H.R. 6102. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 200 Lawyers Road, NW in Vienna, Virginia, as the ''Captain Christopher P. Petty and Major William F. Hecker, III Post Office Building''.

H.R. 6151. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 216 Oak Street in Farmington, Minnesota, as the ''Hamilton H. Judson Post Office''.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed with an amendment a bill of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

H.R. 864. An act to provide for programs and activities with respect to the prevention of underage drinking.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed a bill of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 4050. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 103 East Thompson Street in Thomaston, Georgia, as the ''Sergeant First Class Robert Lee 'Bobby' Hollar, Jr. Post Office Building''.

IRAQ

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, I come to the well of the House today to address America's predicament in Iraq and I do so with the thoughts of my neighbor's son who tonight is serving in Baghdad as many of our proud men and women, sons and daughters, husbands and wives are serving. I am going to have his future in mind during my comments today. I know my colleagues, both Republicans and Democrats, share these views. They have their own kin and neighbors.

My neighbor was one who is the young man I watched growing up playing peewee football in Bainbridge Island, Washington. He was called to service in Iraq. He went. He served proudly for a year. He was ready to return. He was literally on the plane to return when he was called back to go back into Baghdad in the President's effort to send more troops into Baghdad. He has suffered two IED explosions, just about lost his ear in one of them. He is now in continual firefights in Baghdad. And I think of his 1-year-old son who is being raised by his grandparents since the mother is also serving in the United States Army in Iraq at this time. Their lives are in my mind, and Iraq is not an abstraction nor a partisan issue, it is a very personal one for many of us. And those are what my thoughts will be and I would like them to infuse some of my comments tonight.

The reason I have come, of course, is we have had this Iraq Study Group report. It is an amazing document. I hope people who are interested in Iraq will take some time to look at it. It is both accurate in some places and woefully short in others, and I would like to address both places where it is stunningly accurate and amazingly candid and refreshingly real and the places where it falls short in what we really have to do to accomplish our true national interests in Iraq.

Before I do that, though, I think it is appropriate in talking about Iraq and our obligation to our soldiers there, like my neighbor's son, just for a moment to ask how we got in this current predicament in Iraq. We went into Iraq with two goals: One goal was to remove Saddam Hussein, a brutal dictator, from power, to give the Iraqi people the chance to restore some dignity and freedom to their country. That mission was accomplished through the incredible, efficient and courageous act of our military men and women in fairly short order. It was accomplished. It has been now accomplished for over 3 years. That is mission accomplished, truly.

The second reason we went into Iraq was to make sure that there were no weapons of mass destruction in Iraq. Despite scouring Iraq with a fine-toothed comb and literally billions of dollars trying to find any scent, any hint, any fingerprint, any dust of WMDs, that has been eliminated as a threat because it did not exist in the first place. Our two national missions in Iraq have been complete now for some time.

We have had a third national mission in Iraq that comes not out of our self-interest as a Nation but out of our obligation as a fair country to lead the world in caring for our neighbors, and that is to give the Iraqis a fair opportunity to form a government and take control of their own destiny. We now have been at that mission for longer than we were fighting World War II. That mission is accomplished. We have given the Iraqi people every opportunity to form a meaningful government in Iraq at this time. Yet our sons and daughters are still there tonight with the administration still tonight committed to staying as long as the Iraqis decide we are going to stay.

The President has said that our people are going to stay there indefinitely unless conditions that are under control of the Iraqis will allow him to bring them home. I am here tonight to say we should not allow the Iraqis to control when our sons and daughters come home. That should be a decision of the United States of America. That position finds substantial support in the report I will allude to as well as our common sense as Americans.

Now, first I want to say I am glad this report has been issued. Before the election, we heard a President who was bound and determined to stay the course. He was bound and determined to never take off rose-colored glasses. He was bound and determined to stay with his Secretary of Defense, despite the fact that every living human being who had looked at Iraq has seen nothing but a continued evidence of failure of leadership in the civilian ranks in the Secretary of Defense. He was bound and determined to have his Vice President say that we were dealing with dead-enders and that this was just a matter of a short period of time to roll up the opposition in Iraq. Every single one of those statements by the President of the United States was flat wrong.

