

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, ABC Nightly News named Bert Brady Citizen of the Week. Here is why. Bert Brady is a 69-year-old veteran. He gets up nearly every day for the last year and heads over to the Dallas-Fort Worth Airport. He is there to do something that was not done for him. He is there to welcome soldiers coming home.

Bert organizes folks to go down with him to the airport and greet the soldiers coming home from the war. Sometimes these greeters number in the hundreds. Most of the citizens are veterans of Korea or Vietnam, but they also include Boy Scouts and Girl Scouts, all to say "thank you" to the troops.

As Bert pointed out, there was no one there when our soldiers came home from Korea or from Vietnam. These dedicated individuals are making sure no soldier feels they are forgotten when they are returning from this war.

People line up along the paths. They cheer the soldiers as they come through the path, shaking their hands, giving them hugs, telling them thank you, and waving American flags. For our troops that moment is powerful.

When asked why he is so driven, Bert spoke of one soldier who shook his hand and said, "Mister, I will never forget you. It's the greatest thing that ever happened to me, this homecoming reception."

So we Americans thank you, Bert Brady.

And that's just the way it is.

□ 1715

#### STOP FAST TRACK

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, for generations Hershey's chocolate has been an American symbol. Soldiers abroad distributed it to smiling children. Across our country people everywhere recognize the distinctive shape of Hershey kisses. Now Hershey's, too, is being outsourced to Mexico, as the great sucking sound of outsourced jobs accelerate in our country.

Yesterday, the Hershey Company announced it was moving 1,500 more manufacturing jobs to Mexico, terminating 1,500 U.S. workers and all the dairy farmers that supply work and product into that company.

Hershey now joins the ranks of Hoover, Stanley, Champion, Ford, Chrysler, Huffy, Zebco, Levi's and Maytag, who have shipped thousands more U.S. jobs to countries where workers toil for starvation wages.

Now President Bush wants to renew more of the same fast-track trade authority, to ship more of these jobs to Mexico and other trade rivals. He wants to sell our economy to the highest bidders in foreign countries.

NAFTA, CAFTA, PNTR and its cousin agreements have broken the middle class. Congress is long overdue to stand

up for them. We must take back the authority to regulate commerce with foreign nations and start creating good jobs in our country again. It is time to stop fast track.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KLEIN of Florida). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

#### NORTHERN IRELAND

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. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening in amazement at what can only be described as the utter inflexibility of the Reverend Ian Paisley. Mr. Paisley's dislike of the Catholic population in the north of Ireland is well documented and needs no repeating on the floor of this body. Suffice it to say that John Hume's observation "if the word 'no' was removed from the English language, Ian Paisley would be speechless" is an accurate description of Mr. Paisley's ability for thoughtful negotiation and compromise.

What does deserve recounting here, however, are the remarkable strides that have been taken by Sinn Fein in the quest for a just and lasting peace for all the people of Northern Ireland, as well as the hard work and dedication shown by the Taoiseach Bertie Ahearn and Prime Minister Tony Blair in this endeavor.

Prime Minister Blair has not always used the full force of his office to secure peace on the island of Ireland. However, he has shown himself to be a true friend to the Irish people and a strident negotiator for peace, and I am proud to commend him for that. His diligence and the pursuit of peace stands in stark contrast, however, to that of Mr. Paisley.

Mr. Speaker, heroic efforts have been put forth by all parties, republican, nationalist and unionists alike, to address this situation. It began with the signing of the Good Friday Accords in 1998 and the commitment of the IRA to end its armed campaign and commit to the development of purely political and exclusively peaceful means. The IRA then went on to put their arms completely and verifiably beyond use, which was confirmed by the Independent International Commission on Decommissioning.

Then, most recently, Sinn Fein voted in its extraordinary Ard Fheis, or political convention, to support the policing institutions. This includes a police service that has been shown by the independent Police Ombudsman to have engaged in collusion with loyalist paramilitaries, resulting in the death of at least 10 people, both Catholic and Protestant.

Despite all of this, Mr. Paisley has refused to enter into government with Sinn Fein and put the needs of his constituency and that of the citizens of Northern Ireland above those of his own petty hatred and extremist allies.

Mr. Paisley cannot continue to stand in the way of peace and justice for the people of Northern Ireland. The people of the North have waited far too long and sacrificed far too much for him to continue to be a roadblock to peace. Responsible leadership is needed on the unionist side of the North to show that extremism, bigotry and hatred will not be tolerated.

Mr. Speaker, I have taken to this floor many times in the last few years to talk about the situation in Northern Ireland. The progress which has been made is nothing short of remarkable, considering the violence that has plagued this area literally for centuries. But the one constant that those of us who care about a just and lasting peace have seen is Mr. Paisley, increasingly out of touch, afraid of losing his grip on power, and more interested in living with the past than embracing the promise of tomorrow.

It is well past time that Reverend Ian Paisley move along and let the people of Northern Ireland get on with their lives.

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

(Mr. GINGREY 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 Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### IRAQ WAR RESOLUTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate this profound honor to have the opportunity to address you here on the floor of the United States House of Representatives, the People's House.

I would reflect that all week long, starting really on Tuesday morning, we have had a series of marathon debates taking place here, Mr. Speaker, marathon debates that ranged in the area of 12 hours a day, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday until after 1 a.m. this morning, taking up again this morning shortly after 8 o'clock, and then moving on until mid-afternoon, when we finally had a vote on the resolution, the resolution that was offered by the majority, the resolution that in one voice said, we honor the troops, and the

other voice said, but we are opposed to the reinforcements and opposed to the surge that the President had ordered, the surge that is already in motion, the troops, many of them have already been deployed, and it is not possible to back out of this.

So the voice that came, Mr. Speaker, to the people across this world was answered and was heard in a lot of different ways.

On one side of it, the antiwar movement within the United States, the activists, liberal left, the protesters that are, at least if not the people that were in the streets during Vietnam, were descendants of the people that were in the streets during Vietnam, philosophically, if not literally, and in many cases it was both. They heard a message, which is, at every cost, the Speaker's leadership is going to drag our military and pull our Commander in Chief back of their commitment to the Iraqi people in the Middle East.

