

Wexler
Wilson (OH)Woolsey
WuWynn
Yarmuth

NAYS—189

Aderholt
Akin
Bachmann
Bachus
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boustany
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite,
Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Emerson
English (PA)
Everett
Fallin
Feeney
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)

Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gilcrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Hall (TX)
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Jindal
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Keller
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Latham
LaTourette
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McKeon
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Murphy, Tim
Musgrave

Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Pickering
Platts
Poe
Porter
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Saxton
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shays
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Tancredo
Terry
Thornberry
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—17

Alexander
Brady (TX)
Davis, Jo Ann
Engel
Farr
Fattah

Ferguson
Gillibrand
Lampson
Lewis (CA)
McMorris
Rodgers

Napolitano
Ortiz
Pitts
Ros-Lehtinen
Sullivan
Tiahrt

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are advised there are 2 minutes left in this vote.

□ 1246

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 275, had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

U.S. TROOP READINESS, VETERANS' CARE, KATRINA RECOVERY, AND IRAQ ACCOUNTABILITY APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2007—VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 110-31)

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TIERNEY) laid before the House the following veto message from the President of the United States:

To the House of Representatives:

I am returning herewith without my approval H.R. 1591, the "U.S. Troop Readiness, Veterans' Care, Katrina Recovery, and Iraq Accountability Appropriations Act, 2007."

This legislation is objectionable because it would set an arbitrary date for beginning the withdrawal of American troops without regard to conditions on the ground; it would micromanage the commanders in the field by restricting their ability to direct the fight in Iraq; and it contains billions of dollars of spending and other provisions completely unrelated to the war.

Precipitous withdrawal from Iraq is not a plan to bring peace to the region or to make our people safer here at home. The mandated withdrawal in this bill could embolden our enemies—and confirm their belief that America will not stand behind its commitments. It could lead to a safe haven in Iraq for terrorism that could be used to attack America and freedom-loving people around the world, and is likely to unleash chaos in Iraq that could spread across the region. Ultimately, a precipitous withdrawal could increase the probability that American troops would have to one day return to Iraq—to confront an even more dangerous enemy.

The micromanagement in this legislation is unacceptable because it would create a series of requirements that do not provide the flexibility needed to conduct the war. It would constrict how and where our Armed Forces could engage the enemy and defend the national interest, and would provide confusing guidance on which of our enemies the military could engage. The result would be a marked advantage for our enemies and greater danger for our troops, as well as an unprecedented interference with the judgments of those who are charged with commanding the military.

Beyond its direction of the operation of the war, the legislation is also unacceptable for including billions of dollars in spending and other provisions that are unrelated to the war, are not an emergency, or are not justified. The Congress should not use an emergency war supplemental to add billions in spending to avoid its own rules for budget discipline and the normal budget process. War supplemental funding bills should remain focused on the war and the needs of our men and women in uniform who are risking their lives to defend our freedoms and preserve our Nation's security.

Finally, this legislation is unconstitutional because it purports to direct the conduct of the operations of the war in a way that infringes upon the powers vested in the Presidency by the Constitution, including as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces. For these reasons, I must veto this bill.

GEORGE W. BUSH,
THE WHITE HOUSE, May 1, 2007.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal, and the veto message and the bill will be printed as a House document.

The question is, Will the House, on reconsideration, pass the bill, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding?

The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS), and pending that I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this issue before us is the kind of issue that the Congress was designed to deal with. This Congress exists today because in 1215, almost 800 years ago, our forefathers many times removed, by adopting the Magna Carta, established for the first time in the English-speaking world the principle that the monarch was not unilaterally sovereign.

That expression wound up being turned into a reality for our country in 1789, when the Constitution of the United States was adopted. That Constitution created three coequal branches of government. It gave this body, the legislative body, the Congress, the ability to declare war. It certainly gave us the obligation to oversee the conduct of war. It gave us the obligation to oversee the use of taxpayers' money in dealing not just with war, but with every other issue as well.

The President yesterday vetoed the legislation now before us, which, for the first time, had he chosen to use it, would have given him the opportunity to have an exit strategy for a war that has brought incredible frustration and agony not just on the people of Iraq, but the people of our own country.

Now, the President has told the public that he is "the decider." Well, he is a very important decider, but he is not the only decider in a democratic form of government. The ultimate deciders are our constituents, and we are elected to speak on their behalf and to participate in that decisionmaking. That is what the Congress did when it passed this legislation through both Houses.

I regret very much that the President did not use this legislation to establish a bipartisan approach to the war which has plagued us now for more than 4 years.

As we all know, yesterday was the fourth anniversary of the President's landing on that aircraft carrier under the banner "Mission Accomplished" and telling us that our troops had fulfilled their mission. Indeed, they had;

our troops won the war in Iraq, but it is the White House, in its pursuit of its Iraqi policy, it is the civilian leadership of the Pentagon which systematically, especially in the early days, ignored the judgment of the military that has brought us to the chaos that we see in Iraq today.

Now, the legislation before us attempted to do a number of things. It attempted to meet the financial needs of the budget in supplying our troops with everything that they need. Secondly, it attempted to hold the administration accountable and to hold the Iraqi Government accountable for the actions that they have taken. And thirdly, it was meant to provide the beginnings of an exit strategy from that civil war. The President has decided to veto that legislation, and the question before us now is whether we will override that veto or not.

The President said in his veto message yesterday that we had all too many so-called nonrelated items in this bill, along with funding for the troops in Iraq. I don't believe that the American people would agree with the President that \$1.8 billion for veterans health care, \$3.3 billion for defense health programs, \$2.2 billion for additional Homeland Security initiatives, \$6.9 billion for Katrina recovery, \$663 million to protect the country from the ravages of a potential world flu pandemic, or \$650 million to prevent kids from losing health insurance is unnecessary funding. I think the American public recognizes each of those as a legitimate expenditure of public funds.

I also think that the President has focused so much attention on those items simply to divert public attention from the fact that this bill is first, last and foremost about the war. It is about how we get our troops out of the war. It is how we send a message to the Iraqi politicians that our troops cannot be expected to accomplish the compromises that only they can reach if that war is to be brought to a conclusion.

Mr. Speaker, I would urge every Member of this House, regardless of party, to vote to override the President's veto.

And I would point out to the President that we already have provided for two major compromises in this legislation. When we first established the Murtha principles for unit readiness, the White House objected. And so we said, all right, we'll change that, we will give the White House a waiver. When the White House objected to the timetable that we laid out for withdrawal of our troops from that civil war, again we compromised, and we said we will keep as hard deadlines the deadlines by which we must begin that process of redeploying troops, but we made the end date for the actual withdrawal of our troops from combat in a civil war, we made those dates extremely flexible in response to the President's views. So we have already compromised on two very major items in this bill.

Now that the President has laid down his veto, it seems to me that he has an obligation to lay on the table what compromises he is willing to make in order to bring us together in pursuit of an exit strategy from a war that we should never have gotten into in the first place.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEWIS OF California. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 4 minutes to the gentlelady from Florida.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. I thank the gentleman from California.

Mr. Speaker, last month, a member of the majority leadership stated, "This war is lost, and the surge has not accomplishing anything." He further stated, "We are going to pick up Senate seats as a result of this war," and adding that he had been shown numbers that are compelling and astounding.

□ 1300

I cannot imagine that there were many in either party who were not shocked by these brazenly cynical words.

This past Saturday, I sat down with Phyllis and Huber Parsons, constituents from my congressional district who have three sons serving in Baghdad. They are pictured here in the poster behind me. They are officers with the Army Stryker Brigade. They said to me that remarks such as the ones that I just quoted by our congressional leaders "made them sick." Their sons, Charlie, Huber and Bill, are not bullets to be used to hit a political target. And while some of my colleagues may not agree with the administration's efforts to win the battle against Islamic jihadists in Iraq, the Parsons brothers should not be abandoned without ammunition to defend themselves.

My stepson, Doug, and my daughter-in-law, Lindsay, both served in Iraq. Lindsay is now in Afghanistan. They were not following the orders of would-be generals here in Congress. They were serving their country and their President, whom the Constitution clearly states is the commander-in-chief.

Not one of us here in Congress can usurp that role. Nor can we fill the role of General David Petraeus, who bears the enormous burden of directing this war and who has said that our mission is just and necessary.

These men and women of our Armed Forces, such as the Parsons brothers and my stepson and daughter-in-law, understand their mission. They understand that they are locked in a generational struggle with global Islamic radicals who seek our destruction. If we declare that we have been beaten in this phase of the struggle and then retreat, it will only grow, it will follow us home, and it may never end.

Imposing a timetable for withdrawal of our forces and retreating over the horizon, as some have suggested, will not insulate us from the terrible stra-

tegic consequences that would result. This fighting will spill into neighboring countries, threaten our allies and then spread throughout the Middle East.

In addition to these frightening strategic consequences, if we surrender the Iraqi nation to the terrorists, we would open the gates to a potential humanitarian crisis of epic proportions, including mass murder and displacements of thousands and thousands of innocent Iraqi men, women and children that our retreat helped make possible.

Let me remind the advocates of defeat of the words of one of our former presidents who battled against the legions of those who sought to block his efforts to save democracy for this country and for the world. He said, "This generation of Americans has a rendezvous with destiny. In this world of ours, there are some people, who seem to have grown too weary to carry on the fight. I believe in my heart that only our success can stir their ancient hope. They begin to know that here in America we are waging a great and successful war. It is a war for the survival of democracy."

These are the words of Franklin Roosevelt, and I think were he here today, I am confident that he would never give in to those who say that we have lost and who demand that we retreat.

