

more expensive tax cuts, or provide affordable prescription drugs for our Nation's seniors? Do we fund a \$1.6 trillion tax cut, or provide school lunches for our Nation's children? Do we focus on modernizing our Nation's schools and providing assistance for unemployed workers, or do we provide tax breaks for the few?

Mr. Speaker, it is clear that the Republicans have chosen the interests of the elite few over the needs of the many. It is clear where their priorities lie.

I urge my colleagues to align their priorities with those of the American people and vote against the Republican budget resolution.

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

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

A PLEA FOR PEACE

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

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak for peace one more time, to speak against a rush to war.

Our courageous sons and daughters have been placed in harm's way, and I will continue to support our young men and our young women, but I cannot in good conscience betray the non-violent principles on which I have worked all my life. I cannot sit in silence when I believe there is still time. It is late, it is very late, it is midnight, but it is not too late for diplomacy, Mr. Speaker.

War with Iraq will not bring peace to the Middle East. It will not make the world a safer or better place, a more loving place. It will not end the strife and hatred that breeds terror. War does not end strife, it sows it. War does not end hatred, it feeds it. War is bloody, war is vicious, it is evil, and it is messy. War destroys the dreams, the hopes, the aspirations and the longings of a people. I believe that war is obsolete.

As a great Nation and a blessed people, we must heed the words of the spiritual, "I am going to lay down my burden, down by the riverside. I ain't going to study war no more."

For those who argue that war is a necessary evil, I say you are half right. War is evil, but it is not necessary. War cannot be a necessary evil, because nonviolence is a necessary good. The two cannot coexist. As Americans, as human beings, as citizens of the world, as moral actors, we must embrace the good and reject the evil.

If we want to create a beloved community, create a beloved world, a world that is at peace with itself, if that is

our end, if that is our goal, our means, our way, it must be one of love, one of peace, one of nonviolence.

Gandhi said, "The choice is nonviolence or nonexistence."

America's strength is not in its military might, but in our ideas. American ingenuity, freedom and democracy have conquered the world. It is a battle we did not win with guns or tanks or missiles, but with ideas, with principles, this whole idea of justice and freedom and liberty.

We must use our resources not to make bombs and guns, but to solve the problems that affect humankind. We must feed the stomach, clothe the naked body, educate and stimulate the mind. We must use our resources to build and not to tear down, to reconcile and not to divide, to love and not to hate, to heal and not to kill.

Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King Jr.'s words, many years ago, said, "Take offensive action in behalf of justice to remove the conditions which breed resentment, terror and violence against our great Nation."

This is the direction in which a great Nation and a proud people should move.

War is easy, but peace, peace is hard. When we hurt, when we fear, when we feel vulnerable or hopeless, it is easy to listen to what is most debase within us. It is easy to divide the words into us and them, to fear them, to hate them, to fight them, to kill them.

War is easy, but peace is hard. Peace is right, it is just and it is true, but it is not easy to love thy enemy. No, peace is hard.

Again, Martin Luther King said when he spoke out against the Vietnam War, he said, "War is not the answer. Let us not join those who shout war. These are days which demand wise restraint and calm reasonableness."

He was right then, and the wisdom of those words hold true today. War was not the answer then, and it is not the answer today. It is not the answer in this hour. War is never, never the answer. War is obsolete.

It is my belief, Mr. Speaker, that humankind would rise to a much higher level if we would lay down the tools and instruments of war and violence. It is not too late to stop our rush to war. Let us give peace a chance.

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

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

EXCHANGE OF SPECIAL ORDER TIME

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take the time of the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KENNEDY).

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

There was no objection.

WASTE, FRAUD, ABUSE AND INEFFICIENCY IN THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

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

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I find it hard to understand how anybody could be in favor of big government when we see, day in and day out, so much waste, fraud, abuse and simple inefficiency in the Federal Government.

I realize that the government keeps growing, despite the horrendous waste, because so many big businesses are making huge profits from Federal contracts, and so many bureaucrats are drawing salaries and benefits on average far higher than in the private sector. So while I have read and heard about so much waste and exorbitant spending by the Federal Government that it is hard to surprise me anymore, even I have been shocked and amazed by the spending of the new Transportation Security Administration.

