

Mrs. CAPITO. Madam Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MATSUI), 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.

(Mrs. CAPITO asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. CAPITO. Madam Speaker, House Resolution 1102 waives clause 6(a) of rule XIII, requiring a two-thirds vote to consider a rule on the same day it is reported from the Rules Committee, against certain resolutions reported from the Rules Committee. The resolution applies the waiver to any special rule reported on this legislative day.

The rule also provides that suspensions will be in order at any time on the legislative day. The resolution also provides that the Speaker or his designee shall consult with the minority leader or her designee on any suspension considered under the rule.

Madam Speaker, we have before us this morning a simple rule that will allow for the consideration of important final measures that must be addressed before we adjourn sine die. Most important is the consideration of the continuing resolution, which will continue funding of the government until February of 2007.

Although I am disappointed this Congress was unable to complete its spending bills for fiscal year 2007, we must consider and pass this continuing resolution before we leave tonight. It is my hope that in future Congresses we can work together with the other body to ensure we finish the appropriating process on schedule and in a fiscally responsible manner.

This balanced rule provides the minority with the ability to consult with the Speaker on any suspension that is offered, ensuring that their input and views are duly considered before any legislation considered under this rule is brought to the floor. This rule also allows for consideration of special rules reported on this day.

We are nearing the end of our session, always a chaotic time, and this rule will allow the House to finish its business in a timely fashion. I now ask my colleagues to support this rule so that we may continue the work of the American people in a timely fashion today. Completing consideration of these suspensions and remaining bills ensures that we may accomplish as much as possible in the final days of this Congress, and I encourage my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this balanced rule.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. MATSUI. Madam Speaker, I thank my good friend, the gentlewoman from West Virginia, for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Ms. MATSUI asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. MATSUI. Madam Speaker, it is disappointing we are adjourning after passing only 2 of the 13 appropriation bills that fund the Federal Government. We should have done better, and clearly we could have done better. Instead, we are leaving this year's unfinished business to the next Congress. That is far from the ideal way of handling our constitutional responsibilities.

Nonetheless, that is a reality, and we will deal with it as such when Congress returns next year under new leadership. But the American people should be assured that such a turn of events will not alter the focus of the next Congress. We will remain focused on the critical priorities of American families, priorities that were made clear in the recent election: a sensible energy policy, affordable health care for working families, reforming prescription drug benefits, honest wages for honest work, increasing homeland security, and responsible oversight of and a change in direction of our policy in Iraq.

I hope those issues will be addressed next year in a bipartisan manner, with open debate and a focus on concrete results for the American people.

The time to deal with those will come soon. The problem before us now is that the Federal Government shuts down at midnight tonight unless we invoke martial law under this rule. It concludes the 109th Congress on a less than satisfactory note, but it is nonetheless necessary.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. CAPITO. Madam Speaker, I have no further speakers, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER
AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT
ON H.R. 5682, HENRY J. HYDE
U.S.-INDIA PEACEFUL ATOMIC
ENERGY COOPERATION ACT OF
2006

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1101 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1101

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 5682) to exempt from certain requirements of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 a proposed nuclear agreement for cooperation with India. All points of order against the conference report and against its consideration are waived. The conference report shall be considered as read.

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

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Madam Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN); 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. BISHOP of Utah asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Madam Speaker, House Resolution 1101 allows for consideration of the conference report on House Resolution 5682, the Henry J. Hyde United States-India Peaceful Atomic Energy Cooperation Act of 2006. It provides for a closed rule with 1 hour general debate, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on International Relations. It waives all points of order against the conference report and against its consideration, and it provides that the conference report shall be considered as read.

The underlying bill is not only an excellent bipartisan bill, but also a tribute to the skill and wisdom of one of the body's most distinguished and respected representatives, the Honorable HENRY HYDE, Chairman of the House Committee on International Relations, a representative from Illinois's Sixth Congressional District for the last 32 years.

