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. Its 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 Intelligence 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 gentlewoman 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