

In the backdrop of the Iraq debate that we held last week, let me restate a plea that I have made on behalf of these soldiers and on behalf of the United States military. It is imperative that this sovereign government of Iraq clarify and make very clear that anyone who kidnaps or abducts an American soldier will be held liable. The prime minister needs to make a very pronounced statement about seeking information on the whereabouts of these soldiers, and then he must make it additionally clear that he will not hold to anyone receiving amnesty for killing an American soldier.

It is time to transition both security and leadership to the Iraqi Government now.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CONAWAY). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

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

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

#### NEWS FROM THE FRONT

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take the time of the gentleman from North Carolina.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, news from the front: the battle for the border continues. The news is disturbing. The enemy is among us. There are invaders here from other nations that were smuggled here, and they live in the shadow of crime. They prey on our families. Some are thieves; some are killers. According to the Government Accountability Office, 25 homicides a day are committed in this country by people that are illegally here. That is 10 times more Americans killed in Iraq since 2003. Americans pay for the prison cost to lock these outlaws up. Then when our government tries to deport them, eight nations refuse to take back their own people. So since we cannot detain these individuals indefinitely, our government lets them go, lets them go into the heartland of America, thereby letting these illegals free to roam our streets with a permanent get-out-of-jail-free card, and a permanent stay-in-America-forever card.

Mr. Speaker, this ought not to be. Eight countries turn a blind eye, a deaf ear on their illegals in America. Many of them are criminals. They have committed crimes and gone to our prisons, and these countries will not even take

their own people back, even though they have lawfully been deported.

How many people are we talking about? In 1 year alone, these eight countries left more than 130,000 people ordered to be deported back to their homeland, and they refused to take these individuals. Many of these people were thieves and bandits, and they are left on our soil.

The detention cost to Americans was \$33 million.

Mr. Speaker, Americans pay. They always pay for illegal entry. That is \$10 million more than the people in my district got after their lives were ripped apart by Hurricane Rita. And despite all that money spent, we are forced to turn these immigrant inmates out on our streets, many to prey on our families, many to strike again, many to steal again.

We foot the bill for their prison stay, then their countries won't take them back. This isn't a matter of illegals ignoring a deportation order and disappearing into the night. It is about eight countries who ignore their obligations. Some of these countries accept foreign aid from the United States.

Who are these eight countries? They include China, Iran, India, Jamaica, Vietnam, Ethiopia. These countries put up immigration obstacles impossible for our government to hurdle, but these same nations gladly take our foreign aid. They gladly take that free American money, but won't take back their own people.

Also, America allows 123,000 legal visas each year to be issued to these nations. So, Mr. Speaker, these nations cannot have it both ways. Take our money and take your illegals back, or no more American money. We should deny foreign aid to nations that refuse to accept their lawfully deported illegals. We should deny American visas to those nations who refuse to take back their lawfully deported citizens. America cannot allow this nonsense to continue.

Mr. Speaker, the war for the border continues, but we will not let ourselves become bogged down by the demands and expectations of the leaders of these obstinate eight, these nations who expect money from our pockets, but won't take back their criminals who have picked our pockets. That's just the way it is.

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

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

#### RETIREMENT SECURITY

Mrs. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask permission to speak out of turn.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to talk for a little while about retirement security. More and more when I am home on the weekends, I am having more of my seniors coming up to me and talking about their nervousness about the talk about changing Social Security next year in 2007. They are also concerned about Medicare because a lot of them are starting to reach that doughnut hole that is in the Medicare part D part.

A lot of people are concerned. They have worked hard all of their lives, and they are basically saying why are you guys down in Congress doing this. We have worked hard, we have put our money into Social Security and Medicare. And I try to reassure them.

Last year, Democrats from across the country, the congressional Democrats, came out to the districts and talked to people about why they needed to get out and have their voices heard.

We believe in Social Security. I know certainly some of my friends who are on Social Security now, they need that money every single month. A lot of them are widowed, and the pension that they thought they were getting is not there any more. So Social Security is giving them that little safety issue.

I think we have to bring back again why we have Social Security. It was basically to make sure that people would not go into poverty. It was not meant to be a retirement fund. It was never to be a retirement fund. It was supposed to be insurance to give you a little bump to make sure that you could pay the rent and heating.

I can say we as Democrats are going to fight to make sure that we do protect Social Security. I think it is important that people remember people with disabilities also get Social Security. Or those who, unfortunately, have lost their husbands at an early age and have children, they will be getting Social Security and their children will be getting Social Security.

I know that going back just about 13 years ago when my husband died, I couldn't imagine how was I going to make it. Well, we did make it and I was lucky that my son was able to recover and that we didn't have to ask for Social Security. But I know a lot of my friends had to because they had young children. This is what it is, a safety net. It is a safety net for all Americans.

So I can say that I certainly pledge for all Democrats that we will protect Social Security. I think people have to understand the scare about taking away Social Security. We are good for Social Security for many, many years down the road. And we are probably going to have to tinker with it as time goes by to make sure that the next generation and the generation after that has Social Security.

There are many that say let's have savings accounts. I am all for savings accounts. I think Americans don't save enough. Those that are old enough and

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."

LTG 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.