It is fitting that this underlying bill is named after Chairman HYDE, in recognition for his long and faithful service and commitment to American ideals as well as nonproliferation activities. Yesterday we had many people pay their respect to this great man, and this is a fitting conclusion with this bill today.

I would also be remiss if I did not also thank the ranking member, Representative LANTOS of California, for his repeated efforts and his strong efforts in pushing this legislation forward and the hard work he also put in, in a dedicated and respected manner, to come up with a truly bipartisan bill and a bipartisan conference report.

We should also thank the conferees for their efforts to come in here with a conference report that is focused, that is clean, that is direct and without extraneous materials added to it. It is one that actually goes to the heart of the issue in a very direct report and is a very good conference report.

To the substance of the bill, which was passed on July 26 of this year by an overwhelming majority, with 359 of our colleagues supporting the bill, it contained a myriad of important measures, beginning with a Sense of Congress Resolution that the preventing of proliferation of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction, the means to produce them, and the means to deliver them are critical objectives

of United States foreign policy, and that sustaining the Nuclear Non-proliferation Treaty and strengthening its implementation, particularly its verification and compliance, is the keystone of the United States' non-proliferation policy.

We live in an uncertain world where any number of demagogues would pay any price to obtain the technology to inflict pain and suffering on the world's inhabitants.

□ 1000

Because of that it is important that India's commitment to nuclear non-proliferation and America's commitment is the same, and it makes the world a safer place.

This bill, with additions added by the Senate, and one of those unique elements actually strengthens the overall bill itself. It provides for the administration to report to Congress of its activities in forwarding this particular agreement. It provides for an affirmative response by Congress to that agreement that is there. And it provides for greater control on non-proliferation efforts between both of our countries in this very uncomfortable and unstable world.

I have to commend Chairman HYDE, Ranking Member LANTOS, the entire conference committee that did a wonderful job, excellent work with this particular committee report.

With that, I urge adoption of the rule and the underlying legislation.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I want to thank my colleague from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) for yielding me the time, and yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of the U.S.-India Nuclear Cooperation Promotion Act. I, too, want to commend Chairman HYDE and Ranking Member LANTOS and the members of International Relations Committee for their work on this. This conference report that comes before us has been signed by all of the conferees, the process has been good, and I support the rule.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE).

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague from Massachusetts for yielding me time.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the rule and in strong support of the U.S.-India Nuclear deal conference report. I would like to thank Chairman HYDE and incoming Chairman LANTOS for their hard work to help ensure passage of this bill after the agreement was announced. I would also like to thank the House and Senate conferees who negotiated throughout the night to reconcile differences and reach a compromise.

The U.S. has an important strategic partnership with India, and this civilian nuclear cooperation deal is a crit-

ical component to a continued successful partnership. The agreement strengthens energy security for the U.S. and India, and promotes the development of stable and efficient energy markets in India to ensure adequate and affordable supplies.

This deal is also the foundation of a promising U.S.-India alliance that will serve as a defense against terrorism and nuclear proliferation. The U.S. has an important stake in ensuring regional stability in South Asia, even as Pakistan continues to produce and test nuclear weapons without proper safeguards.

With the rising power of Communist China in the region and Osama bin Laden continuing to hide in Afghanistan or Pakistan, we need India as our strategic ally. The bill before us today has a new policy that will solidify the U.S.-India bilateral relationship. India has been a responsible nuclear power and deserves to be treated that way.

I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on both the rule and the conference report.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH).

Mr. KUCINICH. Madam Speaker, I rise to express my concern about the impact that this agreement will have on the state of nonproliferation in the world. The United States has not had a nonproliferation policy, per se. As a matter of fact, if we look at the administration, this administration has moved to build new nuclear weapons called bunker busters. They have moved to discourage efforts at nuclear disarmament. They have, in the first days of their administration, canceled the antiballistic treaty with Russia. This administration does not have a commitment to nonproliferation, and the world knows that.

