The lesson of the Bush Doctrine is very clear: You cannot separate homeland and national defense. They are one and the same comprehensive and indivisible security policy.

Critics can complain about one application of this policy or another, but given its overwhelming success and the absence of an alternative, these critics do so to the detriment of their own credibility. Without an alternative policy, these critics must be supporting the weak and indecisive foreign policy of the past.

This week, America's war on terror will move forward with strength and confidence, as always, with one objective in mind, and that is victory.

I commend the President for his leadership and urge him to stay bold in his defense of American lives and human freedom.

COMMENTS FROM THE HOME FRONT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, in 1838 a former President, John Quincy Adams, was a Member of this House of Representatives. Congress in those days, conservatives in Congress, had passed a House rule saying that slavery, believe it or not, could not be debated or discussed on the floor of the House of Representatives.

John Quincy Adams decided that he wanted the people of his district and other districts in Massachusetts to be heard, so he brought to the floor, every day or a couple of times a week, letters from his constituents protesting that slavery could not be discussed on the floor and supporting the ending of slavery in the United States.

Today, we are faced with a serious issue, perhaps not the seriousness quite of slavery in our country, the biggest blot in our history, but we are faced with the issues of what we do in Iraq and what we do with Iraq.

Debate in this House has not been particularly open or forthcoming, so I have chosen today, as John Quincy Adams did, to bring letters from constituents about Iraq to the House floor. I have received literally hundreds of them, as have my colleagues, questioning our intentions and the President's intentions, questioning the veracity of the administration, whether the administration has been straightforward with the American people. I would like to share some of those letters with you.

Patty from North Royalton, Ohio, said, ''All of the worst case possibilities with Iraq, with the exception of the weapons of mass destruction, of course, and the truth of the administration, have proven true, and the American public is being asked to foot the bill.

''I suggest a proposal to break apart the military spending from the rebuilding. Focus this administration on the bare necessities for now. We are trying to do way too much at one time.''

Mary Lu wrote, ''U.S. out, UN in. We should pull our soldiers out and turn the rebuilding process over the United Nations. Congress should vote no on the $87 billion until the President works it out with the United Nations. Roll back the tax cuts to pay for the war. The only way we could responsibly pay for Iraq's reconstruction is by rolling back President Bush's tax cuts for the wealthy. If we roll back the tax cuts on the top 1 percent, we could pay for the $87 billion and have money left over for other programs, like prescription drugs for the elderly.''

Jay of Richfield, Ohio, writes, ''If we assume there are 290 million men, women and children in the U.S., that means that every man, woman and child in America will be contributing $300 to the reconstruction of a country we will never visit, and whose welfare would have never affected us but for the lies of the Bush administration.''

Janet from Norton, Ohio, writes, ''Please do not vote for one more cent to be spent on this losing proposition in Iraq. Enough is enough.''

Judith writes, ''Our President has arrogantly put us into a position where we stand, in many ways, alone, and we are making a huge mess of things. We do have an obligation to the Iraqis, but they aren't happy with our presence there and are crippling our ability to help them. The most effective thing we can do is turn over control of the operation to the United Nations.''

Helen writes, ''Wealthy Republicans who voted for Bush do not send their kids to die in Iraq, and wealthy Republicans made sure their tax money was given to them before presenting the bill in Iraq. The rest of the tax money isn't theirs to spend on defense contracts. It is ours.

''The U.S. kleptocrats want to profit from Iraq,'' talking about Halliburton and many of the President's friends who are getting the unbid contracts. ''They can only do it by keeping the UN out.''

I found in these letters, Mr. Speaker, literally dozens of them questioning the fact we are spending $1 billion a week right now, before the President asked for $87 billion more. A third of that money is going to private contractors, many of them contributors to the President, most of those contracts unbid, and many of them going to a company called Halliburton, from which Vice President CHENEY is still drawing a $13,000 a month benefit check.

Andrew writes, ''I believe the Bush administration should be required by law to submit to the following conditions before his request for $87 billion is approved. The $87 billion should be funded by the immediate cancellation of the recently-passed tax cut for the wealthy, where 43 percent of the tax benefit goes to the richest 1 percent of Americans.''