I ask my colleagues to uphold the President's veto and demand a clean supplemental to support our troops in the field, to give Bill, Charlie and Huber Parsons the resources they need to achieve victory in Iraq.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the distinguished Speaker of the House.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I want to acknowledge the exceptional leadership of Chairman OBEY, Chairman MURTHA and Chairman SKELTON in putting together this important piece of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, Congress passed this bill, and yesterday we sent it to the President of the United States. We did so with great pride, because it is a bill that supports our troops, honors our promises to our veterans, holds the Iraqi government accountable and winds down this war. It is a bill that honors the sacrifice of our men and women in uniform. Thank you, Chairman OBEY, MURTHA AND SKELTON.

The President had an historic opportunity. He had an opportunity to take yes for an answer, because the bill contained what the President had proposed. The President proposed benchmarks. His very own benchmarks were contained in this bill. The Department of Defense has guidelines for readiness for our troops, for their training, their equipment and the time they can spend at home and overseas. They are in the bill, even with a waiver for the President, giving the President more latitude. The President said no. The President said no.

I had hoped that the President would see the light, instead of turning a blind ear to the wishes of the American people and a blind eye to what is happening on the ground in Iraq.

The President, in signing the veto, is reporting that progress is being made in Iraq. Well, I don't know what his definition of "progress" is, but, sadly, April was the deadliest month this year, with over 100 of our troops killed there.

The President, in his statement on vetoing the bill, said that he vetoes the bill because, in his words, "It makes no sense to tell the enemy when you start to plan withdrawing."

In criticizing these timelines, of course, the President is wrong. But when he was a candidate for President, it made sense to him to say to President Clinton, "I think it's also important for the President to lay out a timetable as to how long our troops will be involved and when they will be withdrawn." This is candidate Bush on the war in Kosovo, where we did not lose one single American soldier; this from a President whose initiative has lost over 3,000 Americans and countless, countless Iraqis.

Bipartisan congressional majorities approved of using timelines for redeployment to instill urgency into benchmarks that have already again been endorsed by the President and the Iraqi leaders. They have agreed to this, except they reject them in this bill.

A wide range of people have noted the value of timelines in persuading the Iraqis to make the political compromises needed to end the violence, including Secretary of Defense Gates, who said, "The strong feelings expressed in the Congress about the timetable probably have had a positive impact in terms of communicating to the Iraqis that this is not an open-ended commitment."

The Congress will not support an open-ended commitment to a war without end. He wants a blank check. The Congress will not give it to him.

Next the President said that Congress is substituting our judgment for the judgments of commanders in the field 6,000 miles away. Wrong again, Mr. President. We are substituting our judgment for your judgment 16 blocks down Pennsylvania Avenue in the White House. We are substituting the judgment of this Congress for your failed judgment.

The American people have lost faith in the President's conduct of the war. They have said that they want accountability and a new direction. This bill gives them both.

Next the President claimed, and Mr. OBEY again referenced this, that this bill is loaded with non-emergency spending. Well, it may be a non-emergency to the President, but it certainly is an emergency to the people affected. Once again, the President is wrong.

The needs of the survivors of Hurricane Katrina think it is an emergency, and so does any person of conscience in

our country who cares about the victims of Katrina. That millions of children are about to lose their health insurance is an emergency for them and for our country. America's farmers, devastated by natural disasters, think it is an emergency.

These situations remain emergencies because the President and the last Congress, the Republican Congress, refused to act. So now we must. So they have made it even more of an emergency.

Today, the President faces consequences of his own making. This is the seventh supplemental for the war in Iraq. Certainly somebody was planning something at the White House and could have put over the years the funding necessary for this war into the budget. Instead, the President did not do that. I don't know why. Maybe they didn't want the American people to see the real cost of this war in dollars. Certainly we know the price that we have paid more seriously in lives, in health, in reputation, in the readiness of our military and in probably \$2 trillion now for this war.

The President claims that this legislation infringes upon the powers vested in the President by the Constitution. The President is wrong. Congress is exercising its right as a coequal branch of government to work cooperatively with the President to end this war.

By voting "yes" to override, Congress sends a strong message:

To support our troops. They have done everything that has been asked of them, and excellently. They deserve better.

To rebuild our military, which has been seriously strained by this war in Iraq.

To honor our commitment to our veterans, our heroes.

And to demand accountability.

With passage of this bill, we then can refocus our energy on the efforts against terrorism by bringing the war in Iraq to an end, bringing this war in Iraq to an end.

The President said there are real enemies out there. Yes, we know that, Mr. President, and we are prepared to make that fight. We will do whatever is necessary to protect the American people.

The war on terrorism was in Afghanistan. We took our fullest attention from Afghanistan to go into Iraq, and now Iraq is a magnet for terrorists. The war in Iraq has made matters worse in the war on terrorism.

What we have to do is work together, Democrats and Republicans, with the President of the United States, to bring stability to that region.

Now into the fifth year of a failed policy, this administration should get a clue. It is not working. This is the fourth surge they have proposed. When they proposed it in January, they said in 60 to 90 days we will know. It is 120 days, and now they are saying September. And then they say maybe by the end of the year. So what is this? We will be into another whole year of this war, far longer than World War II.

Nobody who serves in this body, who takes the oath of office to protect and defend the Constitution, needs anybody to tell them, whether you are a Democrat or Republican, what our responsibility is to protect the American people. Nobody needs a reminder of what the threat of terrorism is to our country. But we do need to work together to keep our focus on where the war on terror really is. If we clear up this matter, bring this war to an end in Iraq, we can give the war on terror our fullest attention.

Let us stop this war without end. I urge a "yes" vote.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the gentlelady who spoke just before me, our respected Speaker, is a person I have worked with for most of my life in public affairs. Our Speaker suggested that the President was wrong, and, Mr. Speaker, I humbly suggest that in this instance, our esteemed Speaker is wrong.

Madam Speaker, it was no secret that this conference report was going to be vetoed. Early on, the President made very clear his intention to veto this legislation because of the Iraq withdrawal language and the many unrelated and costly spending items that have absolutely nothing to do with the global war on terror and recovery efforts on the gulf coast.

It is no secret that many Members of the House and Senate, both Republicans and Democrats, had strong reservations about the manner in which this legislation undermined the authority of the President, our Commander in Chief.

From the beginning of this process, Members have expressed their concern about how this legislation placed military decisions in the hands of politicians rather than military commanders in the field. The last thing our country or our troops need is to have 535 Members and Senators micromanaging the war in Iraq. That simply is not our job, Madam Speaker.

Recent history reminds us that the enemy we face in Iraq, Afghanistan and in other countries that harbor terrorists will stop at nothing to attack the United States and our allies.

My colleagues, now is not the time for the United States to back down from its commitment to the war on terror. Now is not the time for America to signal retreat and surrender. Indeed, now is not the time for the House of Representatives to throw in the towel, wave the white flag or signal retreat and surrender in Iraq.

How could this Congress walk away from our men and women in uniform? How could we walk away from them now? We must not let that happen. We must support our troops. Our failure to learn the lessons of history, our failure to lead, will result in devastating consequences, including an even greater loss of life and even more resources needed to fight tomorrow.

□ 1315

It is absolutely essential that America, the last remaining superpower on Earth, continue to be a voice for peace and a beacon of freedom in our shrinking world. Walking away would further signal to Syria, Iran, Afghanistan, and others that the United States is no longer committed to a successful outcome in Iraq.

Before closing my remarks, I want to express my disappointment and dismay at yesterday's political and theatrical display by Speaker PELOSI and Senator REID.

The delivery of this conference report to the White House was intentionally delayed so the President's veto would coincide with the fourth anniversary of the President declaring "Mission Accomplished." This display in sending the supplemental to the President was a deliberate and shameful attempt at scoring political points solely at the expense of our troops.

Mr. Speaker, this veto has been anticipated for some time. The majority party has had ample time to plan and prepare for the next step. Passing a clean supplemental free of arbitrary deadlines and excessive spending is obviously the path we should be following.

There is \$20 billion, \$20 billion, in this package unrelated to the war effort and the gulf coast recovery. That money is designated as emergency spending. Every nickel of this unrelated spending should be removed from the emergency supplemental. All this spending should be debated in regular order through the fiscal year 2008 appropriations process.

In closing, I say to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle: You've made your point. You've had your dog-and-pony show. You have posed for political holy pictures on TV. Now what is your plan to support the troops?

It is time to put the posturing and political stunts aside and do what is in the best interest of our troops. It is time to do the right thing and pass a clean emergency supplemental free of arbitrary deadlines and arbitrary spending. It is time to support our Commander in Chief and sustain the President's veto. I strongly urge a "no" vote.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members on both sides of the aisle are reminded that remarks in debate should be directed to the Chair and not to others in the second person.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1½ minutes.

The gentleman expresses his concern about funding designated as emergency spending. In fact, I would point out that the President himself asked for the antiflu money that we put in this bill. The President himself asked for that money 2 years ago as an emergency request.

I would also note, since he has expressed concern about our micromanaging the war, I would simply say we have had the administration providing us with bad intelligence. We have had the administration demonstrating bad judgment in saying we would be welcomed with open arms. We have had them demonstrate bad judgment in ignoring General Shinseki's warnings about the number of troops that would be needed to pacify a postwar Iraq. We have seen bad judgment in the President's refusal to talk to the Syrians and the Iranians. We have seen bad judgment all across the board for the last 4 years. It seems to me that we are badly in need of having some kind of management to that war, and if it is not going to come from the executive branch, then the only alternative is for the Congress to express its views.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland, the majority leader, Mr. HOYER.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, at the outset, let me comment on the ranking member's observation about political posturing.