Iran knows that. That is why it is very difficult for us to be able to simultaneously discourage Iran from acquiring nuclear technology, and at the same time speak to the imperative of a bilateral progress with India.

The United States has to have a consistent policy with respect to nuclear nonproliferation. This country cannot speak out of one side of its mouth and tell Iran and North Korea, don't you dare go in that direction, don't you dare try to acquire nuclear technology, because we cannot see whether you can separate civilian and military, and on the other hand give a blessing to that same kind of an arrangement with a country that, yes, we have a great relationship with; yes, it is the longest and the oldest democracy in the world; yes, there is a lot to be said about the people in the Indian Government being responsible people.

My point here is not in any way to diminish the role that India has in trying to develop social and technological progress in the world, but it is to speak to our responsibility as citizens of the

United States to ask: What is the impact of any agreement that we have with India on the rest of the world?

And I would say that with this administration not being willing to talk to Iran with respect to Iran's nuclear ambitions, with this administration not being ready to talk to North Korea with respect to North Korea's nuclear ambitions, this is a dangerous time to be approving such an agreement, because it will be seen as a license to other countries which have nuclear ambitions to proceed whether they are talking to the United States or not.

The imperative of the Nuclear Non-proliferation Treaty at its inception was not to manage proliferation, but it was to do away with all nuclear weapons. Read the treaty. We are at a moment in human history where we have not found a way to be able to resolve our differences without war.

Witness the failed policies of this administration with respect to Iraq. Iraq did not have weapons of mass destruction, but we chose to attract Iraq anyway. Policies of unilateralism, of first strike breed the same kind of policies around the world.

It is premature for us to be promoting an agreement with India when we have not shown the capacity as a Nation to take a direction which prizes diplomacy, which shows that we can use the science of human relations to be able to avert conflict. We have to show a capacity to demonstrate that war is not inevitable; we have not done that.

And so when we are on the threshold of approving a new nuclear agreement with India, notwithstanding our good relations with that country, we cannot do that without looking at the impact that will have on the rest of the world.

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

Madam Speaker, without speaking to the merits of the allegations made by gentleman from Ohio, he should indeed be happy with this particular resolution and conference report coming to us. For not only does it take the country of India that did not sign the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty and provide that both the United States and India will work together to try and combine ourselves so we are working within the parameters of that treaty, it also provides for the administration to present any results of their negotiation back to Congress, and forcing Congress to actually take an affirmative approach "yea" or "nay" on the results of those negotiations, which once again will allow all Members of Congress to again have some kind of say in the ultimate process.

I also appreciate once again what the conferees did with this report in trying to narrow the focus down to the specifics of how the United States and India deal together in separating civilian and military uses of this new type of energy, and not trying to expand it into other areas which may indeed

make the process much more complex and the questions much more difficult to answer.

Madam Speaker, this once again is a very clean, specific and focused conference report.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WU).

(Mr. WU asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WU. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the rule and the underlying legislation. When I was a child, this country sold F-15s to Iran so that Iran could be our offset to Soviet power in South Asia. And because we sold F-15s and other arms to Iran, we wound up selling chemical weapon precursor materials to Iraq to offset Iranian power in the Middle East, and today we have 135,000 troops in Iraq, in part, because of those unwise decisions.

Now, we are told that we should sell nuclear materials to India, which would free up Indian nuclear reactors to produce many more nuclear weapons for the Indian nuclear weapons program as an offset to Chinese power in Asia.

If we approved this deal with India, it would encourage China to increase its nuclear arsenal, and I submit to you that we, that we are one of the potential targets of that enhanced Chinese nuclear arsenal.

Even more worrisome is that an Indian nuclear build-up would further accelerate the Pakistani nuclear build-up. While I have strong confidence in the stability of the Indian Government and in the stability of Indian democracy, I have much, much less faith in the stability of the Pakistani Government and of Pakistani democracy, and of the Pakistani Government's ability to keep under control those nuclear weapons which it already has and the additional weapons it would build because of an Indian nuclear build-up.

