

out front and continued coalition support, this trend will continue.”

Obviously, the general could not have been more wrong.

Madam Speaker, we can only hope that when General Petraeus reports to us this September that he will take off his rose-colored glasses and see things more clearly. The American people deserve a full accounting of what is really going on. But it actually looks like we won't get it. Ambassador Crocker has said that the report will be just a “snapshot.” So it looks like the White House spin machine is already trying to lower expectations and do preemptive damage control again.

But the damage in Iraq has already been done, and the American people deserve more than spin. What we need is a national security plan that is based on what will actually make our Nation safe. Such a plan must include diplomacy, strong international alliances against terrorism, initiatives to address the root cause of terrorism, and a new approach to foreign policy, an approach that restores America's credibility and moral leadership in the world.

I have proposed such a national security plan. It is called SMART, which stands for Sensible, Multilateral American Response to Terrorism. I invite all my colleagues to learn about it and consider this plan.

In the meantime, the runup to General Petraeus's report continues. I hope that this September he will be more accurate than he was in September 2004. But I am not holding my breath. In fact, I will not breathe easily until all of our troops are home safely.

□ 1715

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

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

#### THE THREAT FROM RADICAL JIHADISM

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

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Madam Speaker, I rise today to express my disappointment that we're going to go into another weekend not having addressed the threat from radical jihadism.

Just moments ago, this House passed a 9/11 bill supposedly to increase the security and the safety of the United States of America. But since April 12, our national Director of Intelligence, the position that was created in the Intelligence Reform Act earlier in 2004 to specifically provide us with information about the threats to the United States, this organization that was put together to make our intelligence community more effective, the Director of

National Intelligence has reported to this Congress now for almost 4 months that there are significant intelligence gaps at the same time while we are a Nation at greater threat than perhaps any time since 9/11.

In a letter that Director McConnell recently sent to the Intelligence Committee in an unclassified version, he highlights a situation in which our intelligence community every day is missing a significant portion of what we should be getting in order to protect the American people. He goes on and says this is about foreign intelligence, about foreign targets overseas, and that to collect this kind of an intelligence, what he needs to do is he needs to get a court order. Now, think about this; we need to get a court order to listen to an alleged terrorist, who may be in Pakistan, may be in Afghanistan, but we know that they're outside of the U.S. borders, so it's foreign intelligence about a foreign terrorist outside of the United States, and we need to go get a court order to listen to that conversation at a time when we know that we are at heightened risk.

Isn't it ironic that as we pass a 9/11 bill, in the 9/11 bill that we passed this afternoon, the 9/11 bill gives al Qaeda and radical jihadis more information about the United States and about our intelligence community than what they had before. The 9/11 bill says we are going to reveal our top-line spending on intelligence. If we believe that revealing our spending at a macro level on intelligence makes us safer, maybe we should just give radical jihadis a breakdown of how we spend all of our money.

So on a 9/11 bill we're going to say, you know, because of leaks in the intelligence community, leaks to the press, we've already told you about our Terrorist Surveillance Program, we've already talked with you and given you details about how we do financial tracking, we've talked to you about interrogations, we've talked to you about prisons and all these types of things, and now we're also going to tell you how much money we spend on intelligence on an annual basis. And remember, just about everybody agrees that the tip of the spear in keeping America safe is how effective our intelligence community is. And now we're going to give them more information about our intelligence community, and at the same time, while our Director of National Intelligence for 4 months has been telling us that there are gaps in our intelligence, significant gaps in our ability to get information about what foreign terrorists may be planning against the United States, at a time when we know that one of their highest priorities is to attack the homeland again.

And this is not only about their intentions to attack the United States, but remember, if there is a foreign terrorist in Afghanistan talking to a foreign jihadist or radical terrorist in Iraq and that communications may in some

way come through the United States, that information will not even be available for our combat troops in Iraq or in Afghanistan. Not only are we blind for homeland security, we are also handicapping our troops who are on the front lines each and every day. We're not even getting them the information that they could use on a tactical basis to protect themselves, but also to identify where the radical jihadists are, where al Qaeda might be in Iraq, and what they may be up to in Iraq or in Afghanistan or in the United States or in Western Europe, wherever. And the most concerning thing is that we may not even deal with this before we go on recess next week. This needs to be fixed before we go on recess.

