

this war would have been such an inevitable result and foregone conclusion.

But the clock ticks towards zero, and the President's ultimatum has 25 hours and 12 minutes yet to run. The Republican leadership has adjourned downtown for a big fundraiser, and the House is going dark.

IN SUPPORT OF H.R. 837, FUELS SECURITY ACT OF 2003

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

Mr. OSBORNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening in support of H.R. 837, the renewable fuels agreement.

Mr. Speaker, at the present time U.S. fuel prices are at an all-time high, \$3 per gallon in parts of the country, and \$2 per gallon in most other parts. We are nearly 60 percent dependent on foreign oil. We currently import 13 million barrels of petroleum a day, and we produce only 6 million barrels per day domestically, so there is a tremendous imbalance there.

The Mideast crisis points up the uncertainty of our fuel supply. The renewable fuels agreement would increase ethanol production to nearly that of Iraq by 2012. Right now, we see by this chart that this is our current ethanol production. This is the amount of fuel that we import from Iraq, and by 2002 we would have ethanol production ramped up to somewhere near what we currently import from Iraq.

The way the ethanol industry is going, I would predict that we will far surpass by 2012 the 7 billion gallons or 7 billion barrels that we are currently importing from Iraq.

Many times agriculture and environmental groups are at odds. This is one case where I hope we are all on the same page, because ethanol production certainly benefits the environment. First of all, it decreases carbon monoxide emissions, which lead to ozone pollution; secondly, it decreases carbon dioxide and methane emissions by as much as 35 percent, which causes global warming.

In 2002, the ethanol industry reduced greenhouse emissions by 4.3 million tons in 1 year, 2002. Then, of course, ethanol does replace MTBE, which has been proven to pollute groundwater, so we think it is a win-win, in many cases.

Another common myth people do not correctly understand is that ethanol somehow is a negative use of energy. In actual fact, we find that ethanol production results in a positive use of energy. For every Btu of energy of fossil fuels used to produce ethanol, we get 1.389 Btus in return, a gain of almost four-tenths of a Btu. By contrast, gasoline, for 1 Btu of energy to produce, yields only eight-tenths of a Btu. MTBE produces roughly 6.75. So this is one area where we actually are increasing the amount of energy that we have available to us.

Implementation of the renewable fuels agreement will result in lower prices at the pump. This, again, is something most people understand; but this legislation, H.R. 837, will create much more flexibility within the refinery industry, which will allow ethanol to be produced at certain places at certain times when it is most cost-effective. Therefore, there will be a reduction in price at the pump.

Renewable fuels legislation will boost the United States' economy. I think this, again, is something people are not aware of. This legislation will reduce crude oil imports by 1.6 billion barrels while cutting the trade deficit by \$34 billion over the next 9 years.

Currently the greatest part of our trade deficit has to do with petroleum imports. This will substantially reduce that. Also, this legislation will reduce government payments to farmers by \$5.9 billion while adding \$51 billion to the farm economy through 2012. So again, we feel this is a win-win situation.

H.R. 837 will result in roughly 5 percent of our fuel supply coming from ethanol. Actually, there is much greater potential than this 5 percent. In Brazil, for instance, 22 percent of the fuel supply comes from ethanol. We have many automobiles, and fleets of automobiles and trucks in our country that currently use a formulation 85 percent ethanol, so the opportunity is practically limitless here.

Also, we would like to mention biodiesel, which uses soybeans. This has expanded very rapidly.

I urge, Mr. Speaker, passage of H.R. 837. This is part of the energy bill at the present time. If it does not go in the energy bill, we will introduce it and have introduced it as stand-alone legislation. I urge passage of H.R. 837.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 975, BANKRUPTCY ABUSE PREVENTION AND CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT OF 2003

Mr. SESSIONS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 108-42) on the resolution (H. Res. 147) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 975) to amend title 11 of the United States Code, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

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

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

EXCHANGE OF SPECIAL ORDER TIME

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take the 5 min-

utes of the gentlewoman from Indiana (Ms. CARSON).