If there is a military coup in Pakistan, we should be very, very concerned about the stability of not only South Asia, but of the world. There have been three military coups in Pakistan since its independence in 1947. Rather than approving nonsignatory states like India in violation of nonproliferation treaties, the better course of action is to respect international agreements and immediately bring to the Senate a total ban on nuclear testing and a comprehensive set of treaties to curtail nuclear proliferation.

Back in July, just this summer, there were only 68 of us in this Chamber who voted against approving the legislation to permit sales of nuclear materials to India. I ask more of my colleagues to join me today at this historic moment to prevent adding fuel to the fire of nuclear proliferation in South Asia. This legislation and the following sale of nuclear materials to India blows out of the water any hope we have of treaty

constraints on the proliferation of nuclear weapons.

I want to make it clear for this record and for history that the actions of this administration in containing nuclear proliferation have been patently irresponsible. This administration has underfunded the Nunn-Lugar legislation which takes nuclear materials out of the open market which would otherwise be available for sale to terrorists. This administration has failed to support internal treaties limiting nuclear weapon proliferation, and now, and now it has proposed a treaty with India that would sell India nuclear materials, which would result in a nuclear arms race between India and China and between India and Pakistan.

Pakistan is not a stable country. It is already leaking nuclear weapons technology to other countries and groups. Let the RECORD show that if or when a mushroom cloud ever erupts over an American city, that event will be traced back to this unwise vote in the United States Senate and to the bone-headed policy of this administration toward treaty obligations, Nunn-Lugar, and the sale of nuclear materials to India.

Ladies and gentlemen, compared to this legislation, the authorization to go to war in Iraq was a piker. This is the moment to pull back from the brink of a new nuclear arms race.

□ 1015

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, how much time remains on each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Twenty minutes.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding me time.

Madam Speaker, it is with great respect for my good friends I consider this conference report the right start in the face of challenge of nuclear nonproliferation. It is a start. And even though this conference report allows a relationship with India and the United States to pursue civilian nuclear research and investment, this is not the final stop.

There is a responsibility that there is an agreement with the IAEA that the Indian Government must assure that their purposes are for civilian purposes only. We do need to continue the friendship between India, the United States, and Pakistan. And I would much rather affirm the fact that there are two governments who are allies of the United States in the South Asia region, India and Pakistan, and to include both of those countries in our discussions in the war against terror,

and as well the isolation of Iran and certainly the resolution in Iraq.

To do so we must show the respect and the friendship that India has shown to us. And so this is an important step.

I might say that this conference report ensures that safeguards in the agreements between India and the International Atomic Energy Agency is finalized before the President can exempt India from certain legal restrictions.

It also provides for end-use monitoring of U.S. exports to India, and as well it strengthens the Nuclear Supplier Group, the group of countries that try to stem nuclear nonproliferation around the world. It helps us, in fact, by having India in the family of nonproliferation, but also having civilian use.

Madam Speaker, I am also glad that my amendment stayed in that I offered in the House, remained in the conference report. And that amendment particularly talks about the fact that there are two important countries in South Asia, and that is India and Pakistan, and that relationships should continue with both of them.

Madam Speaker, this is, in fact, the right start. There is a second chance, and that second chance is the atomic energy agency. We do have the opportunity to maintain our friendship, to pass this legislation, to allow India to do its research in civilian nonproliferation nuclear use, and at the same time provide a buffer for those countries who refuse to adhere to international guidelines. India has shown itself a democracy, shown itself to be a friend, and I would encourage that this conference report be a roadmap, if you will, for ensuring the friendship of the United States with India and Pakistan, and at the same time recognizing the longstanding democracy that India has been.

I believe it is a good step. I think it is a first step. I think that we have the checks and balances that would support the idea that we are not promoting the proliferation of nuclear use; we are helping to provide for the safe nonproliferation use of nuclear devices, particularly in the civilian area.

