

have parents coming through the Depression learned at an early age, even if you put \$1 a week away, or \$2, it is something you have for the future.

I happen to believe in saving. Even here in Congress, I try to put away money so when I retire one day, I will have the comfort of knowing I will be able to pay my monthly bills, and I think that is what most senior citizens want to know.

But when we talk about and when you look at the stock market, certainly in the last couple of weeks, it has been up and down like a roller coaster. We all remember in early 2000 when people lost 35 percent of their holdings in the stock market, and many are just starting to recover now. We can't take that kind of chance with Social Security. Social Security is supposed to be something that is safe that the government is going to back. That is something that is extremely important for many of us.

Certainly I know my mom and dad when they retired, and this is going back even 15 years ago, they needed that Social Security. That was the only thing they had to live on. Certainly their children helped them out, but it gave them dignity to be able to pay their own bills, and there are many parents that feel that way. They don't want to be a burden on their children.

I have pledged that in 2007 when we all come back and this debate on Social Security starts again, I pledge that the Democrats will be fighting to save Social Security.

But also pensions. We have seen so many of our people around this country losing their pensions. I know that some corporations say they can't afford it any more. They want to go into a 401(k). Well, I think a 401(k) is fine, but what is happening to us as Americans? What happened to the companies that basically backed us? If you were loyal to your company, you had benefits.

I am going to continue talking about this in the next couple of weeks because I think it is important that Americans know about it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. JONES of North Carolina addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. PALLONE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks).

#### IRAQ WAR STATUS

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, last week we had a big debate about Iraq, and our battles over there continue. There were a lot of accusations about which party cut and run, yielded by those on the other side who said Democrats wanted to cut and run.

It is ironic because this is the first war in American history that a party and a President has chosen to divide Americans on the war rather than unite them.

But let's take the concept of cutting and running. In the spring of 2002, American forces had Osama bin Laden on the run in Tora Bora and Afghanistan, but the administration decided to cut and run from that fight taking resources appropriated for Afghanistan and moving them onto the field of Iraq and cutting and running from Afghanistan and its responsibilities of isolating and getting Osama bin Laden.

Then Donald Rumsfeld, the Secretary of Defense, led the charge into Iraq with a cut-and-run mentality, touting what he called the 10-30-30 strategy, to bug out of Iraq as soon as we finished invading: 10 days of war, 30 days of occupation, and 30 days of transition.

His prediction was by May of 2003 we would have less than 30,000 American troops in Iraq.

□ 1830

So I ask, how are we doing on Don Rumsfeld 10-30-30? His entire mentality was to get out of Iraq as quickly as possible. And we have been bogged down in Iraq because of his cut-and-run mentality, because he had too few troops, not a plan for the occupation for Iraq at all.

And when you go back and think about it, they promised a quick war, and we got a long war. When the Republican Congress cut and run from its responsibility oversight, how did that war change?

They said we were going to find weapons of mass destruction, and all we got was sand. But the Republican Congress cut and run from its responsibility of oversight.

They said we were going to have a conventional war, and we ended up with an insurgency. And the Republican Congress and Don Rumsfeld cut and run from their responsibility of oversight and changing the strategy.

They said we were going to be treated as liberators, and we became occupiers. And they cut and run from the responsibility of oversight, and Don Rumsfeld, the Secretary of Defense, cut and run from understanding the type of conflict we had.

They said we needed no more than 130,000 troops, and it has become self-evident that we needed more troops than even in the first Gulf War, and that Bremer, the then President's ambassador, and others had asked for more troops, and the administration

and, most importantly, the Secretary of Defense cut and run from his responsibility to provide those troops.

And that doesn't even count the Kevlar vests, the Humvees, and the other types of equipment that the troops needed at every step of the way. The Republican Congress and Secretary of Defense Don Rumsfeld cut and run from their responsibility, and that reality that they met with in Iraq cut right into their ideology of cutting and running from their responsibilities.

And need I remind the Secretary of Defense of the words of Winston Churchill. "Never, never, never believe any war will be smooth and easy. The statesman who yields to war fever must realize that once the signal is given, he is no longer the master of the policy, but the slave of unforeseeable and uncontrollable events."

Or as Don Rumsfeld himself likes to say, "Stuff happens, and it's untidy." Perhaps it turned out untidy because from day 1 the administration had a cut-and-run attitude towards the results of the war.

Don Rumsfeld convinced the President to cut and run on the safety of our troops when it came to Kevlar vests and Humvees. Over objections of GEN Eric Shinseki and Secretary of State Colin Powell, Secretary of Defense Rumsfeld produced a plan to invade a nation of 25 million with only 130-some-odd-thousand troops.

GEN Anthony Zinni, Commander of the U.S. forces in the Middle East, said, "We are paying the price for the lack of credible planning or the lack of a plan. Ten years of planning were thrown away."

LTC Greg Newbold, top operations officer for the Joint Chiefs of Staff, put it more succinctly and clearly. "My sincere view is that the commitment of our forces to this fight was done with a casualness and a swagger that are the special province of those who have never had to execute these missions or bury the results."

Secretary Rumsfeld's spokesman Larry DiRita visited Kuwait in 2003 and said, "We don't owe the people of Iraq anything. We're giving them their freedom, and that's enough."