Apparently I am not the only one shocked by this new agency. Michelle Malkin, a nationally syndicated columnist, wrote in a column carried in yesterday's Washington Times and papers across the country, "The Transportation Security Administration is a fiscal black hole and fiscal conservatives ought to be enraged." She said the TSA "is sucking down tax dollars like a bagless Dyson Cyclone vacuum gone berserk."

Ms. Malkin reports that "already the 1-year-old agency has amassed a \$3.3 billion budget deficit, and is demanding upward of \$6 billion for the current fiscal year."

She wrote in this column, "Never has a single government entity spent so much for so little in such a short time."

It is almost unbelievable to me, Mr. Speaker, that any Federal agency could lose \$3.3 billion in its first year in operation. This has to be one for the record books.

A few weeks ago I read in the Washington Post a report of testimony by Kenneth Mead, inspector general of the Transportation Department. He said the TSA had budgeted \$107 million to hire airport screeners, but they ended up paying over \$700 million to the contractor.

The only contact I had with this contractor was when they ran an ad saying they would take applications at a mall in my district, and then no one from the company showed up. I received several calls from angry constituents who showed up at 7 a.m. as the ad had directed and had driven long distances to get there, only to find no one from the company there.

If the TSA had budgeted \$107 million, they should have told this company

that that was what they would get, instead of allowing a \$600 million cost overrun. Hiring screeners may have been an administrative headache, but it is not rocket science. Thousands of companies around the country could have done a better job at much less cost to our taxpayers. Most Federal contracts are sweetheart insider deals in one way or the other, but this one is the most ridiculous I have ever heard of.

Then they hired far too many people. One aviation official told me that TSA now stands for "thousands standing around." I am sure that almost all of the people who have been hired are good, honest, patriotic people, but the TSA has simply hired many thousands more than they need.

I know it is impossible to ever convince any government agency that they have hired even enough people, much less too many. Yet before 9/11, we had about 28,000 or 29,000 screeners. We were told beforehand, before the legislation passed, that we would need to hire about 33,000.

□ 1730

Right after passage, they said they would need about 40,000. Then, a few months later, they went to the staff of an appropriations subcommittee requesting 72,000 employees. There was such an outcry they quickly backed off to 67,000, and then the Committee on Appropriations put a cap on them of 45,000 that they have arrogantly ignored by hiring thousands of temporary employees. So I am told they now have about 66,000 screeners.

I had a screener come to see me at Constituent Day in my district a few weeks ago, and he will have to remain unnamed because I do not want to get him in trouble; but he told me that they have so many screeners at the Knoxville Airport and so many radios that when I walk in the airport, they radio ahead and say Congressman DUNCAN is in the airport, stand up, look busy. It was on the front page of the Knoxville News Sentinel that they were going from about 70 screeners to about 160. I am told one major airport went from about 170 screeners to over 700.

Then two members of the other body have uncovered the worst abuse of all. Apparently, 20 TSA recruiters spent nearly 2 months at a luxury resort in Colorado, a 7-week junket, that resulted in the hiring of just 50 screeners. Rates at this hotel run from a low in the high \$200s to well over \$300 a night for just an average room. The company that ripped the taxpayers off on the screeners' contract, NCS Pearson, has been replaced by the TSA after the obscene cost overrun, but according to Ms. Malkin, the firm still holds several lucrative Federal contracts.

Mr. Speaker, I find it hard to understand how anyone could be in favor of big government when we see, day in and day out, so much waste, fraud, abuse, and simple inefficiency in the Federal Government.

I realize that the government keeps growing, despite the horrendous waste, because so many big businesses are making huge profits from federal contracts and so many bureaucrats are drawing salaries and benefits on average far higher than in the private sector.

So while I have read and heard about so much waste and exorbitant spending by the Federal Government that it is hard to surprise me anymore, even I have been shocked and amazed by the spending of the new Transportation Security Administration.