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

There was no objection.

ERRONEOUS JUSTIFICATIONS FOR WAR IN IRAQ

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

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I listened to the President's speech last night. I have no doubt that the President loves this country as much as I do, and he wants to do what is right. My problem with what he said is this: Many of the facts he cites and the things he believes about Iraq and about international law, and I hate to say this, are just plain wrong.

There is a very good article in today's Washington Post buried on page 13 which is entitled "Bush Clings to Dubious Allegations About Iraq," which I will submit for the RECORD. It reminds us of some things we have forgotten.

For instance, does Iraq have nuclear weapons? Is it trying to make them? The President has said that Iraq tried to buy high-strength aluminum tubes to use in machinery to enrich uranium. The International Atomic Energy Commission determined the tubes were for conventional weapons.

The administration has pointed to 30 pounds of fissile material that was being smuggled into Iraq in a taxi from Turkey. It turned out to be less than 3 ounces of nonradioactive metal.

In his State of the Union Address, the President relied on a report that Iraq tried to buy uranium in Niger, in Africa. That turned out to be a forgery, and it was a forgery that the CIA had warned the administration about.

Last week the Vice President said Iraq has "reconstituted nuclear weapons." Later in the same interview, he said that Iraq would get nuclear weapons, and it was only a matter of time. But the International Atomic Energy Commission, which has people on the ground in Iraq, or did until we told them to get out, says that there is no indication of resumed nuclear activities.

Does Iraq have ballistic missiles that can strike Saudi Arabia, Israel, and Turkey, as the President said? U.N. arms inspectors found the missiles, determined they could not fly as far as those three countries, but they ordered them destroyed anyway. The Iraqis destroyed them, but the President said Hussein has ordered continued production, apparently based on nothing more than an electronic intercept where someone said they could build missiles in the future.

Does Iraq have an extensive ongoing weapons program? Well, a graduate student 12 years ago wrote a paper that

says so. It was plagiarized by the Blair government and passed on to Secretary Powell and cited in the United Nations as a news-breaking British intelligence document. When I weigh a plagiarized graduate school paper against the U.N. inspector's report, my inclination is to go with the United Nations report.

□ 1900

But this administration sticks with the plagiarized paper. The President also threw in some misconceptions about international law. He believes that various U.N. resolutions add up to enough authority to go to war. That is not true. When the President takes his oath, he agrees to follow the treaties in article 6, clause II: "This Constitution and all treaties made shall be made under the authority of the United States and shall be the supreme law of the land."

When we go to war in Iraq, we are breaking that law. Now I hope the President, who still has 2 days to do some thinking, will consider drawing back from the brink.

Mr. Speaker, I listened to the President's speech last night. I have no doubt that the President loves this country as much as I do, and wants to do what is right.

My problem with what he said is simply this: many of the facts he cites and the things he believes about Iraq and about international law are—and I hate to say this—just wrong.

There is a good article in the Washington Post today called "Bush Clings to Dubious Allegations About Iraq," which I will submit for the RECORD. It reminds us of some things we have forgotten.

Does Iraq have nuclear weapons? Is it trying to make them?

The President has said that Iraq tried to buy high-strength aluminum tubes to use in machinery to enrich uranium. The International Atomic Energy Commission determined that the tubes were for conventional weapons.

The Administration has pointed to 30 pounds of "fissile material" that was being smuggled into Iraq in a taxi from Turkey. It turned out to be less than 3 ounces of non-radioactive metal. In his State of the Union Address, the President relied on a report that Iraq tried to buy uranium in Niger that turned out to be a forgery, and a forgery that the CIA had warned the Administration about.

Last weekend, on Meet the Press, Vice President CHENEY said Iraq has "reconstituted nuclear weapons." Later in the same interview, he said Iraq would get nuclear weapons and it was "only a matter of time."

But the International Atomic Energy Commission which has people on the ground in Iraq—or did until we told them they should get out—says "there is no indication of resumed nuclear activities."

