

Leach	Pryce (OH)	Smith (TX)
Lewis (CA)	Putnam	Souder
Lewis (KY)	Quinn	Spence
Linder	Radanovich	Stearns
LoBiondo	Ramstad	Stump
Manzullo	Regula	Sununu
McCrery	Rehberg	Sweeney
McHugh	Reynolds	Tancredo
McInnis	Riley	Tauzin
McKeon	Rogers (KY)	Taylor (NC)
Mica	Rogers (MI)	Terry
Miller (FL)	Rohrabacher	Thomas
Miller, Gary	Ros-Lehtinen	Thornberry
Moran (KS)	Roukema	Thune
Morella	Royce	Tiahrt
Myrick	Ryan (WI)	Tiberi
Nethercutt	Ryun (KS)	Toomey
Ney	Saxton	Traficant
Northup	Scarborough	Upton
Norwood	Schaffer	Vitter
Nussle	Schrock	Walden
Osborne	Sensenbrenner	Walsh
Ose	Sessions	Wamp
Otter	Shadegg	Watkins
Oxley	Shaw	Watts (OK)
Paul	Shays	Weldon (FL)
Pence	Sherwood	Weldon (PA)
Peterson (PA)	Shimkus	Weller
Petri	Shuster	Whitfield
Pickering	Simmons	Wicker
Pitts	Simpson	Wilson
Platts	Skeen	Wolf
Pombo	Smith (MI)	Young (AK)
Portman	Smith (NJ)	Young (FL)

NAYS—201

Abercrombie	Gonzalez	Meek (FL)
Ackerman	Gordon	Menendez
Allen	Green (TX)	Millender-
Andrews	Gutierrez	McDonald
Baca	Hall (OH)	Miller, George
Baird	Hall (TX)	Mink
Baldacci	Harman	Moakley
Baldwin	Hastings (FL)	Mollohan
Barcia	Hill	Moore
Barrett	Hilliard	Murtha
Becerra	Hinchev	Nadler
Bentsen	Hinojosa	Napolitano
Berkley	Hoeffel	Neal
Berman	Holden	Oberstar
Berry	Holt	Obey
Blagojevich	Honda	Olver
Blumenauer	Hookey	Ortiz
Bonior	Hoyer	Owens
Boswell	Inslee	Pallone
Boucher	Israel	Pascarell
Boyd	Jackson (IL)	Pastor
Brown (FL)	Jackson-Lee	Payne
Brown (OH)	(TX)	Pelosi
Capps	Jefferson	Peterson (MN)
Capuano	John	Phelps
Cardin	Johnson, E. B.	Pomeroy
Carson (IN)	Jones (OH)	Price (NC)
Carson (OK)	Kanjorski	Rahall
Clay	Kaptur	Rangel
Clayton	Kennedy (RI)	Reyes
Clement	Kildee	Rivers
Clyburn	Kind (WI)	Rodriguez
Conyers	Klecza	Roemer
Costello	Kucinich	Ross
Coyne	LaFalce	Rothman
Cramer	Lampson	Roybal-Allard
Crowley	Langevin	Rush
Cummings	Lantos	Sabo
Davis (CA)	Larsen (WA)	Sanchez
Davis (FL)	Larsen (CT)	Sanders
Davis (IL)	Lee	Sandlin
DeFazio	Levin	Sawyer
DeGette	Lewis (GA)	Schakowsky
Delahunt	Lipinski	Schiff
DeLauro	Lofgren	Scott
Deutsch	Lowey	Serrano
Dicks	Lucas (KY)	Sherman
Dingell	Luther	Shows
Doggett	Maloney (CT)	Skelton
Dooley	Maloney (NY)	Slaughter
Doyle	Markey	Smith (WA)
Edwards	Mascara	Snyder
Engel	Matheson	Solis
Eshoo	Matsui	Spratt
Etheridge	McCarthy (MO)	Stark
Evans	McCarthy (NY)	Stenholm
Farr	McCollum	Strickland
Fattah	McDermott	Stupak
Filner	McGovern	Tanner
Ford	McIntyre	Tauscher
Frank	McKinney	Taylor (MS)
Frost	McNulty	Thompson (CA)
Gephardt	Meehan	Thurman

