

any time an employer does not hire an unemployed person. Millions of frivolous EEOC complaints and lawsuits will drive up the cost of doing business in America which, in turn, kills business and destroys American jobs.

Third, Obama raises taxes on charitable contributions to churches, synagogues, mosques, the Red Cross, United Way, and other charitable institutions. Higher taxes mean fewer charitable contributions, which kills religious and charitable institution jobs. Obama does not have a jobs bill; Obama has a kill-jobs bill that encourages jobs to relocate overseas.

Mr. Speaker, America's economy has serious structural issues that Presidential Band-Aids and makeup won't fix and can't hide. President Obama's kill-jobs bill must be defeated because it is poorly thought out, bad economic policy, and costs American jobs. President Obama's kill-jobs bill is a political document, not an economic document. It gets an "A" for class warfare politics and an "F" for job creation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge defeat of President Obama's kill-jobs bill. It must be killed before even more damage is done to America's economy.

IT'S ABOUT TIME: A WELCOME BUT OVERDUE MILITARY REDEPLOYMENT OUT OF IRAQ

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, 8½ years ago, without provocation or just cause, and based on distortions and deceptions, our country launched a bloody and immoral war in Iraq—almost 9 years, a long time for a war whose mission was pronounced accomplished by then-President Bush in May of 2003.

But now the Iraq war, which has cost our Nation so very much in blood and treasure, in moral authority and global credibility, is finally ending. Thank you, President Obama.

When I heard the President's announcement that our troops would be home from Iraq by the end of the year, I had one thought: it's about damn time. And my second thought was: oh, well, we have to stay vigilant, especially with negotiations still to come about the possibility of military trainers or advisers remaining in Iraq. As we move forward with a constructive bilateral partnership, let's make sure we don't backslide into a renewed military occupation under a different cloak.

To me, however, Friday's news was greeted not so much with celebration but with relief and also with reflection about the senseless sacrifice endured by so very many people. Nearly 4,500 courageous American servicemembers gave their lives for this war. More than 30,000 have returned home with searing wounds to their bodies and their minds, if not missing limbs, then too often

post-traumatic stress that can make every day a living nightmare.

And let's not overlook the 100,000-plus innocent Iraqi civilians, many of them children, who were killed because the United States of America chose to "liberate" them. When I think about the humanitarian atrocities of this war, it is most often the faces of those children that I see.

Then there's the fiscal carnage. The \$800 billion appropriated to prosecute the war doesn't even scratch the surface of the total cost. There is the rise in oil price, the interest on the debt we've accumulated, and of course the veterans health obligations, a promise we must and will keep, a promise that will still be with us at least 50 years from now.

President Obama's announcement is welcome, but long overdue. I've been an outspoken opponent of the war since before it started, and I introduced the first legislation to bring our troops home in 2005. More than 400 times I've stood in this very place in this Chamber to call for an end to the Iraq and Afghanistan military entanglements and the beginning of a SMART Security approach that emphasizes humanitarian and peaceful conflict resolution in place of military might.

I was proud to work with my good friends Congresswomen WATERS and LEE to establish the Out of Iraq Caucus. Their leadership, their support, plus our many other colleagues on both sides of the aisle who lent their voices to the cause made the difference because back in 2004 and 2005, ours was not the majority position. Because we broke the silence, because we acted on principle and refused to stand down, the American people came around to the out-of-Iraq perspective. Because we stood on the right side of history, we found ourselves with the majority of Americans on the right side of public opinion wanting—no, demanding—an end to the Iraq and Afghanistan wars.

Our work isn't done, of course. The war in Afghanistan rages on. It's destructive, it's foolish and about 100,000 troops are still in harm's way there on a futile and expensive mission that is not making us safe, but is actually undermining our national security.

Mr. Speaker, again I give President Obama credit for his decision to bring our troops home from Iraq by the end of the year; and at the same time, I will continue to speak out until Americans get the peace that they want and deserve and all of our troops are home from Afghanistan as well.

