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 'Burris' 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 marred in 1966 and had two daughters Sabine and Sonja.