Tierney	Velazquez	Wexler
Towns	Visclosky	Woolsey
Turner	Watt (NC)	Wu
Udall (CO)	Waxman	Wynn
Udall (NM)	Weiner	

NOT VOTING—13

Bishop	Ganske	Moran (VA)
Borski	Hunter	Thompson (MS)
Brady (PA)	Kilpatrick	Waters
Condit	Lucas (OK)	
Cubin	Meeks (NY)	

□ 1409

Mr. BERMAN, Mr. HOFFEL and Mrs. MEEK of Florida changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. GREENWOOD changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 125, had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. DOGGETT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire about next week's schedule.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCKEON).

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce that there will be no further votes in the House for the week.

The House will next meet for legislative business on Monday, May 21 at 12:30 p.m. for morning hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

The House will consider a number of measures under suspension of the rules, including the following bills:

H.R. 1831, the Small Business Liability Protection Act; and

H.R. 1885, the 245(i) Extension Act of 2001.

A complete list of suspensions will be distributed to Members' offices tomorrow.

On Monday, no recorded votes are expected before 6 p.m.

On Tuesday through Thursday, the House will consider the following measures:

H.R. 1, the No Child Left Behind Act; and

H.R. 1836, the Economic Growth and Tax Relief Reconciliation Act Conference Report.

On Friday, the House will not be in session for the start of the Memorial Day district work period.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for that explanation.

If I might inquire further, many Members, of course, have travel plans for next Thursday evening, does the gentleman anticipate any event that would prevent our departing at least by 6 p.m. on Thursday?

Mr. MCKEON. If the gentleman will continue to yield, we hope to get the

tax conference report back by Thursday so that we can get that passed Thursday, but we do not have a guarantee of that.

Mr. DOGGETT. Of course, the conference has not been convened because the Senate has not acted. Is the gentleman saying in the event the tax reconciliation conference report, if that is not available by Thursday night, we might be facing some interference with the Memorial Day weekend?

Mr. MCKEON. Our goal is to finish that up on Thursday, and we cannot guarantee that, but that is our goal.

□ 1415

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, backing up to Monday, does the gentleman from California (Mr. MCKEON) anticipate that there will be any business other than suspensions on Monday evening?

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, we may start the general debate on the education bill.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, it had been my understanding that was beginning on Tuesday, but there is a possibility of general debate, not amendments on Monday night?

Mr. MCKEON. There would be no education votes, but there is a possibility that we would have the general debate begin.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, because there is such interest in the education bill, is the gentleman from California informed as to what days we would be considering the education bill next week?

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Speaker, we hope to finish it Tuesday, but it could spill over into Wednesday.

Mr. DOGGETT. The gentleman mentioned both H.R. 1831 and H.R. 1885. Does he know on which days those are most likely to be considered?

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Speaker, those will be Monday under suspension and voted on after 6 o'clock.

Mr. DOGGETT. All right, Mr. Speaker. Then on H.R. 1 and H.R. 1836, when might they be considered?

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1 will be Tuesday and Wednesday and hopefully H.R. 1836 on Thursday.

NO CHILD LEFT BEHIND ACT OF 2001

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). Pursuant to House Resolution 143 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 1.

□ 1416

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1) to close the achievement gap with accountability, flexibility, and choice, so that no child is left behind, with Mr. HASTINGS of Washington in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered as having been read the first time.

Under the rule, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER) and the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) each will control 60 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER).

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, beginning today, we have an opportunity to make a true difference in the lives of our Nation's children, particularly our most disadvantaged children in America. This rare opportunity presents itself in the form of No Child Left Behind, President Bush's plan to improve elementary and secondary education in America.

This process began last December before President Bush technically was even President Bush. It began with a meeting in Austin, Texas when the President-elect invited Members of both parties to discuss education reform, the item at the top of his agenda.