Then we had Tuesday, November 7 came along and the American people gave a very strong verdict to the President's stay-the-course position. We hope that has been a sobering influence on the White House. Secondly, we had this Iraqi Study Group report come out. We hope that the combination of those two events will knock the White House off its pedestal into a position where it will work with the U.S. Congress to get our troops home. It remains to be seen whether or not those two events have that desired effect.

I would like to allude to this report now. There are things in this report that I think have not been in the news that I have reviewed, that I think it is important to realize in substantial detail, and the reason is that this report is the most categorical, clear, objective, bipartisan and well-reasoned rejection of President George Bush's assessment of the conditions in Iraq that you will find. It was bipartisan, as people know. It had people, I don't think any of whom had been against the Iraq war when it started, I don't believe, wiser heads who had been around policy for many years in this country, and unanimously they rejected the hallucinations of the White House that things were going okay in Iraq. And it is long overdue to have had a pronouncement from Washington, D.C. to that effect.

So, if I can, let me allude to what their conclusions have been. Number one, and I will quote:

''The situation in Iraq is grave and deteriorating. The government is not adequately advancing national reconciliation, providing basic security, or delivering essential services.''

Iraqis have no electricity, they have no functioning police, they have no employment, they have no means to run their army, they have no functioning control over their borders. They have no functioning government. This is a government in name only.

Number two: ''Iraqis have not been convinced that they must take responsibility for their own future. Iraq's neighbors and much of the international community have not been persuaded to play an active and constructive role.'' I want to just focus on that for a moment. Iraqis have not been convinced that they must take responsibility for their own future. Why is that? Why have the Iraqi politicians refused to make an agreement about disposition of oil? Why have they refused to make a disposition about employment practices in the Iraqi government? Why have they refused to make an agreement about how the ministries will be handled?

Well, there is one reason. President George Bush has told them that troops will stay indefinitely in Iraqi. They do not have a real-life incentive to form a true government in Iraq because we have given them a crutch to lean on forever, according to this President. We have got to change that message dramatically, immediately, and I think this report makes that clear.

Quoting: ''The United Nations estimates that 1.6 million Iraqis are displaced within Iraq, and up to 1.8 million Iraqis have fled the country.'' The Iraqis are voting with their feet.

''Iraqis may become so sobered by the prospect of an unfolding civil war and intervention by their regional neighbors that they take the steps necessary to avert catastrophe. But at the moment, such a scenario seems implausible because the Iraqi people and their leaders have been slow to demonstrate the capacity or will to act.''

We have not focused their intention on the necessity of reaching agreements to form a true national government in Iraq. We have given them a security blanket at the cost of over 2,800 lives, over 20,000 seriously injured Americans, over 400 billion American taxpayer dollars, and probably over $2 trillion in the long-term costs of this war with no end in sight, with no guarantee to the American people that this war is going to end, and with no requirement by the Iraqis that they act.

For some time I have been bothered by this. I have been bothered that the President has stood on the sidelines and allowed this situation to deteriorate, with rose-colored glasses on cruise control. I picked up the phone a few weeks ago to call one of the administration officials to talk to them about that. I said it was my perception that there is no Iraqi government essentially because there is no agreement about oil. The oil in Iraq is located under the Shiites' territory and the Kurds' territory. It is not located where most of the Sunnis live. And the Shiites to date have been insisting at least on the new oil fields remaining in the regional areas, meaning, bottom line, Shiites get the oil. Sunnis who have run the country for 75 years, if not more, are left out. Therefore, they have had continuing sectarian violence.

So I asked this official, is that assessment a fair assessment of this situation? And he said, yes. And it is interesting because his assessment is the same one as this report as we will talk to in depth.

I said, well, then, I hope to believe that the President has given an ultimatum, at least privately, to Mr. Maliki and all of the other Iraqi officials that we are leaving if they do not form an agreement about oil. And the answer stunned me. He said, no, we have not done that. We haven't put that pressure on the Iraqis. And I said, why not? He said, well, we don't think that's our place.

So while our sons and daughters are dying tonight, and my neighbor's son is in Baghdad when he should be home with his 1-year-old son, the White House doesn't think it is its place to put pressure on the Iraqis to reach an agreement about oil so that they can form a government and we can get our troops home. This is the most callously indifferent, negligent attitude of this administration and it is costing our country dearly and it is wrong. And this report on a bipartisan basis has said it is wrong. It has said very clearly that we need to make a statement.

