

rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 613, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 406, nays 2, not voting 26, as follows:

[Roll No. 26]
YEAS—406

Abercrombie	Davis (VA)	Horn
Ackerman	Deal	Hostettler
Aderholt	DeFazio	Houghton
Allen	DeGette	Hoyer
Andrews	Delahunt	Hunter
Archer	DeLauro	Hutchinson
Armey	DeLay	Hyde
Baca	DeMint	Insole
Bachus	Diaz-Balart	Isakson
Baird	Dickey	Istook
Baker	Dicks	Jackson (IL)
Baldacci	Dingell	Jackson-Lee
Baldwin	Dixon	(TX)
Ballenger	Doggett	Jefferson
Barcia	Dooley	Jenkins
Barr	Doolittle	John
Barrett (NE)	Doyle	Johnson (CT)
Barrett (WI)	Dreier	Johnson, E. B.
Bartlett	Duncan	Johnson, Sam
Bass	Dunn	Jones (NC)
Bateman	Edwards	Jones (OH)
Becerra	Ehlers	Kanjorski
Bentsen	Emerson	Kasich
Bereuter	Engel	Kelly
Berkley	English	Kennedy
Berman	Eshoo	Kildoe
Berry	Etheridge	Kind (WI)
Biggart	Evans	King (NY)
Bilbray	Everett	Kingston
Bilirakis	Ewing	Kleczka
Bishop	Farr	Klink
Blagojevich	Fattah	Knollenberg
Biley	Filner	Kolbe
Blumenauer	Fletcher	Kucinich
Blunt	Foley	Kuykendall
Boehkert	Forbes	LaFalce
Boehner	Ford	LaHood
Bonilla	Fossella	Lampson
Bonior	Fowler	Lantos
Bono	Frank (MA)	Largent
Borski	Franks (NJ)	Larson
Boswell	Frelinghuysen	Latham
Boucher	Frost	LaTourette
Boyd	Galleghy	Lazio
Brady (PA)	Ganske	Leach
Brady (TX)	Gejdenson	Lee
Brown (FL)	Gekas	Levin
Bryant	Gephardt	Lewis (CA)
Burr	Gilchrest	Lewis (GA)
Burton	Gillmor	Lewis (KY)
Buyer	Gilman	Linder
Callahan	Gonzalez	Lipinski
Calvert	Goode	LoBiondo
Camp	Goodlatte	Lowey
Canady	Goodling	Lucas (KY)
Cannon	Gordon	Lucas (OK)
Capuano	Goss	Luther
Cardin	Graham	Maloney (CT)
Carson	Granger	Maloney (NY)
Castle	Green (TX)	Manzullo
Chabot	Green (WI)	Markey
Chambliss	Greenwood	Martinez
Clay	Gutierrez	Mascara
Clayton	Gutknecht	Matsui
Clement	Hall (OH)	McCarthy (MO)
Clyburn	Hall (TX)	McCarthy (NY)
Coble	Hansen	McCollum
Coburn	Hastings (FL)	McCrery
Collins	Hastings (WA)	McDermott
Combest	Hayes	McGovern
Condit	Hayworth	McHugh
Conyers	Hefley	McInnis
Cooksey	Heger	McIntosh
Costello	Hill (IN)	McIntyre
Cox	Hill (MT)	McKeon
Coyne	Hillery	McKinney
Cramer	Hilliard	McNulty
Crane	Hinche	Meehan
Crowley	Hinojosa	Meek (FL)
Cubin	Hobson	Meeks (NY)
Cummings	Hoefel	Menendez
Cunningham	Hoekstra	Metcalfe
Danner	Holden	Mica
Davis (FL)	Holt	Miller (FL)
Davis (IL)	Hooley	Miller, George

