

President Bush unwisely has transformed this nuclear cooperation agreement into the centerpiece of our bilateral relationship with New Delhi. In doing so, he has ignored the broad range of areas on which the United States and India can and should cooperate—ranging from science and technology to economic and business partnerships. In the security realm, our two nations should be doing more together on counterterrorism, especially in the wake of the devastating attacks in India over the past year.

I strongly believe in the promise of the future partnership between our two great nations. I am voting in favor of this agreement, despite its serious nonproliferation flaws, because I do not want to jeopardize that emerging alliance that can bring so many benefits to both of our peoples.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I would like to take a few moments to discuss my vote against the India Nuclear Agreement.

In 2006, I voted in favor of the Henry J. Hyde United States and India Nuclear Cooperation Promotion Act, primarily because of the safeguards included in the act that would ensure that assistance to Indian's civilian nuclear program to meet its domestic energy needs, would not assist the Indian nuclear weapons program. Unfortunately, I do not believe that the United States-India Nuclear Cooperation Approval and Nonproliferation Enhancement Act that we voted on last night has the full scope of necessary protections.

India is the largest democracy in the world. Its economy is growing by 8 percent annually. Their domestic energy needs are enormous and they simply do not have enough indigenous resources to meet them. India is an important ally and our nation has benefitted from a strong trade and defense relationship for decades. Furthermore, my State of Rhode Island has prospered because of a vibrant Indian community. I believe that the United States should do all that it can to assist India and further strengthen the partnership between the two countries.

However, our country's relationship with India must be balanced with concerns about nuclear proliferation and the stability of the Middle East and Asia.

I believe that proliferation of nuclear weapons and weapons material and technology is the greatest threat facing our country today. The most effective method of controlling such proliferation is a multilateral regime where all countries are subject to the same standards.

The agreement that was approved by the Senate last night establishes a separate and unique regime for India. This particular agreement would allow India to be treated like a nuclear weapons state but not impose upon India the responsibilities and commitments placed on other nuclear weapons states. As such I believe that this particular

agreement is flawed. This agreement has the potential to actually weaken the carefully constructed, long-standing nuclear nonproliferation regime that the world depends on to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons.

This agreement does provide some benefits. Under this agreement India will put 14 of its nuclear reactors under safeguards agreements with the International Atomic Energy Agency, the IAEA. This will help to ensure that these reactors and the fuel supplied to them will be used only for the peaceful production of nuclear power. In addition the IAEA will bring its expertise to help to improve the operational safety of the reactors.

On the other hand the rest of India's nuclear reactors will not come under the IAEA and these reactors can be used as India wishes to produce power or to produce more material for nuclear weapons. But it is troublesome to me that India retains the right to deny IAEA access to some or all of the reactors that it has now agreed will come under IAEA agreements.

While this agreement will help India with its energy needs, India is also now free to use its limited indigenous uranium for to support a build up of its nuclear weapons stockpile. India has specifically preserved its ability to increase the number of nuclear weapons in its arsenal, its ability to increase the amount of nuclear weapons materials that it produces and its right to conduct a test of a nuclear weapon.

While India has a voluntary moratorium on testing, India still refuses to sign the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty and to support a fissile material cutoff treaty. Finally, I am greatly concerned about the effect this agreement will have on the region, particularly the reaction of Pakistan. Pakistan will undoubtedly seek a similar agreement if it perceives an increased threat from India. Pakistan may seek to partner with China—and the United States would have few grounds to protest. In such a case, Pakistan will have additional access to nuclear technology.

While I believe that the United States should help India with its urgent energy needs, I believe we missed an opportunity to provide assistance with adequate and necessary safeguards in place. For these reasons, I reluctantly decided to vote against this agreement. It is my hope that the United States and India continue to work together to make the world safer from nuclear proliferation.

IN MEMORIAM: PAUL NEWMAN

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I am honored to remember a great American icon who was a renowned actor, activist, and philanthropist—Paul Newman, who passed away on September 26, 2008, at the age of 83.

Paul's movie career spanned five decades, acting in over 65 films. He captivated all of America with his natural on-screen talent and his off-screen abil-

ity to give to others. He was more than an incredibly gifted, Academy Award-winning actor; his zeal for life was evident through his remarkable charitable work and favorite pastimes.

Paul Leonard Newman was born in Shaker Heights, OH, on January 26, 1925, to Arthur and Theresa Newman. Though he hoped to be a professional athlete, his gift for the performing arts showed early as he acted in grade school and high school plays. After high school he served in the U.S. Navy Air Corps and eventually went on to study theatre at prestigious institutions such as the Yale School of Drama and the famous Actor's Studio in New York.

In the 1950s his acting career began in theatre and television. He moved to films and was eventually nominated for 10 Oscars—winning Best Actor for "The Color of Money" and also two honorary Oscars. He played many major roles in classic American films such as "Exodus," "Hud," "Butch Cassidy and the Sundance Kid," "The Verdict," "The Sting," and "Absence of Malice." His legendary performances will forever entertain and captivate the American imagination.

Paul was not only an iconic actor, but he also fervently cared about our Nation. He opposed the Vietnam war and ardently favored civil rights and equality. In addition he was a world-class race car driver, and a flourishing nonprofit entrepreneur. He founded the popular Newman's Own line of food products 25 years ago, and 100 percent of its profits are donated to charities around the world. Among those charities are the Hole in the Wall Camps that Paul helped to create over 20 years ago. These camps allow for a carefree experience for children with illnesses. Newman's Own has raised \$250 million so far.

When his son, Scott, tragically passed away, Paul established the Scott Newman Center in 1980 to prevent drug abuse through educating children. He also helped to cofound the Committee Encouraging Corporate Philanthropy, a consortium of global CEOs in support of corporate giving. Paul Newman lived his life by giving to others and encouraging others to give.

He is survived by his wonderful wife of 50 years, award-winning actress Joanne Woodward; five daughters, Susan, Stephanie, Melissa, Nell, and Clea; two grandchildren; and his brother Arthur. I send my deepest condolences to them.

Our Nation lost an amazing talent and humanitarian with the passing of Paul Newman, but his legacy to the State of California and to all of America will live on.

GAO SLOT AUCTION RULING

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, as chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Related