

this level. It is not an impossibility but a massive education mobilization must be mounted for the U.S. to catch up. And one great untapped brainpower resource is in the Black community. Black colleges and universities can be the catalysts for saving and developing this diamond mine.

Republican and Democratic bi-partisan support for Black colleges over the last twenty years has paid off and this investment could yield far more profitable results if we expand it.

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to my friend, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS).

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Louisiana. I appreciate it very much.

I just rise to thank MAJOR OWENS for his steadfastness, not only in this particular area but in the area of education generally. The time is coming when MAJOR will not shepherd any longer any of these measures, but certainly all of us are grateful to him.

Also, I am grateful to my classmate and colleague for bringing this legislation to the floor. Quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, I can join the list. I heard DANNY DAVIS, my good friend from Illinois, speak of his experiences.

In 1953, I left Sanford, Florida, on a train for Nashville to attend Fisk University, one of the Historically Black Colleges that has been recognized. I left there and came here to Howard University and left there and went to Florida A&M University, where I achieved my JD degree.

Ms. BROWN, my colleague and classmate, spoke momentarily about Florida's schools. I have taught at Florida Memorial, been a Board of Trustee member at Bethune, and I am a graduate of Florida A&M University.

If it were not for those Historically Black Colleges, I would not be here. That may be something that a lot of people wish didn't happen, but it happened, and I am proud of it, and I thank my colleagues.

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank all my colleagues on the other side of the aisle for the hard work that they are doing to ensure that all Americans have access to education. I urge my colleagues to recognize the important contributions made by Historically Black Colleges and Universities and their graduates and to vote "yes" on this worthy resolution.

Mr. JEFFERSON. Mr. Speaker, I am here today to speak in support of establishing a National Historically Black Colleges and Universities Week. I am not only the product of an HBCU—Southern A&M College in Baton Rouge—but I represent three of these colleges in my district, Xavier, Dillard and Southern University in New Orleans.

These universities are the leaders in Louisiana in graduating African-Americans. Xavier graduates more black pharmacists than any university in the country and has a near 100 percent bar passage rate. The university also sends more African-Americans than any other university to medical school. Dillard University is nationally known for its nursing program and

Southern University educates nearly 100 percent New Orleans residents who may not have received a college degree if SUNO was not open. These universities, as well as the other schools in the Southern University system and Grambling State University, have been vital in producing the best and brightest African-Americans in the American workforce. For their work in educating African-American students for over 100 years and their continued need for those who may not have the opportunity to go to college otherwise, they certainly should be recognized.

The Historically black institutions in my district were the hardest hit of our university system in New Orleans after Hurricane Katrina. SUNO is operating out of a trailer campus and Dillard will reopen this spring in the Hilton Hotel again. And all of the universities are struggling to recruit and retain students. We need the continued support of Congress to recognize the importance of these institutions in our community. Graduates of these universities often stay in New Orleans to work as teachers, doctors, or nurses in underserved communities because they want to give back to the community in which they have fostered an education. We need this to continue. Furthermore, these universities are critical to the recovery of our professional workforce in New Orleans. We could not rebuild our community without the support of the students who come to learn in our city or the professors who commit to stay in our city.

This resolution is important to me personally because without Southern A&M College, I might not be here today. But beyond that, the continued need for the opportunity that HBCU's provide and the local need for these universities to be involved in the recovery of the Gulf Coast region makes this resolution even more timely and necessary and I encourage all of my colleagues to support it.

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BOUSTANY) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 928, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5682, UNITED STATES AND INDIA NUCLEAR COOPERATION PROMOTION ACT OF 2006

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 947 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 947

*Resolved*, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5682) to exempt from certain requirements of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 a proposed nu-

clear agreement for cooperation with India. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on International Relations. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on International Relations now printed in the bill, modified by the amendment printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, shall be considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as the original bill for the purpose of further amendment and shall be considered as read. Notwithstanding clause 11 of rule XVIII, no further amendment to the bill, as amended, shall be in order except those printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill, as amended, to the House with such further amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 947 provides for a structured rule, with 1 hour of general debate equally divided and controlled between the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on International Relations, and waives all points of order against consideration of this bill, and provides for a motion to recommit with or without instructions.

This rule also makes in order several amendments brought forward to the Rules Committee, two of which are Democrat amendments, two are Republican, and two are bipartisan amendments, so the rule is fair in allowing a wide range of debate on issues that will be affecting nuclear technology, U.S. foreign policy and our strategic partnership between the world's two largest democracies, India and the United States.