Minge	Rodriguez	Sununu
Mink	Roemer	Sweeney
Moakley	Rogan	Talent
Mollohan	Rogers	Tancred
Moore	Rohrabacher	Tanner
Moran (KS)	Ros-Lehtinen	Tauscher
Moran (VA)	Rothman	Tauzin
Morella	Roukema	Taylor (MS)
Myrick	Royce	Taylor (NC)
Nadler	Ryan (WI)	Terry
Napolitano	Ryun (KS)	Thomas
Neal	Sabo	Thompson (CA)
Nethercutt	Salmon	Thompson (MS)
Ney	Sanchez	Thornberry
Northup	Sanders	Thune
Norwood	Sandlin	Thurman
Nussle	Sanford	Tiahrt
Oberstar	Sawyer	Tierney
Obey	Saxton	Toomey
Olver	Scarborough	Towns
Ortiz	Schaffer	Traficant
Ose	Schakowsky	Turner
Packard	Scott	Udall (CO)
Pallone	Sensenbrenner	Udall (NM)
Pascrell	Serrano	Upton
Pastor	Sessions	Velazquez
Payne	Shadegg	Visclosky
Pease	Shaw	Vitter
Pelosi	Shays	Walden
Peterson (MN)	Sherman	Walsh
Peterson (PA)	Sherwood	Wamp
Petri	Shuster	Watkins
Phelps	Simpson	Watt (NC)
Pickering	Sisisky	Watts (OK)
Pickett	Skeen	Waxman
Pitts	Skelton	Weiner
Pombo	Slaughter	Weldon (FL)
Pomeroy	Smith (MI)	Weldon (PA)
Porter	Smith (NJ)	Weller
Price (NC)	Smith (TX)	Weygand
Pryce (OH)	Smith (WA)	Whitfield
Quinn	Snyder	Wicker
Radanovich	Souder	Wilson
Rahall	Spence	Wise
Ramstad	Spratt	Wolf
Rangel	Stabenow	Woolsey
Regula	Stark	Wu
Reyes	Stearns	Wynn
Reynolds	Stenholm	Young (AK)
Riley	Stump	Young (FL)
Rivers	Stupak	

NAYS—2

Chenoweth-Hage Strickland

NOT VOTING—26

Barton	Kilpatrick	Roybal-Allard
Brown (OH)	Lofgren	Rush
Campbell	Millender	Shimkus
Capps	McDonald	Shows
Cook	Miller, Gary	Vento
Deutsch	Murtha	Waters
Ehrlich	Owens	Wexler
Gibbons	Oxley	
Hulshof	Paul	
Kaptur	Portman	

□ 1825

Mr. STRICKLAND changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the Senate 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. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, I regret that I was not present for rollcall vote No. 26 because I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “yes.”

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Speaker, due to a previous commitment in my district, I was absent for rollcall vote No. 26.

Had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent from the Chamber today during

rollcall vote No. 26 on S. 613. Had I been present I would have voted “yea.”

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BALDACCI. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, February 16, 2000, I was traveling in my district with Energy Secretary Bill Richardson, examining the devastating impact that high fuel and heating oil prices are having on Maine people. As a result, I missed four votes. Had I been present, I would have voted in the following way:

Rollcall vote 22, yea; rollcall vote 23, nay; rollcall vote 24, aye; and rollcall vote 25, no.

GIL HODGES BELONGS IN BASEBALL HALL OF FAME

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

Mr. WEINER. Mr. Speaker, earlier this month the Bay News in Brooklyn had this headline on their newspaper. It says, “Get Gil In. Brooklynites Demand, Put Hodges in the Hall of Fame.”

Well, today, the veterans committee of major league baseball announced, once again, that Gil Hodges had been passed over. This is an outrage.

In fact, we all know that Gil Hodges was the first major league player to ever hit four home runs in a game. And those of us who are Met fans know that he was the first Met to ever hit a home run and, of course, the manager of the “Miracle Mets” of 1969.

But even the casual baseball fan knows that Gil Hodges deserves to be in the Hall of Fame. They know that he ranks 38 in home runs, with over 370; six seasons with 30-plus home runs. He hit twice, more than 40 home runs. He had a lifetime slugging percentage of nearly 500, and nine times he exceeded a 500 slugging percentage. He was a Gold Glove winner. He played on seven pennant winners and two World Series champions.

He was a hero to the people of Brooklyn and a baseball player that deserves to be in the Hall of Fame.

The Bay News said, “Get Gil In.” All Brooklynites agree. The Committee on Veterans Affairs’ should heed that call.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). Under the Speaker’s announced policy of January 6, 1999, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

U.S., INDIA, AND CHINA: TIME FOR NEW RELATIONSHIP

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, in the latter part of March, President Clinton is scheduled to travel to India. His trip will mark the first visit by an American President to the world's largest democracy since 1978. I would say that a visit to India by the leader of the free world is long overdue, and I want to express my appreciation to the President for making this historic trip.

Mr. Speaker, my purpose this evening is to suggest that the President devote significant time during the trip to developing closer bilateral cooperation on defense and security issues to respond to common threats and challenges. This is an area where the need for a U.S.-India partnership is growing increasingly urgent. For years we have seen how many of the same forces of international terrorism that threaten American interests also pose a direct threat to India's security.

