

burst of energy in promoting the international nonproliferation system.

This deal is a great opportunity for the United States to form a truly beneficial partnership with India, an up-and-coming 21st century power. India has proved its stability as a multi ethnic democracy with an ever-growing economy, a middle-class that is well-versed in English, a lively technology sector, and a tremendous domestic market.

Advocates of arms control argue that the removal of a ban on the supply of fuel to India's civilian nuclear-power sector should not compromise nonproliferation efforts. However, it is clear that admonishing India for its failure to join the Non-Proliferation Treaty, NPT, is not enjoying the success that it should and therefore must be modernized.

The need for efforts to improve the NPT is confirmed by the inception of several new nuclear states and the potential for the establishment of even more in the near future.

Considering India's exceptional nonproliferation efforts, a United States-India partnership in designing a superior global nonproliferation system should prove to be beneficial worldwide.

Mr. Marshall and Mr. Clark encourage a push for NPT reforms, including more effective inspection and control of nuclear activity across the globe. They cite the critical reform as disallowing states who agree not to build nuclear weapons to then develop civilian nuclear energy programs. A loophole such as this permits countries, such as Iran, to insist upon a "right" to produce their own nuclear fuel supplies, as opposed to acquiring their supply from already established nuclear powers.

The article cites a simple solution to the problem: internationalize the nuclear fuels cycle. U.S. officials can organize an adequate source of fuel to countries that agree not to produce nuclear weapons and submit to rigid inspections through an international consortium. India should be at the forefront of this effort.

Mr. Marshall and Mr. Clark also encourage the Senate to demand that the U.S., along with other nuclear powers, move in the direction of disarmament. The current administration has failed to do this, and has in fact done the opposite.

I thank Mr. Marshall and Mr. Clark for their thorough analysis of the President's proposed agreement with India. Their views on the matter are greatly respected.

I therefore submit for the RECORD a piece from the May 23 issue of the Hill for our consideration.

[From the Hill, May 23, 2006]

WARMING TO THE INDIA NUCLEAR DEAL

(By Will Marshall and Wesley Clark)

At first glance, President Bush's proposed agreement with India on civil nuclear cooperation is a no-win proposition for the U.S. Senate. Rejecting the deal could chill relations between the world's biggest democracies; approving it might shred America's credibility as a leader of global efforts to restrain nuclear proliferation.

Senators can escape this dilemma, however, by offering the White House a deal of their own: support for the India agreement conditioned on concrete commitments by the Bush administration to breathe new life into the international nonproliferation system.

Under the deal struck last summer, the United States would lift its ban on supplying

expertise and fuel to India's civilian nuclear-power sector. India agreed to place 14 of its 22 nuclear reactors under safeguards with the International Atomic Energy Agency. The deal is intended to remove the chief irritant in U.S.-India relations: America's long-time policy of banning sales of civilian nuclear technology and fuel to any country—most prominently India—that has refused to sign the 1968 Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT).

U.S. leaders should not miss the best opportunity since the Cold War ended to forge a true strategic partnership with India. As a stable, multiethnic democracy with a brisk economic growth rate, a vibrant technology sector, an English-speaking middle class and a potential domestic market four times larger than America's, India is fast emerging as a 21st century power of the first rank.

Arms-control advocates, however, warn that closer U.S.-India ties should not come at the price of undermining the nonproliferation framework. Yet U.S. efforts to punish India for spurning the NPT have manifestly failed. More important, it's clear that the NPT cannot survive in its present terms and needs fundamental revision.

Since the treaty's inception, four new states have elbowed their way into the exclusive nuclear club, and such scofflaw regimes as North Korea and Iran are pounding on the door. Without bold action now to strengthen and modernize the NPT framework, we could be looking at as many as 20 nuclear-armed states within the next decade or two.

So instead of persisting in vain attempts to punish India—which, unlike rival Pakistan, has an exemplary nonproliferation record—the United States should enlist New Delhi's help in designing a fairer and more effective global nonproliferation system.

The Senate, for example, should insist on boosting spending on the Cooperative Threat Reduction programs aimed at securing Russia's loose nuclear materials. It should also press the Bush administration to push for overdue NPT reforms, including stronger inspections, tighter control of nuclear know-how and a closer watch on the activities of nuclear-trained scientists and engineers worldwide.

The key reform is to close the NPT loophole that allows states to develop civilian nuclear energy programs if they agree not to build nuclear weapons. The problem comes when countries demand, as Iran has done, a "right" under NPT to develop their own nuclear fuel supplies rather than acquiring what they need from the nuclear powers. As Ashton Carter and Stephen LaMontagne point out, "Enrichment and reprocessing facilities low states to cross into a proliferation 'red zone,' putting them dangerously close to a nuclear weapons capability."

Carter and LaMontagne offer a simple solution: Internationalize the nuclear fuels cycle. Building on Russia's offer to provide nuclear fuel for Iran, the United States should organize an international suppliers consortium to provide a reliable source of fuel for nuclear energy plants (and a repository for spent fuel) to countries that forswear nuclear weapons and submit to robust inspections. India, as a former leader of the nonaligned nations, could show its commitment to nonproliferation by helping to build support for such an approach among the developing nations.

