

Osborne	Ryun (KS)	Tanner
Ose	Sabo	Tauscher
Otter	Sanchez	Tauzin
Owens	Sanders	Taylor (MS)
Oxley	Sandlin	Taylor (NC)
Pallone	Sawyer	Terry
Pascarell	Saxton	Thomas
Pastor	Scarborough	Thompson (CA)
Paul	Schaffer	Thompson (MS)
Payne	Schakowsky	Thornberry
Pelosi	Schiff	Thune
Pence	Schrock	Thurman
Peterson (MN)	Scott	Tiahrt
Peterson (PA)	Sensenbrenner	Tiberi
Petri	Serrano	Tierney
Phelps	Sessions	Toomey
Pickering	Shadegg	Towns
Pitts	Shaw	Traficant
Platts	Shays	Turner
Pombo	Sherman	Udall (CO)
Pomeroy	Sherwood	Udall (NM)
Portman	Shimkus	Upton
Price (NC)	Shows	Velazquez
Pryce (OH)	Simmons	Visclosky
Putnam	Simpson	Vitter
Quinn	Sisisky	Walden
Radanovich	Skeen	Walsh
Rahall	Skelton	Wamp
Ramstad	Slaughter	Waters
Rangel	Smith (MI)	Watkins
Regula	Smith (NJ)	Watt (NC)
Rehberg	Smith (TX)	Watts (OK)
Reyes	Smith (WA)	Waxman
Reynolds	Snyder	Weiner
Riley	Solis	Weldon (FL)
Rivers	Souder	Weldon (PA)
Roemer	Spence	Weller
Rogers (MI)	Spratt	Wexler
Rohrabacher	Stark	Whitfield
Ros-Lehtinen	Stearns	Wicker
Ross	Stenholm	Wilson
Rothman	Strickland	Wolf
Roukema	Stump	Woolsey
Roybal-Allard	Stupak	Wu
Royce	Sununu	Wynn
Rush	Sweeney	Young (FL)
Ryan (WI)	Tancredo	

NOT VOTING—19

Baird	Clement	Moakley
Becerra	Doolittle	Morella
Bono	Evans	Rodriguez
Buyer	Greenwood	Rogers (KY)
Calvert	Grucci	Young (AK)
Cannon	Istook	
Capito	Meehan	

□ 1059

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. GRUCCI. Mr. Speaker, due to the death of my mother-in-law, Mrs. Carmella Fierro, I was unable to participate in today's recorded vote. However, I would have voted in the affirmative on the suspension bill on today's agenda: H.R. 132 to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 620 Jacaranda Street in Lanai City, Hawaii, as the "Goro Hokama Post Office Building."

Ms. CAPITO. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 11, I was not present due to erroneous information. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

ENSURING FAIRNESS AND JUSTICE WITH REGARD TO TREATY OF GUADALUPE HIDALGO

(Mr. UDALL of New Mexico asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize an impor-

tant anniversary of the United States: 153 years ago, the United States and Mexico signed the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo. This treaty sought to protect the property rights of those who remained in the United States and became United States citizens.

There is now substantial evidence there were many violations of this treaty's provisions. The GAO has undertaken an investigation to get to the heart of this important matter. This situation cries out for justice.

I urge all my colleagues to follow this study closely so we can bring justice to this issue.

Mr. Speaker, February 2nd marks the 153d anniversary of the signing of the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo. The Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo ended the Mexican War, and ceded to the United States what is now California, Arizona and New Mexico. The Treaty also recognized U.S. claims over Texas, with the Rio Grande as its southern boundary.

In turn, the United States paid Mexico \$15,000,000, and among other things, agreed to recognize prior land grants issued by Spain and Mexico to individuals, communities, and indigenous pueblo people. Thus, during the 50 years that followed the signing, numerous procedures were developed to evaluate and validate the land grants.

However, the change in sovereignty in 1848 brought together two different legal systems—the Spanish/Mexican and the Anglo-American. These competing legal systems resulted in the inability of the United States to properly recognize and honor the role that custom played in preserving the lands and waters in accordance with Spanish and Mexican law.