Mr. Speaker, there was a time when I acted in a great many plays, one of which was the children's theater "Willy Wonka and the Chocolate Factory." And Willy Wonka has a song

that he sings in there called "Pure Imagination," with the wonderful lyrics like "there is no life I know that compares with pure imagination," which may work well for the stage or for a children's book after which it was based but not in the reality of our partnership between India and the United States.

There we must face reality, and the reality is India has had nuclear technology for four decades, they are a nuclear power, they have been in the possession of that technology since 1974 when they conducted their first nuclear test, they have never signed the nuclear nonproliferation treaty, nor do they have the international Atomic Energy Agency safeguards, and since that time they have sought to increase the development of nuclear energy to support the needs of their large population.

In June of last year, President Bush announced an agreement with Prime Minister Singh of India on increasing cooperation on various fronts, including civilian energy production, which will hopefully ensure that India will join with the rest of the world and with us in the nonproliferation mainstream.

This underlying bill, H.R. 5682, builds upon those principles outlined in the President's agreement with India and grants the President certain prerogatives to waive restrictions of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 to facilitate transfers of civilian nuclear technology and materials, while specifically preserving the right of the Congress to ultimately approve or disapprove those waivers by requiring an unamendable joint resolution of approval by Congress in order for any of the formal detailed agreements to be entered into force.

□ 1600

In that regard, the Committee did well in protecting the rights and prerogatives of Congress. The bill also increases congressional oversight of nuclear cooperation with India by requiring detailed annual reports on India's activities.

Finally, the legislation requires the President, prior to requesting a waiver of the Atomic Energy Act prohibitions to certify to Congress very specific conditions that have been met by India, which would include: A credible plan for a separation of India's civilian and military facilities, increased safeguards and inspection of India's nuclear facilities, strengthened controls on India's export of nuclear technology, and an agreement that India will work with the United States towards the FMC treaty, which will also certify that the NSG has consensus agreement on the guideline modifications that will be enacted.

Mr. Speaker, as the ranking member on the International Relations Committee said at the Rules Committee hearing yesterday on this bill, it is perhaps the single most important bill in this area of international relations

that this Congress will have acted upon.

Our country has much to gain by working cooperatively with India in exchange for tighter controls than by not engaging them on these matters at all.

Without this agreement, India could move unilaterally into a nuclear realm without our Nation's consent or cooperation. Since September 11, 2001, India has demonstrated that it is an important partner with the United States in combating the war on terror. It is a nation of strategic and economic interests, and it is one in which we need to further our cooperation with India.

One of the most concise yet persuasive concepts for us to consider as well is that by facilitating civilian nuclear energy in India through cooperative agreements with our country, we will also have a significant influence on the international impact of oil, of emissions and jobs.

This is one of those bills, unlike some of the others we do, that does not expand the scope of government, it does not impose a mandate, has congressional authority, and if you are watching or reading one of the newspapers passed around this Hill today was supported by eight different veterans groups today.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 5682 is a bipartisan bill. It enjoys a broad range of support. I urge the adoption of the rule and the underlying legislation.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I thank my friend from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) for the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the U.S.-India Nuclear Cooperation Promotion Act. As our colleague, Chairman HYDE, said yesterday in the House Rules Committee, this is the single most important piece of legislation that has come through the International Relations Committee this year.

We must do everything in our power to pass it today. India, the world's largest democracy, and the United States, the world's oldest democracy, must come together and strengthen their friendship. After centuries of an unsteady relationship, there has been dramatic improvement starting with the Clinton administration and continuing today.

This bill tells India that we believe in them, and that we want to support them just like they have consistently supported us. The civilian nuclear initiative will deepen the U.S.-India strategic partnership. The initiative reflects U.S. trust in India as a global tactical partner, and indicates our admiration for India's democratic traditions, her commitment to tolerance and her commitment to freedom.

I, as well as many of our colleagues, have had the great pleasure of traveling to the country of India on several different occasions. Any person who

goes to India recognizes the crucial necessity of clean energy.

This legislation will provide productions of clean energy, and can potentially reduce further pollution on the environment through decreasing the dependency on fossil fuels.

Civil nuclear cooperation is vital to the development of a clean and safe environment for our Indian friends. As our distinguished colleague, the ranking member of International Relations, Tom Lantos, said in the Rules Committee yesterday, India is a nuclear nonproliferator.

India has pledged to identify and separate her civil and military nuclear facilities and programs and place the civil portions under IAEA safeguards. I would urge my colleagues who have some hesitancy about this legislation to pay particular attention to that particular part of the legislation.

This bill will bring India closer to the international nonproliferation mainstream. India has ensured that 65 percent of her current and planned power reactors will come under IAEA safeguards. This, in the legislation, would rise to as high as 90 percent in future years as India constructs new reactors.