None of us knew what to expect from that meeting, but all of us left with a sense that something extraordinary was within our grasp. It was clear that our new President had a genuine interest in the issue of education. He had a powerful desire to bring Members of all parties together on this issue here in Washington just like he had done in the State of Texas. Now, just under 6 months later, we are here today together to consider the most important change in Federal education policy in 35 years.

I want to thank my colleagues on both sides of the aisle who have worked hard on behalf of American students: The gentleman from California (Mr. MCKEON), the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON), the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SCHAFFER), and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) and the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Mrs. MINK) and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER).

I particularly want to thank the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE) on his tireless efforts on behalf of our Nation's students and the job that he has done as the subcommittee chairman on the 21st Century Subcommittee on Education Reform.

I also want to thank the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) for his leadership and willingness to work in good faith for this bipartisan bill.

The measure before us gives students a chance, parents a choice, and schools a challenge to be the best in the world. After 35 years of spending without accountability, it challenges States to use Federal education dollars to deliver results for our students. Instead of relying on money and red tape, it taps into our Nation's most precious educational resource, parents.

In the hands of caring parents, information is a powerful tool for reforming

our schools. Why ask States to evaluate schools annually? Because parents deserve to know how their child's school stacks up against the others. Why have a report card for States and school districts? Because parents deserve to know whether their children are being taught by qualified teachers and whether their child's school is failing and falling below expectations.

The more parents know, the more they are likely to push for meaningful change in our schools. Without the ability to measure, there is simply no way for parents to know for certain that their children are, in fact, truly learning. There is no way to know for certain which students are in danger of slipping through the cracks.

As Education Secretary Rod Paige has noted, President Bush's education plan rests on 4 pillars: accountability, local control, research-based reform, and expanded parental options.

The legislation before us meets all of the President's principles. It challenges States to set high standards for public schools, demanding accountability for results. It provides unprecedented flexibility to local districts, letting them make spending decisions instead of letting Washington make decisions for them. It triples Federal support for proven reading programs rooted in scientific research. And it provides an escape route for students trapped in chronically failing schools.

These reforms would mark the first time in a generation that Washington has returned a meaningful degree of authority to parents at the expense of the education bureaucracy. It would streamline a significant share of the Federal education regime in one swift stroke. It would provide new hope that the next generation of disadvantaged students can escape the misery of low expectations.

I am grateful to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle who have worked hard to turn the President's vision for education reform into reality. I believe we have produced a plan that is worthy, not just of the support of my Republican colleagues and my Democrat colleagues and independents, but of teachers, parents, and most of all our children.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I want to begin my remarks on this legislation by thanking the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER), the chairman of my committee, for all of his cooperation and for the honorable manner in which he dealt with every member of our committee, especially those members on our side. We recognize we are in the minority. It makes it very difficult from time to time, but the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER) was very candid with us, very forthcoming, and I think created an atmosphere in which we could arrive at this work product with this bipartisan conclusion.

I would also say that, as I watched him work, as he assumed the chairmanship of this committee, and as I watched him work with individual members of the committee and to deal with all of the issues that were thrown at us during the months of discussion of this legislation, and during our markup, I saw a legislator at work, and he should be very proud.

I also want to thank those who worked so very hard, the members of our committee as members of the working group: the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE), the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE), the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Mrs. MINK), the gentleman from California (Mr. MCKEON), the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER), and the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON).

These Members and their staff spent an awful lot of time in sessions trying to iron out the differences between us to see whether or not we could come to agreement. In some cases, we were able to. In other cases, we were not, but we moved on to the other topics and finally arrived in the negotiations that led to this legislation.

I think we feel that, in fact, this legislation truly represents both, what both Members on both sides of the aisle have been saying they want with respect to the Federal role in education and to what the President has said that he wants in this legislation.

I believe that we have an opportunity with this legislation to pass a sound, bipartisan education reform bill that will benefit children. We will have an opportunity to pass a bill that achieves a consensus, a consensus, as I have said, between the education proposals and reform proposals offered by Members of Congress, both parties, and by the President.