I thank the Gentleman for yielding, I thank the Rules Committee for making consideration of the conference report to accompany H.R. 5682, the "United States and India Nuclear Cooperation Promotion Act of 2006" in order.

Madam Speaker, the United States' relationship with India and Pakistan is of paramount importance to our nation's political and economic future. With the receding of the Cold War's global divisions and the new realities of globalization and trans-national terrorism, we have embarked on a new era of promise, possibility and uncertainty. This means the United States, the world's only superpower, bears an especially heavy responsibility to remain engaged in all regions of the world, with all nation-states. It is in the national interest for the United States to continue our policy of engagement, collaboration, and exchange which has served the nation well in the past, particularly in the South Asia region.

It is important that we are considering this conference report today. I also want to thank my colleagues for adopting my amendment to H.R. 5682. My bipartisan amendment, which was endorsed and co-sponsored by Congressman BURTON, and which was not opposed by either the Majority or Minority of the Committee on International Relations, simply states that the "South Asia region is so important that the United States should continue its policy of engagement, collaboration, and exchanges with and between India and Pakistan."

Peaceful nuclear cooperation with India can serve multiple U.S. foreign policy objectives so long as it is undertaken in a manner that minimizes potential risks to the nonproliferation regime. This will be best achieved by sustained and active engagement and cooperation between India and the United States.

Similarly, Pakistan has been a critical ally in the global war on terror. Pakistan has been a good friend to the people of the United States. Although H.R. 5682 signals no change in this country's relationship with Pakistan, it is not difficult to understand why it may give pause to some supporters of Pakistan. This is another reason why it is vital for the United States to continue to engage both Pakistan and India in ongoing political engagement, economic and technological collaborations, and personal exchanges, which will bring the United States closer to these two vitally important democracies in the South Asia region and will bring India and Pakistan closer to each other.

I support this Rule, this Bill with my Amendment, and this Conference Report. I urge my colleagues to do the same.

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

Madam Speaker, I commend the gentlewoman from Texas for her very articulate expression of what this resolution and this conference report does indeed do, and refocusing the debate on the specifics that brought an unusual harmony together from both sides of the aisle and to a specific report and specific conference report that is here.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, I yield 8½ minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), who has been a leader in this area for some time here in the Congress.

Mr. MARKEY. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much for yielding me time.

This bill that we are considering is an historic mistake, a mistake which will come back to haunt the United States and the world. India has refused to sign the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty. Iran is a signatory to the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty.

We are asking the U.N. to isolate Iran, to force it to comply with its signature on the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty, not to use civilian nuclear materials in order to create a military nuclear weapon.

What are we doing here today? We are saying to India, you do not have to abide by the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty at all. You never signed it, we

put it on the books because of India, we know that it created an arms race with Pakistan, and instead of enforcing our own law, our own law, we are now out here going to carve out an exception.

Now, what do the experts say? Well, the experts say that India produces approximately seven nuclear bombs per year, but they have a limited amount of nuclear material. What are we doing? We are going to provide the nuclear materials for their civilian nuclear program so that it will free up their domestic nuclear materials for their weapons program.

What do the experts say? The experts say that is going to increase India's capacity to make nuclear weapons to 40 to 50 nuclear bombs per year. Now, people here say, well, that is fine. Why worry about it? India is a country that we trust. Well, you know who does not trust India? I will tell you who does not trust India: Pakistan does not trust India. Pakistan, the home of al-Qaeda. Pakistan, the home of A.Q. Khan, the nuclear Pied Piper, the nuclear Johnny Appleseed, who spread nuclear weapons material across the world.

Here is what we have learned now: We have learned that Pakistan is constructing its own nuclear weapons manufacturing facility that will increase their capacity from 2 to 3 nuclear bombs per year to 40 to 50 nuclear bombs per year.

