

agents. The company, which employs 30,000 workers from 38 countries in support of the U.S. military, said it had been unaware of the workers' concerns until recently."

This is the kind of thing, Kellogg Brown, Halliburton, is always unaware of, workers problems, because they are too busy having their accountants going to work on the excessive profits they are making.

It brings to mind the work that was done by one Senator Harry Truman when, during World War II, he had his committee on a bipartisan basis looking into the question of excessive profit-making from World War II. This is not something that is invented for this time and place by members of the Democratic Party. This is something that was headed up by a Democratic Senator, who was in charge in the United States Senate, on a bipartisan basis, to see to it that profiteering does not take place at the expense of the American soldiers or the expense of the American taxpayer.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Speaker, I think it is important to note that the Democratic minority in this House attempted to add an enhancement of the penalties for fraud and abuse and profiteering, and yet the majority in this House and in the Senate denied that proposal.

I would like to conclude, and I will be very brief because I think we have got to go back to the initial question I think that was raised by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE), how did we get here?

If we are to believe Richard Clark, who led the anti-terrorism effort under both Presidents Clinton and Bush until his retirement 2 years into the Bush administration, if we are to believe the highly respected, again, Republican conservative, who initiated the term of this administration as Secretary of the Treasury, Paul O'Neill, it was one week, one week after the inauguration that there was a meeting of the National Security Council and what was discussed there was the need for regime change in Iraq. Nothing about terrorism. And again, 6 weeks later, according to Paul O'Neill, there was a meeting of the National Security Council where it was discussed how the oil fields in Iraq were to be divvied up and divided among nations and corporations. That is according to Paul O'Neill and that is according to Dick Clark.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. There is an important article that was written in Harper's Magazine by David Armstrong back just before the outbreak of the war. The title of the article was "DICK CHENEY'S Song for America." In there he goes back and talks about the concept for this plan being hatched by the then-Secretary of Defense and the two Under Secretaries which at the time were Paul Wolfowitz and Richard Perle. The goal was to be the lone force in the Middle East. The plan that was put forward was a bold one: To go forward and overtake Baghdad.

It was rejected at the time. It was rejected by Colin Powell. It was rejected by Bush the elder. It was rejected by the most outspoken people against this war back in 2002 in this invasion and that was Jim Baker, Brent Scowcroft and Eagleburger.

So as the gentleman said at the beginning, this is not a partisan effort. This is an understanding of the wrong turn the Nation has taken with respect to foreign policy. Again, I commend the members of the Iraq Watch for their vigilance.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. I want to indicate I think we are down to our last 2 minutes. I would yield to the gentleman from Washington to close.

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, I want to note getting back to the war on terrorism, where is Osama bin Laden? Where is Osama bin Laden? Why is the President not talking about Osama bin Laden, who is free tonight threatening our citizens where they live in our neighborhoods?

We found out last week that this administration is spending five times more money tracking people who travel to Cuba than they are trying to interdict the money going to Osama bin Laden, who is continuing a threat to this country.

This is one example of this administration taking their eye off the ball of the guy who killed almost 3,000 Americans. We are going to continue this discussion.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, I believe we are down to our last minute or so. I do want to indicate to members of Iraq Watch that are here tonight that the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services in the previous hour indicated that he and perhaps other Members might be interested in having a dialogue with us and perhaps even combining hours, if that is acceptable under the House rules, perhaps this week or as soon as possible. And if it is okay with everybody, I wanted to pursue that, and I have indicated to the Speaker as we began the hour that that was contemplated and we will try to pursue that with the leadership.

□ 2200

Mr. Speaker, I believe we have come to essentially the end of our hour.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GINGREY). Members are reminded that it is not in order in debate to engage in personal abuse of the President.

THANKING MEMBERS INVOLVED IN IRAQ WATCH

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

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Georgia for the oppor-

tunity to speak for 5 minutes. Two of our esteemed colleagues are en route here, and I would like to take this 5 minutes to further thank the Members who have been involved in the Iraq Watch.

I say so from the bottom of my heart because I think at the end of the day there has been a great discussion that has been going on within this body, but unfortunately, in so many respects, it has not fully reached the American people, or it has in drips and drabs; and I commend our colleagues on the other side of the aisle who were down here in the previous hour.

I think, as the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. ABERCROMBIE) has suggested, we need to have that kind of frank discussion and debate that all too often really does not take place on this floor. It is an important dialogue that the American public needs to hear.

I believe in the final analysis it is not the shock and awe of our military and the strength that it has that determines America's greatness, but rather, the strength of our ideas and our ability to express those ideas not only here on the floor but for citizens who are out there listening, for them to partake and ultimately put in their own words, with their own voice, from their own heart and head, their feelings about these issues.

So often I go back to my district and so many of them will ask why is no one speaking out about these issues, and not understanding the workings of the House of Representatives and not understanding that so many times meetings are actually going on in committees that do not happen to make it on to C-SPAN, but also wondering where the voice and conscience of the country is, and the Iraq Watch has done an outstanding job in terms of making sure that there has been this opportunity to reach out to the American public and inform them in a nonpartisan way about these issues and raise these questions that are so important for the American people to digest, especially as we face upcoming elections that will determine the fate and course of the Nation.

If we consider that in the previous election, less than 50 percent of the American people voted and understanding that in the aftermath of September 11 there has been a great outpouring of patriotism and citizenship, and what better way to express that than by going out and voting and immersing and involving one's self in the issues of the day, it is our responsibility as Members of Congress to make sure that we inform and educate the general public; but it is equally responsible that the public have an opportunity to express their concerns.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Connecticut for yielding, and I think he is so on the mark, if you will.