The Senate also should insist that the United States hold up its end of the nuclear bargain. Under the NPT, the nuclear "haves" are obliged to move toward disarmament. Yet the Bush administration has gone in the opposite direction. It has rejected the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, failed to engage the other nuclear powers in talks aimed at mutual cuts in nuclear arsenals and even

launched new programs for developing nuclear "small" bombs and "bunker-buster" weapons.

Finally, the United States should offer similar terms to Pakistan, providing it is willing to return to the NPT, put its nuclear programs under international safeguards and offer a full accounting for the worldwide nuclear bazaar operated by A.Q. Khan.

If accompanied by imaginative U.S. efforts to update and strengthen the global nonproliferation system, the proposed deal with India could become a cornerstone of a comprehensive post-Cold War strategy—but only if elected leaders at both ends of Pennsylvania Avenue have the insight and courage to seize this opportunity.

HONORING CURRIE AND NELSON
ANDREWS

HON. MARSHA BLACKBURN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 2006

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I want to take a moment today to recognize two individuals who exemplify the spirit of entrepreneurship that makes America great.

A father and son team, Currie and Nelson Andrews were recently named 2006 Dealer of the Year Finalists by the American International Automobile Dealers not only for their success managing a dealership but for outstanding contributions to our community as well.

For 25 years, Andrews Cadillac and Land Rover of Nashville, has been part of our community and consistently ranks as one of Nashville's "Top 100 Privately Owned Businesses."

Thanks to Currie and Nelson's hard work and commitment to our community, 140 people are employed by their dealership today. We look forward to many more years of community involvement from the Andrews and appreciate the example they set for all aspiring entrepreneurs.

Please join me in congratulating Currie and Nelson for their achievements.

HONORING THE LIFE OF JAMES A

HON. JIM COSTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 2006

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and remember the life of James A of Fresno, California. Mr. A served in the U.S. Army in both Vietnam and Korea and was a prominent veteran's activist; he passed away May 15, 2006.

James A was born James Burris on October 18, 1946 in Yreka, California. He attended school in Fresno and graduated from Edison High School in 1964. As a way of protesting early American slavery, James Burris legally changed his name to James A. After investigating his genealogy, Mr. A had felt 'Burriss' was his slave name.

While serving in the U.S. Army, Mr. A learned to speak German, Korean, and Vietnamese. While stationed in Germany, Mr. A met the love of his life, Edith Isamann. They were married in 1966 and had two daughters Sabine and Sonja.

The couple returned to Fresno to raise their daughters in the community James affectionately called home. It was during this time that Mr. A began noticing physical problems that later resulted in his paraplegia. He was diagnosed with a neurological condition and as a result of this he was forced to use a wheelchair. Ever the active sole, Mr. A participated in wheelchair basketball and wheelchair races as a way of not letting his illness beat him.

Mr. A used his experience with misfortune to lend a helping hand to others. He waged a personal campaign for veterans in Fresno and in the state of California. James A helped to establish the Vietnam Veteran Monument in Woodward Park. He was also involved with the effort to establish the California Vietnam Veteran's Memorial in Sacramento. Mr. A worked with the Bay Area Western Chapter of Paralyzed Veterans of America and in 2005 he served as its Vice President.

In 2002, Mr. A was diagnosed with lung cancer and was in remission until January of 2005. Determined to be a shining example for his family, despite all of the physical challenges he faced, James A continued to serve his community.

James A is survived by his wife Edith; two daughters Sabine and her husband Asker and Sonja and her husband Andrew; grandchildren Ilkin, Timur, Emily and Rebecca; two sisters and two brothers.

James A cared deeply about advocating for veterans. His warm and compassionate personality which inspired those around him will be missed deeply. I stand today to honor this noble veteran, who served our country not only as a soldier but also as a citizen.

PAYING TRIBUTE TO "TANTE"
GERTRUDE ZAHNER

HON. JON C. PORTER

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 2006

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor "Tante" Gertrude Zahner on her 100th birthday.

Gertrude was born in Stuttgart Germany on June 15, 1906. She had three brothers and was the only daughter in the Zahner family. In 1923, when Gertrude was 17 years old the family moved to the United States. Gertrude worked for a number of years at the Ford plant in Michigan. She greatly enjoyed her tenure with the company and even worked for Mr. and Mrs. Henry Ford in their home. In 1979 Gertrude's service to the Ford family ended with her retirement.

Gertrude loved actively participating with her friends in the "Women's Guild", the "German Society", and the "Card Club" while she was living in Detroit. Every year several of the ladies in the "Card Club" would make a journey with her to Las Vegas, where Gertrude had a number of family members. In 1990, Gertrude moved to the greater Las Vegas area to be closer to her family. She has one nephew, Horst Maile, and a niece-in-law, Elfriede Maile. Gertrude is also god-mother to Rolf and Marvin, her grand-nephews.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to honor "Tante" Gertrude Zahner on her 100th birthday. I wish her many more years of happiness with her family.

