

and headed up very quickly. Our government, in just a few years, will not be able to pay all of the military pensions, the civil service pensions, the Social Security, the Medicare, the Medicaid, and the new prescription drug benefit. We have guaranteed 44 million private pensions through the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation. We will just not be able to pay all those things with money that means anything.

But what we will do, we will do what governments all over the world have done in similar situations, and we will simply begin printing more money. This will cause Social Security and all those government and private pension plans to buy less each year.

It doesn't work. It is like a ball headed downhill. It starts out slow and gathers speed. When this money supply gimmick does not do enough, pensions will have to be cut. Anyone who is relying just on Social Security for his or her retirement will face tremendous financial hardship.

All of this could be avoided if the Congress would become much more fiscally conservative and do it now. However, because there are too many liberal big spenders in the Congress, and because it is unpopular to say "no" to anyone, the Congress could not even, late last year, pass a \$50 billion slowdown in spending spread over the next 5 years. The overall reduction was reduced to \$39.5 billion, with the bulk of the reductions put off until the fourth and fifth years. The plan that was passed did not cut spending, it simply slowed the rate of growth, barely. But, of course, even that very meager effort at fiscal restraint could be changed by the next Congress.

Now, let me go to a totally different topic, Mr. Speaker, another concern.

At the end of 1994, the conservative business magazine, *Forbes*, carried a lengthy article about the Justice Department. It said we had quadrupled the Justice Department since 1980, and that Federal prosecutors were falling all over themselves trying to find cases to prosecute. The article said people were being prosecuted for laws they didn't even know were in existence. And then the Congress, trying to prove it was tough on crime, has expanded the Department of Justice greatly since then.

In addition to all this expansion, we then passed a so-called PATRIOT Act to try to show strong opposition to terrorism. This was such a great expansion of government power and such an overreach that now approximately 400 cities and counties and seven State legislatures have passed resolutions against this act. Those who love big government love the PATRIOT Act.

The Federal Government, through the super-secret National Security Agency, in addition to the CIA, FBI, and about 12 other intelligence agencies, has more than enough power and ways and means to discover and prosecute terrorists. The Foreign Intel-

ligence Surveillance Act Court, created in 1978, approved 18,742 warrants for wiretapping and physical surveillance by the end of 2004. In the 5 years from 2000 to 2004, the court received 6,650 requests from the government and approved 6,642.

We will probably have another terrorist incident of some sort with or without the PATRIOT Act. We need to take reasonable precautions, but we also need to recognize that you are still hundreds of times more likely to be struck by lightning or to win a lottery than you are to be killed by a terrorist. Those in charge of all the many government programs which have sprung up to fight terrorism do not like to admit this because they want continual increases in funding. But, Mr. Speaker, we should not create some kind of a Federal police state in a huge overreaction to this threat.

It is sad that conservatives, who have always been the main opponents of big government, have gone along with this huge expansion of government power just because the word "terrorism" is used by every government agency to get more money and power.

A TURNING POINT IN IRAQ

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago, President Bush said that we had reached a turning point in Iraq. Given that he declared "Mission Accomplished" and the end of major combat operations more than 3 years ago, I would say it is about time we reached a turning point.

But as the Washington Post pointed out, this kind of turning point language is pretty commonplace for the President. There have been many milestones. There have been many turning points from this White House, even a turning point in the history of freedom over the last several years. The President should ask the people who risk their lives, their bodies, and their minds every day, just walking down the streets of Baghdad, if they see a turning point. We should ask the Iraqi citizens how they see it.

The day after the President's last attempt at spin, more than 30 Iraqis were murdered in violent attacks. They joined tens of thousands of other innocent civilians, many of them children, who have died for the cause of their so-called "liberation." There are some rumblings now about drawing down our troop levels, but we have heard that before, and I will believe it when I see it, and I will believe it to be real when the President puts forward a plan on how he is going to end this war.