And the other voice, a voice was heard by a number of American people, stalwart patriots, people who believe in the destiny of America and understand that there is a price to be paid by each succeeding generation because of the decisions that are made by the preceding generations. We are the recipients of the sacrifice of our Founders and of every generation's sacrifice, starting with the shaping of the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, those veterans of the Revolutionary War, those who supported the effort in the Revolutionary War, those who shaped the Constitution, Mr. Speaker, those that built the economy, those that built the churches, those that built the schools, those that built the communities that link together, which is this greater American civilization, we are the beneficiaries.

The decisions that they made July 4, 1776, to pick a point we all understand, we benefitted from that decision. And it was a hard decision. And it wasn't a decision that was made without great concern or without great debate. There was. And there was dissension on both sides.

Some of the people that were opposed to freedom, a free nation, were identified as the Tories, the people that aligned with the British. They didn't think it was worth the price. They didn't want to risk the blood. They didn't want to risk the treasure. They thought that they could suffer the indignities and the injustices that were being poured upon them from the crown, and that was more tolerable than the price that would have to be paid for freedom.

But freedom won out. Freedom was established. And they pledged their lives, their fortunes and their sacred honor, and they did so knowing that they might very well lose their lives and their fortunes, but they would never lose their sacred honor. That was the creed that came from the Founding Fathers, and that was just the Revolutionary War. Of course, it was the biggest and most significant.

But, shortly after that, we had another conflict, and one of those conflicts, Mr. Speaker, was one that started out over in the Mediterranean. The hostilities between the United States and the British concluded in 1783. That was when the military victory was won by George Washington, and that was when, also, the protection of the Union Jack that flew over the seas and the oceans was removed from the protection of our Merchant Marine.

So 1783, our Merchant Marine, our ship sailing on the high seas, lost the Union Jack protection, the intimidation of the British Royal Navy, 1783, 1784, American ships were attacked and boarded and pirated, and our sailors were forced into slavery, and the cargos were sold, and the ships were put back into the fleets of the Barbary pirates, the Barbary pirates being the predecessors of the enemy that we have today.

And it is an interesting study in history, Mr. Speaker, to see what unfolded here in the history of the United States when we sent our best diplomats over to the Mediterranean to negotiate with the Barbary pirates. Those were Thomas Jefferson and John Adams.

Now, I have here a copy, Mr. Speaker, this is of the papers of Thomas Jefferson, right here, volume nine. This is dated 1785, November 1, 1785 to 1786. This is the report that Thomas Jefferson returned upon his conclusion of his diplomat mission to the Tripoli pirates.

In a paragraph that he has written to the American commissioners and John Jay he says, soon after the arrival of Mr. Jay in London, we had a conference with the ambassador of Tripoli at his house. This ambassador of Tripoli was a representative of the Islamic Caliphate. And he says, he writes, "We took the liberty to make some inquiries concerning the grounds of their pretensions to make war upon nations who had done them no injury," meaning the United States of America, "and observed that we consider all mankind as our friends, who had done us no wrong, nor had given us any provocation."

In other words, the statement that came from Thomas Jefferson and John Adams was, to the ambassador from Tripoli, we consider you friends. We have had no hostilities toward you. We have not provoked you in any way. We are simply sailing our ships on the high seas and providing open commerce and trade like any country would do. Why do you attack us? Why do you kill us? Why do you press our sailors into slavery?

Jefferson answered, The ambassador from Tripoli answered us that it was founded on the laws of their prophet, that it was written in their Koran that all nations who should not have acknowledged their authority were sinners, the authority of the Koran. I continue quoting, that it was their right and duty to make war upon them wherever they could be found and to make

slaves of all they could take as prisoners and that every Muslim who should be slain in battle was sure to go to paradise.

That is from the negotiations that took place in 1786, and that is from Jefferson's report to John Jay.

Now, here we are, 2006. We are going through this debate, Mr. Speaker, and I am hearing over and over again there is a reason why they hate us. We should understand why they hate us. If we could figure that out, maybe we could change our ways and we could find a way to accommodate our disagreements, because surely there are two sides to every argument.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I am here to submit that Thomas Jefferson understood this thing clearly. He understood a principle that I laid out this afternoon in debate called *nosce hostem*, which is a Latin term. It comes from the Roman legions, and that is Latin for "know thine enemy".

The Romans understood, and they were the most successful long-term military legions in history all the time up to that point and maybe in all of history. They had to know their enemy, and they had to persevere, and that is where that term came, *nosce hostem*, know thine enemy.

Thomas Jefferson understood the same thing.

□ 1730

And, in fact, his curiosity and his compulsion to understand and know the enemy caused him to go out and buy a Koran, and that Koran was part of his opposition research, if you will. And Jefferson's being one of the most curious individuals as a figure in our history and maybe the most learned man of his time, he studied Greek so that he could read the Greek Bible and do the translation himself. He wasn't quite satisfied with just King James. He wanted to do that comparison because he was that much of an intellectual and he had that level of curiosity. He had the same level of intellectual curiosity in understanding our enemy the Barbary pirates; so his study of the Koran, I am confident, concurred with his report back to John Jay that was handed over to Congress, that report that says they believe their path to salvation is in killing us.

So Jefferson persevered in his endeavor to understand our enemy. He studied Koran, understood our enemy, put the report in place, and in that one simple paragraph is an explanation of our enemy today. And there is quote after quote after quote that have been brought forward here by my colleagues on this side of the aisle in the last several days that support that statement. Statements made by Osama bin Laden, statements made byawahiri, statements made by other leaders of al Qaeda where they say their religious duty, their responsibility, is to keep attacking infidels; infidels, being defined as unbelievers in their Koran; unbelievers, being those who have not sworn allegiance to Islam.

And you saw that in that quote where he said that they continued to attack us wherever we might be found until we either converted to Islam or pay homage or are beheaded. And historically looking back, most of us recognize when we say "leathernecks," that means the Marine Corps today. That nickname came from the Barbary pirate wars when they went to the shores of Tripoli, and our Marine Corps wore heavy thick leather collars, Mr. Speaker. Those collars were worn to reduce the number of marines that would be beheaded by the swinging swords of the Barbary pirates.