DIVISIVE IN ANY LANGUAGE

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 2006

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend E.J. Dionne Jr. for his recent article published in the Washington Post entitled, "Divisive In Any Language", in which it describes how the argument surrounding the English Language can become more of a tool to divide instead of unify.

It is my belief that all who seek to enter our borders understand the vital importance of learning English, for it is the path to any route of social mobility. The immigrants of the past have understood the importance of learning English just as those who come today do. English must not be seen as a barrier to upward mobility, but as an extremely useful device that opens up the doors to opportunity.

This "American Dream" that we speak of so often seems to now be under fire from those who have made the dream a reality, or who are the beneficiaries of a dream sought many years ago by their forbearers. It is now those who have since benefited from the "American Dream" who seek to shut the door on the hopes and aspirations of others.

To create amendments in our laws and especially in the Senate immigration bill that explicitly say that English is the language of this land will indeed be disrespectful to our current large population of Spanish-speaking members. Dionne pointedly says this will be "legally and formally" disrespectful in a way earlier generations of immigrants from—just a partial list—Germany, Italy, Poland, Russia, Norway, Sweden, France, Hungary, Greece, and China" were not.

I acknowledge my fellow colleague in the United States Senate, KEN SALAZAR from Colorado for his realistic approach to this divisive ordeal. He declared that, "English is the common and unifying language of the United States" while also insisting on the existing rights of non-English speakers "to services or materials provided by the government" in languages other than English".

Senator SALAZAR knows that the key to settling the issue is not by imposing restrictions and making amendments on people who speak English as a second language, primarily Spanish speakers. Our job here today is to get others to see the light, and to understand the real issue at hand.

I enter into the RECORD the Washington Post article by E.J. Dionne Jr. for presenting this issue regarding the use of the English language with a personal perspective. Being brought up in a home where English is not the only language spoken, he knows firsthand the plight of the other side. More of us need to understand and put ourselves in the shoes of those we have come to discriminate against. Let us use English to bring ourselves closer together, for if it is the only common bond we have why not use it. It is in the best interest of this Nation to get this issue settled efficiently, and accordingly.

[From the Washington Post, May 23, 2006]

DIVISIVE IN ANY LANGUAGE

(By E. J. Dionne Jr.)

Yes, let's talk about the English language and how important it is that immigrants and their children learn it.

And please permit me to be personal about an issue that is equally personal to the tens of millions of Americans who remember their immigrant roots.

My late father was born in the United States, and grew up in French Canadian neighborhoods in and around New Bedford, Mass. When he started school, he spoke English with a heavy accent. A first-grade teacher mercilessly made fun of his command of the language.

My dad would have none of this and proceeded to relearn English, with some help from a generous friend named James Radcliffe who, in turn, asked my dad to teach him French. My dad came to speak flawless, accent-free English. He and my mom insisted that their children speak our nation's language clearly, and without grammatical errors.

None of this caused my parents to turn against their French heritage. On the contrary, my sister and I were taught French before we were taught English because my parents took pride in the language of our forebears and knew that speaking more than one language would be a useful skill.

My mom would give free French lessons at our Catholic parochial school to any kid who wanted to take them. When we were young, we'd visit our cousins on a farm in Quebec during the summer, partly to improve our French. (And Parisian French elitists take note: I still love the much-derided accent of the Quebec countryside, which many have compared to the English of the Tennessee mountains.) I tell you all this by way of explaining why I can't stand the demagoguery directed against immigrants who speak languages other than English. Raging against them shows little understanding of how new immigrants struggle to become loyal Americans who love their country—and come to love the English language.

As it considered the immigration bill last week, the Senate passed an utterly useless amendment sponsored by Sen. James Inhofe (R-Okla.) declaring English to be our "national language" and calling for a government role in "preserving and enhancing" the place of English.

There is no point to this amendment except to say to members of our currently large Spanish-speaking population that they will be legally and formally disrespected in a way that earlier generations of immigrants from—this is just a partial list—Germany, Italy, Poland, Russia, Norway, Sweden, France, Hungary, Greece, China, Japan, Finland, Lithuania, Lebanon, Syria, Bohemia, Slovakia, Serbia, Croatia and Slovenia were not.

Immigrants from all these places honored their origins, built an ethnic press and usually worshiped in the languages of their ancestors. But they also learned English because they knew that advancement in our country required them to do so.

True, we now have English-as-a-Second-Language programs that have created some resentments and, in the eyes of their critics, can slow the transition from Spanish to English. Still, the evidence is overwhelming that Spanish speakers and their kids are as aware as anyone of the importance of learning English. That's why we have an attorney general named Gonzales, senators named Salazar, Martinez and Menendez, and a mayor of Los Angeles named Villaraigosa.

Ken Salazar, a Colorado Democrat, introduced an alternative amendment to Inhofe's that also passed the Senate. It declared English the "common and unifying language of the United States" while also insisting on the existing rights of non-English speakers "to services or materials provided by the government" in languages other than English. As Salazar understands, the best