Without this initiative, 81 percent of India's current power reactors and all future power programs would remain unclear. Energy power and clean air are necessities for the Republic of India, especially because the excessive harm of global warming that is affecting India and indeed the world every day.

The amount of carbon dioxide emitted through the combustion of fossil fuels, otherwise known as the carbon footprint, is constantly upsetting this region.

Their need for alternative sources of energy is staggering, and we must pass this legislation to make a change in this region possible. India, America's strongest ally in the Southeast Asia region, is on the verge of an energy crisis. India is the sixth largest energy consumer in the world.

But in order to maintain their strong economic growth, India's energy consumption will need to increase substantially. The facts are astounding, and civilian nuclear cooperation is the only way India's energy can remain secure.

On a note of personal privilege, Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Sonal Patel, a young woman who is interning in my office this summer. She worked hard on this issue, and she and other young Indian nationals who are interning here on the Hill this summer worked very actively, along with my friends, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. PALLONE and others, to bring to the floor the legislation dealing with the condemnation of the horrible bombing incidents that took place in India.

This is a year where many of our interns are demonstrating staff-like work, and certainly, she qualifies in that category. The facts are astounding, and civilian nuclear cooperation is the only way India's energy can remain secure.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote for the rule and the underlying bill.

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

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN), the chairwoman of the subcommittee, and one of the experts we have here in the House on international relations.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, as an original cosponsor of this legislation, as well as the co-chair of the Congressional Caucus on India and Indian Americans, I rise in strong support of House Resolution 5682, the United States and India Nuclear Cooperation Promotion Act.

I would like to thank Chairman HYDE and Ranking Member LANTOS for their dedicated work on this important issue, and for their willingness to work with me as well as other Members of the House International Relations Committee to ensure that the bill before us today achieves that delicate balance between strengthening our democratic ally, India, and expanding our bilateral strategic efforts, while promoting U.S. nonproliferation priorities.

Given the overwhelming positive committee vote on this measure, I am confident that we have achieved this balance, Mr. Speaker. By providing the legal foundation for full civilian nuclear cooperation, this bill supports the strategic objectives for our global partnership with India, and that was signed a year ago by President Bush and Prime Minister Singh.

As India stands firm with the United States and our efforts to confront and eliminate the scourge of global terrorism, and to prevent the spread of dangerous nuclear technology, this bill seeks to reward and recognize India's commitment, while building upon our bilateral cooperation and strategic relationship to address broader U.S. national security priorities.

Mr. Speaker, this is not a proposal that we would offer to just any nation. It is a venture we would only enter with our most trusted and proven democratic allies. As such, the bill we will be considering today clearly notes that India is a special case. It outlines the record of achievement that distinguishes India from the pack, and that has earned India this special treatment.

Notably, I am referring to section 2 of the bill, Mr. Speaker, which defines certain criteria that are crucial to the U.S. and which India has met. Section 2 recognizes that India is a country that has demonstrated responsible behavior with respect to the nonproliferation of technology related to weapons of mass destruction programs, and the means to deliver them; that India is working with the United States in key foreign policy initiatives related to nonproliferation.

India's commitment to cooperate with us on such major issues as the spread of nuclear weapons material and technology to groups and countries of concern, such as Iran, advances the strategic security interests of us in the United States.

However, to reiterate, Mr. Speaker, this bill seeks to go beyond the status quo, and it builds upon existing commitments and cooperation. Section 3 of the bill focuses our policy on securing India's full and active involvement in dissuading, isolating, and if necessary, sanctioning and containing Iran for its efforts to acquire chemical, biological and nuclear weapons capability, and the means to deliver those deadly unconventional weapons.

This section also establishes, as U.S. official policy, the need to secure India's participation in the Proliferation Security Initiative, including a formal commitment to the statement of interdiction principles.

It also calls for the achievement of a moratorium by India, by Pakistan, and by China, of fissile materials for nuclear explosives purposes. Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, this bill ensures that Congress can exercise its congressional oversight, and it outlines a number of steps that the President must determine and report to the Congress that have taken place before we consider the final agreement.

Among other conditions, the certification under section 4 requires that India provide the U.S. and the International Atomic Energy Agency with a credible plan to separate its nuclear facilities, and that India file a declaration with the IAEA regarding the civilian sites.

It calls for India and the International Atomic Energy Agency to have concluded an agreement that subjects these nuclear facilities to perpetual safeguards. The President must also certify that India is taking concrete steps to prevent the spread of dangerous nuclear-related technology, such as by enacting and enforcing comprehensive export controls and regulations that are in keeping with the highest regional and international standards, such as those of the Nuclear Suppliers Club.

