

course in Vietnam, and he changed the course of direction.

It is not anti-patriotic to be able to stand up against the wind of the majority, to be able to say that the dissenting Americans need to be heard, and if we are heard, it will be for the betterment of this Nation and the betterment of this world. Then we can begin to fight the global war on terror. Then we can be more successful. Then we can form the coalition that we need to weed out the terrorists and to truly create for our children a better world.

I hope tomorrow we will shed the light on this place and change direction in the Iraq War.

#### GLOBAL WAR ON TERROR

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

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Mr. Speaker, on June 6 we commemorated D Day, the day that American military forces stormed the coast of France 62 years ago to turn the tide in one of the most brutal conflicts the world has ever known. The United States sustained 6,603 casualties that day, yet the final victory over the forces of fascism remained nearly a year away.

Rows of silent graves at the American Military Cemetery in Normandy bear witness to the high price of freedom. They solemnly remind us that there is no substitute for perseverance and sacrifice if we are to prevail over the threats which challenge this Nation and the world today.

The global war on terror is a different war from the wars of the past. This is not a war of uniformed armies on clearly defined battlefields. It is a war that invades tranquil space and time without warning, carried out by those who hide among and behind civilian populations, seeking to exploit the vulnerable for ruthless purposes.

While we have endured the sacrifice of global wars during the past, we have never waged a war in an age of globalization, in an age when technology eviscerates the concept of distance, magnifies our losses, trivializes our accomplishments, and places our adversaries in a far better position to leverage the freedoms of our society against us.

In seeking to prevent another 9/11, the President and the United States Congress would have been utterly irresponsible to ignore the threat posed by Saddam Hussein in Iraq. It is important to note that in 1998 President Clinton ordered U.S. Armed Forces to strike military and security targets in Iraq because Iraq's nuclear, chemical and biological weapons programs posed a credible and serious threat.

But I am not here to argue the case for war today. The United States and our coalition partners made judgments to enter Iraq based upon the best available evidence, and now the commit-

ment is ours to complete. We are all in this together, and the successful progression of our commitment in Iraq, from which I remain convinced that an abrupt withdrawal of U.S. troops would do more harm than good, is vital to achieving national security for America, stability and hope for all peoples of the Middle East, and establishing the prospects for civil reforms and long-term peace throughout the entire world.

While our mission continues to be dangerous and costly, it continues to make strong progress as well. The recent establishment of democratic institutions in Iraq is without cultural or historical precedent. This fact, combined with rapid progress in the deployment of Iraqi security forces, gives us realistic hope of diminishing conflict and a stable foundation for the prospects of long-term peace.

As we proceed with our obligation, may each one of us endeavor to discharge our responsibilities in a manner that is worthy of the sacrifices of the United States Armed Forces.

And may each of us recall that this obligation is ultimately connected to the mantle of leadership that has fallen to the United States, not only for our own welfare, but for the welfare of the entire world.

#### IRAQ WAR RESOLUTION

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. Mr. Speaker, on October 10, 2002, this Congress voted to give the President of the United States broad powers to engage in a unilateral first strike war against Iraq without a clearly demonstrated and imminent threat of attack on the United States.

Our oath of office as Members of Congress, our constitutional charge, the mandate laid upon us by the people, does not permit us to delegate the responsibility of engaging the awesome military power of the United States.

Our oath of office does not permit us to delegate our responsibilities in placing our fighting men and women in the field of battle, and I commend each and every one of them for the sacrifices they are making for freedom-loving people throughout the world.

Our Constitution places the power to declare war squarely and solely in the Congress. This issue rises far above partisan politics.

President Lincoln put our congressional responsibility this way, when he said: "We cannot escape history. We of this Congress and this administration will be remembered in spite of ourselves. No personal significance or insignificance can spare one or another of us. The fiery trial through which we pass will light us down in honor or dishonor to the last generation."

I opposed that initial resolution, and I would later oppose because after all

of the information I have seen, and after all I have heard, neither I nor a majority of the residents of my district, the 7th Congressional District of Illinois, are convinced that the war is our only, our best or was our most immediate option.

I was not convinced, and I am still not convinced, that the resolution would properly guide us to act cooperatively and legally through the United Nations with the agreement and the involvement of the international community. In fact, it led us to pursue risky, unilateral actions in defiance of international law and the United Nations Charter.

As the American people are attempting to make sense of this complex situation, it is the duty of Congress to ask some hard questions.

What are we accomplishing by keeping our troops in immediate danger in Iraq? In my judgment, the answer is not much.

□ 2300

In my judgment, commitment to the peaceful solution of problems and conflict is an important part of what our democracy should stand for, and that does not necessitate or demand continuous military presence in Iraq.

I am a member of the Out of Iraq Caucus, and we need to prepare for an honorable way out. It is my profound hope that as we press forward, we will press forward towards the mark of a high calling; that we will take the high road; that we will take the road that leads to peace and not to war, the road to peace based on mutual security and international cooperation.

Let us walk the road to peace knowing that it is also the road to the rights we have defined in the United Nations Charter for all humankind. Let us walk the road to peace not because it is the easiest road or the smoothest road or the shortest road, but knowing that it is the right road for the American people.

Sometimes in the pursuit of noble and inescapable goals it takes more courage and more vision not to fight or to fight in a different way. We can fight by arming, training, and equipping the Iraqi military and civilian police forces to provide security and protection for the Iraqi people in their country. We can fight by providing clean water, food, and medicine to the Iraqis.

This is one of those times when we must take the road that leads to peace and not down the path to continuous destruction. Let us have the courage and the vision to find a permanent peace and security, to remove the presence of terrorism and not just drive it underground. Surely, if America has a destiny, it is a responsibility to lead the world to such peace.

This is a time of testing for all of us. Let us not fail this great test. Let us pursue peace, and not war.