

Agent Orange had any effect whatsoever on the troops.

In 1984 we settled a claim for all of the problems created by Agent Orange, which we finally admitted. Now we have a case before the Supreme Court at this very time where they are trying to reopen that claim on behalf of people who are suffering even 40 years after the war.

It is for that reason that I raise the issue today of depleted uranium in Iraq. I was there. I was in Iraq in 1991, and I was there again this year; and the evidence is overwhelming of the impact of what Iraq has suffered from depleted uranium and what we, the United States, are about to suffer.

Dr. Al-Ali said that before the Gulf War they had only three or four deaths a month from cancer. Now it is 30 to 35 patients dying every month, and that is just in his department. That is a 12-fold increase, 1,200 percent increase in cancer mortality. Studies indicate that 40 to 48 percent of the population in that area will get cancer in 5 years. That is almost half the population.

A woman doctor, Dr. Ginan Hassen, said, "I studied what happened in Hiroshima. It is almost exactly the same here. We have an increased percentage of congenital malformations, an increase of malignancy, leukemia, brain tumors, and the rest." Under the economic sanctions imposed by the United Nations Security Council, now in its 14th year, Iraq is denied the equipment and expertise to decontaminate its battlefields from the 1991 Gulf War.

These are two Iraqi doctors talking. Let me quote an American doctor, Dr. Doug Rokke, who was appointed by Norman Schwarzkopf to go in as a part of the decontamination team and clean up what we did. We dumped 300 tons of munitions with depleted uranium in this area that he was sent in to clean up. He says: "I have 5,000 times the recommended level of radiation in my body. Most of my team are now dead." Eighteen out of 24 people, American soldiers sent in to clean that up, are now dead.

Dr. Rokke says, "We face an issue to be confronted by the people in the West, those with a sense of right and wrong." First, a decision by the United States and Britain to use weapons of mass destruction, depleted uranium. When a tank fired a shell, each round contains 4,500 grams of solid uranium. What happened to the Gulf was a form of nuclear war. That was 1991. We are about to do it again. People are talking about 3,000 missiles into Baghdad in the first day and 3,000 on the second day, all with depleted uranium on the point. Why is that used? Because it is so penetrating, when it explodes, it creates a white dust, uranium oxide, and people walk around, it gets in their lungs and reproductive organs. Children died. That is where those figures come from for the children. That is why we have so many malformations at birth among Iraqi women. It is to the point today where Iraqi women say, Is my child normal?

Mr. Speaker, we did that once to them, and we are about to do it again. We are about to do it again, and we are about to do to our own troops, hundreds of thousands of them, what we did to Doug Rokke. Dr. Rokke marched in there and did his duty. I am here talking for the veterans of our country and for the women and men who are on the line for us out there. I do not want them sent into that.

We are going to march troops right through the very place where this happened to the Iraqi people. Will our government admit what they are doing? No. They will not talk about what is going on with depleted uranium.

Here is the issue. The Secretary of VA, Mr. Principi, remember the Bush administration, writes a letter to the Department of Defense and says please do preservice evaluations on all of the men and women so we can look at, when it is over, what the difference is.

How can we send 300,000 American people into war that kills Iraqis left, right and center with impunity? This is an unjust war. There are many reasons to be against this war; but this reason, the soldiers and Marines and sailors of the United States are the major reason we should not be doing it. We are exposing our own people to something that we will not admit we are doing.

□ 1515

MOURNING THE PASSING OF WAUKEGAN POLICE CHIEF MIGUEL JUAREZ

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

Mr. KIRK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to give sad news to the House, that we have lost the police chief of Waukegan, Illinois, Miguel Juarez, last night in a tragic heart attack. Miguel Juarez led the police department in the largest city in my congressional district, he was the highest ranking Latino official in our city, and he was my friend. Miguel Juarez at age 50 passed away and completed a distinguished career.

Miguel was born in Chihuahua, Mexico, and came to the United States at the age of 1. He joined the U.S. Marines and served our country with distinction in Japan, Norway and Denmark and finished as a decorated veteran at Fort Sheridan in my congressional district. In 1979, he joined the Waukegan Police Force as a police officer, rising through the ranks continuously, until he became our chief of police in May 2001. But that only understates Miguel's contribution to our community. Miguel was a member of 22 different community organizations in our town.

I extend the House's profound condolences to Miguel's wife, Rosa, and his four children. Miguel was a unique man who spoke not just English and Span-

ish, but also Japanese. He was fully qualified as a SWAT team member, he taught gang awareness, and he accompanied me recently on a drug raid at a house in South Waukegan where I saw the professionalism and bravery of the team that he built under him. I want to extend my profound sorrow to the entire Waukegan municipal team.

In the language of his original country, I would like to say, *Espero que tienes un buen viaje, Miguel, mi Amigo. Tenemos muchas lagrimas en Waukegan esta noche.* It says, I hope you have a good trip, Miguel, my friend, and we are extending many tears in Waukegan this night.

Miguel Juarez, a leader, a Latino, my friend. We lost him last night. We will miss him greatly. The House should mark that time.

THE IRAQI CONFLICT

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

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, to provide for the common defense of our Nation is a constitutional duty here in Congress, and we have no responsibility more serious than to look after the security of the people of America, and to do it in a way that honors and protects the men and women who defend our security. We certainly recognize their courage, their sacrifice and their patriotism.

