Mr. Speaker, 94 days ago, the President of the United

States sent to the Congress an emergency supplemental spending request

to fund our activities in Afghanistan and Iraq. He asked for, in round

numbers, $100 billion, which has now turned into some $20 to $23

billion more than that. But we have been through that fight. The

President vetoed the bill, made it clear what he would sign and what he

would not sign.

I was at the White House last week after the bill had been vetoed by

the President, and there was an agreement in the room, bipartisan,

bicameral agreement in the room that we would sit down together and try

to resolve the differences that we have over funding our effort to take

on al Qaeda and other terrorists in Iraq and in Afghanistan.

What we have seen over the last 10 days or so have been token

meetings. There has been no honest attempt to work together, as we all

committed to. There have been no meetings where we can actually sit

down and discuss our differences and try to bring some resolution to

those differences.

So when I heard earlier this week about this plan that was going to

be brought to the floor today, I thought to myself, why? Why do we have

to play more political games? The President of the United States has

made it clear that he will veto this bill. The Senate leaders, Democrat

and Republican, have made it clear that this plan has no chance in the

other Chamber, but yet here we are playing political games while our

troops are fighting for our freedom and our safety in Iraq.

Now, I am not going to go through all the reasons why Iraq is

important; I have been through them before. I think every Member of

this Chamber understands that Iraq is important to the safety and

security of the United States. But I want to remind all of my

colleagues that all of our Members in this Chamber, except one, all of

our Members in this Chamber, Democrat and Republican, except one, voted

to send our troops to Iraq. There they

have been locked in a battle for the safety and security of Americans,

helping to try to build democracy to bring more stability to the Middle

East. And here we are tonight divided, once again, about whether we

should support our troops that are out there fighting for our safety.

Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, our soldiers are doing their duty in

Iraq and Afghanistan and around the world, a duty that we have sent

them on. And yet we sit here playing political games. That is not what

the American people sent us here to do. Now they asked us to come here,

Democrats and Republicans, to work through our differences and to make

sure that we are helping our troops. And I think every Member here

understands that we have to support our troops. And I think every

Member here knows that, at the end of the day, we are going to pass a

clean supplemental that doesn't have all this excess spending riding on

the backs of our soldiers, that will in fact fund the activities in

Iraq. The question I ask tonight is, how long are the games going to go

on?

Ninety-four days we have been at this; 94 days since the President

asked for this money and we are still playing games. That is not what

the American people expect of us. They understand that Iraq is

important. They understand that their safety and security is dependent

upon what happens there because the consequences of failure in Iraq,

which this bill will bring about, are too ominous to think about.

This bill is designed to bring failure to Iraq. Failure in Iraq means

chaos in Iraq. It means genocide in Iraq, and it means we are

jeopardizing the safety and security of the American people. It is not

what the American people want. We should reject this bill.