More importantly, Mr. Speaker, Congress will be able to review and approve the final framework agreement for U.S.-India nuclear agreements. Lastly, H.R. 5682 calls on the U.S. Government to provide Congress with detailed annual reports on implementation of this deal and on U.S. nonproliferation policy throughout South Asia.

□ 1615

In short, nuclear cooperation under this proposed legislation could enhance not just U.S. security but actually international security as a whole.

In light of the vital implications of this legislation, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues in joining me and voting "yes" on the U.S. and India Nuclear Cooperation Promotion Act. I thank my good friend for the time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KLINE). Without objection, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) will control the time of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS).

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY), a member of the International Relations Committee, one of the distinguished former co-chairs of the House India Caucus.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the rule for the India Nuclear Cooperation Promotion Act, and I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for yielding me this time.

This rule provides debate for relevant amendments to the proposed civilian nuclear cooperation deal between the United States and India. I strongly support the passage of this bill, as do many former Clinton administration officials.

Former Defense Secretary Richard Cohen said, and I quote, "The most important strategic agreement that we will have reached in recent times has been that of the United States and India on this non-nuclear agreement."

Former Assistant Secretary of State for South Asia Rick Inderfurth said, and I quote, "It is the right call for us in the world, really. This is a way to bring India into a global nonproliferation regime, rather than leaving it on the outside."

Former Ambassador and career Foreign Service Officer Terestia Schaffer said, and I quote, "The nuclear system will be much more robust and potentially more effective with India on the inside than on the outside."

And today former Ambassadors to India Tom Pickering and Frank Wisner wrote an op/ed supporting the deal, which I would like to ask unanimous consent to have added to the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

[From the Washington Times, July 26, 2006]

#### TRIUMPHANT INDIA POLICY

(By Tom Pickering/Frank Wisner)

When the House of Representatives votes today on civil nuclear cooperation with India, President Bush, marching hand-in-hand with Congress, will be a step closer to a foreign policy trophy commensurate with Nixon's opening to China: a flourishing strategic partnership with India. Cementing this partnership would overcome decades of unrealistic and futile attempts to force India to abandon its nuclear arsenal while sandwiched between two nuclear-armed rivals.

The House International Relations Committee earlier voted by an overwhelming bipartisan majority of 37-5 to approve the civil nuclear cooperation bill (H.R. 5682), and the Senate Foreign Relations Committee has approved a companion bill by 16-2. The terms of the legislation have been scrupulously crafted in a collaborative endeavor between the executive and legislative branches to answer nonproliferation concerns, among other issues.

Civil nuclear cooperation with India would catalyze alignment of the two great democracies for the 21st century. Prospects for enactment are sanguine during the 106th Congress. It demonstrates how much a president can accomplish in foreign and national security affairs if Congress gets a ticket for the take-off as well as for the landing, to borrow from former Sen. Arthur Vandenberg, Michigan Republican.

Virtually every member of Congress understands the centrality of India to U.S. national security interests. India appreciates the horror of international terrorism because it has suffered on a scale reminiscent of September 11, 2001: hundreds of casualties recently in Mumbai from bombs planted on six commuter trains; an attack on India's parliament; and recurrent horrors in Kashmir.

When India's prime minister addressed the U.S. Congress last year, he vowed: "We must fight terrorism wherever it exists, because terrorism anywhere threatens democracy everywhere." During a return trip to India, President Bush responded: "He is right. And so America and India are allies in the war against terror."

India generally supports the U.S. over Iran's nuclear ambitions, peace in the Middle East, reconstruction of Afghanistan, and spread of democracy in Nepal and elsewhere. The two countries are co-founders of the Global Democracy Initiative.

India is a secular democracy, featuring religious pluralism. It is a majority Hindu nation with a Muslim president, a Sikh prime minister, and a Christian leader of its largest political party. Its permanent interests on energy, free enterprise, the environment and nonproliferation, and a balance of power in Asia converge with those of the United States.

The U.S.-India strategic partnership has been frustrated more than 30 years by a rigid statutory prohibition on sharing civil nuclear technology with India, whereas sharing is permitted with China and other less friendly or responsible nations. India has felt estranged and demeaned. The pending legislation would pluck the "cinder in the eye" of the U.S.-India relationship on terms eminently fair to both.

India would join the international nonproliferation framework. It would place all of its civilian reactors under International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) inspections to prevent diversion of nuclear assistance to military use. It would upgrade its export controls on missile and nuclear technology to the standards of the Missile Technology Control Regime and the Nuclear Suppliers Group. It would continue its moratorium on nuclear testing, and negotiate in tandem with the United States a multilateral Fissile Material Cut-Off Treaty.