First, let me say I wonder what the President was doing standing in front of that sign saying "Mission Accomplished" on that aircraft carrier with taxpayers' dollars. Let me suggest to you that he was politically posturing, trying to take credit for a great victory that occurred 4 years ago. No one in America believes that the mission has been accomplished. No one in America thinks we have had a success.

Let me say that it was totally appropriate for the Speaker and for the majority leader in the United States Senate to sign a bill and let the public know that this is what the Congress believes.

My friend may think political posturing is taking responsibility, which is our constitutional duty, as opposed to simply rubber-stamping what the President wants done. There has not been any question asked for the last 4 years by this Congress. There has not been any interposition of a correct policy as opposed to the President's failed policy.

We don't see that as political posturing, I tell my friend—we see it as exercising the constitutional duty that the American public expects us to do as their independent representative.

This is only the second veto. Why is it only the second veto? Because you wouldn't pass anything the President didn't want. That is not the role of the Congress of the United States. The role of the Congress of the United States is to make policy. That is what article I says. That is what we are doing.

Mr. Speaker, regrettably, the President has chosen not to follow the will of the American people and bipartisan majorities in the House and Senate by vetoing legislation that fully funds our troops in Iraq and Afghanistan, that holds the Iraqis accountable for making progress, and that calls for a re-

sponsible redeployment of American forces who are mired in a civil war.

It is our duty now as the elected representatives of the people to try to override the President's veto even though we may not succeed, and even as we prepare to meet with the President today to discuss next steps. That is our responsibility. We intend to do it.

Mr. Speaker, I believe our President, who was wrong 4 years ago when he stood under a banner announcing "Mission Accomplished," is wrong again. The escalation of American troops in Iraq does not represent a change in this administration's failed policy. In fact, it is the fourth time we have escalated troops. In fact, it has been tried, unsuccessfully.

The President's claim last night that "We've begun to see some important results" is unfortunately contradicted by the facts. I wish it were true. I want to succeed in this effort, although what success is is ill-defined or not defined by the President.

In fact, Iraq is wracked by violence, including massive car bombs, almost daily. The U.S. death toll in April of 104 made last month the deadliest of the year and the sixth most lethal month since the war started, notwithstanding this increase in troop presence.

Senator HAGEL, who recently returned from Iraq, stated: "This thing is coming undone quickly, and the Maliki government is weaker by the day."

And the Special Inspector General for Iraq Reconstruction just reported: "The U.S. project to rebuild Iraq remains far short of its targets, leaving the country plagued by power outages, inadequate oil production and shortages of clean water and health care."

I suggest to my friend, in that context, the Congress ought to be impacting on the policies that are being pursued that are not succeeding.

Finally, let me say, and I call the attention of my friend, the ranking member, to this because he referenced this. The President's claim last night that this legislation "substitutes the opinions of politicians for the judgment of our military commanders" is totally inaccurate.

But let me tell you what is not inaccurate is that our military commanders have made none of the decisions on the policies we have been pursuing in Iraq, and that is the tragedy. The decisions have been made not by military men and women, but by the President, by Mr. CHENEY, by Mr. Rumsfeld, by Mr. Wolfowitz, and, yes, by Mr. Bremer.

We have seen nothing, I tell my friend, but a series of political decisions made on this war over the last 4-plus years; would that it have been otherwise. We do not seek to micro-manage our military, which has done everything we have asked of them. Rather, we do continue to question the decisions of top administration officials, including, yes, the President,

whose judgments regarding this war have proved repeatedly, almost without exception, wrong.

Indeed, it is ironic that the President makes this claim when, in fact, we are mired in Iraq, because politicians who I have just referenced made decisions that prove to be wrong and did not lead to success.

Mr. Speaker, this Congress must not continue to simply rubber-stamp this administration's request. Our Founding Fathers did not think that was our role. They thought our role was to make independent judgments on the people's behalf and have the courage to pass legislation reflecting that judgment.

This legislation responds to the will of the American people and sets forth a policy to take us in a new direction that requires Iraqi responsibility and the pursuit of the political solution that General Petraeus and the Iraq Study Group say was essential if we were going to succeed.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues from both sides of the aisle: Listen to the American people, fully fund our troops, hold the Iraqis accountable, support responsible redeployment of American troops. Vote to override this veto.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. WAMP), a member of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. WAMP. Mr. Speaker, I want to make five points.

First, we need to realize that this threat is real. And I say to the members of the Get Out of Iraq Caucus that if we were not in Iraq tomorrow, this threat is not going away. We don't spend enough time focusing on this fact that the jihadists within Islam are insulated within the Islamists and the moderates, and there is not enough confrontation from them to each other. This threat is mounting globally. It is spreading. Europe is basically lost. And I don't want America to end up alone, but this threat is not going away, and we need to know it.

Former Senator Fred Thompson said here 2 weeks ago, and he is right, that when we do leave Iraq, it is either going to be a dangerous world or a more dangerous world, and it depends on what we do in Iraq as to whether it is dangerous or more dangerous, and this legislation is at the heart of that challenge.

Number two, words matter. The majority leader of the United States Senate saying that the war is lost was on the front page of al-Jazeera in Arabic. That is not good for our country, not in this conflict or the future. Words matter.

Number three, this legislation was flawed. We said it early on. You shouldn't have this kind of micro-management, tying the hands of the generals, telegraphing retreat, and then adding a bunch of extraneous matters to this legislation that should go through the regular order and the

regular appropriations process. It was a bad bill. You poked it up and slowed it down.

Number four, the veto was the right thing to do. The President is not popular. We all know that. But isn't it refreshing that the President is doing the right thing even though it is unpopular because he is putting the interest of our country above that of his party or even this moment doing the right thing? That is leadership.

Our distinguished Speaker came and said a few minutes ago that she was substituting the President's judgment for her judgment. And I say respectfully to our Speaker, I have served under three Speakers. She has her constitutional role, and it is not the Commander in Chief. She is the Speaker, not the Commander in Chief. She is also not General Petraeus, and this is a wrong-headed approach. We can do better.

Lastly, the solution is for the leadership to go and sit down with the President of the United States and put our troops above our parties. Clearly ask: What do you require?

□ 1330

The President should clearly ask what can I do for the Congress, and let's not go through this again.

My nephew is on his way to Iraq, as many Members of this House know. Let's make sure they have what they need. Let's not give up here. We don't need another Somalia. We don't need another Beirut. We don't need to lose this war. We need to stay and improve and do better and come out with our head up.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. I thank the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. Speaker, when the President vetoed this bill, he said it was because he felt that decisions like this should be left to the military, not the politicians. But Mr. Speaker, the fact is that when the President declared that Iraq was part of the global war on terrorism, there was not one single military officer who agreed. That was a political decision made in the White House to go into this war. Had he listened to the military, we wouldn't be in this war.

Mr. Speaker, the fact is that none of us have been asked to sacrifice anything in pursuit of this war. The sacrifice has fallen exclusively on the backs of our military and their families.

Mr. Speaker, this week, the 2,108th child was told that they will never see their mommy or daddy again because they will never return from Iraq. How many more children have to lose their parents before this policy is reversed, Mr. Speaker? 3,351 American soldiers have lost their lives. More than 24,000 have been seriously wounded. This past month, more than 100 soldiers lost their lives, the deadliest month on record.

Things are getting worse rather than better.

The British Broadcasting Corporation and the American Broadcasting Corporation just completed an extensive survey of Iraqis. It turns out that 82 percent have lost confidence in U.S. policy in Iraq, that 86 percent have lost a member of their household due to violence, and the majority feel that this policy is ineffective, and in fact, they were better off under Saddam Hussein than under the American occupation.

Mr. Speaker, the State Department just reported that the number of terrorist incidents has gone up by 25 percent, most of them in Iraq.

This policy has been a failure. I urge a rejection of the President's veto of this bill. This bill will set the course that the American people are demanding.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, only because we are rambling on time, could I have a check of time, please.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS) has 18½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) has 17 minutes remaining.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), the ranking member on the Rules Committee.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my California colleague and congratulate him on his stellar leadership on this and a wide range of other issues.

As I came to the floor just as our colleague the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Maryland, was addressing this House and he talked about politicization of statements that have been made, I will tell you, Mr. Speaker, when Saddam Hussein was toppled, it was not a celebration of one political party over another. It was not even a celebration just of Americans. It was a global celebration over the fact that we took this butcher who had murdered literally hundreds of thousands of his people, and we brought his reign of terror to an end, and that was worth celebrating.

Now, what we saw yesterday was nothing but partisanship because we know there is a real divide here. We know that the country is divided, and we know and the President of the United States, Mr. Speaker, has acknowledged that mistakes have been made, and we have gone through real difficulty.

I also heard the majority leader talk about the fact that there is no definition of victory. Mr. Speaker, it has been very clear from the beginning victory consists of two factors that are very important. First, we need to make sure that we have an Iraqi military force, the ISF, the Iraqi security force, able to defend the country, and we need to make sure that there is a government that can govern the country.

Those are the two items that have been placed forward. That is all we

want. We have seen self-determination take place with three elections that have taken place in Iraq. We have seen, I believe, positive news come forward.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we constantly hear people describe this as the Bush plan. We hear the litany of others, and as my friend from Tennessee (Mr. WAMP) just said, we know that the President is not terribly popular. The President knows that he is not very popular. He likes to say everyone likes to be loved, but I would rather be right than be loved.

So we know that the President obviously does not have a high approval rating right now, but he is doing the right thing. He is doing the right thing, and I believe, Mr. Speaker, that this goal is a very valiant one and a very, very important one for us to pursue. We have to bring about some kind of bipartisan resolution.

I am very pleased to have indications come from our friends on the other side of the aisle about the fact that we are going to provide important funding for our troops. We have to do that. That is absolutely essential, but we need to realize that we are in the midst of a new strategy.