Another common threat faced by India and the United States emanates from the People's Republic of China. In the last week, we have seen China threatening Taiwan with military force, belying Beijing's claims to favor peaceful reunification. This is, unfortunately, a familiar pattern. U.S. naval officials in the Pacific are currently trying to defuse the situation, and the administration is obviously concerned about the implications that Beijing's saber-rattling will have in a variety of areas. In this House just a few weeks ago, we passed the Taiwan Security Enhancement Act, which I supported.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it is time for the United States to stop basing so much of our Asia policy on the hope of achieving a strategic partnership with China. Instead, I believe we should recognize the benefits of closer defense ties with India, a country which, unlike China, is a democracy and which, also in contrast to China, does not threaten its neighbors with the kinds of rhetoric and actions that Beijing has most recently demonstrated with regard to Taiwan.

Toward this end, President Clinton's upcoming trip to India offers an opportunity to embark upon a new direction in U.S. policy in Asia. It is an opportunity to confront the threat posed by China to regional and independent national security and to make responses to this threat a higher priority.

Mr. Speaker, India faces a very serious threat from China. The two countries share a border of approximately a thousand miles. In the 1960s, China initiated a border war against India and continues to occupy Indian territory. More recently, we have seen China providing missile development and nuclear technology assistance to Pakistan as well as other unstable regimes. Pakistan, a country currently ruled by military dictatorship, launched a border conflict against India last year in Kashmir and continues to threaten India in a number of ways, including by

providing support and a base for terrorist movements active in Kashmir. By aiding Pakistan, China is indirectly, but in a very real sense, threatening its neighbor India.

India, on the other hand, Mr. Speaker, does not engage in proliferation activities. India has developed its own indigenous nuclear weapon and missile systems, but it does not share the sensitive technology with other nations, much less with unstable regimes that support international terrorism. India does not seek to promote tensions among neighboring countries, as China has cynically done in the India-Pakistan dispute.

Given Chinese behavior and the common threat it poses to the United States and India, I believe that President Clinton should use his trip to India as the occasion to launch a new Indo-U.S. defense partnership. I will be calling on the President to take this much-needed action.

While this is a bold new step, I believe we can lay the groundwork now for a far-reaching alliance between the United States and India, including greatly expanded International Military Education and Training, joint exercises and other military and political links that the U.S. currently maintains with our key democratic allies around the world. Such a partnership may take some time to fully develop, but now is the time for launching it and also pondering the details.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I maintain my view that the President should not go to Pakistan on his trip to South Asia. It is important that the administration continue to send the message to Islamabad that we are very concerned about Pakistan's role in promoting instability in Kashmir, about the links between Pakistan and terrorist organizations, and the crushing of civilian government by the military junta now in power.

Currently, Pakistan is not on the President's South Asia itinerary. Mr. Speaker, Pakistan has done nothing to deserve a visit by the President of the United States.

CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, Americans understand that, without campaign finance reform, attempts to restructure our healthcare system, create a prescription drug benefit, improve our communities, protect our environment will all be for naught. The big, important issues will remain trapped by the pressures of special interests and big-money politics.

The fight for campaign finance reform will not go away. I personally

pledge to continue to make campaign finance reform one of Congress's most urgent priorities. However, opponents of real reform continue to create a legislative logjam. Deadlines are set and ignored.

June will mark the fifth anniversary of President Clinton and then House Speaker Newt Gingrich shaking hands before a group of senior citizens and pledging to create a bipartisan campaign finance reform commission. As we all know, nothing ever came of it.

This last session, I was very encouraged when the Shays-Meehan bill passed the House by a large bipartisan vote. This important legislation, while not the ultimate solution, is a significant step forward. It would ban soft money contributions and deal with sham issue ads, which are so prevalent.

Despite the House's action, Shays-Meehan has met its death in the Senate. The other body was unable to terminate debate on this crucial issue. We lost the opportunity to make a real change.

I am fortunate to represent a very historic congressional district in northern New Mexico. During the winter recess, I traveled around my district and spoke to the people. In gathering after gathering, the issue of campaign finance reform kept coming up. I assured them that I would fight to put campaign finance reform on the front burner.

Voters in my State are so concerned that they are pushing for a publicly financed State system, which will be voted on in November. This constitutional amendment has solid grassroots support.

The State senator that introduced this constitutional amendment, Dede Feldman, and her colleagues in the State legislature should be applauded for having the courage to bring this issue to the forefront.

I had the opportunity today to proudly march with Granny D, the campaign finance reform champion who arrived in our Nation's capital. The determination of this 90-year-old woman and her crusade for reform is truly inspiring. I want to thank Granny D for her courageous efforts.

I honestly believe that, if our country's founders were here to witness today's campaigns, they would join us in this endeavor. Indeed, Alexander Hamilton wrote: "It will not be alleged that an election law could have been framed and inserted in the Constitution which would have been applicable to every probable change in the situation of the country; and it will not therefore not be denied that a discretionary power over elections ought to exist somewhere."

We have got to reform this system and preserve our precious democracy.