

to refugee camps, been around parts of this country. I have seen hunger. I have seen devastating hunger.

I would desire to eliminate hunger, if we can. Our farmers are part of being able to do that at some point with the prodigious quantities of good food which they produce. We are not going to eliminate hunger by taking "hunger" out of the lexicon of the Department and replacing it with "very low food security." I think it is not about the terminology; it is about the will. Do we have the will to decide in a country such as ours to address the issue of hunger and make sure they have enough to eat.

We have programs in this country such as food stamps and the WIC Program and other programs to try to address some of these issues. Now apparently we have some folks in the bureaucracy who will address it by changing the words to "very low food security."

Remember that when we later today talk about family farmers and the plight many of them have. They are the ones planting the seed and growing the crops—or at least trying to do that, except during the years where there is a disaster when they have serious problems.

We have a hungry world. The fact is in this world we circle the Sun. Our little planet has 6.3 billion neighbors. Half of them have never made a telephone call and live on less than \$2 a day. There is plenty of hunger in this country and the world. Eliminating the word "hunger" from the lexicon of the U.S. Department of Agriculture is not addressing the issue of hunger.

I yield the floor. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CONRAD. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. CONRAD. Madam President, we have had a flurry of phone calls and consultations this morning about the dispute that has gone on over the last several days about getting to the agriculture appropriations bill so we might consider disaster relief for farmers and ranchers hard hit by drought across the country, the third worst drought in our Nation's history.

My understanding of the agreement is that we will go to the India nuclear matter but that at some time today we will turn our attention to the agriculture appropriations bill and I will have the chance to offer the first amendment to that bill. Is that a correct understanding of the agreement that has been entered?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct in that under the unanimous consent entered into earlier we will move to the United States-India legislation, after which the agriculture appropriations bill will be taken up. It provides under that agreement for Senator CONRAD to be recognized in order to offer a first-degree amendment following the statement of the chairman.

Mr. CONRAD. Very good. That is my understanding. I appreciate the Chair confirming that.

There are 26 cosponsors of the legislation. It is wholly bipartisan—many Republicans and many Democrats. I want to alert my colleagues that at some point we will go to this issue today. It is not specified when, as I understand it. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. CONRAD. It is specified that sometime today we will go to it, and after statements of the Chair and ranking member I will be given an opportunity to offer an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CONRAD. I thank the Chair and yield the floor. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LUGAR. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

FEDERAL AND DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA GOVERNMENT REAL PROPERTY ACT OF 2006

Mr. LUGAR. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 3699, that it then be referred to the Energy and Natural Resources Committee and immediately discharged, and that the Senate then proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 3699) to provide for the sale, acquisition, conveyance, and exchange of certain real property in the District of Columbia to facilitate the utilization, development, and redevelopment of such property, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Madam President, I take the opportunity to thank the Governmental Affairs Committee for bringing H.R. 3699 to the floor for passage today. The Federal and District of

Columbia Government Real Property Act of 2005 is a unique proposal to re-evaluate the significant Federal property in DC and make some land available to redevelopment by the city. This redevelopment will broaden the District's tax base and will eventually add strength to the city economy. As the ranking Democratic member of the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on the District of Columbia I am tasked with my friends on the Government Affairs Committee to provide appropriate oversight of the District and ensure a strong financial condition.

The Federal property that will be transferred to the District through this bill will provide for a variety of new projects and there is a great deal of potential. Reservation 13 is envisioned as a mixed-use new community that will include new housing and businesses, and improve access to existing healthcare facilities. That property also includes the Court Services and Offender Services Agency, CSOSA, a Federal entity providing offender and defendant oversight in the District. I commend my colleagues for including a provision in this bill to ensure the CSOSA will remain on reservation 13 in a facility which the Federal government has provided significant resources to renovate. They are doing a tremendous job to ensure that offenders returning to the city are prepared for the challenges that face them and should continue that good work.

In addition, I emphasize my strong support for youth recreation and education opportunities in this bill. Properties all along the Anacostia River and elsewhere will now be under the District's control to develop and I strongly encourage them to commit to reserving a portion of each property for youth recreation. We all know the health benefits to children being outdoors, whether in organized sports or the chance to learn about the environment. There are many tremendous youth sports organizations in DC that boost kids' self-esteem and oftentimes provide educational support or mentoring at no cost to low income children. Particularly in an urban area where space is limited it is critical that the District commit to providing opportunities for youth to be outdoors.

I recognize the important need for outreach to the poorest and most vulnerable children in DC. I strongly urge the Anacostia Waterfront Corporation to form a partnership with a DC-based organization whose mission is to provide environmental education to children in natural and historic settings, and particularly to underserved populations. In my work with the District I have always encouraged partnerships with community organizations who know the need and how best to meet it and this is a perfect opportunity to create new vibrant partnerships to benefit the community.

I thank Senators COLLINS, VOINOVICH, LIEBERMAN, and AKAKA for their hard work on this legislation over the past year. The base of the bill was proposed by the administration in 2005 and we have worked collaboratively with the District government and the Federal agencies holding property in the city to develop a sensible approach. I support the goals of this bill to rationalize property in the District and I encourage city leaders to ensure youth have a place to play in their plans for the property. I urge passage of H.R. 3699 and thank the authorizing committee for their work.