I had the opportunity to talk with my good friend Mr. MURTHA, the distinguished chairman of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, the other day, and we agree that we have got to come to some kind of bipartisan resolution of this.

But the important point that needs to be made, as we hear the names of these unpopular people, Wolfowitz, Rumsfeld, Bush, thrown out there, we have to realize again that this is a new strategy, and this is the Petraeus plan. It was Dave Petraeus who last week said, before a large bipartisan gathering of Members, that Iraqis today are fighting and dying for their country. And it was Dave Petraeus who said, let us have until September, at which time I will report back with my colleagues to the President of the United States and the Congress.

I talked to, just day before yesterday, a very strong supporter of Mr. KERRY's when he was running for President, a strong, committed Democrat, and he said that he believed that establishing some sort of artificial timeline would be wrong.

The President described it last night following issuance of his veto that it clearly would be a prescription for defeat, and I believe that we need to make sure that, again, as Dave Petraeus said, since Iraq is the central front in the battle against al Qaeda, we need to keep it there.

Mr. Speaker, sustain this President's veto. Let's come together and provide the necessary funding for our men and women in uniform.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH).

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, three points. First, why is this an emergency? It is an emergency because

the administration has never funded this war on the books. The people who will pay for this are the sons and the daughters of the men and women in the military who are now fighting it. That is wrong and irresponsible.

Number 2, the military has done its job. They were asked to get rid of Saddam. He's gone. Find weapons of mass destruction. They don't exist. And allow Iraq to have democratic elections. They have had three.

Third point, the President says "no" to timetables. Of course we must have timetables. How else to hold the Iraqi politicians responsible? They have to have an oil law. They have to renounce sectarianism in the security force. And the only way that we are going to stop asking our military and our taxpayers to referee a civil war and to finance it is by having the President of the United States do what he must do and say we want accountability from the Iraqi political leadership.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON).

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I thank you very much and I thank the whip for allowing me to go at this time.

Let me just say I remember my Democrat colleagues after 9/11. They, along with us, were one voice saying we're going to go after these terrorists, no matter where they are; no matter how long it takes, we're going to get them.

The terrorists attacked the World Trade Center, the Cole, our barracks. They've attacked us many times. They attacked us once before at the World Trade Center. And al Qaeda has attacked in France, England, Spain, Indonesia, and elsewhere.

Now, the leader of the military wing of the terrorists in Iraq is al Qaeda. He's the guy that's going to lead the fight to make Iraq an Islamic State, a jumping-off point for terrorism around the world, al Qaeda, the same ones that attacked the World Trade Center and these other things.

I can't understand how my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, knowing al Qaeda is in charge over there, the military wing of the terrorists, knowing that they want to destroy us, knowing that Osama bin Laden said he wants to destroy America, that you want to pull out, that you want to tell them exactly when you're going to leave.

We're going to start moving in 4 months. We're going to be out of there in 12 months. You want to cut our troops off at the knees, and do you think al Qaeda is not going to be happy about that? What do you think Iran is thinking right now? What do you think Syria is thinking right now? What do you think al Qaeda is thinking right now? They're thinking we don't have the guts to go get 'em, and so they're encouraged.

Al Jazeera was mentioned just a minute ago. That paper has got all

kinds of articles saying we're going to get out, and you guys are giving them all the information they need to know that they can prevail if they wait us out. If they do, we're going to have more terrorist attacks here in America. They're waiting for us to get out so they can focus all their attention on the United States and our allies.

We must not do this, and that's why we should sustain the President's veto.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

I would simply point out to the gentleman who just spoke that the bill before us specifically allows our troops to continue to go after al Qaeda in Iraq, even after they are repositioned out of fighting that miserable civil war.

I would also simply say, the gentleman asks "What do you think al Qaeda thinks." I think al Qaeda wants us to stay in Iraq. It is clear from the beginning that they were happy that we went there, that we got sucked in there, because we have served as a recruiting poster for al Qaeda. That is what al Qaeda thinks.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT), the Republican whip.

Mr. BLUNT. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

We all know that in a few minutes the President's veto will be sustained. We didn't all figure that out this morning. We didn't all figure that out last week. We didn't even all figure that out last month. We've known that since the very start of this debate, 90 days of debate at a time when there are real consequences for our troops.

There are consequences, we are told this week, in the preparation for troops going to Iraq and action. There are consequences of maintenance on bases in this country. There are consequences in the way we are dealing with our equipment and our repairs, and we have taken 90 days to get to this point so we can start all over again.

I hope when we start all over again this afternoon that we will start all over again with a commitment to get this job done as soon as possible, rather than to take as long as possible. It does matter. The message we send to the world matters. The message we send to our troops matters. This bill needs to be as clean as possible. It needs to be straightforward.

There are things in this bill that in another bill I could support. There are things in this bill I couldn't support in any bill, but there are things here that should be done that have nothing to do with this bill. I don't know why they were put on. Maybe they were put on to try to see if the majority could get the last votes necessary to pass a bill that has restrictions on the military that this Congress should never have advanced to the President's desk.

The President has vetoed. We will uphold that veto. Let's work together now to get the job done to support the

troops in Afghanistan, in Iraq and everywhere else around the world who are feeling the consequences of this 90 days we have already taken.

I will work with you. I hope you will work with us. We need to get this job started.

□ 1345

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I believe our Republican colleagues are correct. This Congress spoke with one voice on the war on terrorism, and we continue to do so. Indeed, if President Bush had pursued the war on terrorism and the perpetrators of 9/11, instead of getting diverted to Iraq, which had nothing to do with 9/11, then when he hoisted that "Mission Accomplished" banner four years ago, it would have had meaning.

Instead, we have a burn rate of \$10 billion every month in Iraq, \$14 million every hour, 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, every week, every month of the year. More importantly, the real burn rate is in the loss of more than 3,300 American lives, brave men and women over there fighting for our country; 96 percent of those deaths, almost all of them, lost their life after President Bush declared "Mission Accomplished."

Today, the President can veto our attempt to secure a safe, orderly, phased redeployment of our troops from Iraq, but he can't veto reality. Our troops are coming home. It's just a question of what price is paid in blood and money before that happens.

The President talks about listening to the commanders and the generals. I wonder if he was listening to General William Odom, the former National Security Agency Director, last Saturday when he said the President has let the Iraq war proceed on "automatic pilot, making no corrections in the face of accumulating evidence that his strategy cannot be rescued."

If the President had listened to the generals, we would never have gone into Iraq in the first place. It was General Schwarzkopf who said, we would become "like [a] dinosaur in a tar pit."

If he had listened to the generals like General Shinseki, if he had insisted on going into Iraq, he would have sent enough troops to get the job done and not turned over all those weapons dumps to be converted into IEDs.

If he had listened to the generals, he would have provided our veterans with the health care that they have earned and deserved instead of subjecting them back here to the facilities and care they found in the United States.

The generals who disagree with this President earn a new title: Retired.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to yield 3 minutes to the former chairman of the Armed Services Committee, DUNCAN HUNTER of California, now the ranking member.

Mr. HUNTER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I think it's important to interpret this debate. I have heard the Speaker talk about redeployment and say that there is a lot of discretion that is left to the administration. There is no discretion. The dates of so-called redeployment are defined. You either start going out July 1 or October 1. Redeployment means withdrawals.

If generals do not start redeploying, do not start withdrawing from the battlefield, you can bet Democratic leadership will be here pulling them into hearings, asking them why they didn't saddle up their brigades, their battalions and their divisions and start to move them off the battlefield. So let's get this straight. This is about withdrawing from the battlefield.

Listening to this debate, and listening to the controversy and the statements by Democratic leadership that have preceded this vote today, there is a constant theme: Somehow American soldiers and marines are victims. They are victims of extended tours; they are victims, the last gentleman said, they claim, of not getting enough health care. They are people that have been victims in the war against terror.

Let me tell you, I have seen the timelines that are given, the 270 days for Marines, the 365 days. A number of them have gone through one, two, three and sometimes four tours. Our Americans, and that includes my son, who is deploying now for the third time, will not fail, they will not crack, they will not stretch. They will hold, and they will carry out this mission against terrorists.

We are right now in the second phase of a program we have used for 60 years to stand up free governments around the world. You stand up a free government. We have done that.

Secondly, you stand up a military capable of protecting that free government. That is a second stage. That is a stage we are in right now.

Thirdly, we leave, because America doesn't covet anything that another nation has.

We are in the second stage right now. It's tough, and it's difficult. This is a tough, difficult mission, but it is a mission that we can accomplish.

I am reminded, lastly, that the Speaker talked about stopping the war. That is how she described this bill. The Democratic leadership does not have the power to stop the war against terror. All they have the power to do is to leave the battlefield. That would be a disaster for the United States of America.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 20 seconds.

I would also observe that our soldiers don't have the power to require Iraqi politicians to quit killing each other and make the diplomatic and political compromises necessary to end this civil war. Only Iraqi politicians have that, and we are trying to send them a message with this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

(Mr. ANDREWS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, by vetoing this bill, the President refuses to sustain the troops that we have sent to Iraq. Every dollar they need, every ounce of protection they need, and the health care they need when they come home is in this bill that he has vetoed. We refuse to sustain a failed, endless policy that takes us nowhere.

The President refuses to acknowledge the reality that we have sent our sons and daughters to be referees in a bloody civil war. We acknowledge that reality, and we want to stop it.

The President refuses to acknowledge the comments of General Petraeus, who says that ending this civil war is a political mission, not a military one. We acknowledge that reality, and we provide the tools to achieve success in that political mission.

Today the President has refused to acknowledge the will of the American people, but we are expressing the will of the American people.

