

asked that the Attorney General be directed within 14 days to be able to present all of the facts so that, again, the truth could be known.

I am disappointed that even after a vigorous debate, even after narrowing the resolutions, even after the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) offered an amendment to suggest that issues dealing with congressional staff, issues dealing with any other staff that could be utilized, a fair amendment, even after encountering a debate with our colleagues on the other side of the aisle that we would be willing to compromise so that the truth would be known why we had leadership of this House calling the FBI to go after individuals who were only expressing their viewpoint in objection to a runaway legislative process in the State of Texas.

That resolution was voted down, but we will not be stopped because it is important that the Committee on the Judiciary and this House not be known as the cover-up House of 2003. This body, dominated by Republicans, refused to pull back on the Articles of Impeachment on the President of the United States, William Jefferson Clinton, though many of us spoke against it. And their view was, the truth must be known.

Now, when there has been an enormous suggestion and allegations of abuse of power, the use of the FBI, when we have newspaper reports and testimony or statements made by legislators who heard from the FBI, who heard from Homeland Security, we still cannot seem to get, if you will, the truth that should be told.

So frankly, Mr. Speaker, I am hoping that there may be a reconsideration and we are going to offer another resolution of inquiry to be able to ensure the actual truth be told to the people of this House.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan with respect to this issue because his amendment was a very advanced amendment, cooperative and collaborative amendment in the committee; and I would be happy to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS).

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

Mr. Speaker, the judiciary considered a resolution of inquiry into a matter involving the Texas legislature when many of the members removed themselves in an attempt to prevent a redistricting scheme that would have been obviously very detrimental to African American and Hispanic Americans.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take the time allocated to me now.

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

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE OF INQUIRY

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

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, this event is not the basis for which the Committee of Inquiry was created because even though there was so much harm and possible violation of the voter rights of Americans in Texas, that was not what the Committee of Inquiry was gathered to do.

□ 2000

The committee of inquiry introduced by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN) was merely to inquire as to whether or not Federal funds, resources, or personnel had been used in trying to locate the missing members of the Texas legislature during June 11 through June 19, and that was all.

It was claimed by the distinguished majority leader of the House, himself from Texas, that this was a Federal matter, and that there was a justification because redistricting was involved that the Congress had every right to inquire. Whether he is correct or not is not central to the question of whether we should determine whether Homeland Security resources, whether Federal U.S. marshals, whether members of the FBI, whether personnel in the Department of Justice in Washington were used in trying to identify the whereabouts of members of the State legislature. That is all we wanted to do.

In an incredible debate, which fortunately has been reported to the American people and is preserved for all posterity, in a totally party vote, every Republican voted that they did not want to inquire, they did not want to know, they did not want to find out if Federal resources were used. They did not have any interest in knowing if there were any Federal statutes that were broken, whether there were any possible violations of the law.

This is the Committee on the Judiciary of the United States whose responsibility it is to protect the Constitution and its amendments and preserve democracy for the people of the United States of America, a rather striking position, but one that is not over because we did not prevail in the great Committee on the Judiciary in the House of Representatives.

This is a matter, as the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) has admonished us, is not going away. We are not packing up our tents and forgetting about this. We have got to show to people that the Department of Justice is accountable, that the FBI is accountable, that the United States marshals are accountable and that indeed the Members of Congress have a responsibility to know if Homeland Security has now been turned into a partisan operation for any purpose that

anybody in charge happens to think it is.

This is very important because with this kind of attitude there is going to be a great difficulty for the American people to have any confidence in Homeland Security whatsoever.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONYERS. I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. If the gentleman will remember a COINTELPRO was utilized against Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. It was a different time. This is a simple inquiry as to whether or not we find ourselves with a modern day COINTELPRO of 2003, whether Federal resources were used to track civilians who had not violated any law, and as my understanding, Dr. King and civil rights activists, it was determined that the COINTELPRO was excessive, that he was not a terrorist, he was not a threat. If anything, he was healing this land. He was bringing us together.

So I would say that it is appropriate for the FBI, of which we have oversight, to themselves want to be known to the United States of America as the institution that it is, with high regard for integrity and high regard for its commission.

PROVIDING AID FOR AFRICA

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

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, it is always a good thing when the President visits a neglected continent, and so I am very glad that President Bush finally got to Africa; but we must recognize and understand the history of the United States policy and the United States involvement with Africa in order to use this moment to develop a positive, forward-moving agenda that is mutually beneficial.

First of all, the United States has significantly in the past contributed to the underdevelopment of Africa and has been benefited from the geopolitical manipulation of Africa and its leaders, and that is a fact. In the past, the United States has endorsed and funded the regimes of dictators. It has secured and disbursed loans that have left Africa Nations to this day struggling with debt; and it has created a cycle of dependence that has left Africa importing resources, aid, and military support from others. That is a fact.

This cycle of dependency, however, can be broken if the United States would work with Africans instead of against them. Peace, however, is a prerequisite for development. There can be no nation-building without peace. Strengthening Africa's peacekeeping capacity is the only solution to limiting outbreaks of civil conflict and preventing them from spreading to other parts of the region.

In turn, our investment in peace would not only protect our foreign aid investment but would also strengthen and secure an environment for African democracy.