Here are the reforms that we want and the overwhelming majority of parents and taxpayers tell us that they want and that we are attempting to achieve in this bill. We are attempting to achieve real accountability for real results; a specific plan to finally, once and for all, close the achievement gap between rich and poor and between minority and nonminority students.

It is very important because this is the intent of the Federal role in education, to equalize the effort and to close the gap between these students with respect to the results and the educational experience.

To provide for quality teachers through professional development, training and resources available to the teachers to do their jobs; significant new investments in our public school system; doubling Title I funding; increase support, respect and training for teachers; new resources to help schools that are failing; better targeting of funds to schools with high concentrations of children in poverty and to children with limited English proficiency; unprecedented flexibility at the local level to tailor education reforms to achieve the ambitious goals that we have set out in this legislation.

Today we have an opportunity to step forward, to make these changes on behalf of our Nation's school children.

This bill is not perfect. There is much more I would like to do to improve education in this country. I know there are many of my colleagues who would like to do some things in this bill differently, but I think this bill in its current form represents a major step forward. I think it would be a mistake for us to miss the opportunity to do the things we are capable of doing now because we cannot do everything right away.

The fact is that, in far too many communities in this country, particularly in our poorest communities, we have what amounts to gross educational malpractice, and that cannot stand. For too long, the educational system in this country has operated under a policy of acceptable losses. Too many children had been written off, and that cannot stand.

Hundreds of thousands of students leave school every year, in many cases with a diploma, only to find out that they have not received a quality education they need and that they ought to be entitled to. That cannot stand.

We know we can do better. Schools all over this country have succeeded in educating students from every background: poor students, black students, Hispanic students, students with limited English proficiency, students that represent American society in so many settings at so many different parts of the country, under so many different circumstances. In fact, they have been given an excellent education with excellent results. All of America's children deserve that.

In virtually every case, they have achieved these successes by doing the very things that we set out to do in this bill, setting high standards, establishing clear goals, and targeting the investments in better teaching and instructional materials.

We are saying today, on the anniversary of *Brown v. Board of Education*, that this is what we as a Nation want for every child in every school in every State. We want this for the children from Pittsburgh, California to Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania; for children from Portland, Maine to Portland, Oregon. I hope we can work together to fulfill that promise. We have some important work ahead of us.

The voucher provisions to be offered later in this debate in this bill would kill any chance of bipartisanship. In fact, they would likely result in bipartisan opposition to this entire bill. I know there are differences of opinion, but we believe that vouchers in any form fundamentally undermine what we are trying to accomplish to achieve real education reform throughout this country for all of our students. We will vigorously oppose those amendments.

The other significant amendments that would draw strong Democratic opposition would establish a large block grant with Federal education dollars to

the States, known as Straight A's. We will talk at great length later about what we, and almost every credible group representing local educators, students and parents, think is wrong with that Straight A's proposal.

I would assert here, however, that what we have in H.R. 1 is a better alternative to Straight A's, the provision we call transferability at the local level. In fact, I think the gentleman from Ohio (Chairman BOEHNER) and I agree. When it comes to the Straight A's proposal, we have a better deal in H.R. 1.

It was not a deal that I came to these negotiations with. It is not a deal that the chairman brought to these negotiations. We both had very different views about how this could be carried out to provide for the flexibility that so many of us have heard in our districts, school districts and administrators have asked for as they deal with the education of the children that they know best.

□ 1430

But out of these negotiations, with great help from the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER) and others, a solution came forward to provide that kind of flexibility to the local level of school decision-making in each and every one of our States.

We have the opportunity in this legislation, as I have said, to pass a sound bipartisan education reform bill that I believe will benefit all of the children of this Nation, and I look forward over the next few days to work with the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER) and Members on the other side of the aisle, with the members of our committee, and with the Members in the House generally to consider each and every amendment, to give it a fair hearing, and to give it our support or our opposition based on the merits and the differences that some of us have about the direction of the American education system.

