decision to leave Iraq and Saddam Hussein: "And the question in my mind is how many additional American casualties is Saddam worth? And the answer is not that damned many. So I think we got it right, both when we decided

to expel him from Kuwait, but also when the President made the decision that we had achieved our objectives and we were not going to get bogged down in the problems of trying to take over and govern Iraq."

I am entering Mr. Connelly's column in the RECORD. It is seattlepi.com. Read it.

Mr. Speaker, they may call it swagging in Texas, but we call it truth in Washington State.

[From the Seattle Post-Intelligencer, Sept. 29, 2004]

IN THE NORTHWEST: BUSH-CHENEY FLIP-FLOPS COST AMERICA IN BLOOD

(By Joel Connelly)

As George W. Bush has lately shown, the tactic of successfully defining your opponent is to political conflict what occupying the high ground is to waging war.

The Bush-Cheney campaign has gleefully labeled John Kerry a flip-flopper. But what of Bush-Cheney flip-flops? They're getting a lot less ink, but America is paying a price in blood.

Little noticed, and worthy of lengthy consideration, is a speech delivered by then-Defense Secretary Dick Cheney in 1992 to the Discovery Institute in Seattle.

The words of our future vice president—defending the decision to end Gulf War I without occupying Iraq—eerily foretell today's morass. Here is what Cheney said in '92:

"I would guess if we had gone in there, I would still have forces in Baghdad today. We'd be running the country. We would not have been able to get everybody out and bring everybody home.

"And the final point that I think needs to be made is this question of casualties. I don't think you could have done all of that without significant additional U.S. casualties. And while everybody was tremendously impressed with the low cost of the (1991) conflict, for the 146 Americans who were killed in action and for their families, it wasn't a cheap war.

"And the question in my mind is how many additional American casualties is Saddam (Hussein) worth? And the answer is not that damned many. So, I think we got it right, both when we decided to expel him from Kuwait, but also when the president made the decision that we'd achieved our objectives and we were not going to get bogged down in the problems of trying to take over and govern Iraq."

How—given what he said then—does Cheney get off challenging the judgment and strength of those who argue that we are bogged down and shedding blood today?

Is Saddam worth the lives of 1,046 (at last count) dead Americans, and 7,000 injured Americans?

Dick Cheney posed the hard-nosed questions that should be asked by a president in time of war. George Bush is out on the campaign trail boasting he's hard-nosed because he didn't ask how a "Mission Accomplished!" could unravel.

Kerry is taking a pounding from the relentless Republican machine. A GOP TV ad shows Kerry windsurfing, with Strauss' "Blue Danube" waltz playing in the background, as the voice-over claims the nominee has shifted positions "whichever way the wind blows."

In case the "mainstream" media are interested, or Fox News wants to balance its reporting to furnish a few moments of fairness, here are a few Bush flip-flops that might be put before the voters:

Nation-Building: As a candidate, Dubya traveled the land in 2000 denouncing the

Clinton administration for using U.S. troops in what he called "nation-building."

"I'm worried about an opponent who uses nation-building and the military in the same sentence," he told a rally. "My view of the military is for our military to be properly prepared to fight and win wars—therefore, (to) prevent war from happening in the first place."

What are we doing in Iraq if not "nation-building?" Enmeshed in Iraq, are we properly prepared to fight such crazies as the nuclear weapon-equipped "Great Leader" of North Korea, Kim Jong II?

Our Real Enemy: Two days after 9/11, President Bush declared: "The most important thing is for us to find Osama bin Laden. It is our No. 1 priority, and we will not rest until we find him."

Six months later, laying political groundwork for the Iraq war, the President said: "I don't know where he is. I have no idea and I really don't care. It's not that important. It's not our priority."

The 9/11 Commission: The White House initially opposed creation of an independent commission to investigate causes of the 9/11 atrocities. A July 2002 statement read: "The administration would oppose an amendment that would create a new commission to conduct a similar review (to Congress' investigation)."

The administration reversed course five months later. The bipartisan commission, including former Sen. Slade Gorton, R-WA, distinguished itself at hearings and in its findings and recommendations.

Homeland Security: In the fall of 2001 Sens. JOHN MCCAIN, R-AZ, and JOE LIEBERMAN, D-CT, proposed creating a Cabinet-level Department of Homeland Security.

White House press secretary Ari Fleischer outlined the administration's opposition in October 2001, saying Congress did not need to make the director's job "a statutory post" and that "every agency of the government has security concerns."

A year later, the Bush administration was playing Sen. MAX CLELAND, D-GA—a Vietnam triple amputee—for allegedly being an obstacle to creation of the department. Anti-Cleland ads showing Osama bin Laden and Saddam Hussein flashed across the TV screens of Georgia.

Such are this administration's major national security flip-flops. But other flips bear on our safety.

During the 2000 campaign, candidate Bush pledged to limit carbon dioxide emissions into the atmosphere. It didn't happen. The President promised to support—or at least sign—renewal of Congress' 1994 ban on military-style assault weapons. The Bush administration didn't lift a finger to extend the ban, which recently expired.

Out here on America's "Left Coast," candidate George Bush proclaimed himself a steadfast free trader. Even today, Republican State Chairman Chris Vance hammers Kerry as a flip-flopper on trade.

How, then, to explain the President's 2002 decision to slap tariffs of 8 to 30 percent on steel imports to the United States? (The tariffs were lifted after 21 months.)

Answer: The steel-producing states of Pennsylvania, Ohio and West Virginia have 46 fought-over electoral votes in this year's election.

□ 1015

HISTORIC MEETING BETWEEN INDIA AND PAKISTAN LEADERS OFFERS HOPE

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