It goes on to say, ''There is no action the American military can take that by itself can bring about success in Iraq.'' This requires a political resolution. Yet our President has not insisted on a political resolution. He has essentially told the politicians they can diddle, they can squabble, they can bicker, they can disagree, they can create these little deals where the Shiite radicals, al-Sadr gets three ministries and maybe the Sunnis get half a one, and the sectarian violence goes out of control and our kids get killed, with no threat whatsoever that we are bringing our troops home.

□ 2230

That is one of the reasons that we are in the pickle we are in. The report goes on to say, ''The United States must not make an open-ended commitment to keep large numbers of American troops deployed in Iraq.''

That is exactly what the President has done. He has made a commitment to keep these troops there indefinitely. As long as we have been in Japan or Germany, and apparently people still think that this is like World War II, when the Vice President and Mr. Wolfowitz and the whole group of them essentially said we would be welcomed like we were in the streets of Paris in World War II. They still have that image of what this is all about in Iraq.

As a result, our policy is failing, because they still are essentially saying, we are going to stay there for 50 years like we have in Europe, and that is a policy inconsistent with our national security goals.

Next statement, ''While it is clear that the presence of U.S. troops in Iraq is moderating the violence, there is little evidence that the long-term deployment of U.S. troops by itself has led or will lead to fundamental improvements in the security situation.''

Now, that is a profound statement. We believe, because we are truly the greatest Nation on Earth, and we are, we have done remarkable things. We have the most efficient, most capable, most dedicated military force the world has ever seen. We have the best soldiers, Air Force and sailors the world has ever seen. They are great people. I know I visited two of them in a military hospital in Landstuhl, Germany, two young men from Bremerton, Washington, on my return trip from Iraq about a year and a half ago.

These two young men had very, very serious leg injuries, and I went and saw them in their hospital beds and they had their legs propped up and tubes and pins and everything in their legs, and they had only been out of Iraq 2 or 3 days. I asked them how they were doing, and both of them said, sir, I just want to get back to my unit as fast as I can, sir.

That was a pretty impressive moment for me that these young men who had such bad injuries, the first thing they could say is they wanted to get back to their unit. Anyone who has dealt with the people, Americans serving in Iraq, you would be so proud of their service and what they are doing. We have incredible talent and dedication there. They have been amazingly dedicated through a very difficult 3 years, many of them serving on their second, third, fourth rotation throughout Iraq, without complaint. It is really pretty amazing.

So we have got the best people, we have got the best equipment, but we do not have the best policy, and a policy that essentially allows the Iraqi government to dawdle and not form an agreement is one doomed for failure. That is the policy of the President tonight unless something changes, and we are calling for strong changes in that regard. There is a real clear reality in Iraq. No deal on oil, no peace. No deal on petroleum, no way for us out, and we have got to insist on that, and that has not happened.

The report goes on to say, the composition of the Iraqi government is basically sectarian, and key players within the government too often act in their sectarian interest.

Now, we are all thrilled when there was voting going on in Iraq. We would like to think that they, in Iraq, were as committed to their government when they voted as we are to ours. We know how government works. We have had a peaceful transition of power here in the United States Congress. The people were dissatisfied with the course of the Nation this November 7, and they spoke, and I think they spoke very clearly that they wanted a change of course in Iraq.

But the fact of the matter is, this is more like sort of a gangs dealing up turf in Iraq than it is a working government. Right now three of the ministries are controlled by Mr. al-Sadr, who runs this brigade of perhaps 60,000 people in a personal militia, and those three ministries of the government we are supposed to be helping and allied with, will not even work with Americans. Three of the major ministries, might be 40 percent of the government in Iraq, won't even talk to us, and these are the people we are trying to help.

This is not a working situation. And have we basically said to the Iraqis, to Mr. Maliki, you must disarm that Sadr militia? You must get access to those agencies of the government? No, we haven't said that. We haven't said that at all. We have said we will just stay there forever if it takes that long. You

can just play whatever difficult games you have in the sectarian tensions in Iraq, and we will stay forever. That is the wrong message to Iraq.