It is clear there is a theme here. The American people in this mail, and in the mail that literally every Member of this Congress is getting, the people of this country are concerned that this $87 billion is only a start, that it is going to be a lot more in the future. There is no plan. The American people need to continue to speak out.

IRAQI SUPPLEMENTAL SHOULD INCLUDE LOANS, NOT JUST GRANTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, we will soon be asked to provide an additional $87 billion in order to continue our efforts abroad in Iraq and Afghanistan.

Now, many, as you just heard, are complaining about the costs in Iraq and the billions that will be needed to maintain a stable Iraq into the future. One question I ask for my colleagues and the American people to consider is, what is the cost if we do not act? In reality, very few Members of Congress will vote against the President's supplemental request, but we do not need to blindly cast our vote without providing options on how to at least partially offset the cost for this reconstruction.

I recently had town meetings in my Congressional District. Some of the questions that some of the constituents asked centered on why the American taxpayer has to foot the entire bill for Iraq reconstruction? Why can Iraq not provide funding for reconstruction and security themselves? I think all of my colleagues would agree this is a valid question.

However, with the decrepit state of Iraq's infrastructure and economy, such a contribution from a people just emerging from decades of oppression and neglect, it is impossible to expect Iraq to provide much in the way of reconstruction funding in the near future.

The American people are generous people. They understand that it is for the greater good to help someone help themselves. But they also recognize we cannot continue to provide open-ended monetary assistance if we do not receive something in return. It is a meet-us-halfway approach, if you will.

Why not provide loans for reconstruction, or at least for rebuilding some of the infrastructure, to include electric and water, et cetera? I think that we should consider this as an alternative to the grantmaking that the administration is requesting.

Specifically, these loans should be linked to potential future Iraqi oil revenues. As we know, Iraq has the world's second largest oil reserve, 11 percent of the world's total. However, only 17 of 80 oil fields have been developed. In addition, Iraq has a sizable amount of natural gas reserves that have yet to be

developed. Given the substantial amount of revenues that Iraq could generate into the future, there exists a means to repay some of the costs of this reconstruction.

Now, the Coalition Provisional Authority is working on an Oil Trust Fund, a plan hoping to begin operation in early 2004. It would appear sensible to use such a fund in concert with a loan program to allow Iraq to repay some of these construction costs.

Of course, Iraq has already been saddled with billions in debt. However, Mr. Speaker, as we have learned in recent hearings on Iraq's future, much of the debt is owed to countries that refused to lift a finger to help the Iraqi people free themselves from oppression and a destitute existence. Instead, these countries thought it better to put Americans at risk to bring freedom to these oppressed people. So why should the United States and those countries that have allied with us remain concerned with those countries, that they get repaid first?

The American people have been asked to sacrifice much. Three thousand innocent lives were lost in 2001. We have lost more Americans in the ensuing war on terrorism, and families continue to endure the separation of loved ones and the economic hardships of Guard and Reserve members leaving their civilian jobs to serve in Operation Iraqi Freedom.

Are we asking too much for the administration to provide an opportunities for American generosity, persistence, patience and sacrifice to be acknowledged, appreciated and repaid? I think not. Americans will not shy away from the mission it has been tasked to complete. We are making progress every day, and our troops, while facing danger, are at the same time offering their time, money, and supplies to assist the local Iraqi people.

Once this supplemental is passed, we must support the seven necessary steps towards a new Iraq.

One, the appointment of the Iraqi Governing Council in July.

Two, in August the Governing Council named a Preparatory Committee for writing Iraq's new, permanent constitution.

Three, this month, the Governing Council appointed ministers to run the day-to-day affairs of Iraq.

Four, writing the Constitution.

Five, popular vote on ratifying Iraq's Constitution.

Six, finally electing a new government.

Seven, transferring sovereignty from the coalition to the new government.

Mr. Speaker, we will give the President the funds our country needs to protect and sustain our troops and rebuild a country whose people want to live proud and free again. All we are seeking is some measure to ensure that the American people aren't permanently footing this bill.