Does Iraq have ballistic missiles that can strike Saudi Arabia, Israel, and Turkey, as the President said? U.N. arms inspectors found the missiles, determined that they couldn't fly as far as those three countries, but ordered them destroyed.

The Iraqis destroyed them, but the President says Hussein has ordered their continued production—apparently based on nothing more than an electronic intercept where someone says they could build missiles again in the future.

Does Iraq have an extensive, on-going weapons program? Well, a graduate student wrote a paper that says so and it was plagiarized by the Blair government, and passed on to Secretary Powell and cited as a newsbreaking British intelligence document.

When I weigh a plagiarized grad school paper against the U.N. inspector's report, my inclination is to go with the U.N. inspector's report—but this administration sticks with the plagiarized paper.

The President also threw in some misconceptions about international law in his speech last night. He believes that various U.N. Resolutions add up to enough authority for the U.S. to launch an air and ground invasion of Iraq.

This is not true. When we joined the U.N., we signed a treaty. The treaty says a member state can attack another country under two conditions—when attacked or in imminent danger of attack or when an attack is authorized by the Security Council.

The President said last week that we were going to the Security Council for authority and we'd have a vote "no matter what the Whip count is." Well, we didn't. We didn't because we were going to lose.

Mr. Bush came up here to the Capitol steps on January 20, 2001 and said, "I do solemnly swear that I will faithfully execute the office of the President of the United States, and will to the best of my ability, preserve, protect and defend the Constitution of the United States." That's the Oath of Office, friends.

The Constitution he pledged to uphold says, Article 6, Clause 2: "This Constitution . . . and all Treaties made, or which shall be made under the Authority of the United States, shall be the Supreme Law of the Land."

Treaties are the Supreme Law of the Land, on a par with the Constitution. The Constitution says so. We aren't supposed to pick and choose.

We've never before in the history of the United States invaded another country without some kind of immediate provocation. But from now on, under the Bush Doctrine, we're going to invade when we think it's a good idea whether the Security Council agrees or not.

This is a dangerous course—and it's especially dangerous when the information used to decide whom to invade is so very, very bad.

Mr. Speaker, there is still time for the President to pull back from this course of action, to re-examine the so-called "facts" he's relying on and to find another path. Let us pray that he does.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 18, 2003]
BUSH CLINGS TO DUBIOUS ALLEGATIONS ABOUT IRAQ

(By Walter Pincus and Dana Milbank)

As the Bush administration prepares to attack Iraq this week, it is doing so on the basis of a number of allegations against Iraqi President Saddam Hussein that have been challenged—and in some cases disproved—by the United Nations, European governments and even U.S. intelligence reports.

For months, President Bush and his top lieutenants have produced a long list of Iraqi offenses, culminating Sunday with Vice President Cheney's assertion that Iraq has "reconstituted nuclear weapons." Previously, administration officials have tied Hussein to al Qaeda, to the Sept. 11, 2001, terrorist attacks, and to an aggressive production of biological and chemical weapons. Bush reiterated many of these charges in his address to the nation last night.

But these assertions are hotly disputed. Some of the administration's evidence—such as Bush's assertion that Iraq sought to purchase uranium—has been refuted by subsequent discoveries. Other claims have been questioned, though their validity can be known only after U.S. forces occupy Iraq.

In outlining his case for war on Sunday, Cheney focused on how much more damage al Qaeda could have done on Sept. 11 "if they'd had a nuclear weapon and detonated it in the middle of one of our cities, or if they had unleashed . . . biological weapons of some kind, smallpox or anthrax." He then tied that to evidence found in Afghanistan of how al Qaeda leaders "have done everything they could to acquire those capabilities over the years."

But in October CIA Director George J. Tenet told Congress that Hussein would not give such weapons to terrorists unless he decided helping "terrorists in conducting a WMD [weapons of mass destruction] attack against the United States would be his last chance to exact vengeance by taking a large number of victims with him."