We will vote to override this veto, and the result will obtain. But we will never yield, never quit, never back up in this effort to change this failing policy and bring our troops home from Iraq.

Vote to override this veto.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, could I inquire about the amount of time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California has 8 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Wisconsin has 11 1/4 minutes remaining.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON).

Mr. KINGSTON. I thank the gentleman from California.

Mr. Speaker, I think that we have to sustain this veto today. I think it's the right thing to do, because I think we need to go back to the drawing board on this. Number one, the President does have the constitutionally defined duty to fight wars, to direct the militia, particularly in a time of war, and I think that we are getting into a position where we have a lot of folks on Capitol Hill, perhaps as high as 535 of us, who think we can run the war more than the Commander in Chief.

I think we have to recognize that constitutionally the President has to do that. I think the President really has to veto this bill. It's as much for the preservation of the office as it is for his own personal views today.

I think, secondly, while the benchmarks themselves make sense, and there is a lot of bipartisan agreement on the benchmarks, there is also great division as to can these benchmarks be achieved by the dates outlined in the bill.

One of the things General Petraeus said to Congress last week is that the

new Government of Iraq, and keep in mind, this is the fourth election that they have had and the first permanent government, but one of the things they need, as much as anything, is our push. This bill serves to push them. But it also needs our assurance, our assurance that we will be with them through this process.

If you pointed out in 1870 would America be in a position to pass major civil rights legislation, we would not be at that point. The Government of Iraq might not be ready to bring in all the Baathists or to the level in which we would like to see it done by July or by October, and so I think that we have to give them a little more assurance that we're going to push you, but we're not going to pull the rug out from under you.

I think that we, on this committee, the defense committee, the Appropriations Committee, which historically is known for getting things done at the end of the day, often have friends say to me, as a Republican, but I often have the question asked to me, we know you're a Republican, and we know you can be partisan, but do you do things bipartisan?

I am always proud to say, you know, the number one committee that I serve on, which I also think is the number one committee in the House, is a very bipartisan committee. Now, we will debate things, gun control, abortion, things, always are putting riders, environmental stuff, on our bill. Yet we clash about it in committee time and time again on ideological, principle-based positions. Yet at the end of the day, we know that the bill has to be passed, because if you don't get the appropriations train to the station, the government shuts down.

I think at this point, the Appropriations Committee can go back to the drawing board and come up with something that is still based in principle that both sides can respect. But it does put the troops forward, as we do have strong bipartisan basis to want to do right now, but it would also take care of some of the politics of Iraq and the diplomacy. For that reason, I think we have to vote to sustain the veto.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON).

Mr. SKELTON. I thank my friend from Wisconsin.

Mr. Speaker, it really depends on where you put the spotlight. The spotlight has, unfortunately, been on some goals or a goal to redeploy troops, when truth in fact the spotlight of this legislation should have been and should be on the readiness of the troops of the United States. I am truly concerned about the readiness, let me tell you.

In the last 30 years, there have been 12 military contingencies in which the United States military has been involved. If this means anything in the future, sure as God made little green

apples, we are going to have conflicts or concern, we hope none, but in the future.

Readiness is a major part of it. The testimony is that a large, large percentage of our equipment, Active Duty, National Guard and Reserve for the Army, is in the Middle East. It's not here; it's not available for training. What is over there, of course, because of the sand, the conditions and the usage, is getting worn.

I truly worry about the training and the equipment for our Army and for our Marines in particular, because we don't know what the future holds. That is where the spotlight ought to be on this legislation, the positive aspects of it in preparing the readiness for tomorrow as well as for the readiness of today for the groups that are going over time after time, whether it be for 12 or for 15 months.

My hats off to those young people in uniform. It's our job to maintain them and take care of them. This bill would have done that.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I believe that both of us are coming very close to the end of our time.

Mr. OBEY. We are ready for our summary statement.

Mr. LEWIS of California. As we do that, why don't we just join together, as we approach our closing speaker, and express our appreciation, is that all right with you, to the staff of both sides?

Mr. OBEY. Absolutely.

Mr. LEWIS of California. A fabulous job has been done on this. I am very proud of the people over here. I know you feel the same, and presuming that you would like to have me yield, I would be happy to.

Mr. OBEY. I would simply say that I appreciate the work that the staff has done on both sides of the aisle, and the work that they will continue to do. It's going to be a long time before this issue is disposed of. I appreciate the fact that they worked, literally, night and day to bring us to this point.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I am very proud to yield 1 minute to the Republican leader of the House, JOHN BOEHNER of Ohio.

□ 1400

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues, the President was right to veto the bill that we have before us. And I believe that the House today will sustain the President's veto because the bill that we have before us that is purportedly there to pay for our efforts in Afghanistan and Iraq and other issues, in my opinion, ties the hands of our generals and our troops on the ground and almost mandates failure in Iraq.

I think it is time for us to work across the aisle to produce a clean bill that the President can sign into law to sustain our efforts in Afghanistan and in Iraq, and to make sure that at the end of the day we have victory.

The fundamental question that we are all dealing with in this Chamber

and elsewhere is, why is Iraq important? Why is winning in Iraq so important?

In my view, and in others, al Qaeda has made Iraq the central front in their war with us. Those aren't my words, those are their words. They started this war when they attacked us all through the 1990s and when they attacked us in New York City on 9/11.

And while we went to Iraq to take out Saddam Hussein and to help build a more stable, democratically-elected nation in that part of the world and bring more stability there, it has turned into much more than that.

According to the Memorial Institute for the Prevention of Terrorism, a non-profit organization funded by a grant from the Homeland Security Department, Iraq today is home to 77 different terrorist organizations. They have made this, they have made Iraq the central front in their war with us.

We all know that there is a growing movement around the world of radical Islamic terrorists that want to kill Americans and want to kill our allies. They are operating all over the world and they are attacking people all over the world. Just think about where they have been over the last several weeks, whether it was Bangladesh last night or elsewhere. They are continuing their efforts to try to gain control of the world, and part of that effort is aimed directly at us. Americans, freedom loving people, up against people who don't want freedom for people, that want to impose radical Islamic law on all of us. And so they have made Iraq the central front in their war with us.

And if we walk out of Iraq, if we don't give this plan a chance to succeed, we encourage the terrorists. We will encourage them. They will be able to recruit new people all over the world. They will have a safe haven in Iraq itself. We will destabilize the entire Middle East, including the very existence of Israel. And who doesn't believe that if we don't deal with the terrorists in Iraq, that we won't be dealing with them on the streets of America? That is why Iraq is important. And if we are not willing to stand up to the terrorists and defeat them in Iraq, when and where will we draw the line to protect the American people, our ultimate responsibility?

We have a serious responsibility, and there is no greater responsibility for those of us who serve in this Chamber, than to provide for the safety and security of our constituents and our people in our country.

So tell me, if we are not going to stand up to them in Iraq, if we are not going to take them on in Iraq and defeat them there, when and where will we do it?

And the fact is, is that our troops are doing a great job in Iraq under very difficult circumstances. They deserve the support of all the Members of this House.

And so I say to my colleagues, it is time for the games to stop, it is time

for the political points to be taken off the board, and it is time for us to sit down as Members on both sides of the aisle and give the President a clean bill that funds our troops in Iraq and Afghanistan, that furthers our effort to take on the terrorists and defeats them, and doesn't do it with some \$20 billion worth of excess spending that has nothing to do with this bill.

I urge my colleagues to sustain the President's veto.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman who just spoke said that withdrawing from Iraq will destabilize the Middle East. The President's policy has already destabilized the Middle East.

He says that this policy endorses failure. The fact is that the only endorsement of failure comes on the part of those who will vote to continue the President's existing policy, because the President's policy in Iraq has been a 4-year failure.

We need a change in direction. The only question about the President's policy is whether it will produce a disaster or whether it will produce a catastrophe, and I am afraid it will produce the latter.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA).

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, we will have appropriated in one year, \$1.2 trillion. This bill that we are voting on today is called the Iraq Accountability Act.

Now, it's fine to have loyalty to the President of the United States. All of us know how important loyalty is; all of us know how important it is to be loyal to our friends, but there comes a time when this independent Congress has to stand up to the President of the United States.

We will have appropriated \$95.5 billion. And if you vote against this bill, you're voting against that which is \$4 billion more. You're voting for loyalty to the President, but you're voting against \$4 billion more, \$95.5 billion for the amount for the Department of Defense programs.

If you vote for President Bush, you're voting against \$12.3 billion for military personnel pay and benefits, everything the President asked for. If you vote for loyalty to President Bush, you're voting against \$1.2 billion, mostly to cover housing allowances which were left out of the last bill. The total amount provided is \$13.5 billion. If you vote for President Bush and loyalty to President Bush, the conference committee has added \$1.15 billion to cover the full cost of housing allowances. The committee has also added \$2.3 billion to cover the full cost of 36,000 Army troops and 9,000 Marines. If you vote to be loyal to the President, you're voting against those troops.

When you talk about support the troops, I am talking about supporting the troops. Conferees recommend \$50.4 billion for military operations even

more than the President requested. We are adding \$2 billion to address training and equipment shortfall.

The chairman of the Armed Services Committee talked about readiness. Right now, we have a tremendous shortfall of equipment. We have no strategic Active Duty Reserve in this country. And we put extra money, we put \$2 billion in to start to replenish the strategic reserve.

This conference proposes to fully fund the President's request to train and equip Iraqi and Afghanistan troops. If you vote against this bill, if you vote for the President and to be loyal to the President, you're voting not to include \$25.6 billion in equipment purchases, \$800 million above the President's request.

If you vote against this bill, you're voting not to allocate \$3 billion to purchase the mine resistant, new vehicle with the V-shape which resists the IED, one of the most important pieces of equipment that we will send to Iraq. We put \$400 million for Abrams vehicles, Abrams tank, and we put \$768 million for the Strykers.