Apparently I am not the only one shocked by this new Agency. Michelle Malkin, a nationally-syndicated columnist, wrote in a column carried in yesterday's Washington Times, these words: "The Transportation Security Administration is a fiscal black hole, and fiscal conservatives ought to be enraged. . . ."

She said the TSA is "sucking down tax dollars like a bagless Dyson Cyclone vacuum gone berserk."

Ms. Malkin reports that "already, the one-year-old agency has amassed a \$3.3 billion budget deficit and is demanding upward of \$6 billion for the current fiscal year."

She wrote in this column: "Never has a single government entity spent so much for so little in such a short time."

It is almost unbelievable to me that any federal agency could lose three billion, three hundred million in its first year in operation.

This has to be one for the record books.

A few weeks ago, I read in the Washington Post a report of the testimony by Kenneth Mead, Inspector General of the Transportation Department.

He said the TSA had budgeted \$107 million to hire airport screeners, but they ended up paying over \$700 million to the contractor.

The only contact I had with this contractor was when they ran an ad saying that they would take applications at a mall in my District, and then no one from the company showed up.

I received several calls from angry constituents who showed up at 7 a.m., as the ad had directed, and had driven long distances to get there.

If the TSA had budgeted \$107 million, they should have told this company that was what they would get instead of allowing a \$600 million cost overrun.

Hiring screeners may have been an administrative headache, but it is not rocket science. Thousands of companies around the country could have done a better job at much less cost to our taxpayers.

Most federal contracts are sweetheart, insider deals in one way or the other, but this one is about the most ridiculous I have ever heard of.

Then they hired far too many people. One aviation official told me that TSA now stands for thousands standing around.

I am sure that almost all the people who have been hired are good, honest, patriotic people. But the TSA has simply hired many thousands more than they need.

I know it is impossible to ever convince any government agency that they have hired even though people much less too many.

Yet, before 9/11 we had about 28,000 or 29,000 screeners. We were told beforehand we would need to have about 33,000. After passage, they said they would need about 40,000—then a couple of months later, they went to the staff of an appropriations subcommittee requesting 72,000.

There was such an outcry, they quickly backed off to 67,000. Then the appropriations Committee put a cap on them of 45,000 that they have arrogantly ignored by hiring thousands of temporary employees, so I am told they now have about 65,000 screeners.

I am told one major airport went from about 170 screeners to over 700.

Then two members of the other body have uncovered the worst abuse of all. Apparently twenty TSA recruiters spent nearly two months at a luxury resort in Colorado—a seven-week junket that resulted in the hiring of just 50 screeners. Rates at this hotel run from a low in the high \$200s to well over \$300 a night for just an average room.

The company that ripped the taxpayers off on the screeners contract, NCS Pearson, has been replaced by TSA, after the obscene cost overrun, but according to Ms. Malkin, "the firm still holds several lucrative federal contracts. These contracts total more than \$500 million—including a \$140 million deal to manage and operate three national customer-service call centers for federal immigration services."

As Ms. Malkin said: "Deeper into the homeland security money pit we go. Where the traditional watchdogs for limited government are, nobody knows."

EXCHANGE OF SPECIAL ORDER TIME

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take the time of the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR).

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BONNER). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Texas?

There was no objection.

ALTERNATIVES TO WAR SHOULD BE DEBATED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, many times, many of us are not aware of the very special talents and the very diverse backgrounds Members have in this House. I was moved to listen more than I ever have to the words of the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS). For those Members who need to be refreshed in their memories, of course, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS) is one of the valiant soldiers of the civil rights movement, one of the leaders of the civil rights movement, and one of those very privileged persons who had the opportunity to work directly with Dr. Martin Luther King. His words were particularly potent this evening, because he has just led a pilgrimage to Selma, Alabama, to acknowledge the Selma-to-Montgomery march. The march of March 7, 2003, was to acknowledge the march of March 7, 1965, when Congressman LEWIS's attempt to walk across the bridge for civil rights and the right to vote was stopped by the bloody actions of those in Selma, Alabama. Today we are seeking healing, and he is proudly one that leads a