Mr. Speaker, I have yet to hear the President disavow his statement that the decision to bring our troops home will be for future Presidents to decide. I have yet to hear a clear denial from the administration that we have plans

to build permanent military bases in Iraq. If there is some kind of reduction in U.S. forces, my fear is that it will be a cosmetic change only, driven more by the political calendar than any kind of strategic consideration, ultimately making the troops left in Iraq even more vulnerable than they are now.

The answer is not to get down to 100,000 troops by the end of the year, because incremental steps are not enough. There must be a plan to immediately end this occupation and bring every last one of our soldiers home. The longer they stay, the longer suicide bombings will persist, because our very presence is one of the principal causes of the violence.

That is not our soldiers' fault. Of course, it isn't. They have performed their services faithfully and courageously. It is their civilian supervisors who have miscalculated at every turn. It is the President, the Vice President, and the Secretary of Defense who refuse to see that our military presence is fueling the rage of the insurgency, intensifying hatred for America, and stoking the fires of civil war.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for an entirely new approach to Iraq. It is time for the United States to show real global leadership by helping assemble a multinational security force to help keep Iraq stable in the short term. It is time to help establish an international peace commission under the auspices of the U.N. to begin the Iraq postwar reconciliation process. It is time to turn Iraq over to the Iraqi people. It is time to stop being Iraq's military occupier and start being Iraq's reconstruction partner. It is time to rebuild the country we have torn apart and to do it with an emphasis on transparency and accountability and not on padding Halliburton's profit margins.

But before we take these steps, before we do anything, we must end the war and bring our troops home to their families, where they belong. That is the turning point that will make a real difference in the Iraq situation.

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

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

TRIBUTE TO PAT T. DEON, SR.

Mr. FITZPATRICK of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. FITZPATRICK of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the achievements of Pat T. Deon, Sr., a constituent of mine who will be honored tomorrow at the 2006 annual scholarship luncheon at the Justinian

Society of Philadelphia for his contributions to the business community in the Philadelphia region and the community of Bucks County, Pennsylvania, where he lives with his family.

Since 1935, the Justinian Society has searched, as the premier legal organization in the Philadelphia area, for Americans of Italian ancestry. Comprised of attorneys, judges, and law students, the society has directed itself to maintaining the honor of our legal system and the high ethical standards that distinguish its practice in our society. The Justinian Society accomplishes its mission by promoting continuing legal education programs, offering scholarships to Italian American law students and by promoting civic engagement by the legal community.

Mr. Speaker, Pat Deon is a respected member of the Bucks County community. A successful businessman and entrepreneur, Pat has become a leader in his region, serving on numerous local and statewide boards and commissions. Since 1995, Pat Deon has been a volunteer member of the Board of Directors of the Southeastern Pennsylvania Transportation Authority and has been its chairman since 1999. Since being named chairman of SEPTA, Pat Deon has transformed this \$3 billion public transportation asset from an organization wracked by inefficiency to a model of progress and competence.

With SEPTA well in hand, Pat turned his attention to our highways in 2002 when he was appointed to a 4-year term as a member of the Pennsylvania Turnpike Commission.

Besides his public works, Pat Deon is also actively involved in community service. He is vice chairman of the Board of Directors of Temple Lower Bucks Hospital, a board member of the Bucks County Community College Foundation, and the Bucks County Enterprise Zone.

In addition to these endeavors, both Pat and his wife, Carlene, are strong supporters of the Special Olympics, the American Red Cross, and Race for a Cure. His work with the Special Olympics alone has allowed a delegation of 116 athletes and coaches to attend the first-ever USA National Games in Iowa.

For many this would be enough, but Pat has also excelled in business. Pat Deon has completed residential and commercial real estate projects in Bucks and Montgomery Counties and construction services in the northeast region. He is the owner of WBCB-AM Radio in Bucks County and a successful restaurateur through his ownership of the Temperance House Restaurant and Inn located in Newtown Township, Bucks County, Pennsylvania.