Now, let me talk about defense health. Today, the Subcommittee on Defense just had a hearing on defense health. Every single year, Dr. Chu, the Defense Department shorts the health care system of \$2 billion. Every year, the Congress has to make it up.

We have extra money, we have \$3.3 billion for the defense health care programs; \$2.1 billion above the budget request. If you vote against this bill, you're voting against those requests. \$450 million for traumatic stress brain disorders; \$450 million for traumatic brain injuries and post traumatic stress; \$661 million to cover funding shortfalls created by the Congress in having disapproved the Department's proposed increase in health insurance premiums; fees for military beneficiaries; \$62 million for amputee care; \$12 million for caregivers. This is an important point. For caregivers. We heard from the Department of Health, from the Defense Department about the problem caregivers have.

All of us go to the hospitals as often as we can. I get post traumatic stress seeing these young wounded people. I am inspired by them. I see the families when I went to Fort Bragg and Fort Stewart and Fort Hood. I admire them. I admire their discipline, I admire their courage. I admire their patriotism. But let me tell you something: They're burned out. They're hurting.

If you vote against this bill, you're voting not to give them the money that they need. If you vote against this, you're voting against the provision that says no permanent bases in Iraq. If you vote against this, you're voting against 15 percent that comes out of Defense for the contractors. We have 125,000 contractors in Iraq and there has been no oversight, and we had 2 months before we could even find out about the contractors.

One of the provisions we put in this bill was a provision that said you can't deploy troops unless they are trained and equipped. You can't deploy troops unless they've had at least a year at home. Now, more and more I am seeing, they are saying that's the most important provision in this bill. They need a year at home to recuperate from their deployment; they need a year at home to retrain and to get ready to make another deployment. The Secretary of Defense made that decision, and we appreciate him making that decision. But at the same time, because of the policy of the White House, he had to make the decision, in order to sustain this deployment he had to make the decision to extend them to 15 months. I hear rumors that he is going to extend them for 18 months.

The troops that I talked to, the troops that I talked to just recently, were very frank with me. I said, "Look, we want to help in any way we can. Tell us what the problems are." And they went through the myriad of problems they have with these deployments.

These are individuals. These are individual people. They've got families. They have loved ones. One first sergeant said to me, "I hate to tell my kids I have to go overseas again. I hate to tell the kids." One woman in Iraq, and this is in an article in The Washington Post, she sighed and she says, "This war is a war between the Iraqis," she said. Another soldier said, "We're just interfering and letting our soldiers die."

I have to say that when you say there is some success in Iraq, we had four of the deadliest months in the history of this 4-year war in Iraq. We had more people killed in the last 4 months than any other period of time during this war. We have had 330 killed since the surge started. And these are individuals. These are not numbers, these are individuals.

We have less electricity than we had before the war started, less oil production than we had before the war started, less potable water, higher unemployment.

We have a provision in this bill that says the Iraqis have to take over this fight themselves. The Iraqis just maybe killed one of the highest leaders. That's what we want. We want to give them the incentive to take over the security themselves.

And let me say what's important on this floor of the United States Congress and what's important to the President of the United States: It is the national security of the United States. That's what's important. It is important that Iraq take over their national security, but our own need concerns me. Our strategic reserve is depleted completely, our troops are burned out, and we need to find a way to do a diplomatic effort, to put an all-out surge in diplomatic efforts in order to bring our troops home as soon as practicable.

So I urge the Members to override this veto, and start to bring our troops home as soon as practical.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, today there are two distinct messages coming out of Washington. The first message is from a majority of the Congress and underscores impatience with the lack of political progress in Iraq. We call for a new direction, including enforceable benchmarks for the performance of the Iraqi government. The other message is from the White House. The message the President is sending is that America's military commitment in Iraq remains open-ended, no matter what.

The President keeps saying that we're making progress in Iraq. This claim cannot be reconciled with the facts. Nearly everyone agrees that there is no military solution possible in Iraq; rather, the Iraqis must make the political compromises necessary to end the violence.

But where is the progress on the benchmarks that the President himself has endorsed? Where is the agreement to fairly share Iraq's oil wealth among all of Iraq's people? Where is the law reversing the disastrous de-Baathification policy? Where are the promised new election laws? Where is the progress on amending the Iraqi constitution to address longstanding Sunni concerns? The Iraqi government has repeatedly promised action on all of these, but there is little forward movement after many months.

Benchmarks are only real if there are consequences for failure to meet them. Back in January, the President said, and I quote, "if the Iraqi government does not follow through on its promises, it will lose the support of the American people—and it will lose the support of the Iraqi people." But by vetoing the Iraq Accountability Act, the President has made it clear that failure to follow through on the benchmarks will not result in the loss of the White House's support for this open-ended war.

From the beginning, the Bush Administration has been wrong so many times about nearly every aspect of the war in Iraq. Now the President comes to Congress again to ask for yet another blank check. We should not give him one. I urge the House to override the President's veto.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of overriding the President's misguided veto of H.R. 1591, U.S. Troop Readiness, Veterans' Health and Iraq Accountability Act. We need a new direction in Iraq.

This legislation contains every penny the President has requested for our troops in Iraq and adds \$4 billion more. The bill includes additional funding for military health care and military housing and provides \$1.8 billion not requested by the President to begin meeting the unmet health care needs of veterans returning from Iraq and Afghanistan.

As the Representative for Fort Bragg, I strongly support our troops, their families and their communities. Our superb military men and women have done everything that has been asked of them and done it well. America's military victory in Iraq was achieved when Saddam Hussein's regime was toppled. But the Administration went to war without a plan to win the peace, and our military victory has been bogged down in a mindless occupation led by bitterly stubborn politicians here at home.

Just last month, Vice President CHENEY insisted that Saddam Hussein had been allied

with Osama bin Laden's terrorist network despite all evidence to the contrary. Last night, the President vetoed this legislation in favor of his failed strategy of stay the course. The leadership of this Administration continues to be in a state of denial, and Congress must assert its rightful role in our nation's policy-making. I will vote to override this veto for a new direction in Iraq, and I urge my colleagues to join me in doing so.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, as a proud member of the Progressive and the Out of Iraq Caucuses, I rise to announce that I will proudly cast my vote to override the President's veto of H.R. 1591, the "U.S. Troop Readiness, Veterans' Health and Iraq Accountability Act." By vetoing the bipartisan Iraq Accountability Act last night, the President vetoed the will of the American people. The President vetoed a responsible funding bill for the troops that would have provided more funding for our troops and military readiness than even the President requested.

By vetoing the Iraq Accountability Act, the President rejected a bill that reflects the will of the American people to wind down this war. By vetoing the Iraq Accountability Act, the President turned a deaf ear to the loud message sent by the American people last November.

I will vote to override the President's veto because the Iraq Accountability Act offers us the first real chance to end the misguided invasion, war, and occupation of Iraq. It puts us on the glide path to the day when our troops come home in honor and triumph and where we can care for him who has borne the battle, and for his widow and orphan. This legislation helps to repair the damage to America's international reputation and prestige. It brings long overdue oversight, accountability, and transparency to defense and reconstruction contracting and procurement. Finally, it places the responsibility for bringing peace and security where it clearly belongs and that is squarely on the shoulders of the Iraqi government.

Mr. Speaker, in vetoing the legislation, the President claimed the Iraq Accountability Act, H.R. 1591 would undermine our troops and threaten the safety of the American people here at home. Coming from an Administration

that has been wrong on every important question relating to the decision to launch the Iraq War as well the conduct of it, this claim is laughable. It is nearly as ridiculous as the President's often stated claim of "progress" in Iraq. The facts, of course, are otherwise. The U.S. death toll in Iraq reached 104 for April—making it the deadliest month of the year and one of the deadliest of the entire war. It is therefore little wonder that nearly 70 percent of Americans disapprove of the way the President is handling the war. But more important, the President's claim that the Iraq Accountability Act undermines our troops and threatens the safety of the American people here at home is simply not true.

Republican Senator CHUCK HAGEL recently returned from Iraq and paints a bleak picture: This thing is coming undone quickly, and [Prime Minister] Maliki's government is weaker by the day. The police are corrupt top to bottom. The oil problem is a huge problem. They still can't get anything through the parliament—no hydrocarbon law, no de-Baathification law, no provincial elections.

Mr. Speaker, many of the Nation's most highly respected generals and several leading

Republicans have endorsed H.R. 1591; all of them oppose the President's plan to escalate the war in Iraq. Take, for example, Maj. Gen. John Batiste, U.S. Army (Ret.):

This important legislation sets a new direction for Iraq. It acknowledges that America went to war without mobilizing the nation, that our strategy in Iraq has been tragically flawed since the invasion in March 2003, that our Army and Marine Corps are at the breaking point with little to show for it, and that our military alone will never establish representative government in Iraq. The administration got it terribly wrong and I applaud our Congress for stepping up to their constitutional responsibilities.

Maj. Gen. Paul Eaton, USA, Ret. supports this legislation because it "gives General Petraeus great leverage for moving the Iraqi government down the more disciplined path laid out by the Iraq Study Group." According to Major Eaton, the real audience for the timeline language is Prime Minister al-Maliki and the elected government of Iraq:

The argument that this bill aides the enemy is simply not mature—nobody on the earth underestimates the United States' capacity for unpredictability. It may further create some sense of urgency in the rest of our government, beginning with the State Department.

Lt. Gen. William E. Odom, U.S. Army (Ret.), President Reagan's Director of the National Security Agency, supports the bill because it gives the President a chance to pull back from a disastrous course, re-orient U.S. strategy to achieve regional stability, and win help from many other countries—the only way peace will eventually be achieved.