The beheadings of today are not anything new. These are beheadings that go back throughout time, throughout the Crusades, clear back to a thousand years ago, Mr. Speaker. And our enemy believes they are fighting that same war. They carry that same grudge. But furthermore, it is a religious conviction on their part. It is not something that can be negotiated away. And to believe that we could resolve this conflict by negotiations is a myopic and naive position. We cannot. If that were the case, I am going to trust Jefferson would have found a way, Adams would have found a way, all of our negotiators in the past would have found a way. Some of them would have found a way at least.

But we fought the Barbary pirates, and it was a herky-jerky, hit-and-miss, not always successful effort. But we did occupy some land there, and we did force them into submission, and we did get a kind of an agreement to resolve the disputes. But the battles between Western civilization and the Barbary pirates and the radical world of Islam of that era really didn't end until 1830, and I am going to go on record here in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Mr. Speaker, when the French culminated a military operation and occupied Algiers. When they did that in 1830, that was essentially, at least for modern times, the end of the violence. Scattered incidents to be sure, but for the majority the end of the violence between the radical Islamists who were the Barbary pirates of that era up until 1830 and then move us forward to about 1979 when these hostilities started again. They lay dormant. They were essentially in submission. They didn't have many tools to work with. Some of them had been colonized. And during that period of time, they didn't get ahold of governments. They didn't have a place to start. They didn't have an ability transportation-wise to come out here and attack the rest of the world.

But things happened and we moved into the modern world. And when the Cold War was over and there was no longer this titanic struggle between the world's two Superpowers and that power vacuum, in came al Qaeda. In came the Taliban. In came the radicals to fill that void. And the philosophical support became there. The funding was there from oil. The real oil wealth

began to pour into those Islamic states in the 1970s. And if you remember the oil cartels of that era, the gas lines here, Jimmy Carter's legacy, the 44 days of 52 American hostages paraded in front of the television, and the only way they were going to be released was to elect a President that they were afraid of. So that is why you saw the split screen of Ronald Reagan taking the oath of office and those 52 hostages being released at the same time. But that became the beginning of this constant battle that we have now with the jihadists of today. And they have been empowered by oil wealth, families that are wealthy, by the religious network of radical Islam.

Now, to help explain this a little bit, Mr. Speaker, I use an analogy here that is something that I have not heard from anywhere else. I look around and I think how do I compare what is going on? How am I to stand up and say I am opposed to the radical Islam, these jihadists, without directly attacking Islam itself? Many times the President has made the statement that Islam is a "religion of peace." I am looking for more evidence of that before I am going to step up and resoundingly endorse that statement, but I am not willing to indict them at this point, Mr. Speaker. I would rather compare it this way: I am going to say the radical Islam, the jihadists, are a parasite that lives on and within the host called Islam.

Now, Mr. Speaker, when you think about what that means, a parasite living on and within a host, a parasite will ride on a host, feed off a host, reproduce off a host, drop off and attack other species, but also attack the host species. This goes on over and over again. And I could take you down through some different species of parasites to make my case, but it remains a biological fact that that is what a parasite does.

A parasite doesn't respect its host to the point where it will refrain from killing the host. Sometimes the parasite will kill the host. Think in terms of a tapeworm that will draw all of the nutrients out of the host until the host becomes so scrawny and so disheveled and so weak that the host actually expires. That will happen. There are other parasites that will do the same thing, but there are many parasites that will attack more than one species.

This parasite called radical Islam, these jihadists, attack many species. They attack every species of Homo sapien, for that matter. They attack Jews as their preferred target. They attack Christians as a preferred target. They attack capitalists as a preferred target. And when they can do a two-fer, a Jewish capitalist, a Christian capitalist, a Western civilization representative, secular capitalist, they are all for doing that because they know that that destabilizes the civilization that they abhor.

This parasite called jihadists also attacks Islam itself. Moderate Muslims

are killed in greater numbers than anybody else historically over the last 30 or so years because the destabilization that takes place is where they thrive. This parasite called jihad, the jihadist, lives and it grows and it thrives in an anarchy.

So they are seeking to create anarchy. They are attacking the host called Islam, but a host will always provide that food. It will provide the transportation. It provides a home for the parasite. The parasite jihadist, radical Islam, lives within Islam. And so radical Islam goes to the mosques where they preach their hatred and they help sort out those that are truly convicted on the jihad side. The most radical of those are identified by their response, their reaction, and they are connected to and recruited out of the mosques. Many people who go to the mosques are peaceful people. They all aren't. And that is a center where the communication comes through.

The language itself is another tool that helps this parasite called jihadists communicate. So the Arabic language itself is a conduit, Mr. Speaker; a common conduit through the language, a common conduit through the mosque system, a common conduit because of common nationalities and identification with each other. You tie that all together and then you pick the radicals out, and that is how you sort out the species of the parasite jihadists.

But the host hasn't done much to eradicate the parasite from its midst. I haven't seen Islam step up and decide that they are going to eradicate radical Islam from their midst. No. For a number of reasons. One, they are afraid to confront them. They don't know what the price will be. Another one is they are not quite sure they really want to side with the people that are on our side of this argument. Some of them are also dancing in the streets with their radical jihadists when something goes bad for the people on our side, this Western civilization, which I think encompasses the world that the jihadists are opposed to. Western civilization including Christians, Jews, the Judeo Christian ethic, the free market ethic, the liberal democracies that we have that provide freedom for people and give us this flexibility to define our own future. They hate freedom, as the President has said many times, and they attack freedom.

So, Mr. Speaker, this is a difficult nut to crack. And I would like to charge Islam with eradicating that parasite in their midst. I do think it is part their responsibility, but I am not hearing them step up to this task. So I am looking forward to the day that that happens, Mr. Speaker, but until it does, we have a war to fight.

We have a task ahead of us, and this task that is ahead of us is a great big, difficult task. And it is far more difficult today, Mr. Speaker, than it was a week ago because of the message that came out of this Chamber all week long, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday,

and this morning up until mid-afternoon, and especially because of the vote; the vote that passed a resolution that said we support our troops and oppose their mission. I mean a third grader can figure out that that logic doesn't fit. You have got to do one or the other, and they are tied together. You don't send your military off and ask them to put their lives on the line for a mission that you don't believe in. And to say to them, "I am all for you, buddy, but if you get shot over there, if you give your life over there, I can't say that you did it for a good cause because it is a bad cause." That is what got said over here.

This is a good cause. This is a just cause, Mr. Speaker. And our troops have been undermined today and yesterday and the day before and the day before that. And now they have got to carry out a mission, and it is a lot harder than it has ever been over there.