PAST COMMENTS ABOUT COST OF IRAQ

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, during the lead-up to the war in Iraq, we had great assurances from the President and his staff that in the aftermath the United States would not be tagged with the bill.

Press Secretary Ari Fleischer: ''It is a rather wealthy country. Iraq has to be able to shoulder much of the burden of their own reconstruction.''

Deputy Defense Secretary Paul Wolfowitz, arguably the godfather of this policy: ''There is a lot of money to pay for this that doesn't have to be U.S. taxpayer money, and it starts with the assets of the Iraqi people. The oil revenues of that country could bring between $50 billion and $100 billion over the course of the next 2 or 3 years. We are dealing with a country that can really finance its own reconstruction, and relatively soon.''

Then, of course, the wonderful Defense Secretary, Donald Rumsfeld: ''I do not believe the United States has responsibility for reconstruction. In a sense, funds can come from those various sources I mentioned: frozen assets, oil revenues and a variety of others things, including the Oil for Food program.''

Well, what a difference a few months makes. The President has presented the second bill for Iraq, $70 billion last April, and now another $87 billion that he wants this Congress to borrow on behalf of the American people to spend for the ongoing conflict and to rebuild that country.

That is right, borrow. We are going to obligate Americans for the next 30 years to pay for the rebuilding of Iraq. Apparently, it is necessary when creating a democratic and civil society that there be massive investment in public works, public infrastructure, schools, hospitals, universal health care, telecommunications, ports, rail, water, all those things; and the American people should borrow the money, according to the President, to do those things so that the Iraqi people can move toward a democratic and civil society.

But, unfortunately, according to the President, it is not necessary to do those things and pay for those things and not advisable to borrow the money to do those things to pay for the continuance of a democratic and civil society here in the United States of America.

Yes, he says we can borrow $20.3 billion to do all those things in Iraq, but we cannot afford it here. We are borrowing money to pay tens of thousands of Iraqis to have no-show, no-work jobs, to provide stability, but the President says we cannot draw on the Unemployment Trust Fund, the $16 billion balance on taxes we have paid, to give extended unemployment benefits to Americans.

On a per capita basis, the United States is going to spend ten times as much per citizen in Iraq on drinking water as it will in the United States, despite the D-minus grade that our water infrastructure has, despite the unfunded mandates on rural communities that cannot afford to meet those Federal requirements. Two times as much for water resource projects, ten times as much for sewer and drinking water.

Iraqis will receive 300 times as much to put together a reliable electricity system in their country. Did the President not notice, I guess they have generators at the White House and Camp David, he did not notice that the lights went out in the eastern United States, but they did because of a crumbling and underinvested infrastructure. We are going to spend 300 times as much per citizen in Iraq. Thirteen times as much for medical infrastructure.

In the little port of Umm Qasr over there, we are about to borrow from the American people another $45 million to further upgrade that port, at the same time that the President cannot find $8 million to dredge ports in Southern Oregon. We just do not have the money to keep those ports open, he says, but we can borrow $45 million to further improve Umm Qasr, into which we have already dumped $50 million.

Then there is the Mawizeh marsh. The President wants to borrow on behalf of the American people $50 million to restore a marsh. Well, we have big huge controversy over the Klamath marsh and that area in Oregon, and we need $25 million to move toward resolving that controversy. But the President says that money is not here in the United States of America, but he will borrow $50 million to restore a marsh in Iraq.

Then there is the horrible problem of Basra and Umm Qasr. Their water supply comes through an open ditch, only half of which is lined. Of course, my city of Albany gets its water through an open ditch, none of which is lined. So it is an emergency that the American people borrow $200 million for Umm Qasr and Basra so they can have a modern water supply system, but, sorry, there is no money for Albany, Oregon, and hundreds of other communities across this country.

Apparently it is necessary, the President says, to borrow these funds on behalf of this generation and future generations of Americans so that Iraqis can live a better life, but we cannot afford to do similar projects here in the United States of America, to put Americans to work. If that money were spent here in the United States of America, it would put 1 million people to work, but that is not on the President's radar screen.