

view in a series of library shelves, and sell for \$130 to \$750. Hats by Bunn, on Seventh Avenue, sells waxed-straw chapeaus and flat-top felt hats by Bunn, the Trinidad-born milliner.

Bernard Oyama, the owner of B. Oyama, an elegant old-world style haberdashery on Seventh Avenue, sells his own designs of suits, shirts and neckwear, which are displayed amid a collection of black-and-white photographs of dapper greats like Miles Davis and Duke Ellington, each a reminder that the Harlem of the 30's through the 60's was a thriving style capital.

"The idea was to bring back the sense of quality to Harlem," said Mr. Oyama, a native of Gabon who studied fashion design in Paris. His store draws locals and, he said, even greater numbers of clients from the Bronx, Brooklyn and New Jersey, who drop in from time to time to be fitted for custom-tailored suits (\$800 to \$2,200), and to pick up bow ties, cravats and kaleidoscopically colorful gingham and paisley pocket squares.

Not every store is so rarefied. Harlemaide, which has been at 116th Street for six years, is stocked with books and photographs offering glimpses of the historic area and its architecture. It also sells handbags, dolls and an assortment of T-shirts bearing Harlem logos.

"I was the first to brand Harlem," insisted Murphy Heyliger, an owner. "Since then I've seen other companies realize you can get cool by putting your neighborhood on a shirt."

Mr. Heyliger is typical of the merchants catering to both residents and visitors drawn to a Harlem that is increasingly perceived as romantic and vibrant enough to draw several thousand tourists on weekends, many of whom place boutique-hopping high on an itinerary that might also include dining at Emperor's Roe or Settepani, and touring the Studio Museum, which exhibits the work of contemporary African-American artists.

Despite those attractions, some skeptical local merchants and residents wonder if importing fancy wares to Harlem is not premature. The new boutiques are interspersed with bodegas, hairdressers and discount stores, and not all of the retail landscape looks promising. Stores like N "may be too early," said Minya Quirk, the owner of Brand Pimps, a fashion consulting company, and a Harlem resident.

Ms. Quirk also frets that the goods may not be relevant to a local population. "Harlem residents have a deeply ingrained sense of personal style," she said. "They know what they want, and I think a lot of retailers might underestimate that."

Not Mr. Ortiz, who argues that his inventory was conceived expressly to appeal to style-driven locals. N offers fashion at prices that vary from \$165 for a cotton shirt with grosgrain detailing to \$1,000 for a leather coat. Sizes range from 0 to 16.

"We have a market here that has certain needs when it comes to sizing," he said. "We're offering larger sizes mixed in with smaller ones in a very unapologetic way. And we're always making sure we'll accommodate a variety of body types."

The fashions are often more boldly patterned than those at shops in other neighborhoods. "They reflect the way our uptown customers would like to wear clothes, and an understanding that this market is more heavily into color," Mr. Ortiz said.

Harlem shoppers also are serious fragrance consumers, which is evident from the proliferation of shops displaying ever-widening selections of designer scents. That infatuation attracted Laurice Rahmé, the entrepreneur behind Bond No. 9, with scents named after New York neighborhoods. Ms. Rahmé, who was prescient in branding the

area with New Haarlem, a scent introduced in 2004, plans to open a store in Harlem this year. Her flagship is on Bond Street in Lower Manhattan. "But what happened to retailing and tourism downtown is going to happen uptown," she predicted.

Bud Konheim, the chief executive of Nicole Miller, a line with hothouse colors and animated prints that are popular at N, is confident that a presence in the neighborhood is healthy for the bottom line. The collection at N is expected to generate \$300,000 to \$500,000 in its first year, he said.

"Harlem is an undiscovered secret for now, but that won't last," Mr. Konheim went on. "Things are moving too fast."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. DORIS O. MATSUI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 2006

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I was attending the funeral of a former colleague on Wednesday morning, June 28, 2006, and missed two procedural votes. Had I been present, I would have voted as noted: rollcall vote 331 "yea"; rollcall vote 332 "yea."