The legislation has elicited the enthusiastic support of two directors general of the IAEA, the G-8, and Great Britain, France and Russia. IAEA Director General and Nobel Prize winner Mohamed ElBaradei has effused: "The agreement . . . would bring India closer as an important partner in the nonproliferation regime. It would be a milestone, timely for ongoing efforts to consolidate the nonproliferation regime, combat nuclear terrorism and strengthen nuclear safety."

Contrary to detractors, the prospective U.S.-India civil nuclear cooperation has not diminished international opposition to the nuclear adventurism of Iran or North Korea. It has not provoked any nation to consider withdrawal from the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty, because the legislation harmonizes with its terms and objectives. It has not ignited an arms race in South Asia.

By any sensible nonproliferation measure, the legislation for civil nuclear cooperation

with India will make the world safer. India's already commendable export control record would further improve. It has not proliferated to third countries, unlike the A.Q. Khan network. Its indigenous development of nuclear weapons was consistent with its international obligations and an understandable response to the NPT's tilt in favor of five defined nuclear-weapons states: China, Russia, the United States, Great Britain and France. And nuclear assistance to India's civilian sector will not "free up" indigenous uranium to boost its military arsenal because India's uranium reserves are enough for both programs, as Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice has told Congress.

In sum, to vote for civil nuclear cooperation with India is to vote on the right side of history, for nonproliferation, and in the U.S. supreme national interests.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, NPT, the Nonproliferation Treaty, is something that we all hold in great respect. But I believe, as do many of my colleagues, the "T" needs to stand for tent. We need to find a way to bring India into the tent of nonproliferators, as she has always been a nonproliferating country. She has never once proliferated beyond her borders, unlike some of her neighbors.

If you want to have a similar deal as has been struck between the United States and India, you need to act as GARY ACKERMAN says, like India.

I urge all my colleagues to support the rule and final passage of a clean bill.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BOUSTANY).

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 5682 and the rule for this legislation, the U.S. and India Nuclear Cooperation Promotion Act of 2006.

I want to also compliment the distinguished chairman of the House International Relations Committee, Mr. HYDE, and ranking member, Mr. LANTOS, for their leadership in bringing forward this important implementing legislation.

I also want to commend the administration for recognizing that we can learn from our mistakes, a mistake whereby we have failed in the past to link our foreign policy with our energy policy, and this is a very good first step to correcting such mistakes.

This is a very far-reaching agreement whereby the world's oldest democracy will join with the world's largest democracy to work together on foreign policy and energy policy. This is a model for the future where we can work on energy, cooperative agreements, and also fit within our strategic framework.

India for the past 32 years has been a nonproliferator, and we should reward India for that historic effort. In recent years, India has certainly been a critically important ally in the global war on terror. It has proven to be a reliable and secure state when it comes to nonproliferation. We need to build on this relationship and this new-found trust, and this implementing legislation that

will allow us to do this is a critical first step in deepening this cooperation.

India, in working with the IAEA to increase inspections of existing and future reactors and maintaining India's moratorium on weapons testing, and given their assurances to work with us to prevent proliferation throughout the region, will prove to be a great example for other countries in the region to follow.

This is not only just a good bill for India. It is also good for American business. It allows us to increase energy trade, which really has not happened in the past three decades with India.

This is great for the environment. It helps us reduce carbon emissions by some 300 million tons, more than half the total Kyoto protocols; and it is going to reduce India's dependence on foreign sources of energy such as natural gas, which it is heavily dependent upon.

This is a very important piece of foreign policy and energy policy. I urge its passage. I urge passage of the rule so that we can move forward.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 3 minutes to my good friend and colleague on the Rules Committee, the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN).

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, the gentleman from Florida, for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I am not going to talk about the underlying bill. We will do that a little later on today. But, instead, I want to take a couple of minutes to speak about the rule and about what I believe is a flawed process that Members of this House are forced to operate within.

It is easy in this Congress to get as much time as you want to debate trivial issues. We spend hours and hours honoring sports teams, we name post offices, we do all kinds of things like that. But when it comes to serious issues, all of a sudden there never seems to be the time.

There were a number of amendments that were proposed in the Rules Committee last night. Some of them were not made in order, and I regret the fact that those amendments were not made in order. But a number of those that were made in order have been limited to 10 minutes, 10 minutes, to talk about issues dealing with nuclear proliferation and arms control, 10 minutes to talk about issues that impact U.S. treaty obligations, 10 minutes to talk about how we prevent this world from being extinguished in one terrible nuclear flash.

That is what the leadership of this House thinks about issues of arms control and nuclear nonproliferation, 10 minutes; 5 minutes pro, 5 minutes against.