#### HONORING CAL RIPKEN, JR.

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

Mr. SARBANES. Madam Speaker, I rise today with pride to introduce legislation honoring Cal Ripken, Jr. on his induction into the Pro Baseball Hall of Fame.

My bill would rename as Cal Ripken Way Interstate 395 in Baltimore, which runs into the city and ends near Oriole Park at Camden Yards.

Calvin Edwin Ripken, Jr. grew up in Aberdeen, Maryland. A baseball standout from an early age, he led his little league team to the Little League World Series and was a baseball star at Aberdeen High School.

As a professional, Cal spent his entire career with his hometown team, the Baltimore Orioles. Drafted out of high school, he rose through the minor leagues, joining the Orioles full time in 1982 when he was named Rookie of the Year. He then won American League Most Valuable Player honors and led the Orioles to their third World Series Championship in 1983.

From May 30, 1982, until September 19, 1998, Cal never missed a game. He played in an incredible 2,632 consecutive games, passing Lou Gehrig's record of 2,131 on September 6, 1995, in front of family, friends and fans at Camden Yards.

His career redefined the shortstop position, setting multiple offensive and defensive records, and paving the way for a new generation of players.

Cal's stellar career no doubt makes him worthy of induction into the Hall of Fame. In fact, he was elected to the Hall with the highest vote total ever, the highest vote percentage for any position player, and the third highest vote percentage in history. But the numbers don't even begin to explain what he means to our national pastime.

Baseball fans, and especially parents, are too often disappointed when our American idols fail to live up to our American ideals. Too often, our sports stars are famous for all the wrong reasons, but time and again Cal Ripken,

Jr. has been a source of pride for baseball.

Cal was a spectacular player, but not a flashy one. He played fundamental baseball, always doing the little things and setting the example for how a professional should perfect his trade, and he showed up every day.

From the heights of the World Series Championship in 1983 to the depths of the 21-game losing streak that began the 1988 season, Cal was there every day. After the cancellation of the 1994 World Series, many fans marked September 6, 1995, the night Ripken played in his 2,131st game, as the night that America came back to baseball.

Ripken's commitment to working hard and playing by the rules became known as "the Ripken way." He inspired the people of Baltimore every season with his quiet and unassuming dedication to his work. In fact, I believe that Cal has inspired Americans all over the country.

"The Ripken way" is in many ways synonymous with "the American way." When you ask people about American values, they often mention dependability, loyalty, humility, and old-fashioned hard work. Cal Ripken embodies these values.

Madam Speaker, I think Tony Kornheiser captured this well in a column that appeared in *The Washington Post* on September 7, 1995. He wrote, "When I look at this record, I think I hear the rhythms of America. This celebration of Cal is the fanfare for the common man. Going to work every day, come hell or high water, building a career, providing for a family like our fathers did before us is something we can all relate to. I think America looks at Cal Ripken playing every game, playing them in the same small town where he grew up, putting his hand over his fluttering heart as the ovations pour over him like tidal waves and signing autographs afterward, and says to itself, here is a man I can respect, here is a man with values I admire. You don't often hear that about professional athletes anymore."

Madam Speaker, if we pass this legislation, when travelers come to visit Baltimore or pass by on their way to another destination, they will not only be reminded of a terrific ballplayer whose name has become synonymous with the Orioles, but also a model American and the promise of doing things "The Ripken Way."

I hope my colleagues agree that this is a fitting tribute to one of the best loved and most enduring figures in the history of baseball.

Cal, congratulations on your induction into the Hall of Fame.

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

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

## WASTEFUL EXPENDITURES IN U.S. EMBASSY IN IRAQ

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

Mr. DUNCAN. Madam Speaker, the easiest thing in the world to do is to spend other people's money. And it never ceases to amaze how the Federal bureaucracy can rationalize or justify the most wasteful or ridiculous expenditures. But the lavish new embassy we are building in Baghdad and the staffing and expenses for it will just about take the cake.