And our enemy has been encouraged, Mr. Speaker. They have got the words that have been said over here, these quotes put up. They have got to be all over al-Jazeera, over the Islamic blogosphere. There have got to be people dancing in the streets all over the land where they recruit our enemies because they know what this means. They know what it means because they study history.

And, Mr. Speaker, I have studied history as well. And part of that history is, first of all, the United States of America is a Nation that, up until the conclusion of the Korean War, had never lost a war. We had been successful in every conflict that we had engaged in. And I grew up under that. I grew up with a military father and military uncles on both sides of the family. They sat around a lot and talked. The United States of America, of all the Nations in the world, has never lost a war. And the reason we haven't lost a war is because we believe in freedom.

And you are a lucky young man, STEVE KING, for being born in the United States of America. You could have been born anywhere else, but you were born here. You are a recipient of that freedom that they fought for and each preceding generation had fought for. And I was extraordinarily blessed. I am, Mr. Speaker, but I was raised with a reverence for that freedom and the understanding of the price that was paid for it. And up until that time we had been successful in every conflict. They didn't quite define the Korean War except to say, well, we won that, but nobody talked about that very much.

I bring this up, Mr. Speaker, because I picked up a book a little while back. I had to do a little searching to find it. And the title of the book is *How We Won the War*. By General Vo Nguyen Giap. He was a Vietnamese general who commanded their troops throughout the entire period of time that they were in conflict with the United States of America in Vietnam. And his com-

ment in there that caught my eye first was "It all began when the United States failed to win a clear victory in Korea," Mr. Speaker.

If you remember, Korea was resolved in the early 1950s, I think 1952, but when it was resolved, it ended up being on the 38th parallel. We had pushed the Chinese back north of the 38th parallel. We had gone north to the 38th parallel with U.N. troops as well, and pushed back to the 38th. The resolution came, and we shut down the fight on that 38th parallel line, which is pretty much back to the same line before the invasion came from the North Koreans.

□ 1745

So it was fought essentially to a draw, and the line was the same line that the war began on. My father and their generation didn't acknowledge that we failed to win that war. They neither acknowledged or said or even implied that we lost it. I think we fought it to a draw.

But when General Giap took over in Vietnam, Dien Bien Phu came along in the mid-fifties and the French had lost, and President Kennedy ordered our troops into Vietnam in 1963, by my recollection, and the Vietnamese had to look at what was coming at them. This big industrial Nation, this sleeping giant, formerly sleeping giant, there was only about not even two decades after World War II, a huge, powerful industrial, military and economic force in the world, was coming into South Vietnam to help support the freedom fighting people in South Vietnam. He had to come to a conclusion on how they were going to fight so great a nation.

He had seen the French lose their resolve at Dien Bien Phu. They lost their resolve along the way. And he knew something Clausewitz had written about in his book on war years before, when Clausewitz said the object of war is to destroy the enemy's will and ability to conduct war. Will and ability, two factors that are the targets of war.

Now, you can destroy the enemy's ability to conduct war. You can wipe out all their tanks and take all their guns. You can take their swords, knives and hatchets. They can be totally devoid of arms. But if they still have the will to fight, they are going to come at with you with sticks and clubs and fists and boots, if they still have the will. That is what Clausewitz understood. It is a two-section effort when you go to fight a war. You are going after the ability to conduct war, the enemy's ability to conduct war, and you are trying to destroy their will to conduct war.

So as Giap analyzed that, he realized he could never destroy our ability to conduct war. We could always pour more and more munitions into the fight. We could send our ships and planes over and we could always pour more bombs in there and always could bring more soldiers in.

So the strategy was how do you then attack, damage, weaken and destroy

the United States' will to conduct war? And the North Vietnamese, General Giap in particular, recognized that their best ally in that war wasn't an AK-47 or a ChiCom grenade. What it was was the anti-war movement in the United States.

So they encouraged that movement, and nurtured it and negotiated with it. And they brought Jane Fonda over there and put her in a gun emplacement in Hanoi, and that encouraged the anti-war movement here in the United States. They sent the photo-op back. There were a number of photo-ops like that.

You heard from the great SAM JOHNSON at this very microphone earlier this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, when he talked about how the voices of the anti-war leaders in America were transmitted across loud speakers in the Hanoi Hilton where Sam spent far too many days, 2,500 days in captivity, and how those voices demoralized our POWs in Vietnam.

But General Giap understood, we are destroying the United States' will to conduct war. The frontal assault on the will of the American people was going on relentlessly and persistently, and it says in his book, their best ally was the anti-war movement here in the United States.

So here we are today, Mr. Speaker, and the enemy has been encouraged. There is nothing that came out of that side of the aisle that discouraged the enemy. I can't think of a single word, maybe one speaker, and that would have been a little bit qualified, that would have discouraged the enemy. Over on this side, just hearing SAM JOHNSON, if I were the enemy, my feet would tremble in my sandals.

We have to understand that there are two parts to this war, the ability to conduct war and the will to do so. And we don't conduct wars here in the United States any longer looking at that as two different things we need to assault. We are trying to fight a nice-nice war with limited targets and rules of engagement that keep our military from doing the job that they could do.

There isn't a strategy to destroy the enemy's will to conduct war. It is just a strategy to destroy the enemy's ability, I should say limit their ability, try to shrink down the arms and funding they have coming in, and try to limit the transportation routes of the insurgents as they infiltrate into Iraq.

That is not enough, Mr. Speaker, but at least we are in a position where we can go forward and win this war if the will of the President and the will of our military can overcome the encouraged and supported will of our enemy, which has been encouraged and supported by many, many voices here on the floor of this Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I point out also the legacy of Korea and Vietnam. That legacy has already been reflected by one of the leaders of our enemy within Iraq, and this is Muqtada al-Sadr. He is the leader of the Madi militia, and he has been

a thorn in the side of the United States for a long time. I identified him as somebody that had to go a long time ago, at least as far back as early 2004.

I have to say in memory of Charlie Norwood, this man needs a dentist, and wherever he is going to go, Charlie is going to have no chance at him.