DEPORT FOREIGN CRIMINALS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, there's been a lot of talk about immigration, border security and all of the problems in between. But let's talk about one part of the immigration issue that has maybe slipped through

the cracks and we don't hear much about it. There are some illegals in the United States that are just criminals. They have been convicted of crimes from everything from stealing to killing, including rape, robbery and murder.

The Bureau of Prisons says that 27 percent of all the prisoners in Federal prisons are foreign nationals that are illegally in the United States. That's astonishing, that over 25 percent of our Federal prisons house illegals, all at the expense of Americans. These criminals serve their sentence in one of our State or Federal prisons. Then after they serve that sentence and they are ordered deported, here's what happens: many of their native countries refuse to take back their deported criminals.

□ 1040

Why would they take them back? They've got enough criminals of their own.

Since they won't take back all of their own citizens that are convicted criminals after they serve their sentence, that nation tries to pawn off the remainder on the United States. These thugs get a get-out-of-jail-free card in the United States because we do not permanently detain them in jail after they have been ordered deported and their country of origin refuses to take them. That means that they are released on the American streets. They are criminals without a country.

So how many people are we talking about? Well, according to an ICE report earlier this year, we're talking about 138,000 illegal aliens who are pending deportation—either in jail or out on the streets. Some of these are never taken back to their home countries.

Now, who are these offending nations? Well, Cuba, Iran, Pakistan, and, yes, China. Our good buddies the Chinese are the second worst offenders, with 35,000 convicted criminals pending deportation. Imagine that—Chinese criminals in the United States. Who would have thought?

Well, we already have a law on the books that says that the Department of Homeland Security is supposed to report to the Secretary of State any countries that do not accept or unreasonably delay taking their citizens back. Then the Secretary of State is supposed to discontinue granting visas to citizens of that country. That sounds good, but the problem is Homeland Security doesn't always enforce the rule of law. Homeland Security has the obligation to follow the law and ship these criminals back to where they belong. It's simple: If you come to the United States illegally and commit a felony, you go home after you are lawfully deported.

It's time we offer a proper incentive for these uncooperative nations—like China—who freely take money from us—like our debt—and turn around and disrespect our laws. There needs to be a punishment for any nation that refuses to take back lawfully deported

criminal aliens. We should not be issuing visas to diplomats of other nations that refuse to cooperate with our government. There should be consequences for countries whose citizens illegally enter the United States, harm our citizens, go to prison, and the host country disrespects the law of the United States and doesn't take back their malcontent citizens.

So how do we make sure that these disrespectful foreign governments take back their citizens? Today, I introduced the Deport Convicted Foreign Criminals Act. This bill is simple. First, if a country does not take back their criminal aliens after 90 days of being given proper legal notice, diplomatic visas will be withheld. Then, if the country still refuses to take back their criminals, these sanctions will be expanded to include other types of visas.

Our government needs to be more concerned about the rule of law, the security of our Nation, and the cost to the American taxpayer than it is about hurting the feelings of some foreign country. Immigration is a complicated issue. But this part is simple. Foreign convicted criminals need to go back home. Their homeland should take them whether they want them or not. The United States cannot be a halfway house for foreign criminals.

And that's just the way it is.

RAPE IN THE MILITARY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER) for 5 minutes.

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today, as I have risen nine times before, to speak about the unspeakable—rape in the military. Nineteen thousand soldiers each year, women and men, are raped in the military. And what is Congress doing about it? What is the Department of Defense doing about it? Not much.

This is the 10th time I'm standing on this floor to share a story of a victim. Each of these soldiers proudly served their country, each was raped, and each was subjected to a system of justice that protects the perpetrator, not the victim. This is a problem we can fix; we just have to want to.

I will continue to share these stories until something changes. Survivors can email me at stopmilitaryrape@mail.house.gov if they would like to speak up.

Today, I want to share the story of Sergeant Myla Haider. Sergeant Haider served in the Army from 1994 to 1999, and again from November 2000 to October 2005. When Sergeant Haider entered the Army, she planned on being a career servicemember; but in 2002, Sergeant Haider was raped while she was working with the CID, the Criminal Investigative Division. Ironically, it is the CID that is charged with investigating crimes, including rape and sexual assault, in the military.