As the chairman said when he started his remarks in this debate, as he did when we started our discussions in the committee, this is a debate on the merits of the education system in this country and about those proposals being put forth to reform that system, to hold that system accountable, and to get the results all of us want for all of our children. This is not about a personal political debate; this is not about attacking the motives or the integrity of any Member of Congress. Where we differ, it is on the merits.

To his credit, he kept the debate on that level in the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and for that reason we had overwhelming bipartisan support for this legislation, again, that represents the ideas on both sides of the aisle; and I would hope that this is the legislation that would emerge after we go through the markup here in the Committee of the Whole. I look forward to the continuation of the debate next week.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, the desperate need to repair America's schools is not a new issue for any of us here today. Five years ago, I conducted a survey of New York City schools and discovered that one in every four schools holds classes in areas such as hallways, gyms, bathrooms, and janitors' closets. Two-thirds of these schools had substandard critical building features, such as roofs, walls, and floors. This is an outrage and a disgrace.

In response to that shocking study, I worked with the Administration to author the very first school modernization bill in 1996.

Five years later, with school enrollment skyrocketing, the need to renovate and repair our schools is even more pressing. Yet this problem is simply too big for local and state officials to handle alone. States are doing the best they can but they need federal dollars to fill in the holes. In fact, the National Education Association estimates that the unmet school modernization need in America's schools totals over \$300 billion—and that's on top of what school districts and states are already spending!

Simply stated, the need for school modernization is a national problem that demands a national response. And that's why I am so disappointed that the amendment to provide school construction funds was not made in order. Frankly, my colleagues, I think this is an issue where we will pay now, or pay later. We know that students cannot learn when the walls are literally crumbling around them. If we do not provide the resources—even this targeted emergency assistance—we will continue to undermine our students and teachers as they struggle to meet standards and achieve academically.

We can spend this money now, targeted at the most urgent repairs first, providing funding to high-need school districts for critical repairs such as sealing leaky roofs and removing asbestos, or we will pay later—in lower student achievement, ever-more burdened teachers, and potentially even accident or injury in crumbling schoolrooms.

America's children need us to make the right choice now—to use the opportunity we have in this time of unprecedented prosperity to rebuild their schools and lift up the quality of their education. And, if we fail as a Congress—once again—to take action to meet our school modernization needs—we will pay later.

I urge my colleagues to join me to acknowledge the shameful physical condition of our schools and to do something about it. We cannot give our students a 21st century education in 19th century schools.

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Chairman, I would like to take a couple of minutes to speak in favor of the provision in H.R. 1 that expands and improves the Troops-to-Teachers program. Our military is a great reservoir of potential talent, particularly in the area of math and science, and this program taps into that talent by encouraging members of our Armed Forces to become teachers after they leave the military.

Many have warned of an approaching teacher shortage in this country. According to some estimates, we will have to find somewhere between 1.6 and 2.6 million new teachers merely to replace teachers scheduled to retire. The Troops-to-Teachers program has already been a great help to meet this shortfall, and I believe that it can be ever more useful in the future.

Several thousand members of the military retire each year, often at ages young enough that they are searching for new careers. We want to make it as easy as possible for these men and women to take the leadership skills and character that they have gained during their military careers and try to instill these traits in our young people.

In H.R. 1, we have improved the existing Troops to Teachers program to authorize stipends for soldiers participating in the program, and bonuses for soldiers who agree to teach in a high need school.

We have also expanded the category of soldiers eligible to participate in the program. Under current law, when a soldier completes active duty and decides to be a teacher, he or she has to go through a teacher training program that can take up to a year and a half. Because of this delay, many are discouraged from pursuing a teaching career.

H.R. 1 eliminates this roadblock by expanding eligibility so that an active duty soldier nearing retirement can participate in the program.