So when it comes to the accusation of cutting and running, let's look at the record. And the record is quite clear that although the slogan is easy to throw around, that it is the mentality of the Secretary of Defense.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CONAWAY). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BISHOP of Utah addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### LEAKED CABLE FROM U.S. EMBASSY IN IRAQ

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentlewoman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, last week in his surprise visit to Baghdad, President Bush was full of happy talk. "The progress here in Iraq has been remarkable when you really think about it," he said.

But as usual, with this administration, there is a side of the story you don't hear until it leaks out.

Over the weekend, the Washington Post reported on a memo under the name of U.S. Ambassador of Iraq Zalmay Khalizad, which describes the treacherous living conditions faced by Iraqi nationals who work for the U.S. Embassy.

The cable cites harassment from militia groups, hostility from security forces, the ones we have trained, sporadic utilities in 115-degree heat, scarce and expensive fuel, women forced to cover their faces in public, kidnappings of family members, fear of recrimination if it is discovered that they are employed by the embassy and are thus aiding the occupation. Some of these men and women haven't even told their families where they work.

Mr. Speaker, is this the freedom that the President says is transforming the Middle East?

The dispatch describes the central government, the one we have heard the Bush administration pump up to no end, as ineffective and "not relevant." Embassy staff report that it is actually local militia and neighborhood governments that control the streets.

After 2,500 American deaths, more than a quarter of a trillion dollars spent, and our global reputation lying in tatters, we still don't have a grip on basic security in Iraq. It is absolutely scandalous.

Mr. Speaker, if the men and women who work for the U.S. Government feel threatened, how can we possibly hope to maintain peace, rule of law and basic services for millions of ordinary Iraqis living outside of the bubble of the Green Zone?

It couldn't be clearer. We are not trusted, respected or beloved in Iraq. Our military presence is not providing relief from an atmosphere of resentment, danger and paranoia in Iraq; we are contributing to it. In fact, we are exacerbating it.

There is only one answer, Mr. Speaker. It is time, in fact, it is long past time, for our troops to come home. We can help Iraqis build a more promising future. We can help them rebuild their country and do our best to help them resolve sectarian strife. But we can do it only as a partner, not as an occupier. We can do it only if we end this disastrous war, only if we return Iraq to the Iraqis and return our troops to their families.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### EXTENSIONS OF THE VOTING RIGHTS ACT OF 1965

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask permission to speak out of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express strong support for extension of the Voting Rights Act of 1965. The importance and necessity of the Voting Rights Act cannot be over-emphasized. We have learned through experience what a difference the vote makes. In 1964, the year before President Johnson signed the act into law, there were only 300 African American elected officials in the entire country. Today there are more than 9,100 black elected officials, including 43 Members of Congress.

The most fundamental right of our democratic system of government is the right of citizens to participate in the political process. The 15th amendment ensures the right of every citizen, regardless of race, color, or previous condition of servitude, to vote and participate in the electoral process. However, as we have seen in previous elections, some local governments have actively and, in some instances, have aggressively attempted to disenfranchise African American and other minority voters.

This year, all who care about social justice and equal opportunity in America can share one overriding goal, and that is Congress needs to review the provisions of the Voting Rights Act which will ensure that our Nation's government has the opportunity to reflect the views, the values and, most importantly, the votes of the people it serves.

Of all the civil rights legislation that the Nation has enacted over the past four decades, the Voting Rights Act of 1965 is arguably the most important. Yes, every major piece of civil rights legislation has helped to eliminate injustices such as discrimination in education, employment and housing, but it is the Voting Rights Act that empowers Americans to take action against injustices by electing those who pledge to eliminate it and removing those who perpetuate it.

African Americans in the South were prevented from voting by a battery of tactics, poll taxes, literacy tests that

were for blacks only, and the crudest forms of intimidation. From the Southwest to some urban areas in the Northeast and Midwest, Latinos were discouraged from voting in more subtle but just as effective techniques that exploited the vulnerabilities of low-income newcomers for whom English was a second language. Both groups were also the targets of districting designed to dilute the ability to elect officials of their own choosing, a fundamental freedom that all too many Americans take for granted.

And this is why it is so important that Congress renew all three provisions that are set to expire: section 5, which requires Federal approval for all proposed changes in voting or election procedures in areas with a history of discrimination; section 203, which requires some jurisdictions to provide assistance in other languages to voters who are not literate or fluent in English; and the portions of section 6-9 of the act which authorizes the Federal Government to send Federal election examiners and observers to certain jurisdictions covered by section 5 where there is evidence of attempts to intimidate minority voters at the polls.

Mr. Speaker, this act is scheduled to come before us in the next few days, and I am gratified to note that it has generated tremendous support on both sides of the aisle. And I am certain that American people all over the country look forward to its passage. I simply urge strong support.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BILIRAKIS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### MORALITY TALE ON AIDS

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Washington is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor tonight to really tell a morality tale that the American people may well not know anything about. Many things go on in the world, and we learn nothing in our press. But if you read widely, as I do, and read something called the Asia Times, which is one of many newspapers around the world, you find out very interesting things are going on.

Everyone knows that there is a problem with AIDS worldwide, and the problem with AIDS is that we, today, have the ability to actually treat people with AIDS with the triple therapy drugs that will make their life longer, allow them to continue working, allow them to take care of their children,