In his appearance Sunday, on NBC's "Meet the Press," the vice president argued that "we believe [Hussein] has, in fact, reconstituted nuclear weapons." But Cheney contradicted that assertion moments later, saying it was "only a matter of time before he acquires nuclear weapons." Both assertions were contradicted earlier by Mohamed ElBaradei, director general of the International Atomic Energy Agency, who reported that "there is no indication of resumed nuclear activities."

ElBaradei also contradicted Bush and other officials who argued that Iraq had tried to purchase high-strength aluminum tubes to use in centrifuges for uranium enrichment. The IAEA determined that Iraq did not plan to use imported aluminum tubes for enriching uranium and generating nuclear weapons. ElBaradei argued that the tubes were for conventional weapons and "it was highly unlikely" that the tubes could have been used to produce nuclear material.

Cheney on Sunday said ElBaradei was "wrong" about Iraq's nuclear program and questioned the IAEA's credibility.

Earlier this month, ElBaradei said information about Iraq efforts to buy uranium were based on fabricated documents. Further investigation has found that top CIA officials had significant doubts about the veracity of the evidence, linking Iraq to efforts to purchase uranium for nuclear weapons from Niger, but the information ended up as fact in Bush's State of the Union address.

In another embarrassing episode for the administration, Secretary of State Colin L. Powell cited evidence about Iraq's weapons efforts that originally appeared in a British intelligence document. But it later emerged that the British report's evidence was based in part on academic papers and trade publications.

Sometimes information offered by Bush and his top officials is questioned by administration aides. In his March 6 news conference, Bush dismissed Iraq's destruction of its Al Samoud-2 missiles, saying they were being dismantled "even as [Hussein] has ordered the continued production of the very same type of missiles." But the only intelligence was electronic intercepts that had individuals talking about being able to build missiles in the future, according to a senior intelligence analyst.

Last month, Bush spoke about a liberated Iraq showing "the power of freedom to transform that vital region" and said "a new regime in Iraq would serve as a dramatic and inspiring example of freedom for other nations in the region." But a classified State Department report put together by the department's intelligence and research staff

and delivered to Powell the same day as Bush's speech questioned that theory, arguing that history runs counter to it.

In his first major speech solely on the Iraqi threat, last October, Bush said, "Iraq possesses ballistic missiles with a likely range of hundreds of miles—far enough to strike Saudi Arabia, Israel, Turkey and other nations—in a region where more than 135,000 American civilians and service members live and work."

Inspectors have found that the Al Samoud-2 missiles can travel less than 200 miles—not far enough to hit the targets Bush named. Iraq has not accounted for 14 medium-range Scud missiles from the 1991 Persian Gulf War, but the administration has not presented any evidence that they still exist.

HONORING LEONARD ASH

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

Mr. FEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I stand here tonight to honor a fallen hero from America's greatest generation. Leonard Ash was a Marine whose life richly illustrated President Ronald Reagan's observation. President Reagan said, "Some people live their entire life and wonder if they ever made a difference in the world. Marines don't have that problem."

Mr. Ash served in the 4th Marine Division and fought at Iwo Jima. Seventy-five percent of the 4th Marine Division were killed or wounded at Iwo Jima. Mr. Ash belonged to that 75 percent. His leg was nearly blown completely off. But some good emerged from that very dark battle. Iwo Jima's airfields provided a refuge for American bomber crews. As one of the Army Corps pilots observed, "Whenever I land on this island, I thank God and the men who fought for it."

While recuperating, Mr. Ash met Lt. Genevieve Durocher, a Navy nurse who eventually became his wife for 55 years and the mother of his four children. While often overlooked by history, Mrs. Ash and her fellow nurses proudly served our country. They healed and comforted the wounded, and they bravely stood by the side of servicemen who at times were on the threshold of eternity.

On January 31 of this year, 78-year-old Sergeant Major Ash watched a television documentary about protests of America's possible action to liberate Iraq. He scrawled out some notes in response to the anti-war protest that he had just watched. The next day he and his wife, Genevieve, attended an anti-war rally in Port Orange, Florida, near their home and in my district. He brought his notes in case he had an opportunity to speak and many of the protesters against America's participation in liberating Iraq did not want him to speak.