Mr. Chairman, this is a great program that enjoys bipartisan support, and it will bring many more qualified, excellent teachers into the profession that we so desperately need. I applaud its inclusion in H.R. 1 and I trust that in improved version of Troops-to-Teachers will be enacted this year.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise. The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD) having assumed the chair, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1) to close the achievement gap with accountability, flexibility, and choice, so that no child is left behind, had come to no resolution thereon.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO CANADA-UNITED STATES INTER-PARLIAMENTARY GROUP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, and pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 276d and clause 10 of rule I, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Members of the House to the Canada-United States Inter-parliamentary Group in addition to Mr. HOUGHTON of New York, chairman, appointed on March 20, 2001:

- Mr. GILMAN of New York;
 - Mr. DREIER of California;
 - Mr. SHAW of Florida;
 - Mr. STEARNS of Florida;
 - Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota;
 - Mr. MANZULLO of Illinois;
 - Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania; and
 - Mr. SOUDER of Indiana.
- There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, MAY 21, 2001

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the

House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Monday next for morning hour debates.

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

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

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

There was no objection.

EXPRESSING SENSE OF CONGRESS WELCOMING PRESIDENT CHEN SHUI-BIAN OF TAIWAN TO UNITED STATES

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on International Relations be discharged from further consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 135) expressing the sense of Congress welcoming President Chen Shui-bian of Taiwan to the United States, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GRAVES). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 135

Whereas for more than 50 years, a close relationship has existed between the United States and Taiwan, which has been of enormous economic, cultural, and strategic advantage to both countries;

Whereas the United States and Taiwan share common ideals and a vision for the 21st century;

Whereas freedom and democracy are the strongest foundations for peace and prosperity;

Whereas Taiwan has demonstrated an improved record on human rights and a commitment to democratic ideals of freedom of speech, freedom of the press, and free and fair elections routinely held in a multiparty system, as evidenced by the March 18, 2000, election of Chen Shui-bian as Taiwan's new president;

Whereas President Chen Shui-bian of Taiwan visited the United States on August 13, 2000, when several Members of Congress expressed interest in meeting with President Chen Shui-bian during his layover in Los Angeles, California, en route to Latin America;

Whereas the meeting with President Chen Shui-bian did not take place because of pressure from Washington and Beijing;

Whereas the Congress thereby lost the opportunity to communicate directly with President Chen Shui-bian about developments in the Asia-Pacific region and key elements of the relationship between the United States and Taiwan; and

Whereas the upcoming May 21, 2001, visit to the United States by President Chen Shui-bian of Taiwan is another significant opportunity to broaden and strengthen relations between the United States and Taiwan: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress—

(1) warmly welcomes President Chen Shui-bian of Taiwan upon his visit to the United States;

(2) requests President Chen Shui-bian to communicate to the people of Taiwan the support of the Congress and of the people of the United States; and

(3) recognizes that the visit of President Chen Shui-bian to the United States is a significant step toward broadening and deepening the friendship and cooperation between the United States and Taiwan.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to support the resolution introduced by the gentleman from Colorado, Mr. SCHAFFER.

This resolution welcomes president Chen Shui-bian of Taiwan to the United States next week. President Chen is stopping in New York on his way to Central and South America. Later, he will visit Houston, Texas.

At the International Relations Committee's request, Mr. SCHAFFER has agreed to make several technical changes, and we are now pleased to waive jurisdiction and support a unanimous consent request that this measure be considered out of order.

This is an important resolution, Mr. Speaker. Taiwan is one of our nation's most important friends in the world. We share the values of democracy, human rights and free markets. President Chen deserves a warm welcome as he comes to New York City and later to Houston, Texas.

Taiwan's democracy and economy have thrived in recent years despite direct threats from the People's Republic of China. We must send a strong message to China that Taiwan and the United States stand together against such intimidation.

I thank the gentleman from Colorado for bringing this resolution before us, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. GILMAN

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by Mr. GILMAN:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

That the Congress—

(1) warmly welcomes President Chen Shui-bian of Taiwan upon his visit to the United States;

(2) requests President Chen Shui-bian to communicate to the people of Taiwan the support of the Congress and of the people of the United States; and

(3) recognizes that the visit of President Chen Shui-bian to the United States is another significant opportunity to broaden and strengthen the friendship and cooperation between the United States and Taiwan.

Mr. GILMAN (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment in the nature of a substitute be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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