Mr. Speaker, this along with other facts, suggests that the manner in which these private and communal land grants were evaluated by the U.S. Courts and by Congress, did not satisfy the obligations assumed by the United States when we signed the treaty. To address this issue, the GAO has embarked on a study of whether the United States fulfilled its obligations under the Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo with regard to land grants made by Spain and Mexico. I am pleased that the initial exposure draft was recently completed, and I believe that this ongoing study is a proper step in addressing the numerous issues regarding the Treaty and its implementation.

Mr. Speaker, the issues that have evolved from the signing of the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo center on the concept of fairness and justice. Thus, I ask that all Americans acknowledge the 153d anniversary of the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, by recognizing the many issues that remain to be properly addressed in order to assure a fair evaluation of the land grant claims.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MILLER of Florida). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

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

[Mr. BROWN of Ohio 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 gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mrs. BIGGERT addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

CONTINUING ESCALATION OF HIV AND AIDS

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, as we reconvene the Congress, as we begin to deal with the various issues which affect our Nation and our country and our world, I thought I would take some time this morning to highlight one of those; and it has to do with the continuing escalation of HIV and AIDS.

As a matter of fact, I was looking at a report that suggests that, in the first detailed study to target some of the AIDS epidemic's overlooked victims, researchers in Chicago reported Monday that fully 30 percent of young gay African-American men are infected with HIV.

The infection rate for gay blacks was twice that of any other ethnic group, a finding that shocked some experts despite the already well-documented racial gap in AIDS cases.

"This is a disturbing and frightening number, and something should be done about it," said Linda Valleroy, an epidemiologist at the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, who led the six-city survey of gay men in their twenties. The results were outlined Monday at the 8th Annual Retrovirus Conference being held in Chicago this week.

The new figures reflect a troubling reality for gay black men who may not have enough income to live in the largely white gay enclaves where AIDS health centers are located. Such problems are amplified, gay advocates say, by lingering rifts over homosexuality within the African-American community itself.

For example, and I quote, "I am an African-American gay man living with HIV. In some people's eyes, I'm damned several times over," said Frank Oldham, Jr., who is the assistant commissioner of AIDS public policy at the Chicago Department of Health.

Previous AIDS surveys tended to focus on members of the white population, Valleroy said, in part because the researchers sampled gay neighborhoods where relatively few blacks live, men who frequented gay bars, clubs, restaurants and coffee houses.

Valleroy's team succeed in recruiting 408 gay black men for the survey, about 17 percent of the total. Moreover, no

previous study had looked at the infection rate among gays in this age group, which included men, ages 23 to 29.

The findings suggest that gay men of all races are engaging in risky behavior. Nearly half of the men interviewed had unprotected anal sex during the previous 6 months. Even those who are not infected are in danger of becoming infected.

I think what this report suggests, Mr. Speaker, is that, notwithstanding whatever the resources are that have heretofore been made available, that there is a tremendous need.

I would urge President Bush, as he prepares his budget for the coming year, to make absolutely certain that there are ample provisions for the prevention, detection, and treatment of the AIDS-HIV virus.

#### SOCIAL SECURITY REFORM VITAL IN BUDGET PROCESS

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

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I would like to spend a couple minutes talking about the challenges that this body faces over the next several weeks and months.

We are talking about a tax cut. We are talking about what is the status of the economy in the United States, where will we go with unemployment, what can we do as a body in Congress to help make sure that the economy of the United States continues.

We were talking about economic expansion in the neighborhood of 1.8 percent a year for economic expansion. Now we are talking about maybe 2.8 percent a year economic expansion, even with the slowdown. The technology that we have acquired over the last several years is a result of our investment in research.

If there is one thing that I would suggest that we do in this body to help make sure that we have a strong economy, it is capital investment.

I divide capital investment in two areas. One is physical capital, where we make sure that we put the effort into research to develop the state-of-the-art equipment and technology and techniques that can maximize our productivity. The other is investment in human capital so that we have a better education system.