But this individual, Muqtada al-Sadr, said over Al-Jazeera TV on the evening of June 11, 2004—I was in Kuwait City waiting to go into Iraq the next day—Sadr came on Al-Jazeera TV and said in Arabic, with the English crawler underneath, he said, “If we keep attacking Americans, they will leave Iraq the same way they left Vietnam, the same way they left Lebanon, the same way they left Mogadishu.” Muqtada al-Sadr, June 11, 2004, and that was Al-Jazeera TV.

That voice out of that man. And when I heard that, I concluded, he has read General Giap's book. He understands maybe not what happened in Korea, but he understands what happened in Vietnam. He understands that he has got to continue to fight, to break the will of the American people here, here in the United States of America, Mr. Speaker, because the last battle in this war, if the United States doesn't ultimately prevail, will be fought right on this blue carpet, right in this place right here. It won't be fought over there in Iraq, it won't be fought in the Middle East anywhere. It is here.

Here is where our vulnerability is, Mr. Speaker. Here is where the battle needs to be fought, and here is where the battle needs to be won, for our posterity and for the liberty and freedom we have been passed from our Founding Fathers. Sadr knows it.

I will submit this, Mr. Speaker: If we don't prevail in Iraq, and I believe that tactically we have every opportunity to do that, if we don't prevail in Iraq and Jack Murtha gets his way and troops come out of Iraq before there is a clear victory, then this man comes back into power. He is probably done talking about how to get Americans to leave Iraq.

But I can tell you Osama bin Laden will surface, or Zawahri will surface, and I will bring their picture down here to the floor, Mr. Speaker, and I will make a statement then. But I make the prediction now, you will see a picture of either Osama bin Laden or Zawahri or whoever the leader of al Qaeda is, and underneath it I will put the quote from them which will go something like this: If we keep attacking Americans, they will leave Afghanistan the same way they left Vietnam, the same way they left Lebanon, the same way they left Mogadishu, the same way they left Iraq.

And every time we lose our resolve and the legacy becomes the legacy that has been stipulated to us by Muqtada al-Sadr, it gets harder and harder to win the next war, harder and harder to have the will to conduct war, harder and harder to destroy their will, when

they know that there is a legacy of us losing our will, us losing our nerve, a legacy of Members of Congress demonstrating a lack of spine, a lack of understanding of history, a lack of commitment to the legacy that has been handed to them and handed to all of us by our founders, Mr. Speaker.

So, I would reiterate, nosce hostem, know thy enemy. War, according to Clausewitz, the object of war is to destroy the enemy's will and ability to conduct war. No one can destroy our ability, but we don't have the will to match our ability. And that was proven here today, Mr. Speaker.

And one of the members of the Democrat party said, and I applaud him for saying so, it does our military no good for the people on our side to sit in the corner and boo when they have been ordered into battle. We need to be on their side.

Who would go into the bleachers and boo their home team and think somehow the home team was going to perform better? Who would believe, when you hear the voices that came out of here for the last 4 days, Mr. Speaker, or I go back to the presidential campaign as it went through for 2004, where we heard continually “wrong war, wrong place, wrong time.” All we heard from another Senator in Massachusetts, it was all a war cooked up by oil people in Texas.

Voice after voice after voice of quasi-leaders of the United States have spoken, and it has undermined our troops and it has weakened their resolve, and it has empowered and emboldened our enemies. And when they are sitting in a hovel in Iraq making an IED and watching their Al-Jazeera TV, Mr. Speaker, and they hear the voices that came out from C-SPAN from the floor of this Congress, do you think that they make more bombs or less? Do you think they have more or less courage to plant them, more or less courage to attack Americans, more or less resolve to continue the fight, more or less perseverance because of the voices that came collectively from this side of the aisle and this Congress, Mr. Speaker?

We all know the answer to that. The answer is they have more resolve, more persistence; they will make more bombs, they will attack more Americans, and more Americans will die because the booing from this section has encouraged our enemy, and I got to bury some of those soldiers in my district, as do most of us. And that breaks my heart, because I understand it doesn't have to be. It doesn't have to be, Mr. Speaker. It didn't have to be and it doesn't have to be. And others will say, but it is. It is the price of a democratic system and a democratic process. And they say it is patriotic to speak about our disagreements.

So, if one yells fire in a crowded theater and 50 people are trampled to death on the way out and there was no fire, did they abuse their freedom of speech? And don't we know that there is a Supreme Court decision that says

your freedom of speech doesn't extend to the right to yell fire in a crowded theater? Verbatim and specifically the answer to that, Mr. Speaker, is yes.

So how can we give a pass to people whose words cost more lives? And beyond the lives, people's whose words alter our national destiny and make us poorer for it and diminish our potential and affect our future and burden our children and put them at risk, Mr. Speaker? I can't tolerate that.

As I travel over to the Middle East and settle in and talk to the soldiers there on the ground, and I like to do that more than anything else over there, Mr. Speaker. I will walk into a room, maybe a mess hall, climb aboard a C-130. I will say, anybody over here from Iowa? There have been a couple of times there hasn't been. Most of the time there is somebody there from Iowa.

I will sit down, and it is our immediate bond, and I will ask them what is going on here on the ground? What do I need to know? What do you want me to know? And please rest assured I will not identify you or take that information to your officers. This is something for me, because it is my duty to do this kind of oversight.

And I hear continually, I am proud to fight for freedom, I am proud to serve my country, Congressman, but why do we have to fight the United States news media too? Why is there a conflicting message coming out of Congress? Why do we have to take on that part of this battle? We are fighting the enemy over here. We need to know that Congress is behind us.

□ 1800

One of the lieutenant colonels that I travelled over there with made a statement to me in one of those late evenings as we were talking this over deeply and profoundly. I will not use his name either because I have not asked him that I could do so, but I will use the quote.

And he said, Do not save me, pacifists; do not save me. I volunteered for this. I want to be over here fighting for freedom and liberty because I know the world will be a safer place. I want to take this battle on for my children so they do not have to live in fear and they do not have to carry on this fight.

They are all volunteers, and they say do not save me. I will take my chances. I volunteered for this war. I want to save my children from this burden.

Who are we? Who are we to micro-manage a war and try to pull our troops out after all that blood and treasure has been invested in freeing Iraq and giving them an opportunity for freedom? Who are we?

I had gold star parents, Mr. Speaker, come into my office a week before I last went to the Middle East. So this would have been the third week in November, and several families had lost a son or a daughter in combat over in Iraq or Afghanistan.