My colleagues, Congressman BERMAN and Congresswoman TAUSCHER, have an amendment that restricts exports of

nuclear reactor fuel to India until the President determines that India has halted the production of fissile material for the use in nuclear weapons. It is a serious issue. Regardless of whether you believe it should be part of this underlying bill or not, it is an issue that deserves debate and that the more debate that it gets on the floor the more of an indication we are going to send to our negotiators and to the Government of India that these issues are important to those of us in this Congress.

Congressman MARKEY and Congressman UPTON had an amendment that essentially would require the President to determine that the U.S. has received India's support in preventing Iran from acquiring weapons of mass destruction before the U.S. engages in nuclear cooperation with India.

The President and Members of this Congress take to this well constantly to talk about how we are concerned about Iran possibly acquiring weapons of mass destruction. This seems like a reasonable amendment. It was not made in order, so now we are forced to use it as a motion to recommit. We get 10 minutes to debate that, 5 minutes in favor, 5 minutes against.

We need to get our priorities straight in this House. We give resolutions honoring sports teams 40 minutes, 40 minutes; and we can only give 10 minutes to deal with amendments that are dealing with issues of whether or not we are going to see this arms race proliferate throughout this world? We need to get our priorities straight.

For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I am going to vote against this rule. Regardless of how you want to vote on the final passage of this bill, we should demand, all of us, Republicans and Democrats, that serious issues that get debated, get debated with enough time on this floor, at least as much as we give to these trivial issues like honoring sports teams.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I reserve my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 2½ minutes to my good friend, the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH) and former mayor of Cleveland.

Mr. KUCINICH. I rise in opposition to the rule and the underlying bill. This proposal would threaten global security and unilaterally modify the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty.

This administration has pursued contradictory policies with respect to the NPT, both misusing and disregarding the NPT to suit its stumbling interests. Regarding Iran, for example, the administration cited Iran for minor breaches of the NPT and are trying to rally support based on that for a military attack. At the same time, the administration itself undermines the NPT by this proposal which would help develop nuclear weapons.

The NPT requires that nuclear weapons states keep their weapons to them-

selves and allows nonweapons states to receive civilian nuclear technology only in exchange for their refusal to produce nuclear weapons. Yet this deal, in this deal the U.S. will provide India with civilian nuclear technology even though India is not a signatory to the NPT, is known to possess nuclear weapons and has no intention of limiting its nuclear weapons cache or production capability.

Moreover, since the U.S. will supply India with uranium fuel, India will be able to use more of its own limited uranium reserves to produce nuclear weapons. It is estimated India will be able to produce dozens more nuclear weapons per year under this deal.

We are going in the wrong direction here. At this time of great crisis in the world, we should be looking towards nuclear disarmament, nuclear abolition, saving the world, not ramping up for Armageddon by nuclear proliferation.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, on the rule for the bill that was passed out by a bipartisan vote of 37-5, I reserve my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased at this time to yield to my good friend from New Jersey, the distinguished gentleman, Mr. PALONE, 1 minute.

Mr. PALONE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule and in support of the bill.

India has been a strong U.S. ally and should be viewed as a credible and worthy nation of our help and support. India is ready to accept all the responsibilities of the world's leading states with respect to advanced nuclear technology.

India has no record of proliferating dual-use nuclear technology to other countries. It understands the danger of the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and has agreed to key international nonproliferation requirements. India has committed to separate its military and peaceful programs and adhere to international nuclear and missile control restrictions. It is actively working with the Nuclear Suppliers Group and the International Atomic Energy Agency to place all of its nuclear facilities under international safeguards.

This nuclear agreement strengthens energy security for the U.S. and India and promotes the development of stable and efficient energy markets in India. Development and expansion of U.S.-India civil nuclear cooperation should over time lessen India's dependence on imported hydrocarbons, including those from Iran.

Today, the world's two largest democracies have established a remarkable strategic partnership. A civil nuclear cooperation would be a great accomplishment. Its implementation is important for national security and for U.S.-India relations. I urge my colleagues to vote an "aye" on this bill.

I want to commend the chairman and the ranking member for their hard

work in constructing a bill that both the administration and the House could support. Their version will set the process by which Congress will in the future review and vote on the final framework agreement to implement the nuclear cooperation deal.

Based on their shared values of diversity, democracy and prosperity, the United States and India have a natural connection. Recently, we fostered a transformed relationship that is central to the future success of the international community; and this important legislation would solidify this relationship.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am going to yield myself such time as I may consume; and I am going to take just a small amount of time hoping that colleagues who have demonstrated an interest would have time to get to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, one of the things that has not been mentioned by anyone that I believe that this legislation will assist in is providing safe reactors.