A RESPONSIBLE APPROACH TO EXPANDING AMERICA'S FRIENDSHIP WITH INDIA

HON. DAVID E. PRICE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 2006

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to affirm the critical importance of our Nation's friendship with India and to add my name as a cosponsor to H.R. 5682, legislation implementing the U.S.-India Civilian Nuclear Agreement concluded earlier this year.

Our friendship with India is among the most important bilateral relationships for our Nation's security and prosperity. The world's largest democracy, India is a vital partner in many different arenas: fighting the war on terrorism, expanding and advancing both the U.S. and Indian economies, modeling responsible democratic government to other regions of the world, addressing climate change and other key environmental challenges, and crafting a productive relationship with an emerging China, to name a few.

It is also a nation with which we share many common characteristics, making it a natural friend and ally. Both nations emerged from British rule to become flourishing democracies, each giving political voice and representation to hundreds of millions of citizens and each serving as a beacon of democratic values and human rights to the rest of the world. Both nations share a tremendous diversity of ethnicity and religion, and despite periodic setbacks, both have found sustainable and just models for drawing strength from this diversity. The United States and India have, in the last decade, forged increasingly intimate linkages economically, as India has emerged as one of the fastest growing free markets in the world. And, of course, our Nation has welcomed a large and vibrant community of Indian-Americans to our shores, a community that has immeasurably enriched the fabric of American life.

Unfortunately, our friendship with India over the last three decades has not been as strong as it should be. It is the only democracy with which our Nation had poor relations through most of the cold war. In 2000, President Clinton ushered in a new era in our bilateral relationship, becoming the first President to visit India since President Carter. But that positive momentum stalled in the early years of the Bush administration, as the aftermath of the September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks unsettled South Asian relationships and India-Pakistan tensions increased.

The primary obstacle to a stronger relationship remains India's nuclear program. In 1974, India defied the world by conducting a nuclear weapons test, demonstrating that it had developed nuclear weapons capability outside the bounds of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty. From that day forward, India has remained outside nuclear nonproliferation regimes and has faced international sanctions and lack of access to civilian nuclear materials and technology.

The price of its defiance—thirty-two years of sanctions and prohibitions—has not forced India to give up its nuclear weapons program or to make any discernible policy changes. The reality is, despite the best efforts of the international community to limit nuclear proliferation, India is and will continue to be a nuclear weapons state. Moreover, it is a stable, responsible nuclear weapons state that poses no threat to our national security. It is both unfair and unwise to continue to treat India as an international pariah. The time has come to recognize reality and adjust our outdated policies toward one of our most important allies.

The U.S.-India Civilian Nuclear Agreement, as a first step toward recalibrating our policies toward India, holds great promise for bringing our two nations closer together. Characteristically, President Bush has negotiated without adequately engaging Congress and the international community. But he has correctly recognized the need for this landmark policy shift.

The agreement itself is a greatly-needed improvement over current policies, yet the details of the agreement pose some questions and challenges for our national security. The agreement has both negative and positive features, and the American people need to be aware of the full array of consequences as we proceed.

The most critical entry on the positive side of the ledger must be the agreement's impact on our relationship with India. This improved relationship will strengthen our national security in a variety of ways, particularly by enhancing our partnership in the global war on terrorism and in our efforts to forge a productive relationship with an emerging China. Our role as a world leader in confronting several global moral crises—like poverty, hunger, and HIV/AIDS—will also be enhanced, as the improved relationship will allow the United States to bring greater attention to efforts to improve the lot of India's 600 million poor people. Indeed, the accelerated economic development anticipated as a result of expanded civilian nuclear energy production will hopefully lift millions of people out of poverty and into prosperity.

The agreement also has the potential to enhance our efforts to prevent nuclear proliferation around the world. Currently, India's large nuclear program is subject to only limited safeguards. Therefore, bringing any additional part