Now we are challenged with a question of how much do we excite the economy by leaving more money in the pockets of those individuals that have earned that money. In other words, where do we cut taxes? How do we cut taxes? How do we do it in such a way that it is going to maximize the economic benefit of keeping a strong economy?

I have a couple suggestions. One is that we do not look away, or in any way disregard the importance of paying down the Federal debt. Today the Federal debt is \$5.7 trillion. The Gov-

ernment has borrowed \$5.7 trillion either from Social Security and the other trust funds or has issued Treasury paper to lend money to the public.

Out of that \$5.7 trillion, and this is the whole load of hay, out of that \$5.7 trillion, \$3.6 trillion, that is, \$3.6 trillion out of the \$5.7 trillion, is debt held by the public. So over the last several years, whether it is this body or whether it is the White House, when they talk about paying down the public debt, they are talking about only paying down a portion of that debt that has been lent to the public, Treasury bills, what I call the Wall Street debt.

As we pay down the debt, the question that we have to ask ourselves is, where is the money coming from to pay down that debt held by the public? And where it is coming from is the surplus coming into the trust fund. And the trust fund that has the greatest dollar amount of surplus or other taxation is the FICA tax.

In that FICA tax, most of it is Social Security tax, 12.4 percent of the total 15-odd percent is Social Security tax.

This year we will have \$158 billion more coming in from the Social Security tax than is needed to pay benefits. But when we hit the year 2010 to 2012, there will be less Social Security tax money coming in than is required to meet the benefits just 10 years from now.

So the question before this body, the question before America, is, what do we do with the extra surplus now to make sure that that money is more available when we need it 10 years from now?

Some have suggested, look, let us start getting some real return on investment, let us invest that money and let us put it in the name of those individuals so that Government and politicians cannot mess around with it in later years. And that is important. Because what we have done in the past is, when we were short of money, we cut benefits or we increased taxes.

I think Social Security reform continues to be a vital part of the decision of where we go in the budget process, how much we cut taxes, and how much we increase spending in government.

Let me give my colleagues an example of the danger of not having a tax cut, not getting some of this money out of Washington. That danger is that this body and the body over on the other end of this building ends up increasing spending so much faster than inflation.

The last three bills that we put together and passed last December increased spending almost 14 percent over what those three particular appropriation bills spent the year before.

The challenge before us is holding down spending, deciding what percentage of our total income is reasonable in terms of paying taxes.

Right now, if one is an American taxpayer, on the average, he spends 41 cents out of every dollar he makes to pay Government taxes at the local,

State, and national level. I suggest that that amount is too much.

Let us decide on the priority for the limit on taxes. And if that limit is less than what we are paying now, then let us decide on the best way to spend that money so that we keep social security solvent and Medicare solvent and give some priorities to important projects, like improving education.

ADJOURNMENT FROM THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 8, 2001 TO MONDAY, FEBRUARY 12, 2001

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns on Thursday, February 8, 2001, it adjourn to meet at 2 p.m. on Monday, February 12.

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

There was no objection.

HOURLY MEETING ON TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 13, 2001

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns on Monday, February 12, 2001, it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Tuesday, February 13, for morning hour debates.

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

There was no objection.

#### GUAM JUDICIAL EMPOWERMENT ACT

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

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, today I am reintroducing the Guam Judicial Empowerment Act, a bill which seeks to mend the Organic Act of Guam for the purposes of clarifying the local judicial structure.

This legislation will correct the defect in the Guam Organic Act relative to the judicial branch of the government of Guam and seeks to correct a longstanding judicial anomaly.

It would establish the local court system, including the Supreme Court of Guam, as a coequal branch of the government of Guam within the framework of the Guam Organic Act and place the judiciary on equal footing with Guam's legislative and executive branches of government.

Currently, the Organic Act of Guam, which functions as a de facto constitution for Guam, clearly delineates the inherent powers of the legislative and executive branches of the Government of Guam, but it does not do so for the judicial branches.

This legislation seeks to bring the courts in Guam to a level that is comparable and similar to other states and territories and seeks to establish a framework that is equal to the powers of the other branches.