We had a lot of profound discussions in there, and I listened to them. They

had travelled over to Iraq themselves and taken on the risk to go there. They had met with Iraqis. They had been welcomed into the homes of the Iraqis, and the Iraqi people showered them with gratitude for the measure of freedom they have today, even with the insecurities that are part of that, the gratitude for the sacrifice that Americans have given, their lives for Iraqi freedom and American safety and world safety.

And of all the things that were said, one that struck me the most, Mr. Speaker, was a father who had lost his son from California. His name is John. I have forgotten his last name, if I actually ever heard it, and he said, It is different now. You cannot pull out of Iraq. Our sons died there. They gave their lives for the freedom of the Iraqi people, and we are going to have more safety in America because of it? You cannot pull out of there. It is different. That soil is sanctified with the blood of our children.

Mr. Speaker, I challenge anyone to look that man or a father in the eye and say I think I know better, I think we ought to concede, I think we ought to admit and pull out and declare defeat like somebody said this war cannot be won, cannot be won, cannot be won. If I put a word search on there, "cannot be won" over and over again, hundreds of times it got said here in the last 4 to 5 days.

Mr. Speaker, I point out that Iraq, 80 percent of the violence is confined within 30 miles of Baghdad. You just look at the area that is there, Baghdad standing kind of alone in the middle. I checked this all out in the World Factbook just because that is where we go for information. Baghdad represents 1/2500th of the land area of Iraq, and we are saying we cannot prevail because 1/2500th of the land area has some people in there that are battling us? 1/2500th, one day of the life of SAM JOHNSON when he was in the Hanoi Hilton, one out of his 25 days, 1/2500th of the land area of Iraq, and we want to say we do not have the will. Every ability in the world, but we want to say we do not have the will to persevere, even though that soil is sanctified with the blood of our sons and daughters.

It will be a disgrace here on the floor of this Congress, Mr. Speaker, and I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. SALI) who I am sure came down here with his heart full and look forward to whatever he might have to say.

Mr. SALI. Mr. Speaker, first of all, I would like to tip my hat to the good gentleman for his efforts on the floor and for the compelling argument that he has made here.

The idea that our young people, young men and women, have gone to Iraq, gone to Afghanistan, they have spilled their blood there for a purpose that would become meaningless if we withdraw without finishing the job over there, that is something that makes the discussion I think a little different.

All of us are tired of the war. All of us are tired of the casualties that have been inflicted. What we have to do is keep our eye on the ultimate goal, what it is. Is it to quell a disturbance, a dispute that has arisen between different Islamic groups? No, it is not. It can never be.

It has to be the security of the United States. For those folks who have died in Iraq and Afghanistan, for their lives to have meaning, we have to consider what that goal is.

The national security of every person in this country, those interests have to be paramount to everything else that we consider. They have to be paramount to our distaste for the fighting that has gone on. They have to be paramount to every life that has been lost.

Mr. Speaker, for those lives that have been lost to have meaning, it has to be that we will save more lives by their efforts that have been there than if we just pull up stakes and quit. If we do not get that job done, if those radical Islamists are allowed to declare a State, if they have a home, a base from which to operate, we will repeat the events that happened when the Taliban had a home base in Afghanistan.

The recipe is before us. We have seen it before. We will have a repeat of something like 9/11.

The only choice that we have as a Nation is to continue that job over there, to get it finished as best we can. Is there a perfect prescription for that? No, there is not. Is it going to be easy? No, it is not. Will we have more casualties? Unfortunately, we will, and yet we must continue this fight so we will not dishonor those who have paid the ultimate sacrifice to this point in the conflict.

I thank the good gentleman.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentleman from Idaho, and I appreciate him coming down here and adding to this dialogue.

I had a chance to collect my thoughts a little bit during that, too, and a number of points that I did not make here.

First, I would like to say the argument is it is a civil war and we should not be involved in a civil war. We have been involved in a number of civil wars, and we will be involved in more civil wars. The same people who say we cannot be involved in a civil war say go into Darfur. Well, that is a civil war.

The same people said we should have gone to Rwanda. I am one of them that thought we should have gone to Rwanda. It was horrible. We could have done something about it, but it was a civil war.

And that list goes on and on, but let me define a civil war so it is a little more clear, Mr. Speaker, to the people that care, and that is, that you will be able to identify a civil war in Iraq when you see the Iraqi military and the Iraqi police force line up and choose up sides and decide they are going to start shooting at each other. They are not doing that. They are

keeping order all that they can. They march forward in uniform. They stay together, and that is one thing that says it is not a civil war.

Another one seems to me to be the most obvious and that has not been brought up here, and that is, I know of no entity of the five to eight competing factions within Baghdad that is trying to unseat the elected government of Iraq. It is accepted. The people went to the polls and voted in greater numbers percentage-wise than we do here in the United States, and they elected their leaders. They ratified their Constitution. They elected their leaders, seated their prime minister.

So Iraq is a country that is a sovereign country. No one is trying to unseat the government. It is not a civil war. Yes, there is sectarian strife, but it is not so much to do with religion as it is so much the power vacuum that is going on. It is not a civil war.

We cannot constitutionally micro-manage a war. The precedents for that are utterly weak throughout history, even though there was some struggle with that a number of times. But the precedent that remains was here in 1973, after Richard Nixon finished the Vietnamization process, moved our troops out of Vietnam, then a wounded President during the Watergate era was forced into a situation where this Congress shut off all funds from going to Vietnam, and that was on the land of Vietnam, in the skies over Vietnam and the seas offshore Vietnam.

The bill, and I just looked at it again yesterday and I read it a number of times, the bill said none of these funds or any funds heretofore appropriated shall be used on Vietnam, over Vietnam or offshore in Vietnam, which kept all of our military from supporting the South Vietnamese Army which was defending itself after the Treaty of Paris and the resolution of that issue.

Now the North Vietnamese broke the treaty. The South Vietnamese did not have support. They did not have munitions, which we promised them. They did not have air cover, which we promised them. We could not even do a naval bombardment to support them from the seas because this Congress jerked the rug off from underneath that. And the disgrace lies yet in our history books.