Mr. Speaker, to date, the war in Iraq has lasted longer than America's involvement in World War II, the greatest conflict in all of human history. But there is a difference. The Second World War ended in complete and total victory for the United States and its allies. But then again, in that conflict America was led by FDR, a great Commander-in-Chief, who had a plan to win the war and secure the peace, listened to his generals, and sent troops in sufficient numbers and sufficiently trained and equipped to do the job.

As a result of the colossal miscalculation in deciding to invade Iraq, the loss of public trust resulting from the misrepresentation of the reasons for launching that invasion, and the breathtaking incompetence in mismanaging the occupation of Iraq, the Armed Forces and the people of the United States have suffered incalculable damage.

The war in Iraq has claimed the lives of 3,316 brave service men and women—64 in the first 16 days of this month. More than 24,912 Americans have been wounded, many suffering the most horrific injuries. American taxpayers have paid nearly \$400 billion to sustain this misadventure.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to hold the Bush Administration and the Iraqi government accountable. This bill's timetable and benchmarks finally hold the Iraqis accountable. As retired Maj. Gen. Paul Eaton has stated, This bill gives General Petraeus great leverage for moving the Iraqi government down the more disciplined path laid out by the Iraq Study Group. The real audience for the timeline language is Prime Minister al-Maliki and the elected government of Iraq.

Even Defense Secretary Robert Gates has noted that the timetable is helpful—and sends

the message that "the clock is ticking." Gates said "The strong feelings expressed in the Congress about the timetable probably have had a positive impact. . . . in terms of communicating to the Iraqis that this is not an open-ended commitment."

Mr. Speaker, in overriding the President's veto, this House will be doing the business and expressing the will of the American people. In the latest CBS News/New York Times poll, 64 percent of Americans favor a timetable that provides for the withdrawal of U.S. troops from Iraq in 2008. In the same poll, 57 percent of Americans believe that Congress, not the President, should have the last say when it comes to setting troop levels in Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, in overriding the President's veto, Congress is fulfilling its constitutional responsibilities and exercising the first check on the President's power in 6 years. As Iraq Study Group Co-Chairman Lee Hamilton has pointed out, The Founders of our Nation never envisioned an unfettered president making unilateral decisions about American lives and military power. They did indeed make the president the commander in chief, but they gave to Congress the responsibility for declaring war, for making rules governing our land and naval forces, for overseeing policy, and of course the ability to fund war or to cease funding it.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all members to join me in overriding the President's veto of Iraq Accountability Act, H.R. 1591. This is the best way to ensure accountability to our soldiers who have been sent into battle without proper training or equipment or a clear mission. It is the best way to keep faith with our veterans who are not getting the best medical care when they come home. Overriding the President's veto is essential to restoring our military that is being stretched to the limits by the Bush policy. Last, it is absolutely necessary to regain the confidence of the American people who demand a new direction in Iraq.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, the President is making a terrible and costly mistake by vetoing the war funding bill and rejecting the clear desire of Congress and the country for a swift redeployment of U.S. ground forces from Iraq.

The veto and the insistence on staying the course is not a mistake simply because it ignores public opinion; we wouldn't want a Commander-in-Chief to be simply a weather vane.

And it is not a mistake just because our courageous troops and military families are exhausted from bearing the full weight of sacrifice themselves. We know they are prepared to pay any price for American security, which is why we owe them such a debt of gratitude.

No, the President's veto is a grave mistake because refusing to change course in Iraq is compromising U.S. security.

Administration rhetoric notwithstanding, policing the civil war in Iraq does not bring us closer to defeating the global network of extremists who wish to harm us. To the contrary, in order to improve national security and best address our other strategic interests around the world and here at home, we must dramatically change our current direction in Iraq.

Our men and women in uniform have always served our country courageously and performed brilliantly. But asking them to stand between warring factions is not only unfair, it is counterproductive.

Redeployment from Iraq will enhance our security by allowing us to properly address

other potential challenges around the world from Afghanistan, North Korea, and Iran to Latin America, the Horn of Africa, and the greater Middle East. In particular, it will allow us to put our attention back on Afghanistan and the fight against a resurgent al Qaeda and Taliban, the enemies who actually did engineer 9/11.

Bringing troops home also allows us to resolve the concerns about the readiness of our Armed Forces, which have been strained to the breaking point because of this Administration's careless management of the war in Iraq.

Only by extricating ourselves from the mess of Iraq can we begin moving our country back to a common-sense policy of strength through leadership. Every day our military is in Iraq our standing in the international community erodes further.

Already we've seen respect for the United States plunge from record highs after 9/11 to record lows now. This loss of moral authority compromises our ability to lead multinational efforts to fight national security threats from terrorism and nuclear proliferation to global warming and drug trafficking.

Our continuing military involvement in Iraq carries these steep costs with little prospect of benefit. Only the Iraqis can bring about the needed reconciliation in their country. Their political leaders must take the difficult political steps needed to cease the violence in their country, by building coalitions among competing sects, ensuring minority rights, balancing power between provincial and central governments, and sharing oil revenues among all regions in Iraq. We simply cannot do this work for them.

By setting a deliberate timetable for redeployment, we force the Iraqi political leaders to acknowledge and accept that they are the ones who must take steps to bring about an end of the sectarian violence.

Bad things may happen when our Armed Forces leave Iraq if the Iraqis cannot or will not choose reconciliation over conflict. But that will be true if we leave at the end of this year, the end of next year, or in 2015. Delaying redeployment simply delays the Iraqis' moment of responsibility.

Our strong leaders of the last century, like Presidents Roosevelt, Truman, Kennedy, and Reagan, recognized that while American military might was important, American values were our greatest strength.

Just as we rallied the world in the Second World War and defeated the Soviets in the Cold War on the strength of our Nation's democratic ideals, ultimate victory against this generation of enemies will similarly be won in the minds of millions around the world, not on the battlefield in Iraq or anywhere else. Indeed, that long-term victory is impossible while we are in the middle of Iraq's civil war.

There is no easy solution to the problems in Iraq, but it would be irresponsible to push a difficult decision off to another day, another Congress, or another President. We must stand firm and hold the Iraqi leaders responsible for their country. It is time for the United States to turn its attention to its broader global security and redeploy from Iraq.

Mr. HALL of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my disappointment with President Bush's veto of the Iraq Accountability Act. Sadly, this is just the latest example of the President's unwillingness to change his mistaken policy towards Iraq. After more

than 4 years of the President's stay-the-course strategy in Iraq, we must provide a responsible plan to redeploy our troops and require the Iraqi government to meet basic benchmarks for stability. This bill presented that plan and the President should have signed it into law.

Last month, 4 years after the President declared "Mission Accomplished," was the deadliest month for American troops in Iraq this year. For too long, the Republican-led Congress failed to exercise its Constitutional responsibility to hold the Bush Administration accountable—with disastrous results for the American people. No longer.

I have opposed the war in Iraq since its start, and today with my vote to override the veto I was proud to vote once again to take our policy in Iraq in a new direction. More than 4 years after the President declared the end of major combat in Iraq, we suffered over 100 U.S. military casualties in April alone. We must provide a responsible plan to redeploy our troops and require the Iraqi government to meet basic benchmarks for stability.

Our country faces serious threats. There are dangerous people in this world that seek nothing more than to kill as many Americans as possible. The number of people who died from my district on September 11th make me acutely aware of this dire threat. I was proud to vote for a bill that allows us to refocus our military on that threat. That would allow us to seek out, capture, or kill those who were responsible for September 11th or who currently plot to kill Americans rather than police a civil war in Iraq.

I'm disappointed that the President chose to ignore the American people and veto the Iraq Accountability Act. He should have signed this bill, in order to get these needed resources to our troops and our veterans, hold the Iraqi government accountable, change course in Iraq and refocus on destroying Al Qaeda.

As we move forward, the President must realize that this Congress is not going to give the President a blank check with which to ignore the will of the American people on Iraq. Four years of a flawed strategy are 4 years too long.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time has expired.

Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is, Will the House, on reconsideration, pass the bill, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding?

Under the Constitution, this vote must be by the yeas and nays.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 222, nays 203, answered "present" 1, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 276]		
YEAS—222		
Abercrombie	Berkley	Braley (IA)
Ackerman	Berman	Brown, Corrine
Allen	Berry	Butterfield
Altmine	Bishop (GA)	Capps
Andrews	Bishop (NY)	Capuano
Arcuri	Blumenauer	Cardoza
Baca	Boswell	Carnahan
Baird	Boucher	Carney
Baldwin	Boyd (FL)	Carson
Bean	Boyd (KS)	Castor
Becerra	Brady (PA)	Chandler