At the rally, one of the protesters yelled that they would rather bomb President Bush than Iraq. At that point Mr. Ash, outraged, clutching his notes, stood up to defend our President

and our country. The following is what he intended to say:

"I am sickened at this propaganda against our country. Saddam is a murderous dictator. He has exhibited no remorse or hesitation in killing thousands of his own population with poisonous gases and other hideous means. His intent is to delay his defeat until he is able to use weapons of mass destruction against his enemies, the United States and his Arab neighbors.

"Those old enough to remember the few years prior to World War II should recall Mussolini and Hitler executed similar strategies against neighboring countries. Saddam must be stopped before he is able to deliver weapons of mass destruction into the hands of terrorists.

"Our country is blessed to have Colin Powell, DICK CHENEY, Donald Rumsfeld, and President Bush with their commitment to protect Americans and our allies.

"No one wants war. America has only entered a war because war has already commenced itself upon us. America enters war to protect and to honor the freedoms of this great Nation. That is the duty of the President. America is here today because she has not fallen short and because she is not fearful.

"The time to stand firm is now. My wife and I both dislike war. We have seen it firsthand as Marine sergeant and Navy nurse. We stand here today as witnesses that the freedoms we share today have not come without a grave price."

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Ash never got a chance to finish his speech. After standing up and explaining that he and his wife were World War II veterans, he clutched his heart and he collapsed and he died of a heart attack. But because his proud and loving daughter Annette shared his notes with me, while he was unable to finish his speech, I have had the great honor and privilege of doing it for him.

Mr. Speaker, to my friend, Mr. Ash, who I never met but feel like I know, all I can say is, Job well done, America's good and faithful servant.

SAVE HEAD START

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

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address a potential problem hidden deep in the President's budget. The budget says that the President is seeking to give States the opportunity to exercise more control over Head Start and that he would like to move responsibility of Head Start from the Department of Health and Human Services to the Department of Education.

Now, this may not seem like a big deal to many listening tonight, but I believe that it will have a damaging effect on our most vulnerable children. They say this change is intended to

focus Head Start on school readiness and teacher training.

Well, for those who do not know what Head Start is, that may seem like an admirable goal. Head Start already does that and I agree that these are important goals and should be worked on continuously. Moving the program to the Department of Education will fundamentally alter the philosophy of the program.

Head Start is already a readiness program and more. It is a program that prepares the whole child for life. The program teaches families about proper nutrition. It also provides health and mental health screenings and other important services that many of these children would not have if Head Start did not exist. It is important to remember why we created Head Start to begin with under the War on Poverty. Poor children and the children of working-class families did not have the opportunity to have a preschool experience before going into kindergarten. These were children that often times had never had a physical examination. And we were able to discover that there were children with dyslexia, with learning disabilities, with hearing problems, with sight problems. We caught that in Head Start, and we were able to truly give these young people a chance to be successful.

Prior to Head Start, children were going into school with these deficiencies and getting put in special education classes because they thought they could not learn. President Johnson began Head Start and the War on Poverty because he saw a need to help families prepare their children for school and to break the cycle of poverty that many low-income families fall into.

Head Start has been a tremendous success. Study after study has shown that children who were enrolled in this program were more ready to learn when they entered kindergarten than their counterparts who were not enrolled. In addition, they were less likely to repeat a grade and more likely to graduate from high school; and these same students experienced greater long-term social and economic benefits than those students who were not enrolled in the program. Put simply, this is a program that works.

Instead of fundamentally altering this program, ruining its core philosophy that has guided it over the past 37 years, we should be nurturing it. I am here tonight to urge the President and my fellow Members of Congress to fully fund Head Start, resist the urge to provide funding in the form of block grants, and to keep the program within the Department of Health and Human Services. All of these would strip the program of its effectiveness.

Mr. Speaker, I have received many letters from parents and students who are asking that Congress not make any changes to Head Start. I would like to read you have a couple of lines from