On this occasion, after socializing with a group of CID colleagues, the

rapist, a senior agent in CID, isolated Sergeant Haider from the group and raped her. Sergeant Haider, like the overwhelming majority of servicemembers raped in the military, did not report the crime. She didn't report the rape because she had witnessed firsthand the negative attitude that the CID had towards rape victims and didn't believe she would be able to obtain justice if she had reported being raped.

She did, however, confide in two friends, both other division agents at CID. They both promised her that they would not report the rape because they agreed with her assessment that reporting the rape would not lead to justice.

Two years later, in November 2004, Sergeant Haider was contacted by a CID agent who had learned from one of Sergeant Haider's friends that she had been raped 2 years earlier by a senior CID agent. The CID agent informed her that the assailant was being investigated for raping several other women and indecently assaulting others. A serial rapist in the military.

In 2005, Sergeant Haider testified at her rapist's court-martial. However, the agents that Sergeant Haider had confided in testified for the rapist. Sergeant Haider later learned from the agents that they had been threatened by command if they didn't testify on behalf of the accused. So, in order to preserve their careers at CID, they followed orders.

In describing her decision to speak out, she said this: I knew my career was over because our soldiers cannot report a rape in the military and expect to have a successful military career.

You see, only 13 percent of those that are raped in the military actually report it. And of those 13 percent, 90 percent of them are involuntarily honorably discharged from the military. So I have become painfully aware that at the rate the Department of Defense is working to address this issue, the epidemic of military sexual assault will never end.

It is long past time for Congress to act. The real question is: When will we start protecting those that defend us?

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE AWARENESS MONTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE) for 5 minutes.

Ms. MOORE. I'm here today to join my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to recognize Domestic Violence Awareness Month.

I wear my purple ribbon because I'm incredibly supportive of the goals of this commemorative month and yet painfully aware that domestic violence does not confine itself to one singular month. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I rise today to encourage all of us to keep our focus on this pernicious issue year round.

It's not an exaggeration to say that domestic violence is an epidemic in this country. It affects nearly one in four women. This violence has far-reaching effects, not just for women and sometimes men who experience it, but for their families, including their children, as well as their employers and their communities, for generation after generation.

The statistics and stories from my home State of Wisconsin provide a small snapshot of the impact of this violence. The Wisconsin Department of Children and Families reports that between October 1, 2009, and September 30, 2010, nearly 41,000 women, children, and men received services from domestic violence victim service providers in Wisconsin. And over 6,600 people sought refuge in a domestic violence shelter.

□ 1050

The Wisconsin Coalition Against Domestic Violence publishes an annual homicide report detailing domestic violence-related homicides. They've done this since 2000. And in this time span, at least 532 people have lost their lives in incidents related to domestic violence.

Last year, in 2010, there were 39 domestic violence homicide incidents resulting in 58 deaths, 51 homicides and seven perpetrator suicides. These deaths represent nearly one-third of all homicides in 2010 in Wisconsin. Victims in these incidents came from 17 counties across the State and included both the young and the old—the youngest was less than 1 year old and the oldest was 87 years old. And as a result of these homicides, at least 12 children were left orphaned or without a mother.

In Milwaukee County, where the Fourth Congressional District is located, there were 21 domestic violence-related homicides last year. And they include Mae Helm, 58, brutally stabbed by her boyfriend in her own apartment; Shannon Dorsey, 44, strangled with a belt by her boyfriend, age 46; and Sabrina Junior, 43 years old, who was stabbed to death by her partner while the couple's 11-year-old daughter cowered in a closet with her two younger sisters. Children are too often left with neither parents nor appropriate treatment for the collateral damage of domestic violence.

As cochair of the Congressional Caucus of Women's Issues and a longtime supporter of domestic violence-related legislation—and as a survivor of domestic violence—I want to take this opportunity to reiterate my pledge to work towards greater, stronger, and more public policy initiatives to meet the overwhelming need that remains for victim services and a range of domestic violence programs. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to do the same.

We simply cannot continue to stand by and tolerate the ongoing funding gap for victim services while lives are at risk. Three women a day die as a result of domestic violence. We must