

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.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, a historic meeting took place this past Friday in New York City between Indian Prime Minister Singh and Pakistani President Musharraf. This was an important step toward bringing about a peaceful ending to disputes over Kashmir and fears of nuclear conflict in the region.

Both India and Pakistan have been strong allies of the United States in the war on terror and Secretary of State Colin Powell should be thanked for playing a significant role in bringing these leaders together. This is the latest example of positive progress in South Asia and the Middle East, thanks to the leadership and support of President George W. Bush and his administration.

This month the world's largest Muslim nation, Indonesia, had its first direct democratic election of a president, and earlier this year Libya voluntarily gave up its program to develop weapons of mass destruction. Additionally, millions of Muslims have been liberated by coalition forces from brutal regimes in Afghanistan and Iraq and now will build a civil society which protects American families.

In conclusion, may God bless our troops and we will never forget September 11.

TONIGHT'S PRESIDENTIAL DEBATE

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I briefly rise, as well, to join my colleague in acknowledging the meeting between the Prime Minister of India and, of course, the President of Pakistan asking for their fellow countrymen and -women to understand the importance of aspiring for peace for their people.

But I rise today, Mr. Speaker, to really ask my colleagues and the American people what tonight's debate should really be about. This debate has been almost poised as a contest between two warriors. In fact, I believe this is a debate for the American people. The question should be asked, why were the American people told that we needed to go to war for the weapons of mass destruction that did not exist? Why have some thousand-plus of our young men and women and family members died in Iraq when there was no basis for this war? Why did the President not seek a constitutional vote for this war? Why are there thousands of wounded lying in our hospitals and we do not even know if the veterans hospitals will remain open?

The question is, who can lead us forward, and the answer is JOHN KERRY. That is what this debate is about, what will the American people want for their future and I can assure you it is not and should not be a litany of untruths from their national government; they simply want the truth.

DROUGHT RELIEF

(Mrs. MUSGRAVE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. Mr. Speaker, as we approach the end of this legislative session and I near the end of my freshman term, I am amazed by the power this body has when it wants to act quickly. The speed at which recent emergency funding for hurricane victims passed just goes to show what can be accomplished in Congress and how quickly.

Serving my rural district in Colorado, I come to the floor this morning to urge action on funding for victims of another major natural disaster, our 6-year drought, which has devastated farmers and ranchers throughout the West. This is a matter of importance that is not being reported on the 24-hour cable news networks or capturing front-page headlines across the Nation because it is not a sudden, horrific force like hurricanes; but it is very critical nonetheless.

When I am at home on the weekends, I see the devastation firsthand. I see the worry and the anxiety. I see the detriment this natural disaster is imposing on the local small town economies. Recently, the other body included \$3 billion for drought relief in the Department of Homeland Security bill.

To my colleagues here in the House, I urge support of this funding for drought relief. Floridians boarded up before their natural disasters. Let us make sure rural Colorado does not after theirs.

IRAQ

(Ms. DELAURO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, today's Washington Post tells us that the administration recently curtailed the distribution of reports by contractor Kroll Security International that show increasing violence in Iraq. The article goes on to say that the Pentagon is sponsoring a group of Iraqi Americans to speak at military bases throughout the United States to provide "a firsthand account of events in Iraq." That is to say, the administration is sending Iraqi exiles, mostly people who may not have been to the country in years, to tell our troops just back from Iraq the "good news" about how things are going there.

I imagine some of these exiles are the same people who told Deputy Defense Secretary Wolfowitz that we would be greeted as liberators upon arriving in Iraq. These are two more examples of an administration in denial of what is actually going on in Iraq, an administration unhinged from reality. If these emissaries of the administration were going to tell our troops the truth about Iraq, they would say that the inter-

national coalition is getting smaller, that our burden is getting larger, and our casualties are rising at an alarming rate.

That is the reality in Iraq, the reality that our dedicated troops deserve to be told by those sending them into harm's way. The American public needs to know what is happening in Iraq. This administration is failing to do that.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

The Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MILLER of Florida) laid before the House the following privileged message from the Senate:

In the Senate of the United States, September 20, 2004.

Ordered, That the Secretary be directed to request the return of (H.R. 4567) entitled "An Act making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2005, and for other purposes," in compliance with a request of the Senate for the return thereof.

Attest:

EMILY J. REYNOLDS,
Secretary.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the request of the Senate is agreed to, and H.R. 4567 will be returned to the Senate.

There was no objection.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5183, SURFACE TRANSPORTATION EXTENSION ACT OF 2004, PART V

Mr. REYNOLDS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 108-710) on the resolution (H. Res. 811) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5183) to provide an extension of highway, highway safety, motor carrier safety, transit, and other programs funded out of the Highway Trust Fund pending enactment of a law reauthorizing the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

WAIVING REQUIREMENT OF CLAUSE 6(a) OF RULE XIII WITH RESPECT TO CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 807 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 807

Resolved, That the requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII for a two-thirds vote to consider a report from the Committee on Rules on the same day it is presented to the House is waived with respect to any resolution reported on the legislative day of September 30, 2004, providing for consideration of a bill to provide an extension of highway, highway safety, motor carrier safety, transit, and other programs funded out of the Highway