

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?