I am concerned that the American-led war upon which we are about to launch, followed by an American military occupation, would make Americans here at home less secure, not more. With that in mind, I would like to refer to a resolution introduced by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) and cosponsored by a number of others of us. The joint resolution has a number of whereas clauses, including that whereas Saddam Hussein is a repressive dictator who has demonstrated through his own actions, including the invasion of Kuwait and the oppression of the Iraqi people, that it is necessary for the international community to ensure his conduct is in accordance with international law.

And whereas on September 12, 2002, President Bush committed the United States to "work with the United Nations Security Council to meet our common challenge", posed by Iraq and to, "work for the necessary resolutions" while also making clear that, "the Security Council resolutions will be enforced and that the just demands of peace and security will be met or action will be unavoidable;" . . .

And whereas Congress recognizes the efforts of the President to obtain unanimous approval for United Nations Security Council resolution 1441 which affords Iraq, "a final opportunity to comply with its disarmament obligations under relevant resolutions of the Council."

And following various other whereas clauses, we call upon the President to

report to Congress prior to using U.S. Armed Forces against Iraq pursuant to section 3(a) of the Authorization for the Use of Military Force, to report on the following:

1. A determination that further diplomatic and other peaceful means will not adequately protect the national security of the United States against the threat posed by Iraq. In other words, that war is, indeed, a last resort.

2. A full accounting of the implications, both positive and negative, of initiating military action against Iraq in regard to homeland security, the war on terrorism, regional stability in the Middle East, the Middle East peace process, and the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. In other words, to understand the implications that an invasion of Iraq would have for our other international interests, including the combat against terrorism and the regional stability in the Middle East.

3. The steps the United States and its allies will take to ensure that any and all weapons of mass destruction and the related knowledge base will be safeguarded from dispersal to other rogue states and international terrorist organizations. In other words, to see that the risk of use of weapons of mass destruction would actually be reduced, not increased, by an invasion of Iraq. As an aside, I might comment, the serious problem that is created by our lowering the threshold for the use of nuclear weapons in that area.

4. The United States' plan for achieving long-term social, economic and political stabilization of a post-conflict Iraq, including a plan to provide humanitarian assistance to the Iraqi people and to ensure respect of their human rights as well as bringing to justice the individuals responsible for serious violations of international humanitarian and human rights law committed in Iraq.

5. The nature and extent of the international support for military action against Iraq and the impact of military action against Iraq on allied support for the broader war on terrorism. In other words, it is not just a matter of "you're either with us or against us" but how does this help us work together to accomplish our goals around the world now and in the future.

6. The steps the United States and its allies will take to protect United States soldiers, allied forces and Iraqi civilians from any known or suspected environmental hazards, associated with battlefield agents.

7. An estimate of the full costs including humanitarian aid in light of possible refugee flows, reconstructing Iraq, and securing political stability in the region, and

8. The anticipated short and long-term effects of military action on the economy and the Federal budget.

We end by saying it is the sense of Congress that the report required by subsection (a) should be delivered by the President in the form of a public

address to a joint session of Congress. I think with this kind of report, that is satisfactory on all these points, our men and women in uniform will have everything they need to defend the security of the American people. Without such a report I must conclude that it is at least premature, or more likely contrary to our national interest, the fight against terrorism, to our ability to lead the world, to launch a military attack against Iraq now.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(Ms. SOLIS 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 Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

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

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

NOMINATION OF MIGUEL ESTRADA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. RODRIGUEZ) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. Mr. Speaker, one of the reasons why we decided to come over this afternoon is again to talk a little bit about the Miguel Estrada case that is before the Senate. One of the concerns that we had was in terms of

the fact that he had been nonresponsive in terms of the questions.

Let me first of all start by thanking the Senate for doing the right thing and, that is, deciding not to support the nomination of Miguel Estrada. We take, at least as elected officials, a very important role in making sure that when we are asked to support a letter—

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would remind the Member that any reference to Senators' positions or statements is not in order.

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, I will make every attempt not to do that. Thank you.

One of the things that as elected officials, we take pride in doing, letters of support to constituents, letters of support for individuals to certain positions, and we want to make sure that, as elected officials, when we do a letter of support, that we know the nominee, that we know who that person is. We ask for documentation in some cases. I do not write letters for anyone unless I know the person personally, because I know full well as an elected official, one of the first things I was told, Mr. Speaker, and I know you probably have experienced this is you do not want to write a letter for someone that later on commits a crime. There is nothing worse than doing that. We want to make sure we do the right thing. In so doing, also, the Senate has a responsibility, and, that is, to look at the candidates that come before them and to be able to ask the questions of them, and to be able to look and then make a decision based on that.

Here we have a nominee that has failed to respond to questions. Maybe people would say, why not give him a chance? As elected officials, we get elected to 2 years. You might say, well, I'm going to vote for Mr. RODRIGUEZ this time, I'm not sure, but I'm going to give him a chance. With the nominees for the Federal court, we do not have a second chance. They are there for life. I would ask you that if you are going to be hiring someone in your office, if you are going to be hiring someone in a firm, if you are going to be hiring someone and he is going to be staying with you for life, you want to make sure that you feel comfortable about making that decision. And so I want to thank the Senators that have stood there strongly and asked those questions that are important. My thanks to all those who are sharing—

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is reminding the Member again to avoid improper references to the Senate.

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. I can make reference to the Senate as long as I do not tell them what they need to do; is that correct, Mr. Speaker?