

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

War. They were fighting in the wrong way. We are doing the same thing. We have to face the facts.

Supporters of the war are also saying look, we can't get out because the result will be a catastrophe. Note to the administration: It is already a catastrophe. What we need to do is change direction, with the hope that we can actually fight a war on terrorism and save American lives.

We can't continue to try to mediate Iraq's civil war. It is time to redeploy our troops, to bring them back home. We have in fact a civil war in Iraq. Both sides dislike our military presence. Iraqi insurgents are willing to kill themselves and become martyrs for their cause. We don't really understand this phenomenon. How can you beat an enemy that is willing to kill himself before you do? It doesn't work.

This is not a war in which killing more insurgents will result in "victory." In fact, the National Intelligence Estimates indicate that our presence in Iraq is counterproductive. Iraq has more insurgents now, more militants, more terrorists, more jihadists, if you will, today than they did when we deposed Saddam Hussein. Iraq has become a haven for terrorists, and our military engagement is not reducing the number of insurgents. They are increasing.

Our continued presence in Iraq, more than 4 years, leads many Iraqis to the perception that what we really want to do is control their oil resources. This perception undermines any attempt to promote freedom and democracy. They think we just want the oil.

We have done one good thing through this Congress. We passed a resolution in this House that says we will have no permanent bases. That is the type of message we need to be sending, that we are not there to control your country. But what should we do in the overall battle against terrorism and in Iraq?

First of all, how about some diplomacy? Why is diplomacy always last? From Korea to Iran, here is what we do. We call them names first, and then we, finally, years later, say, well, maybe we ought to talk. Let's try talking first.

It is time this administration took diplomatic engagement to a higher level around the world. We need to take it seriously. We need to abandon this go-it-alone policy.

How about supporting Muslim efforts to promote peace? I think there are countries in the region, Jordan, Egypt, Saudi Arabia, Morocco, who have a vested interest in promoting peace. Let's give them a chance to promote peace. They have the greatest stake in having a peaceful region. There are also international religious leaders who could perhaps mediate a peace. What we do know is that the United States lacks the credibility to promote peace or mediate peace in this region.

Let's turn to the U.N. Why don't we ask the U.N. to promote a peace process in Iraq while we pull our troops

out? We need a permanent United Nations emergency peace force. I have introduced such a bill. A permanent U.N. entity that would work in these areas of conflict, both in Iraq, in the Middle East, in Africa, the Sudan, Chad, and on and on. We can use the UN as a vehicle to promote peace and save the lives of American men and women who are in the Army and in our military.

Also we need to introduce the concept of humanitarian aid. Now, we do some, it is true, but how about leading with diplomacy and humanitarian aid? Put a new face on America's foreign policy. More humanitarian aid, building schools and building hospitals, says to the world that Americans really want to be your friend, as opposed to troops beating down your door, going door-to-door.

We also need to keep in mind, although we withdraw our troops, we have not abandoned Iraq. We need to continue to support reconstruction aid. But let me be quick to add, we need reconstruction aid with a lot more congressional oversight. This idea that Halliburton and other companies are just making billions and billions in profits and we don't see anything coming up from the ground in Iraq is unsatisfactory. We need humanitarian aid, we need reconstruction aid, we need congressional oversight to go with it.

In conclusion, we really need to spend our money more wisely to fight the real threat that we have. We know the threat is not in Iraq, the threat is in Afghanistan. What should we do?

First of all, we need greater emphasis on intelligence, to break up these small cells. The attacks we have seen in Britain and elsewhere are done by small cells. We need to interrupt weapons transfers, because that is what is causing the problem. We also need to interrupt these terrorist camps. We need to use our Special Forces intelligently to fight the real war that we have.

Bring our troops home, initiate diplomacy, humanitarian aid, reconstructive aid. We need a sound foreign policy. We don't have it with this administration. But with this Congress continuing to press the fight, we are going to have it.

HIGHLIGHTING PASSAGE OF H.R. 1, IMPROVING AMERICA'S SECURITY ACT OF 2007

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. As usual, let me compliment the Speaker for her leadership and her service to America.

Madam Speaker, I rise today to highlight the passage of the Homeland Security Commission report in H.R. 1, Improving America's Security Act. If I had to give an acronym, I would say R-E-L-I-E-F, it spells relief to the American people.

Now we know that we have a committed and unified war and effort against the war on terror. We have the resources and the mindset, the policy and the unity, six years after 9/11, 6 years after all of us stood awestruck, humbled, seemingly powerless, frightened, saddened and emerged with grief over the loss of so many. Families today still suffer. Children are without parents, husbands are without wives, wives are without husbands, and many, many extended family members.

So my first response is to salute the 9/11 families, for many times they probably were received in less than a jovial manner. But there is something about having that steadfast and courageous point of view that you never give up. You never give up.

Let me thank the chairman of the full committee and the ranking member for working to bring us all together, and the conference and the conferees, of which I was a part of, in understanding that our goal was to be Americans united.

So today I can salute the fact that this bill has passed. There is a greater distribution of Homeland Security Grants to States and high-risk urban areas, a risk-based analysis on how we distribute those funds. Each State is guaranteed a minimum of a certain amount, but it is based on risk. There is a \$1.8 billion authorization for FY 2008 to assist States in high-risk urban areas in preparing for terrorist threats. Planning. More planning. More ways of looking ahead.

After we saw the strange video regarding the airport in Arizona where there was not around-the-clock Transportation Security Administration staff screening of people going into the airport, we know that we have to be forever planning and forward thinking. I am glad that solution is being addressed, and I am asking for an inventory as the subcommittee chair, of all airports in America, the top 400, to determine whether we are securing that airport 24 hours a day.

We can always work more smart and more effectively, but I am glad that we have a dedicated interoperability grant program to improve the communications that did not happen on 9/11; firefighters not being able to talk to other firefighters, or firefighters not being able to talk to police officers or Port Authority police. That money is in the bill.

\$4 billion over 4 years for rail, transit and bus security grants. What a celebration. We worked very hard to ensure that we would have Transportation Security Grants on those properties, on those vehicles that move Americans across the United States. Every day Americans get up and use some form of public transportation, and we are delighted that we have focused on that.

Might I just say, with the tragedy of the steam explosion in New York, it exploded and a bus exploded. But it is important to note that if you were to have a tragedy on a bus or a train, look at the impact around the area.