Now, the Bush administration, as we all know, has already made a mess of our nuclear nonproliferation policy in North Korea, a mess of our nuclear nonproliferation policy in Iraq, a mess of our nuclear nonproliferation policy in Iran. And the world is now looking at us. Pakistan is looking at us. Iran is looking at us. North Korea, Venezuela, Saudi Arabia, Egypt. How will we handle this challenge on the Asian subcontinent? The answer: We are just going to do away with the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty, because that is what this vote will be on the House floor today.

We are just basically saying: It is all over. The rest of the world will not listen to us again. The consequences, the domino effect, the nuclear weapons domino effect begins here, ladies and gentlemen. It begins today. It begins with a policy that says that it is not enough for the United States to have high-tech commerce with India, to have outsourcing of our jobs to India, to have massive increases in diplomatic relations and dozens of other areas with India. No, as a gesture of our friendship with India, we are going to gut our own nuclear nonproliferation policy.

Now, back in the debates of 2004, there was really only one thing that George Bush and JOHN KERRY agreed upon, and that was that the most important issue in the world was nuclear nonproliferation. And here we are on the last day of the Republican era in the United States Congress gutting the most important policy, the policy

which has kept the reins imperfectly but significantly on the spread of nuclear weapons over the last generation.

And this is in a way almost the exclamation point on the end of this Republican era, on the Bush administration's efforts to control nuclear weapons. This era will be looked back at as the era where the Bush administration and the Republicans in this Congress said: Anything goes. Anything for trade with India. When asked, we will surrender our nuclear nonproliferation policy.

Pakistan is now in a massive escalation of its nuclear weapons program. Al-Qaeda is headquartered in Pakistan. A.Q. Khan lives in Pakistan in a palace, still not under arrest, still not in prison, his people who helped to spread these nuclear weapons still walking the streets of Pakistan. What kind of administration do we have that instead of saying, we are going to put together a conference that deals with that issue which will threaten us here in the United States, because these materials will escalate massively in the Asian subcontinent.

This is in many ways comical. I mean, it really is comical. We are going to debate the end of the nuclear nonproliferation regime in the United States for an hour on the last day of Congress. It is comical. I am scraping here to get an extra minute out of this paltry amount of time to debate what the consequences are of what we are doing. And so, yeah, this is a going-away present to the Bush administration. There has been such a mismanagement of the nuclear nonproliferation policy over these last 6 years that this probably does represent, in a crazy kind of a way, you know, the final statement.

But I will tell you, we are going to come back and we will rue this day, because the Pakistanis and the Iranians, they are not going to sit on their hands and allow this to happen. They are going to look at us and they are going to say: These Americans, they preach temperance from a bar stool. They are going to say that this is an era of historic hypocrisy, where the United States expects the rest of the world to listen to us when we tell them that they should not pursue nuclear weapons, while we selectively grant exceptions to countries that never signed the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty in the first place.

It is a nonsustainable policy. It will come back to haunt us, not today, not tomorrow, but there will be a day in 5 years or 10 years when everyone here today will be able to point back to this moment and say that is the day the historic mistake was made.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this conference report.

For over three decades it has been the policy of the United States to restrict nuclear trade with India. Why? Because in 1974 India violated its pledges to the United States and Canada to use American and Canadian nuclear technologies only for peaceful purposes.

Instead, India used our technology to develop and explode a nuclear bomb.

Despite that history, despite the refusal of India to sign the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty or to honor its contractual obligations to the United States, this Administration has now undertaken to ignore the past and to ask Congress to approve legislation that will, according to nonproliferation experts from across the political spectrum, enhance India's nuclear bomb-making capacity from 7 bombs a year to over 40 bombs a year.

This is exactly the reverse of what we should be doing if we are serious about reducing the spread of nuclear weapons in the world. In fact, it was India's blatant misuse of peaceful American nuclear technologies for a weapons program that prompted the Congress to radically strengthen our nonproliferation laws. And when we were done with that, we went to our allies and established new international guidelines to prevent any other country from doing what India had done: misusing imported nuclear technologies for a secret weapons program. And now, in an act fraught with hypocrisy, irony, and hubris, the Congress will approve a sweeping exception from our nonproliferation laws for the very country that prompted us to strengthen those laws.

