

they have the right to dismember and eat their enemies and to make sure they are dead. The Egyptian newspaper says Americans are wallowing in blood and death and disembowelment, and for the crimes of the U.S. troops, the paper says, this is the Egyptian newspaper, an organ of the government, the proper response is to kill American troops.

□ 2130

What does the Egyptian government do? Right now it is encouraging the America-hating because it takes the heat off of the government itself. This is how American-hating works around the world. Call us cannibals, and what we will do is, we will support you.

We give Egypt \$2 billion a year to help their economy; \$2 billion a year. And we have been doing it for a long, long time, ever since the Camp David accords were signed when Jimmy Carter was the President.

If we are going to be giving money to the Egyptians, then we ought to demand that they show respect for our troops and our involvement in the war in Iraq. Our troops went over there to liberate that country, to save those people from a tyrant, to stop terrorism in that part of the world and around the world. And for that our Egyptian friends, whom we give \$2 billion to a year, are calling us cannibals and saying that American troops should be killed and slaughtered.

This is something that we should not tolerate. And so I would say to our State Department and our fine Secretary of State, take a message to the Egyptian government, tell them to cut this out. If they want support from the United States, let them treat us with respect and treat our troops with respect who are laying their lives on the line for the people of Iraq and the people of this world on a daily basis.

Secondly, I hope our State Department will continue to talk to the Saudi Arabian government and tell them to get with the program and stop supporting terrorism around the world.

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

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

EXCHANGE OF SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to replace Mr. MENENDEZ on his time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

AMERICAN PARITY ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gen-

tleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, the President announced to the American people yesterday that he intends in their name to borrow \$87 billion on top of the \$79 billion he borrowed earlier this year to rebuild Iraq, Afghanistan, and continue the struggle in that area.

Now, I would hope that the Congress this time will choose to scrutinize this request. The last time the President just breezed through here and the Congress said, \$79 billion, no problem. So I would hope every penny will be reviewed.

I would hope that this Congress would choose to pay for this instead of borrowing \$87 billion, indebting our children and grandchildren, by freezing tax cuts for the wealthiest people in the country. We could pay for it if we just stop cutting taxes.

But I really want to focus on a part of that which the President proposed, \$20.3 billion on top of \$2½ billion he requested earlier, to rebuild the infrastructure of Iraq, to build schools, electric grid, water and sewage, oil infrastructure, transportation, communications, housing, public buildings, roads and bridges, and money for the police, fire, the first responders.

Now, we are going to borrow \$20.3 billion in the name of the American people, and we are going to send it to Iraq to rebuild their country. Now, it has not been long since we heard from the Bush administration that this would be free, the architecture of the war in Iraq.

Secretary Paul Wolfowitz told a House subcommittee in March that Iraq would generate \$50 to \$100 billion of oil revenue over the next 2 to 3 years. We are dealing with a country that can really finance its own reconstruction and relatively soon. Mr. WOLFOWITZ is somehow still in good standing with this administration despite the fact that he was wrong by about \$100 or \$200 billion here. And the American people are going to be asked to pay for it.

Now, it is time for a little fairness and equity here. I have introduced with the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EMANUEL) a bill, the American Parity Act, which says that if the President is going to request \$20.3 billion to provide jobs and rebuild the infrastructure of Iraq, schools bridges, roads, highways, water systems and dredge the ports, all things which he is not funding here in the United States, then we should have dollar for dollar matching for that under the American Parity Act and put people to work here in the United States, invest in our infrastructure, roads and bridges.

Now, I had someone say to me, well, wait a minute, you are proposing to make the bill bigger here to borrow. Yeah, that is right. We would borrow \$20.3 billion to invest in our Nation in long-term projects, putting people to work today but also investing in roads, bridges, highways, water systems, things that will last us for decades.

Now, I do not object to borrowing money to invest in America and to put people into work in America, but I have a real problem with borrowing \$20.3 billion to invest in the infrastructure in Iraq while ours is crumbling here at home.

The President has proposed a zero fund, no funding of the dredging of ports in my district and elsewhere around the country, yet he is proposing to dredge ports in Iraq.

The President has not proposed a penny for the Federal Government to partner in waste water systems, yet it is estimated we have a \$16 billion annual deficit under Federal mandates in water systems that were being put in our communities from the party that said they were not going to send unfunded mandates.

Mr. Speaker, where is the money to help the communities meet those Federal requirements?

On Interstate 5 just in the State of Oregon, I know this goes on around the entire United States, we have a \$4.5 billion bridge replacement problem. That would put a lot of people to work. But the President is telling the Congress that there just is not money to put into the roads and bridges and highways here in the United States, and he is trying to reduce the spending. We are at a stalemate over a new transportation bill because the President says there is no money to pay for it. But somehow we can borrow \$20.3 billion to do those same projects in Iraq. When is the President going to propose to either fund or borrow the money to fund similar projects here in the United States of America? With the American Parity Act, if it were adopted as part of his proposal, we would fund, dollar for dollar, comparable projects in the United States, putting tens of thousands, hundreds of thousands of Americans to work and provide some fairness and equity and at least some return to the American taxpayers for their borrowing.

But I fear that this administration and the leadership of this House is not that interested in funding infrastructure work here in this country, but they are perfectly willing to borrow the money in the name of the American people to rebuild it in Iraq. It is a sad day for the United States Congress.

SOCIAL SECURITY

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

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise to address another serious security problem. It is retirement security. Let me read a quote from 1994:

"Failing to take prompt action on Social Security will burden our children and our grandchildren with benefit cuts and crippling taxes."