We have got to tell them they are going to stand on their own feet very quickly, or they will fall, and only the Iraqis can make that decision ultimately, and we have made a decision, a commitment, and I know a lot of people who are against this war, myself among them.

I was very vocally opposed to this war when we started. I thought that we did not receive proper intelligence. I thought the intelligence was cherry picked. I thought that the threat was vastly overstated. Even though it was popular to be for the war at the time and the war drums were beating, I and 164 other Members of the House voted against the war.

Many of my constituents felt the same way I did. But even though they were very, very strongly against the war, they felt there was some national obligation on our part to give the Iraqis some reasonable chance to form a government. We had destroyed a government, we had some obligation to give them a chance to reestablish security and a government in Iraq.

But that cannot be a never-ending responsibility of the United States, and we have now spent longer in and given the Iraqis longer than the greatest generation took to win World War II. We have to realize that even though that period of time has gone on, the situation according to this bipartisan report isn't getting better, it is getting worse, and we have to recognize that reality. We have to have a major change in Iraq.

It goes on to say the security situation cannot improve unless leaders act in support of national reconciliation. Shiite leaders must make the decision to demobilize militias. Sunni Arabs must make the decision to seek their aims through a peaceful political process, not through violent revolt. The Iraqi government and Sunni Arab tribes must aggressively pursue al Qaeda. None of those things are happening, and we have not insisted on any of those things happening. We have been the patsy while this sectarian conflict has gone on, and we have not insisted that it stop, or we are removing our troops tomorrow.

As a result, these folks have refused to make the very difficult compromises it takes to form a government. I have got to tell you, I know how difficult it is. It is difficult enough around here in peace time, and I know it is difficult for leaders in Iraq. But American sons and daughters cannot be expected to be sent to the streets of Baghdad when Iraqis will not go.

You know what happened when we decided to pull troops out of Al Anbar Province where the insurgency is essentially taking over to send into Baghdad, and we called for six groups to come of the Iraqi forces? Only two of them showed up. We still don't have the troops the plan called for months ago to get security into Baghdad. Why didn't they show up? They didn't show up because they don't have a government to stand up for yet, because the politicians will not make the compromises necessary to do so, because we haven't required it. We have got to have a tough position in Iraq, and the tough position is one of tough love. Tough love is you tell the Iraqis they have got to fish or cut bait, because our ability to sustain this is not unlimited.

This goes on to say the problems of the Iraqi police and the criminal justice system are profound. Significant questions remain about the ethnic composition of some Iraqi units. Specifically they will carry out missions on behalf of sectarian goals instead of agenda. Units lack leadership, equipment, personnel, logistics and support.

I want to take a moment, if I can, to talk about what this administration has not done in the pursuit of its own policy. You know, for 3 years now, the President has said we will stand down as the Iraqi military stands up. But this administration has always wanted to fight this war on the cheap. It has never been willing to commit the resources to what a successful pursuit of this mission would require, and a successful pursuit of this mission, for the last 3 years, would be to equip, arm and train an Iraqi military as rapidly as possible, and we haven't done 40 percent of that effort.

The reason I know that—I went to Iraq, and I talked to the Iraqi forces, and they say we don't have any equipment, we don't have any communications, we don't have any payroll system, we don't have any recruitment system, we don't have any logistics system, we don't have any medical evacuation system, we don't have any communication system with the public. We are some people with AK–47s in pickup trucks who have been given a very short training period by the United States Government.

As a consequence, a difficult situation where you had extremely low motivation anyway to stand up for the government has been made worse. In fact, it was so bad that a year and a half ago, my friends the Republicans limited the amount we were going to spend training the Iraqi army. They wanted to reduce it. I said if the way out of Iraq is to stand up an Iraqi army, it seems to me we should do this as quickly as possible.

So I offered an amendment to the military appropriations bill that was accepted that at least didn't cut the training for the Iraqi army, but the fact of the matter is, any military assessment of the Iraqi army is they can't fight. They don't have the wherewithal to fight. We go into battle with armor, communications, Medevac, howitzers, gunships, F–16s.

We tell the Iraqis to go out with some pickups and AK–47s and no communications equipment. Why is that? Well, it is because the administration has never been willing to ask the sacrifices that are necessary of the American people to complete this mission successfully. It has tried to fight the war on the cheap, and the people paid dearly with both our losses of 2,800 people, 20,000 people who are seriously injured, and goodness knows how many Iraqis who have lost their lives.