I had the misfortune and at the same time distinguished privilege to serve as the lead election monitor of the elections in Belarus, and while there I had an opportunity to see the horrible effects of a nuclear disaster. Some folks who remember Chernobyl think of it as Ukrainian and Russian in terms of the damage that was done, but the downwind aspects of that disaster fell on Belarusians, and it was devastating, and the effects of that are still showing.

□ 1630

We have had, with the exception of the Three Mile Island incident in Pennsylvania, extremely safe nuclear reactors in the United States, and our technology, indeed, some of technology in the world, may very well provide for even safer reactors. Thus, bringing India under the aegis of the IAEA can only assist in providing safe reactors.

Additionally, as we well know, Indian scientists are extremely resourceful. The residual from nuclear technology has produced the waste that the world needs to determine how best to handle. I believe, without knowing, nor do I think this legislation standing alone will cause that to occur, but I believe that Indian scientists, working with others throughout the world, may very well assist in developing the technology that will handle the nuclear waste that is such a tremendous problem, not only for this country, but indeed the world.

So there are other benefits that may be derived from this legislation, in addition to civilian pursuits that will help to reduce the carbon footprint.

Mr. Speaker, I did take enough time to let one of my colleagues arrive, and that said, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to my classmate and good friend, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY).

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, there seems to be something missing from the debate today. It is like the elephant in the room, no one wants to talk about it. Whatever happens to the United States' own commitment to nonproliferation?

Yesterday, I went before the Rules Committee, and I had an amendment that was quite simple. It stated that until the President has implemented and observed all of our NPT obligations and revised its own policies relating to them, no item may be transferred to India, including exports of nuclear and nuclear-related material, equipment or technology. Unfortunately, my amendment was not included in this restrictive rule.

As many of my colleagues have stated, this objection is not about the deal or our alliance with India. This is about how the Bush administration has made a mockery of the NPT and encouraged other countries to go around the treaty. Basically, the bill says that if a country ignores the NPT, the United States will cut a deal down the road.

If anything, the U.S. is contributing to global nuclear proliferation with this agreement.

Vote against the rule because in a world that is becoming more, not less, violent by the day we must face the facts. Until the United States lives up to its nonproliferation obligations, how can we possibly ask others to do so?

Today, I will vote against this misguided bill. I will vote against the rule. I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Just to illustrate what the Rules Committee actually did do, there were 10 amendments that were proposed to the Rules Committee, one withdrawn, two not germane. The one recently referred to was ruled not germane because it referred to all NPTs, not specifically this particular one. Of the seven that were remaining, six were actually made in order.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, without further closing, in light of the fact that I have already, I yield back the balance of our time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my good friend, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), and his presentation. I am very proud that I was able to go through this entire discussion and I hope to say "nuclear" correctly. It was the biggest fear I had.

I support the rule; I urge all those to support this rule and the consideration for H.R. 5682.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back my time and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KLINE). The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order: Suspending the rules on H.R. 5337, by the yeas and nays; suspending the rules on H.R. 5319, by the yeas and nays; agreeing to H. Res. 947, by the yeas and nays.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

NATIONAL SECURITY FOREIGN INVESTMENT REFORM AND STRENGTHENED TRANSPARENCY ACT OF 2006

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 5337, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. OXLEY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5337, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 424, nays 0, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 404]  
YEAS—424