Today, Africans are getting poorer and hungrier, and conflict and HIV and AIDS really threaten the survival of entire nations that the breakdown of African communities is causing and the breakdown of state and regional governance. This breakdown really has created an opportunity for opportunistic individuals, companies and nations, including the United States, to exploit the absence of state authority and governing institutions and the natural resources vital to the economic and development and growth of a nation.

According to World Bank reports, poverty in Africa remains rampant. During the 1990s, the numbers of poor people on the continent living on less than \$1 per day, \$1 mind you per day, rose from 241 million to 315 million in 1999. The World Bank now estimates that by 2015 this number will be approximately 404 million. Why are the numbers of poor and impoverished Africans going up? We have to ask the question of our own government, is the United States really committed to ending global poverty and promoting democracy?

I am pleased again, as I said earlier, that President Bush is visiting the African continent, but I just wonder why he is not visiting a hunger-stricken country like Ethiopia or Zambia.

Development assistance continues to be underfunded in our budget. Budgets of international programs, especially for Africa, have been moved into budgets for rebuilding Iraq. I believe that the United States should rebuild countries that it bombs, but it should not rob Peter to pay Paul. For this one country, the United States will invest over half a billion dollars for a little over 24 million people in Iraq, while the entire foreign assistance budget for 54 African countries, with over 858 million Africans, will be a measly \$2 billion. That is an embarrassment and a real dismal dismissal of our history, heritage, and international significance for Africans and African Americans worldwide.

As I said earlier, I believe that the United States should help rebuild countries that we bomb and destroy, but we should find new money to do this. Otherwise, rebuilding a nation such as Iraq comes at a price.

The Bush administration has proposed decreases in several critical accounts in the 2004 Africa budget which will negatively impact Africa's long-term economic and political development efforts. So it appears that rebuilding Iraq, of course, is much more vital to the international community than the lowered nutritional status of Africans and the higher incidence of preventable illnesses like HIV and AIDS.

I urge our appropriators here to minimally step up to the plate and

fully fund the \$3 billion in HIV and AIDS money that we authorize tomorrow while the President is in Africa so that he can at least deliver on his promise to attack the HIV/AIDS pandemic in a real way.

RESTORING CIRCULARITY TO MEXICAN MIGRATION PATTERNS

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

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss the untenable situation facing our country as a result of our current immigration policies. I certainly do not believe that our Nation's borders should be left wide open. Especially today, in light of terrorist threats, we must keep track of who is entering and leaving the country. We can try to tighten up our border enforcements even more than we already have; but as long as the U.S. offers aliens more opportunity for work, people will risk their lives to cross the border.

From 1986 to 1998, the number of tax dollars that Congress appropriated for the INS increased eightfold and for the Border Patrol sixfold. The number of Border Patrol agents assigned to the southwest border doubled to 8,500.

The end result of this huge increase in enforcement efforts? More than 7 million illegal aliens reside within U.S. borders. How can we honestly tell the taxpayers that this strategy has been a success?

The increase in border enforcement has made it less likely that undocumented workers who have successfully entered the country will return home. Crossing the border is risky, so illegal workers are increasingly reluctant to repeat the trip more often than necessary once they are here. Also, smugglers are expensive. So workers must remain in the U.S. longer to pay for the high cost of crossing the border.

Before the Immigration Reform and Control Act, or the IRCA, became law in 1986, the average trip of illegal immigrants entering the U.S. lasted 3 years. After IRCA, the average trip length has risen to 8.9 years. It seems that increased border enforcement has been effective at keeping illegal immigrants in the United States.

The enormous rise in trip length has had a devastating effect on the cost of public service, particularly in my home State of Arizona. The longer illegal immigrants stay in the U.S., the more it costs local governments to provide services like health care, education, and criminal costs.

Another disturbing trend is the loss of life experienced by those who are attempting to enter the U.S. According to the Border Patrol, 146 aliens died in my home State of Arizona in 2002 while attempting to enter the country from Mexico. Nearly every day the desert claims another life of an illegal immigrant attempting to cross the border,

most likely those seeking work or a chance for making a better life for themselves and their families.

Is the answer to this problem to abandon any hope of enforcing our borders and swinging the door wide open to anyone who wishes to enter the country? Of course not. We can enforce our borders in a smarter way and greatly reduce the flow of illegal migration across them.

Rather than denying the reality of labor migration, we should instead work to regularize it and manage it within a legal framework so as to promote economic development abroad, minimize costs and disruptions for the United States and maximize benefits for all affected. Congress can and should consider an initiative that would alleviate many of the burdens that Arizona and the rest of the country suffer due to the problem of illegal immigration.

A temporary foreign worker program would direct the flow of workers into legal channels and promises to aid the government in getting a handle on who is here and who is crossing the border.

I support a program that would allow these workers legal entry into the U.S. so that they can perform the jobs that U.S. employers are offering. This legal framework would allow the U.S. to collect taxes and would provide the workers a safe and legal way to return to their homes and families.

I would submit that such a system would be far preferable than the status quo that we have today.

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

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

PRESCRIPTION DRUGS AND MEDICARE

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

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I come tonight to talk about prescription drugs and Medicare. The bill the House passed just 2 weeks ago is simply the first step toward the Republicans goal to privatize Medicare.

□ 2015

They want to do this for a few reasons, but their most important reason for doing this is that, I think, they firmly believe, or I would even say blindly believe, that the private sector and the free market solution is always better than a government one.

The free market is an incredible tool, and it has advanced many areas of human endeavor, but for it to work, it must have one important component, and that is the bottom line, or profit.