SAM JOHNSON also went back to Saigon here just not too long ago, within the last number of weeks, and laid a wreath at the U.S. embassy where we lost 10 to 12 Marines as you saw them being air lifted off the top of the U.S. embassy. Ten to 12 marines does not sound like much. That was the cry and the agony of a Nation, but those 10 to 12 Marines, think in terms of the millions of skulls that are piled in south-east Asia that came in the aftermath of the Vietnam War, the human tragedy.

I would say, Mr. Speaker, that none of us could pick up one of those skulls in The Killing Fields, and say this was

a Cambodian skull or a Vietnamese skull or an American skull. And I can tell you, God does not draw the distinction, but he understands what goes on in a conscience of humanity and the conscience of a Nation.

One would think that this Congress, Mr. Speaker, would have learned from that colossal error and be able to stand and have enough resolve when we are in a situation where Baghdad is surrounded, and by the way, Baghdad is not a stronghold. I asked a commanding general at the time of our ground forces within Baghdad, and I said, What is this about a stronghold? Are there places you cannot go? He said we go everywhere we want to go. We go when we want to go there. Sometimes we do not want to squabble. Sometimes we go in there because we want to pick a fight, but there is no such thing as a stronghold. So that resolves that.

I wrote an editorial a while back, Mr. Speaker, and released about December 20 because December 22 was the anniversary of General McAuliff's retort to the Nazis at the battle of Bastone. History will record, and you will remember, Mr. Speaker, the 101st Airborne in World War II was surrounded in Bastone. Bastone, a city that had seven highways coming to it, it was the confluence of the transportation and a critical area that had to be held and controlled for whichever side was going to be successful in the Battle of the Bulge.

When the Nazis surrounded the 101st at Bastone and were mercilessly shelling them, they sent a message in that demanded our surrender. General McAuliff's response was, "Nuts." Nuts, Mr. Speaker. Nuts, Nazis. They had to go all kinds of linguists and ask what does this mean? How do you translate this into German? It did not translate very well into German because that was the American spirit that echoed through that word, "nuts." Nuts, we have got you right where we want you. We are going to stay and hold our ground.

They did so, and to this day, the 101st will tell you, they did not really need Patton to relieve them, they would have won anyway. But Patton did come, history shows. They held their ground. Bastone was held. The Battle of the Bulge was turned back and the Nazi regime was destroyed forever because of American courage and American guts and an America that said "nuts" when they were surrounded in Bastone.

Mr. Speaker, today, 2,499 parts of 2,500 parts of Iraq are essentially pacified, and are there under our control. Parts of Baghdad essentially are all that is left.

□ 1815

Baghdad surrounded, it is not a stronghold. And if we pull out of there, history will rule us as nuts. Nuts, a weak nation, a weak nation that didn't have the resolve, Mr. Speaker.

I will put one more point in here, and hopefully I can get this done within the time that I have, and that is the straddle that is taking place with this resolution, Mr. Speaker. The straddle that gives the majority side of this thing an argument that they are right, no matter what the results are in Iraq. And that is, the way the resolution reads, they support the troops but oppose the mission.

Then they go on and say, we are going to do a slow bleed. JACK MURTHA says we are going to do a slow bleed and we are going to eliminate the President's ability to conduct these operations in Iraq.

Well, all right. So if the President's plan succeeds and Baghdad is pacified and the government of Iraq grows stronger and more stable, you will hear from over this side of the aisle, Mr. Speaker, over and over again, "See," they are going to say, "we were right. It took us to encourage the Iraqi government and the Iraqi military to step up to the plate and do the job. If we hadn't done that, the Americans would have held their hand and been their training wheels forever. They never would have learned to defend their country." That will come out of that side if history makes it clear that we are successful in Iraq.

And if we deploy out of there and Iraq turns into what I believe will be a disastrous chaos and cede the Shi'a region of the Iraq to the Iranians, who essentially have significant influence in there now, that would be 70 to 80 percent of Iraq's oil as well. It would give Iran control of the global export quantity of the oil. Iran would then have control of 42.6 percent of the oil that would go on the market, which is absolutely enough to control the market and enrich them fantastically and let them buy their nuclear capability and intimidate everyone in the Middle East and everyone in Europe and intimidate the United States as well. They would not be limited.

That is what happens if we pull out and the catastrophe, not to mention the human catastrophe, not to mention all the skulls that will be stacked up in Iraq like they were stacked up in Southeast Asia to the numbers of 3 million. That is the catastrophe there, Mr. Speaker.

But I am going to compare this. There was only one country that was guaranteed to be on the winning side in World War II, and that was France, because they were on both sides, Mr. Speaker. They were on both sides because you had Charles de Gaulle's freedom fighters, and they had gone into exile into Great Britain and continued their "Free France" battle going on. That was part of the effort, and we supported and helped them.

But you also remember there was the Vichy French. The Vichy French jumped right into bed with the Nazis and they staked their claim there, and that was Marshall Petain. And the French, not much of their country was

destroyed really in World War II. Paris certainly held together pretty good, and I am glad it did.

But if the Nazis had won and prevailed, the Vichy French would have emerged to the top. And then the French would have said, see, we got on the right side of this war, we avoided a lot of conflict, and Marshall Petain now is our president who is cutting a deal with Hitler. Or, as it turned out, it turned out to be Charles de Gaulle instead.

Straddle the issue, go right down the middle, prepare yourself to be on the victorious or at least be right, no matter what the results.

That is what this resolution does, Mr. Speaker. It allows the majority party and those that voted for this resolution to make the claim that they are right, no matter what happens. And they brought not one word of strategic plan to resolve this issue in Iraq. Not one. In 4 days of debates, not a single plan came out of that side of the aisle, not one.

None came out in the campaigns, either. They never stepped up and said, "This is what I would do." Except some said, "I would cut and run. I just wouldn't call it that." Some of that went on. But, beyond that, there was nothing, except they said we need a strategic plan, we need a better plan.

And one of them came here to the floor and said, "I used to command a carrier task force offshore of Afghanistan," which would be by my look of the map the Arabian Sea. And he says, "My job now is to come here and plan a strategy to resolve the issue in Iraq."

And I reflected, Judge Louie Gohmert found himself wanting to legislate from the bench in Texas, so he ran for Congress because he knew constitutionally this was the place to legislate.

But that Member, Mr. Speaker, if he wanted to micromanage a war, should have kept command of his task force and the Arabian Sea. This is no place, Mr. Speaker, to micromanage a war. Our job constitutionally is to fund it, and the Commander in Chief's job is to run it, and we have endorsed his authority to do that.