You know, maybe we would have a different attitude if we had a chief executive who was committed to this commission enough to ask for sacrifices of the American people, but we don't have that. We have a situation where for 3 years this has been essentially a half-hearted effort, an unwillingness to get tough with the Iraqis and an unwillingness to commit the resources necessary to do the job, and a debacle has unfolded. Probably the largest foreign policy debacle has unfolded in the last of America's history.

So this is a stunningly disturbing report, and I note that it contains many of criticisms that I and my colleagues and what's called the Iraq Watch have been making on the floor of the House now for 2 years. We have come to the floor of the House in the evening. Many, if not all of these criticisms we have espoused. I think they have more reliabilities now that a bipartisan group has essentially been saying what we have been saying about the failure of this administration policy in Iraq. So the question now becomes what should be the change?

Well, the first thing is there has to be a change in the Iraqi government. I will quote this report, the composition of the Iraqi government is basically sectarian, and key players within the government too often act in their sectarian interest. The security situation cannot improve unless leaders act in support of national reconciliation. Shiite leaders must make the decision to demobilize militias. Sunni Arabs must make the decision to seek their aims through a peaceful political process, not through violent revolt. We must insist on this. We must require. We must compel it. Today we have not done so.

Now, what conclusions has this report drawn? It gets a little bit murky reading the report. It is not entirely clear what this group actually said. It is a committee of individuals who signed a report, and most people know the old saying that a camel is a horse designed by a committee, and what this group really recommends is a little bit ambiguous in part. But I would suggest there is one thing that is important and one thing that has a little lacking in this report.

□ 2245

The first thing is it demands a change in our policy, it demands a realistic assessment of our policy, and it demands that we get tough with the Iraqis to demand a political solution in Iraq, because that is a central prerequisite to any progress being made in Iraq. And that is a very import offering of this report, that we have to do that.

Now, the question then becomes, what do we do as far as troop levels and our military mission in Iraq? Their report is a bit of weak tea in that regard. It essentially alludes, and you will hear news reports that this calls for essentially removing our major combat missions by the end of next year, by 2008, by the first quarter of 2008.

The report isn't quite that clear. It says that by the first quarter of 2008, subject to unexpected developments in the security situation on the ground, all combat brigades not necessary for force protection could be out of Iraq. ''Could be.''

At the time U.S. combat forces in Iraq could be deployed only in units embedded with Iraqi forces in rapid reaction and special operations teams and search and rescue. ''Could.''

''Could'' is not a strong enough word for what this situation demands of American leadership. The word ''must'' must be in our response from Congress about Iraq. It is time to talk turkey with the Iraqi government. We cannot shade it. We can use polite language, but we cannot use language that is susceptible to multiple interpretations.

We must tell the Iraqi government that their training wheels have to come off, they have to strike the political deals on oil that have to be made, because our troops are coming home at a date, if not certain, that is at least within certain parameters. There is no reason that that process should not start now in a way that is militarily defensible. We have to send that strong message to the Iraqis, and only our actions will do so.

Frankly, language like ''could be'' I don't think is going to register on the streets of Baghdad, where 100 to 200 bodies are being found every couple of days. We need to send a stronger message.

The question is, how do we do that? I would like to think the President of the United States would have an epiphany reading this report. I would like to think that he will shed those rose-colored glasses that he has worn for 3 years. I would like to think that he will decide not to heed the advice of his vice president, who has been wrong on virtually every single thing in Iraq policy.

I would like to think that he will then come to the U.S. Congress and say, ''I am totally changing my statement on Iraq. I now believe we have to start bringing our troops home, because nothing less will result in the Iraqi government having an incentive to form a real government.''

If those things happen, Congress will be able in short order to reach an agreement to end this war in Iraq and give the Iraqis what they need, which is an incentive for action on the political front.

I am not all that hopeful that will happen. The President since the election has said some gracious things. The day after the election he said that he wanted to work on a bipartisan basis, and those words were greeted happily by us and we would like to believe that was the case.