Mr. Speaker, I can think of no better person deserving the honor of the Justinian Society than Pat Deon. His success is a clear example of the American dream and that it is indeed alive and well.

In addition to serving as a model of success, Pat Deon is also an example of

modesty. He never searches for the spotlight and never creates fanfare or publicity for his good works. I am proud to represent him in the Congress and am proud to acknowledge him here today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

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

SALUTE TO COLLEAGUE AND THE WAR IN IRAQ

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I assume the time of Mr. PALLONE of New Jersey.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the Speaker for recognizing me at the time shortly after my colleague LYNN WOOLSEY has spoken, because I rise to salute LYNN WOOLSEY as a great point of inspiration to her colleagues and for all Americans who are fighting to end the deadly, wasteful war in Iraq.

I rise at this particular time because yesterday was Primary Day in California, and Congresswoman WOOLSEY had a challenge. I do not think that challenge was unrelated to her position on the war in Iraq. I think the challenge was a frontal attack on the majority of Americans who now disapprove of this administration's actions in Iraq. I think that the candidacy of the opposition was a not-very-subtle attempt to intimidate the leading spokesperson of the peace movement. I think it was a blatant effort to send a message.

Congresswoman WOOLSEY is supported, fortunately, by the constituents in her district. Everybody knows that. Congresswoman WOOLSEY has been here for 14 years. She has a great record in areas ranging from child care to policies related to the war in Iraq.

I want to congratulate her on a stunning, decisive victory. There was never any doubt of her winning, but she swept the field. I think with almost a two-to-one vote.

The voters sent a message to all those who would challenge her and try to silence her that they care about what is happening in the world, they care about what is happening in Iraq. They are the majority, just as right now the majority of the people in America are against the war in Iraq.

Her wide margin reaffirms support for her positions.

No one has spoken more passionately and consistently against the war on this floor than LYNN WOOLSEY. I think she has a record of floor speeches, 5-minute speeches. About 149 5-minute speeches have been made against the war in Iraq.

The bold move of the war supporters to go after her, to get newspapers to call her a radical and clamor for a more moderate voice, all of these things did not happen by accident. I think it was a plot. In her 14 years, LYNN WOOLSEY has earned the right not to be challenged. She has a unique point of view based on her unique set of experiences. I serve with her on the Education Committee. There is much to be discussed about Iraq and the war in Iraq, and not enough time is ever allowed to do it. I think she has chosen the only avenue possible.

We have not discussed very important matters, like the oil contracts. What is happening with the plan to disperse the oil in Iraq after the U.S. leaves? Nobody ever talks about that. How much of the oil revenue will flow to American corporations for technical assistance and rebuilding versus to the Iraqi people?

□ 2000

Underlying the problem of getting the settlement, the question is never discussed. Power sharing is discussed. Getting the government set up is discussed.

Senator BIDEN was ridiculed for saying you ought to take Iraq and split it up into three parts, one for Sunnis, one for the Shiites and one for the Kurds. I do not think that general proposal is all he meant, but power sharing is a major issue. Why can't we discuss power sharing. We have the Voting Rights Act here in America, one of the best examples of power sharing in the world.

Other nations are looking at us and trying to find out how do you have a minority represented when the majority is a very different group. How can you get the minority to the table? There are ways to do that, and power-sharing ought to be discussed openly. Maybe they need a Voting Rights Act in Iraq. That could be put on the table as part of the solution to guarantee to the Sunnis and that Kurds that despite the Shiites being in the majority, they will always have a place at the table.

As far as orderly withdrawal of the troops, I think Congressman MURTHA, an expert if there ever was one, a man who knows the military very well, has proposed a very conservative but effective way to draw down the troops. Nobody knows better than Congressman MURTHA what is happening in that war. He goes frequently to visit the wounded at Walter Reed Hospital and at the Naval Hospital. He knows the dilemma of the men on the ground, the troops there. He knows and that is why he spoke out so forcefully about the situation in Haditha. He knows that under