Clarke	Jefferson	Rahall	Johnson, Sam	Miller, Gary	Schmidt
Clay	Johnson (GA)	Rangel	Jordan	Moran (KS)	Sensenbrenner
Cleaver	Johnson, E. B.	Reyes	Keller	Murphy, Tim	Sessions
Clyburn	Jones (NC)	Rodriguez	King (IA)	Musgrave	Shadegg
Cohen	Jones (OH)	Ross	King (NY)	Myrick	Shays
Conyers	Kagen	Rothman	Kingston	Neugebauer	Shimkus
Cooper	Kanjorski	Royal-Allard	Kirk	Nunes	Shuster
Costa	Kaptur	Ruppersberger	Kline (MN)	Paul	Simpson
Costello	Kennedy	Rush	Knollenberg	Pearce	Smith (NE)
Courtney	Kildee	Ryan (OH)	Kuhl (NY)	Pence	Smith (NJ)
Cramer	Kilpatrick	Salazar	LaHood	Peterson (PA)	Smith (TX)
Crowley	Kind	Lamborn	Linder	Porter	Taylor
Cuellar	Klein (FL)	Sánchez, Linda	LoBiondo	Price (GA)	Terry
Cummings	Langevin	T.	Lucas	Pryce (OH)	Thornberry
Davis (AL)	Lantos	Sanchez, Loretta	Lungren, Daniel	Putnam	Tiahrt
Davis (CA)	Larsen (WA)	Sarbanes	E.	Radanovich	Tiberi
Davis (IL)	Larson (CT)	Schakowsky	Mack	Ramstad	Turner
DeFazio	Lee	Schiff	Manzullo	Regula	Upton
DeGette	Levin	Schwartz	Marchant	Rehberg	Walberg
Delahunt	Lewis (GA)	Scott (GA)	Marshall	Reichert	Walden (OR)
DeLauro	Lipinski	Scott (VA)	Matheson	Renzi	Walsh (NY)
Dicks	Loebbecke	Serrano	McCarthy (CA)	Reynolds	Wamp
Dingell	Lofgren, Zoe	Sestak	McCaull (TX)	Rogers (AL)	Weldon (FL)
Doggett	Lowey	Shea-Porter	McCotter	Rogers (KY)	Weller
Donnelly	Lynch	Sherman	McCrary	Rogers (MI)	Whitfield
Doyle	Mahoney (FL)	Shuler	McHenry	Rohrabacher	Wicker
Edwards	Maloney (NY)	Sires	McHugh	Ros-Lehtinen	Wilson (NM)
Ellison	Markey	Skelton	McKeon	Roskam	Wilson (NY)
Ellsworth	Matsui	Slaughter	McNulty	Royce	Wilson (SC)
Emanuel	McCarthy (NY)	Smith (WA)	Mica	Ryan (WI)	Wolf
Eshoo	McCollum (MN)	Snyder	Miller (FL)	Sali	Young (AK)
Etheridge	McDermott	Solis	Miller (MI)	Saxton	Young (FL)
Farr	McGovern	Space			
Fattah	McIntyre	Spratt			
Filner	McNerney	Stark			
Frank (MA)	Meehan	Stupak			
Giffords	Meek (FL)	Sutton			
Gilchrest	Meeks (NY)	Tanner			
Gonzalez	Melancon	Tauscher			
Gordon	Michaud	Thompson (CA)			
Green, Al	Miller (NC)	Thompson (MS)			
Green, Gene	Miller, George	Mitchell			
Grijalva		Tierney			
Gutierrez	Mollohan	Towns			
Hall (NY)	Moore (KS)	Udall (CO)			
Hare	Moore (WI)	Udall (NM)			
Harman	Moran (VA)	Van Hollen			
Hastings (FL)	Murphy (CT)	Velázquez			
Herseth Sandlin	Murphy, Patrick	Visclosky			
Higgins	Murtha	Walz (MN)			
Hill	Nadler	Wasserman			
Hinchey	Napolitano	Schultz			
Hinojosa	Neal (MA)	Waterson			
Hirono	Oberstar	Watson			
Hodes	Obey	Watt			
Holden	Olver	Waxman			
Holt	Pallone	Weiner			
Honda	Pascarella	Welch (VT)			
Hooley	Pastor	Wexler			
Hoyer	Payne	Wilson (OH)			
Inslee	Pelosi	Woolsey			
Israel	Perlmutter	Wu			
Jackson (IL)	Peterson (MN)	Yarmuth			
Jackson-Lee (TX)	Pomeroy				
	Price (NC)				

NAYS—203

Aderholt	Campbell (CA)	Flake			
Akin	Cannon	Forbes			
Alexander	Cantor	Fortenberry			
Bachmann	Capito	Fossella			
Bachus	Carter	Foxx			
Baker	Castle	Franks (AZ)			
Barrett (SC)	Chabot	Frelinghuysen			
Barrow	Coble	Galllegly			
Bartlett (MD)	Cole (OK)	Garrett (NJ)			
Barton (TX)	Conaway	Gerlach			
Bigert	Crenshaw	Gillmor			
Bilbray	Cubin	Gingrey			
Bilirakis	Culberson	Gohmert			
Bishop (UT)	Davis (KY)	Goode			
Blackburn	Davis, David	Goodlatte			
Blunt	Davis, Lincoln	Granger			
Boehner	Davis, Tom	Graves			
Bonner	Deal (GA)	Hall (TX)			
Bono	Dent	Hastert			
Boozman	Diaz-Balart, L.	Hastings (WA)			
Boren	Diaz-Balart, M.	Hayes			
Boustany	Doolittle	Heller			
Brady (TX)	Drake	Hensarling			
Brown (SC)	Dreier	Herger			
Brown-Waite, Ginny	Duncan	Hobson			
Buchanan	Ehlers	Hoekstra			
Burgess	Emerson	Hulshof			
Burton (IN)	English (PA)	Hunter			
Buyer	Everett	Inglis (SC)			
Calvert	Fallin	Issa			
Camp (MI)	Feeley	Jindal			
	Ferguson	Johnson (IL)			

Johnson, Sam	Miller, Gary	Schmidt
Rangel	Jordan	Sensenbrenner
Reyes	Keller	Sessions
Jones (NC)	King (IA)	Shadegg
Cohen	Ross	Shays
Conyers	King (NY)	Shimkus
Cooper	Kingston	Shuster
Costa	Kirk	Simpson
Costello	Kline (MN)	Smith (NE)
Courtney	Knollenberg	Smith (NJ)
Cramer	Kuhl (NY)	Tancredo
Crowley	LaHood	Smith (TX)
Cuellar	Lamborn	Taylor
Cummings	Sánchez, Linda	Terry
Davis (AL)	T.	Pryce (OH)
Davis (CA)	LaTourette	Thornberry
Davis (IL)	Leahy	Tiahrt
DeFazio	Lewis (CA)	Tiberi
DeGette	Platts	Turner
Delahunt	Poe	Upton
DeLauro	Porter	Walberg
Dicks	Price (GA)	Walberg
Dingell	LoBiondo	Walberg
Doggett	Lucas	Walberg
Donnelly	Latham	Walberg
Doyle	Pryce (OH)	Walberg
Edwards	Lungren, Daniel	Walberg
Ellison	E.	Walberg
Ellsworth	Putnam	Walberg
Emanuel	Radanovich	Walberg
Eshoo	Reynolds	Walberg
Etheridge	Rogers (AL)	Walberg
Farr	Rogers (KY)	Walberg
Fattah	Rogers (MI)	Walberg
Filner	Rohrabacher	Walberg
Frank (MA)	Ros-Lehtinen	Walberg
Giffords	Roskam	Walberg
Gilchrest	Royce	Walberg
Gonzalez	Ryan (WI)	Walberg
Gordon	Sali	Walberg
Green, Al	Saxton	Walberg
Green, Gene		Walberg
Grijalva		Walberg
Gutierrez		Walberg
Hall (NY)		Walberg
Hare		Walberg
Harman		Walberg
Hastings (FL)		Walberg
Herseth Sandlin		Walberg
Higgins		Walberg
Hill		Walberg
Hinchey		Walberg
Hinojosa		Walberg
Hirono		Walberg
Hodes		Walberg
Holden		Walberg
Holt		Walberg
Honda		Walberg
Hooley		Walberg
Hoyer		Walberg
Inslee		Walberg
Israel		Walberg
Jackson (IL)		Walberg
Jackson-Lee (TX)		Walberg

ANSWERED “PRESENT”—1

□ 1437

NOT VOTING—7

Davis, Jo Ann	Lampson	Ortiz
Engel	McMorris	Westmoreland
Gillibrand	Rodgers	

Mr. CULBERSON changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”
 Mr. CUELLAR changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So, two-thirds not having voted in favor thereof, the veto of the President was sustained and the bill was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Speaker, due to being unavoidably delayed, I missed a vote on H.R. 1591, U.S. Troop Readiness, Veterans’ Care, Katrina Recovery, and Iraq Accountability Appropriations Act, 2007—Passage, Objections of the President Not Withstanding (rollcall No. 276). I would have voted “nay” had I been present to record my vote.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The message and the bill are referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

The Clerk will notify the Senate of the action of the House.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to submit their remarks on H.R. 1429, to be taken up next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

IMPROVING HEAD START ACT OF 2007

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 348 and rule

XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 1429.

□ 1439

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1429) to reauthorize the Head Start Act, to improve program quality, to expand access, and for other purposes, with Mr. SCHIFF in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

The gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) and the gentleman from California (Mr. McKEON) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER).

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman and Members of the House, today we take up the Head Start Improvement Act of 2007. This is a bipartisan piece of legislation, as it was last year when it was brought to the House floor. And in that vein, I certainly want to begin by thanking Mr. Lloyd Horwich, who is working for Mr. KILDEE; Stephanie Milburn, with Mr. McKEON; Sarah Rittling, working with Mr. CASTLE, and Molly Carter and Ruth Friedman of the majority staff. This staff knows this program backwards and forwards. They have worked long and hard with the Head Start community, with the States, with Governors, with local communities, to make sure that, in fact, we have a program that we can be proud of, that we can continue to place our faith in, and does what we want, which is to give children from impoverished families and communities the opportunity to have a head start and to come to kindergarten school ready, if you will, with the skills necessary to take advantage of the opportunity that will be presented to them when they start school.

Head Start has been the premiere early education program in this country for more than 40 years. It has served more than 20 million children and families in that time. It is a highly successful research-based, comprehensive childhood development and early education program for low-income children from birth to 5 and for their families.

Both Head Start and Early Head Start help our country’s most disadvantaged children become better prepared to succeed in school and in life by addressing the needs of the whole child and providing services such as