Two weeks later, the President sent up six judges that he knew would be rejected by the U.S. Senate because of their entirely right-wing beliefs. Last week he appointed an individual to take care of the contraceptive program of the United States, to give women control over their destiny, and he appointed a person who thinks contraception somehow should be illegal, or at least inappropriate.

So the signs have not been entirely favorable that the President received the message from the American people given him on November 7. Some of my colleagues have. In the earlier discussion here, we had some of my colleagues, Republicans, quite a number of them, doing a valedictorian speech tonight who had come out on the short end in the election. I think they received the message. Many of them I consider friends, and they are good people, and they are credible people and hard-working people, and I know the taste of defeat, so I have some empathy for them.

But the American people have spoken, and we need the President to listen to them, and we need the President to listen to this report, and we need the President to listen to his troops, and those messages are we need a radical rethinking of Iraq policy.

Now, I have a message I would hope my colleagues will also consider tonight, and that is if the President does not heed that message of the American people, we here in the House of House of Representatives have a responsibility to act. We cannot just be folks who give speeches about Iraq, all though that is what I am doing here tonight. We cannot be people who just issue press releases about Iraq. We cannot be Congressmen and women who simply send letters to the White House.

If the President of the United States refuses to change course in Iraq in a meaningful way, this Congress has to use the ability granted to it by the United States Constitution to assure that there will be a change in Iraq, and we have an opportunity to do so through the appropriations process.

This war cannot be fought and the President cannot continue to put these troops in harm's way without funding. The geniuses in Philadelphia established the People's House and gave as its first obligation responsibility for the fiscal condition of the Nation.

No President can continue a war without funding. If the funding stops for the Iraq war, our troops will come home, and this Congress has to have the gumption to take such action if the President does not heed the will of the American people.

Now, people say, oh, isn't that fraught with political risk? You know, it might be. And that is why people in Vietnam waited 3 to 4 years after it became obvious that our policy was wrong, of not removing our sons and daughters at that time, and my friends at that time and my colleagues at that time, from harm's way in Vietnam.

Iraq is not Vietnam. It is dangerous to draw comparisons between Vietnam and Iraq. They are manifestly different in many, many ways, including our national interests and the nature of the threat and the extent of the losses that we have suffered.

But it is similar in this way: If we follow the failure of the Congresses in the early 1970s who refused to stand up to a chief executive to demand a change in course, we will have fallen victim to what they did during the Vietnam years. We have at least 15,000 names on the Vietnam Memorial wall as a result of Congress' refusal to be willing to use the appropriation mechanism to bring our troops home.

That is not a failure of will or courage or backbone that we should suffer. We have an obligation to these kids and not-so-kids in Baghdad tonight, and we should know, we should be willing to do so, and we should say we should be willing to do so, so that the President of the United States knows that we are serious in our discussions.

I am hopeful that is not necessary. I am hopeful we can forge a bipartisan agreement with the President to heed the recommendations of this report and the will of the American people from November 7. But we have to be prepared to do our duty here, and I think that is important for us to say early in this discussion, so that we can move forward.

I want to, if I can, say another thing that I think would be important for the President to do. He can do this tomorrow and he hasn't done it. He can have a statement to the people of Iraq that the United States of America does not intend to have permanent military bases in Iraq. This is a statement that the Iraqi people need to hear.

In polls, 75 percent of the Iraqi people believe we are not a positive influence in Iraq. Sixty percent of the Iraqi people in a poll believe it is appropriate to attack Americans in Iraq. Think about this. These are people that the war was started out, at least in its later chapters, to try to give Iraqis a chance at democracy. We have spent $400 billion, 2,000 lives, 20,000 injured, the honor of the Nation to help Iraqis, and 60 percent of them believe it is okay to attack Americans.

This is not a situation where we are capable of helping them militarily. Our presence there is a reason, at least one of the reasons, for violence in that country. And we lost 10 of our best yesterday and 24 in the last 2 days. It is a recognition that we have to come to grips with.

One of the reasons for that antipathy is a conviction, as much as we don't share it, that the Bush administration wants to have permanent bases in Iraq. But because of stubbornness and willfulness and refusal to show any flexibility to reality, this administration has refused to say that. That would be

helpful. That would be a first start, and we hope that that happens.