As these amendments come and these appropriations bills come, one after another in this slow bleed that has been promised, we will know that the constitutional authority doesn't exist to do that. The President has the authority to take the money that has been appropriated and to do intradepartmental transfers and I will say interdepartmental transfers as well to fund the military however he sees fit to protect this Nation.

And if this party sees fit to starve our military and put them at risk, then woe are we. But they have also taken responsibility for the results of this war by this.

So I will say, Mr. Speaker, this resolution that passed here on the floor today, it assists our enemy. It assists our enemy. It assuages our enemy. It

encourages our adversaries. It provides benefit for our enemies. It encourages the bad guys. It provides comfort and charity to the criminals. It encourages and exhilarates our enemy. It provides favor and gifts to the enemy, our foe. It is a handout. It is help to the insurgents. It is relief and reward for the opposition. It is salvation and succor for terrorists. It emboldens and encourages.

This day on this floor of the United States Congress will live in infamy, and I pray it may not be a precedent for the future of America and for our national destiny.

Mr. Speaker, I would make another point, and that is I have decided I will follow General Petraeus, and you have decided you will follow General Pelosi.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. BAIRD (at the request of Speaker PELOSI) for today on account of attending a funeral.

Mr. DEFAZIO (at the request of Speaker PELOSI) for today after 3 p.m.

Mr. NADLER (at the request of Speaker PELOSI) for February 14, February 15 and February 16 on account of family medical emergency.

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today after 4 p.m. on account of illness.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. PALLONE) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

#### SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills and a concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 188. An act to revise the short title of the Fannie Lou Hamer, Rosa Parks, and Coretta Scott King Voting Rights Act Reauthorization and Amendments Act of 2006; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 487. An act to amend the National Organ Transplant Act to clarify that kidney paired donations shall not be considered to involve the transfer of a human organ for valuable consideration; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

S. Con. Res. 12. Concurrent Resolution supporting the goals and ideals of a National Medal of Honor Day to mark the significance and importance of the Medal of Honor and to celebrate and honor the recipients of the Medal of Honor on the anniversary of the first award of that medal in 1863; to the Committee on Armed Services.

#### BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Lorraine C. Miller, Clerk of the House, reports that on February 15, 2007, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill.

H.J. Res. 20. Making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2007, and for other purposes.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the order of the House of today, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Accordingly, pursuant to the previous order of the House of today, the House stands adjourned until 4 p.m. on Tuesday, February 20, 2007, unless it sooner has received a message from the Senate transmitting its adoption of House Concurrent Resolution 67, in which case the House shall stand adjourned pursuant to that concurrent resolution.

Thereupon (at 6 o'clock and 21 minutes p.m.), pursuant to the previous order of the House of today, the House adjourned until 4 p.m. on Tuesday, February 20, 2007, unless it sooner has received a message from the Senate transmitting its adoption of House Concurrent Resolution 67, in which case the House shall stand adjourned pursuant to that concurrent resolution.

#### OATH OF OFFICE MEMBERS, RESIDENT COMMISSIONER, AND DELEGATES

The oath of office required by the sixth article of the Constitution of the United States, and as provided by section 2 of the act of May 13, 1884 (23 Stat. 22), to be administered to Members, Resident Commissioner, and Delegates of the House of Representatives, the text of which is carried in 5 U.S.C. 3331:

"I, AB, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God."

has been subscribed to in person and filed in duplicate with the Clerk of the House of Representatives by the following Members of the 110th Congress, pursuant to the provisions of 2 U.S.C. 25:

#### ALABAMA

1. Jo Bonner.
2. Terry Everett.
3. Mike Rogers.
4. Robert B. Aderholt.
5. Robert E. (Bud) Cramer, Jr.
6. Spencer Bachus.

7. Artur Davis.

ALASKA  
At Large

Don Young.

AMERICAN SAMOA  
Delegate

Eni F. H. Faleomavaega.  
ARIZONA

1. Rick Renzi.
2. Trent Franks.
3. John B. Shadegg.
4. Ed Pastor.
5. Harry E. Mitchell.
6. Jeff Flake.
7. Raúl M. Grijalva.
8. Gabrielle Giffords.

ARKANSAS

1. Marion Berry.
2. Vic Snyder.
3. John Boozman.
4. Mike Ross.

CALIFORNIA

1. Mike Thompson.
2. Wally Herger.
3. Daniel E. Lungren.
4. John T. Doolittle.
5. Doris O. Matsui.
6. Lynn C. Woolsey.
7. George Miller.
8. Nancy Pelosi.
9. Barbara Lee.
10. Ellen O. Tauscher.
11. Jerry McNerney.
12. Tom Lantos.
13. Fortney Pete Stark.
14. Anna G. Eshoo.
15. Michael M. Honda.
16. Zoe Lofgren.
17. Sam Farr.
18. Dennis A. Cardoza.
19. George Radanovich.
20. Jim Costa.
21. Devin Nunes.
22. Kevin McCarthy.
23. Lois Capps.
24. Elton Gallegly.
25. Howard P. "Buck" McKeon.
26. David Dreier.
27. Brad Sherman.
28. Howard L. Berman.
29. Adam B. Schiff.
30. Henry A. Waxman.
31. Xavier Becerra.
32. Hilda L. Solis.
33. Diane E. Watson.
34. Lucille Roybal-Allard.
35. Maxine Waters.
36. Jane Harman.
37. Juanita Millender-McDonald.
38. Grace F. Napolitano.
39. Linda T. Sánchez.
40. Edward R. Royce.
41. Jerry Lewis.
42. Gary G. Miller.
43. Joe Baca.
44. Ken Calvert.
45. Mary Bono.
46. Dana Rohrabacher.
47. Loretta Sanchez.
48. John Campbell.
49. Darrell E. Issa.
50. Brian P. Bilbray.
51. Bob Filner.
52. Duncan Hunter.
53. Susan A. Davis.

COLORADO

1. Diana DeGette.
2. Mark Udall.
3. John T. Salazar.
4. Marilyn N. Musgrave.
5. Doug Lamborn.
6. Thomas G. Tancredo.
7. Ed Perlmutter.

CONNECTICUT

1. John B. Larson