Abercrombie	Bonilla	Castle	Diaz-Balart, M.	Kelly	Paul
Ackerman	Bonner	Chabot	Dicks	Kennedy (MN)	Payne
Aderholt	Bono	Chandler	Dingell	Kennedy (RI)	Pearce
Akin	Boozman	Choccola	Doggett	Kildee	Pelosi
Alexander	Boren	Clay	Doolittle	Kilpatrick (MI)	Pence
Allen	Boswell	Cleaver	Doyle	Kind	Peterson (MN)
Andrews	Boucher	Clyburn	Drake	King (IA)	Peterson (PA)
Baca	Boustany	Coble	Dreier	King (NY)	Petri
Bachus	Boyd	Cole (OK)	Duncan	Kingston	Pickering
Baird	Bradley (NH)	Conaway	Edwards	Kirk	Pitts
Baker	Brady (PA)	Conyers	Ehlers	Kline	Platts
Baldwin	Brady (TX)	Cooper	Emanuel	Knollenberg	Poe
Barrett (SC)	Brown (OH)	Costa	Emerson	Kolbe	Pombo
Barrow	Brown (SC)	Costello	Engel	Kucinich	Pomeroy
Bartlett (MD)	Brown, Corrine	Cramer	English (PA)	Kuhl (NY)	Porter
Barton (TX)	Brown-Waite,	Crenshaw	Eshoo	LaHood	Price (GA)
Bass	Ginny	Crowley	Etheridge	Langevin	Price (NC)
Bean	Burgess	Cubin	Everett	Lantos	Pryce (OH)
Beauprez	Burton (IN)	Cuellar	Farr	Larsen (WA)	Putnam
Becerra	Butterfield	Culberson	Fattah	Larson (CT)	Radanovich
Berkley	Buyer	Cummings	Feeney	Latham	Rahall
Berman	Calvert	Davis (AL)	Ferguson	LaTourrette	Ramstad
Berry	Camp (MI)	Davis (CA)	Filner	Leach	Rangel
Biggert	Campbell (CA)	Davis (FL)	Fitzpatrick (PA)	Lee	Regula
Bilbray	Cannon	Davis (IL)	Flake	Levin	Rehberg
Bilirakis	Cantor	Davis (KY)	Foley	Lewis (CA)	Reichert
Bishop (GA)	Capps	Davis (TN)	Forbes	Lewis (KY)	Renzi
Bishop (NY)	Capuano	Davis, Tom	Ford	Linder	Reyes
Bishop (UT)	Cardin	DeFazio	Fortenberry	Lipinski	Reynolds
Blackburn	Cardoza	DeGette	Fossella	LoBiondo	Rogers (AL)
Blumenauer	Carnahan	Delahunt	Fox	Lofgren, Zoe	Rogers (KY)
Blunt	Carson	DeLauro	Fox	Lowey	Rogers (MI)
Boehert	Carter	Dent	Frank (MA)	Lucas	Rohrabacher
Boehner	Case	Diaz-Balart, L.	Franks (AZ)	Lungren, Daniel E.	Ros-Lehtinen
			Frelinghuysen	Lynch	Ross
			Gallely	Mack	Rothman
			Garrett (NJ)	Maloney	Roybal-Allard
			Gerlach	Manzullo	Royce
			Gibbons	Marchant	Ruppersberger
			Gilchrest	Markey	Rush
			Gillmor	Marshall	Ryan (OH)
			Gingrey	Matheson	Ryan (WI)
			Gohmert	Matsui	Ryun (KS)
			Gonzalez	McCarthy	Sabo
			Goode	McCaul (TX)	Salazar
			Goodlatte	McCollum (MN)	Sanchez, Linda T.
			Gordon	McCotter	Sanchez, Loretta
			Granger	McCrery	Sanders
			Graves	McDermott	Saxton
			Green (WI)	McGovern	Schakowsky
			Green, Al	McHenry	Schiff
			Green, Gene	McHugh	Schmidt
			Grijalva	McIntyre	Schwartz (PA)
			Gutierrez	McKeon	Schwarz (MI)
			Gutknecht	McMorris	Scott (GA)
			Hall	McNulty	Scott (VA)
			Harman	Meehan	Sensenbrenner
			Harris	Meek (FL)	Serrano
			Hart	Meeks (NY)	Sessions
			Hastings (FL)	Melancon	Shadegg
			Hastings (WA)	Mica	Shaw
			Hayes	Michaud	Shays
			Hayworth	Millender-McDonald	Sherman
			Hefley	Miller (FL)	Sherwood
			Hensarling	Miller (MI)	Shimkus
			Herger	Miller (NC)	Shuster
			Herseth	Miller, Gary	Simmons
			Higgins	Miller, George	Simpson
			Hinchev	Mollohan	Skelton
			Hinojosa	Moore (KS)	Slaughter
			Hobson	Moore (WI)	Smith (NJ)
			Hoekstra	Moran (KS)	Smith (TX)
			Holden	Moran (VA)	Smith (WA)
			Holt	Murphy	Snyder
			Honda	Murtha	Sodrel
			Hooley	Musgrave	Solis
			Hostettler	Myrick	Souder
			Hoyer	Nadler	Spratt
			Hulshof	Napolitano	Stark
			Hunter	Neal (MA)	Stearns
			Hyde	Neugebauer	Strickland
			Inglis (SC)	Ney	Stupak
			Inslee	Northrup	Sullivan
			Israel	Norwood	Sweeney
			Issa	Nunes	Tancredo
			Jackson (IL)	Nussle	Tanner
			Jackson-Lee (TX)	Oberstar	Tauscher
			Jefferson	Obey	Taylor (MS)
			Jenkins	Olver	Taylor (NC)
			Jindal	Ortiz	Terry
			Johnson (CT)	Osborne	Thomas
			Johnson (IL)	Otter	Thompson (CA)
			Johnson, E. B.	Owens	Thompson (MS)
			Johnson, Sam	Oxley	Thornberry
			Jones (NC)	Pallone	Tiahrt
			Jones (OH)	Pascrell	Tiberi
			Kanjorski	Pastor	Tierney
			Kaptur		Towns
			Keller		