Here is part of a recent Fox News report: "It's as big as Vatican City and makes foreign embassies dotting the tree-lined streets of Washington, D.C. look like carriage houses." But the barely finished U.S. Embassy in Baghdad is already prime for expansion.

Due for completion in September, the \$592 million campus is surrounded by concrete blast walls and features green grass gardens, palm-lined avenues, and volleyball and basketball courts. Available to embassy employees are a PX, commissary, cinema, retail and shopping areas, restaurants, schools, a fire station, power and water treatment facilities, a swimming pool, a recreation center, and the ambassador's and deputy ambassador's residences.

And with months still to pass before it opens, Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice told a Senate subcommittee in May that additional staffing and housing needs have forced officials to add more structures to the now 21-building site. She asked for an additional \$50 million from Congress to make that happen. In other words, almost \$600 million is not enough. Then the budget for 2006 for the employees was \$923 million, not including salaries and expenses for about 600 employees from other Federal agencies and departments than the State Department.

To a recent story from *The Washington Post*: "Mention the U.S. Embassy in Baghdad to Lawrence Eagleburger and he explodes.

"I defy anyone to tell me how you can use that many people. It is nuts. It's insane, and it's counterproductive. And it won't work," says the Republican former Secretary of State and member of the Iraq Study Group."

Secretary Eagleburger said, "I've been around the State Department long enough to know you can't run an outfit like that." And Secretary Eagleburger was reacting to a staffing level of 1,000, twice the size and 20 to 30 times the budgets we have at our embassies in China, Mexico and Britain.

The *Post* story quoted a senior State Department official as saying, "Maintaining an oversized mega embassy in Baghdad is draining personnel and resources away from every other U.S. embassy around the world, and all for what?" The story also said that counting contractors and Iraqi employees, the staff actually is not 1,000, but a staggering and astounding 4,000.

Madam Speaker, I know that many people in our Federal Government want to think of themselves as world statesmen and to feel real important, but it is both unconstitutional and unaffordable for the U.S. to try to govern or police the whole world. And all this certainly goes against every traditional conservative position I have ever known.

Above all, what we are doing building this Taj Mahal industry in Baghdad and allowing an almost \$1 billion budget to operate is as far from fiscal conservatism as you can get.

And finally, Madam Speaker, because a previous speaker mentioned General Petraeus's report, let me add this: There is a very important reason why our Founding Fathers, and throughout the history of this Nation our leaders, have always believed in civilian control over the military. The admirals and generals will almost always give positive or optimistic reports saying progress is being made. We have received positive reports from our top military leaders all through the war in Iraq. It is almost like the generals saying they're doing a bad job if their reports are not positive.

Madam Speaker, we should admire, respect and appreciate our military, and I certainly do. But we should not worship them or feel it is somehow unpatriotic to ever criticize any Pentagon waste or any decision a general might make.

□ 1730

## FAILED POLICY IN IRAQ

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

Mr. WYNN. Good evening, Madam Speaker. To varying degrees, Americans realize that it's time to end this war. You hear frustration; you see almost rabid anger. Americans understand we have a failed policy in Iraq. It's not working. 3,600 American troops have been killed; 2,700 U.S. troops have been wounded; 50,000 Iraqis have been killed. This administration is pursuing a failed foreign and military policy.

Now, let me be quick to note: This doesn't mean that our military has failed. Our military has in fact performed very admirably. They have done so despite the inept management of this administration, which has failed to provide them with the adequate armor that they need. Yet our military has fought on. But, again, it is the wrong policy.

First of all, we need to redefine our notions of winning and losing. This is the wrong war, it is in the wrong place, and it is being, as I indicated earlier, handled in the wrong way.

A lot of people are afraid to pull our troops out because they will say we will have lost. No, we will not have lost. We will have been pursuing the wrong policy. It is almost like the British redcoats facing the U.S. revolutionaries in the American Revolutionary