That was part of my opening statement as chairman of the Task Force on

Social Security in 1994. When I wrote this almost 10 years ago, I was simply acknowledging what was evident to the actuaries of Social Security. Because we know how many people are paying into Social Security, and we can estimate the cost of future benefits from what has been paid in, the looming insolvency of the program was very clear then. It is even more clear today. Yet a crisis that is imminent in the eyes of an actuary looks like a long way off to many politicians, and as a result Congress has ignored and delayed action on what is probably this country's most serious long-term financial challenge.

In just 10 years, we will need \$100 billion from other sources to make up \$100 billion, that is 5 percent of what will be coming in 10 years from now from the total income tax revenues, we are going to need that much in addition to what is coming in on Social Security and Medicare taxes to pay promised benefits. It has been frustrating at times, but we have worked for more than a decade trying to focus attention on fixing Social Security.

I introduced my first Social Security bill back in 1994. In fact, I wrote it while I was still chairman of the Senate taxation committee in Michigan. Tomorrow, I will offer my sixth legislation that has been scored by the actuaries to keep Social Security solvent. The good news is, I think awareness has increased. There is a greater appreciation and an acknowledgment that Social Security is going broke. Today, most Members are aware of the problem, even if there is still reluctance to tackle it.

President Bush's support in the 2000 campaign, I think, moved us a long ways toward a greater American understanding of the seriousness of the problem, and tomorrow I will introduce my bipartisan Retirement Security Act that has been scored by the Social Security actuaries to keep Social Security solvent and restore its tremendous support for retirees in the United States. Workers could voluntarily devote 2.5 percent of their income for a start from their payroll taxes. It would be voluntary. And workers would own the money in the accounts, which can be put in well-diversified investments. In our bill, we guarantee that the individuals that opt for these personally-owned accounts will earn as much as those that opt not to go into that particular investment. The government would supplement the accounts of low-income workers to help build up those accounts for future retirement savings. People would continue to receive government benefits, as in the current system, as part of their retirement income, but those participating in the private account would have their government benefits reduced to reflect the money that goes into their private accounts. But, again, it would be insured.

To ensure fairness for women, a married couple's account contributions would be divided equally between spouses. My bill also increases the wid-

ow's/widower's benefit to 110 percent of the higher earning spouse's benefit and would give retirement credits to spouses who stay at home to care for young children.

In conclusion, there are some important costs to the bill which eliminates \$10 billion in unfunded liabilities. It calls for a \$900 billion loan over the next 20 years from government to Social Security in addition to repaying the trust funds that have been borrowed from Social Security and this will be repaid after the program becomes solvent. It also slows down the increase in benefits for the highest earning retirees. It does not, however, change benefits for those who have already retired or are close to retirement.

Action to preserve and strengthen Social Security is long overdue. By acting now, we can reduce the cost of restoring Social Security for our children and our grandchildren. By increasing the return earned on Social Security surpluses, we can make the transition to a better system cheaper and easier. The Retirement Security Act is my proposal along with my eight cosponsors to move forward.

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

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

EXCHANGE OF SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask permission to speak out of order and to take the time of the gentleman from Illinois.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

PAYING TRIBUTE TO FALLEN FIREFIGHTERS, LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS AND EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICE WORKERS

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

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Speaker, as the second anniversary of September 11 approaches, I rise this evening to pay tribute to our Nation's fallen firefighters, law enforcement officers and emergency medical service personnel. Mr. Speaker, every day public service officers protect our families and possessions from fire, they keep our streets safe and are the first to respond to an emergency. Across this Nation, our public safety officers are dedicated and prepared. They truly embody the values and spirit that make America the great Nation that it is. These men and women are dedicated, and when we

call on them, they risk their lives for all of us. Our firefighters, law enforcement officers and EMS workers are truly our hometown heroes. However, all too often these heroes must give their lives in the line of duty.

For the family of these brave souls, Congress created the Public Safety Officers Benefit. Since its inception 25 years ago, this important benefit has provided surviving families with financial assistance during their desperate times of need. However, a glitch in the law prevents some families from receiving the assistance. Heart attacks and strokes are among the greatest threat to public safety officers, especially firefighters. In fact, almost half of all firefighter deaths in the line of duty are due to heart attacks and strokes. Fighting fire is dangerous, exhausting and extremely stressful work. Indeed, a firefighter's chances of suffering a heart attack or stroke greatly increases when he or she puts on the gear and rushes into a building to fight a fire. Likewise, law enforcement officers, correction officers and EMS workers face daily situations that put stress and strain on their heart. Imagine the scenario where, while fighting a house fire, a company of firefighters tragically loses two of its members. One is killed by a piece of falling debris. The other dies of a heart attack in the same building. Under current law, the family of the firefighter who suffered the fatal blow to the head receives their benefit, but the family of the heart attack victim receives nothing.

□ 2145

It is wrong that these families are denied this benefit when their loved ones are suffering the loss of a loved one in our communities.

A constituent of mine, Mike Williams, of Bunnlevel, North Carolina, who works for the Office of State Fire Marshal, alerted me to this glitch in the law after Ms. Deborah Brooks, the widow of Thomas Brooks of Lumberton, North Carolina, was denied benefits because of this technicality in the law. Mr. Brooks, a master firefighter with the Lumberton Fire Department, tragically died of a heart attack after returning from several calls on an evening shift. They found him dead the next morning.

As part of his duties with the state fire marshal, Mike helps families file for public safety officer benefits, and he has received many benefit rejection letters from the U.S. Department of Justice. This rejection letter in Thomas Brooks' case was one too many. Mike wrote to me and asked that we investigate the situation. We tried with other Members of this Congress to correct that technicality in the law administratively. We found out it could not be done.

During the last Congress, I, along with my colleagues, introduced the Hometown Heroes Benefit Act to correct this technicality in the Public