So we now have an obligation to follow one conclusion of this, and the first phase of this report, if I can in conclusion read, ''Current U.S. policy is not working.'' That is the most powerful statement in the whole report. And we need radical changes, the ''radical changes'' is my language, not the report.

Quoting the report, ''Current U.S. policy is not working as the level of violence in Iraq is rising and the government is not advancing reconciliation. Making no changes in policy would simply delay the day of reckoning at a high cost. Nearly 100 Americans are dying every month. The United States is spending $2 billion a week. Our ability to respond to other international crises is constrained. The majority of the American people are soured on the war. The level of expense is not sustainable over an extended period, especially when progress is not being made. The longer the United States remains in Iraq without progress, the resentment will grow among Iraqis who believe they are subjects of a repressive American occupation.''

We need a change, and we need it now, and we cannot dither or dally or wait or have debates amongst ourselves. We have to take action now. And I hope my colleagues will join me in a willingness to do that.

That will be difficult. While we have troops in the field, it is always difficult to talk about the mission. But I am here tonight, proud of my neighbor's son who is tonight in Baghdad. I am proud of the mission he has done and is doing, and I am caring about he and his 1-year-old son.

I believe the U.S. Congress owes an obligation to him and his own to insist that this President come to grips with the reality of Iraq, send a message that our troops are coming home; that this is something the Iraqis have to deal with quickly because they are going to be on their own. We can no longer keep training wheels forever on Iraq at the expense of our sons and daughters.

That statement, I believe, in the long run will be best, with the least possible damage to all concerned. And I don't offer a panacea. I don't offer a silver wand in Iraq. But I can say that the current situation is not acceptable, and we will change it one way or another, and the sooner the better.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. OSBORNE (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for December 5 after 2:00 p.m. on account of personal reasons.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

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

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

Mrs. MCCARTHY, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SCHIFF, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. RANGEL, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. KUHL of New York, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia, for 5 minutes, December 7 and 8.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CASTLE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WALSH, for 5 minutes, today.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 4050. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 103 East Thompson Street in Thomaston, Georgia, as the ''Sergeant First Class Robert Lee 'Bobby' Hollar, Jr. Post Office Building''; to the Committee on Government Reform.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House reports that on December 5, 2006, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bills.

H.R. 3699. To provide for the sale, acquisition, conveyance, and exchange of certain real property in the District of Columbia to facilitate the utilization, development, and redevelopment of such property, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4377. To extend the time required for construction of a hydroelectric project, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 59 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, December 7, 2006, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

10434. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Fish, Wildlife and Parks, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Designation of Critical Habitat for the Fender's blue butterfly (Icaricia icarioides federi), Lupinus sulphureus ssp. kincaidii (Kincaid's lupine), and Erigeron decumbens var. decumbens (Willamette daisy) (RIN: 1018-AT91) received November 28, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

10435. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Fish, Wildlife and Parks, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Designation of Critical Habitat for Astragalus brauntonii and Pentachaeta lyonii (RIN: 1018-AU51) received November 28, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

10436. A letter from the Chairman, National Indian Gaming Commission, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Minimum Internal Control Standards (RIN: 3141-AA27) received November 27, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

10437. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Gulf of Mexico Recreational Grouper Fishery Management Measures [Docket No. 060322083-6288-03; I.D. 032006C] (RIN: 0648-AU04) received November 29, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

10438. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries off West Coast States; Pacific Coast Groundfish Pacific Coast Groundfish Fishery; End of the Pacific Whiting Primary Season for the Catcher-processor Sector [Docket No. 051014263-6028-03; I.D. 110706A] received November 29, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

10439. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Allocating Gulf of Alaska Fishery Resources [Docket No. 060511126-6285-02; I.D. 050306E] (RIN: 0648-AT71) received November 29, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

10440. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries Off West Coast States; Pacific Coast Groundfish Fishery; Amendment 18 [Docket No. 060609159-6272-02; I.D. 060606A] (RIN: 0648-AU12) received November 29, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

10441. A letter from the Chief, Trade & Commercial Regulations Branch, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Extension of Import Restrictions Imposed on Archaeological and Ethnological Material from Bolivia [CBP Dec. 06026] (RIN: 1505-AB74) received November 29, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

10442. A letter from the Acting Director, Regulations & Rulings Div., Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's