I fully support strengthening American ties with India on trade, high-tech, military cooperation, and so many other issues, but why do we need to gut our nonproliferation laws at the same time? The simple fact is that we DON'T have to gut our nonproliferation laws in order to improve our relationship with India, but the President took us into the nuclear Twilight Zone, instead.

During the Conference, the Bush Administration, reportedly at New Delhi's urging, tried to strip out the few good nonproliferation provisions that the Congress inserted into what is a deeply flawed piece of legislation.

Last week, Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice wrote a letter asking Congress to remove a requirement that India help us prevent Iran from going nuclear. I don't know what the administration was thinking, telling the Congress that we can't ask for India's help on Iran's nuclear program.

I want to thank the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) for fighting to ensure that at least an ongoing assessment of India's cooperation with U.S. and international efforts to curb Iran's nuclear ambitions be performed, both at the time that the formal nuclear cooperation agreement is submitted to Congress and every year thereafter. While the Gentleman and I may disagree on the underlying legislation, I appreciate his efforts, and those of Chairman HYDE, to try to address this issue and to try to mitigate some of the damage that this agreement may do to our nation's nuclear nonproliferation policies.

But the bottom line is that under the President's plan to fuel India's nuclear power reactors, we're going to free up their nuclear material for weapons. And just this summer, we learned that India's arch-rival Pakistan is building a huge new reactor to make nuclear bomb material.

There's a nuclear arms race on in South Asia, and the United States is about to become an accomplice to this arms race.

If we want the rest of the world to stop fueling the proliferation of new nuclear weapons, we had better stop throwing gasoline on the fire ourselves. The India Nuclear Deal is bad

for U.S. security. It undermines U.S. nuclear nonproliferation efforts around the world, and it risks fueling an accelerated nuclear arms race in South Asia.

Madam Speaker, this is a watershed moment for the world. If the United States goes soft on nuclear weapons proliferation, the entire world will go soft. Countries which in good faith abstained from nuclear weapons development will have a green light to go ahead following the India-U.S. model. In my view, this is a prelude to catastrophe. I cannot imagine that the House will ever again confront a vote that is so central to our leadership, our standing, our moral authority on the issue of stopping the spread of nuclear weapons. I urge my colleagues to vote against this Conference Report.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

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

This legislation will provide production 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 and incoming Chairman TOM LANTOS said in July and no doubt will repeat shortly, 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.

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.

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

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of our time.

Madam Speaker, in closing, I would like to urge Members' support of the rule, providing for the consideration of the conference report for this particular piece of legislation. It is a bipartisan bill. It was based in a bipartisan and bicameral fashion, which is a unique combination we have.

It is a nice, harmonious way to actually end this particular session of Congress on something that does move us forward when you focus in on what the bill is actually about, and the issues that are actually handled in this particular report.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

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

Mr. KUCINICH. 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 X, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed with an amendment in which the concurrence of the house is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 482. An act to provide for a land exchange involving Federal lands in the Lincoln National Forest in the State of New Mexico, and for other purposes.

H.R. 486. An act to provide for a land exchange involving private land and Bureau of Land Management land in the vicinity of Holloman Air Force Base, New Mexico, for the purpose of removing private land from the required safety zone surrounding munitions storage bunkers at Holloman Air Force Base.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed bills and a concurrent resolution of the following titles in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 997. An act to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain land in the Beaverhead-Deerlodge National Forest, Montana, to Jefferson County, Montana, for use as a cemetery.

S. 1529. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain Federal land in the city of Yuma, Arizona.

S. 1535. An act to amend the Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe Equitable Compensation Act to provide compensation to members of the Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe for damage resulting from the Oahe Dam and Reservoir Project, and for other purposes.

S. 1548. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain Forest Service land to the city of Coffman Cove, Alaska.

S. 2030. An act to make permanent the authorization for watershed restoration and enhancement agreements.