Mr. LUGAR. Madam President, I further ask unanimous consent that the bill be read three times and passed, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate, and that statements relating to the measure be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (H.R. 3699) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

UNITED STATES-INDIA PEACEFUL ATOMIC ENERGY COOPERATION ACT

Mr. LUGAR. Madam President, I ask that the bill S. 3709, the United States-India Peaceful Atomic Energy Cooperation Act, be called up and be the pending business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of S. 3709, which the clerk will report.

The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislation clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 3709) to exempt from certain requirements of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 United States exports of nuclear materials, equipment, and technology to India, and to implement the United States Additional Protocol.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana is recognized.

Mr. LUGAR. Madam President, today the Senate begins consideration of legislation on the U.S.-India Civilian Nuclear Agreement. This agreement is the most important strategic diplomatic initiative undertaken by President Bush. By concluding this pact and the far-reaching set of cooperative agreements that accompany it, the President has embraced a long-term outlook that seeks to enhance the core strength of our foreign policy in a way that will give us new diplomatic options and improve global stability.

The Committee on Foreign Relations undertook an extensive review of this agreement. We held four public hearings with testimony from 17 witnesses, including Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice. We received a classified briefing from Undersecretaries of State Nick Burns and Bob Joseph. Numerous briefings were held for staff with ex-

perts from the Congressional Research Service, the State Department, and the National Security Council. I submitted 174 written questions for the record to the Department of State on details of the agreement and posted the answers on the committee web site.

The agreement allows India to receive nuclear fuel, technology, and reactors from the United States—benefits that were previously denied to India because of its status outside the Nuclear Non-proliferation Treaty—NPT. This pact is a lasting incentive for India to abstain from further nuclear weapons tests and to cooperate closely with the United States in stopping proliferation.

The bill before us is an important step toward implementing the nuclear agreement with India, but we should understand that it is not the final step in the process. This legislation sets the rules for subsequent congressional consideration of a so-called 123 Agreement between the U.S. and India. A 123 Agreement is the term for a peaceful nuclear cooperation pact with a foreign country under the conditions outlined in section 123 of the Atomic Energy Act.

Our legislation does not restrict nor does it predetermine congressional action on the forthcoming 123 Agreement. Unlike the administration's original legislative proposal, this bill preserves congressional prerogatives with regard to consideration of a future 123 Agreement. Under the administration's original proposal, the 123 Agreement would have entered into force 90 days after submission unless both houses of congress voted against it, and with majorities that could overcome a likely Presidential veto. I am pleased the administration changed course on this matter and agreed to submit the 123 Agreement with India to Congress under normal procedures. This means that both the House and the Senate must cast a positive vote of support before the 123 Agreement can enter into force.

In our view, this better protects Congress's role in the process and ensures congressional views will be taken into consideration.

I thank Senator BIDEN for his close cooperation on developing this important bill. It reflects our shared views and concerns. He and his staff were valuable partners in the drafting of this legislation, and the final product is much improved because of their efforts. Together, we have constructed a bill that allows the U.S. to seize an important strategic opportunity, while ensuring a strong congressional oversight role, reinforcing U.S. non-proliferation efforts, and maintaining our responsibilities under the NPT. I also want to thank all members of the Foreign Relations Committee for their support, and the work of their staffs, in crafting a bill that received the over-

whelming support of the committee last June.

For the benefit of Senators, I offer the following section by section analysis.

Section 101 identifies the bill as the U.S.-India Peaceful Atomic Energy and U.S. Additional Protocol Implementation Act. Sections 102 and 103 of the Lugar-Biden bill include sense of the Congress provisions on U.S.-India relations and policy declarations. These provisions give voice to a set of important policy issues involving bilateral relations, democratic values, nuclear non-proliferation regimes, fissile material production in South Asia, and support for IAEA safeguards and the Nuclear Suppliers Group. All of these concerns are reinforced by the bill's comprehensive reporting requirements.

Section 104 provides waiver authority from provisions in the Atomic Energy Act and removes the prohibition on cooperating with India due to its 1998 weapons tests and its existing weapons program. At the same time, section 129 of the Atomic Energy Act, which is preserved under the Lugar-Biden bill, terminates nuclear cooperation if India conducts a nuclear test, proliferates nuclear weapons or materials, or breaks its agreements with the IAEA or the United States.

Section 105 of our proposal adopts all of the administration's requirements to ensure that India is meeting its non-proliferation commitments. In addition, we require that decisions in the Nuclear Suppliers Group enabling nuclear trade with India are made by consensus and consistent with its rules. Our aim is to ensure that this multilateral organization will continue to play a vital role in global nonproliferation efforts.

Section 106 prohibits exports of equipment, materials or technology related to the enrichment of uranium, the reprocessing of spent nuclear fuel, or the production of heavy water. The provision allows narrow exceptions for the export of these items from the United States to India if they are for proliferation-resistant activities that involve the United States or have the sponsorship of a recognized international body such as the IAEA. This provision is consistent with the administration's policy regarding such transfers. It would allow cooperation in sensitive nuclear areas only if such cooperation could be implemented with no risk of proliferation.

Section 107 requires the creation of a system to ensure that no items exported to India are diverted to any uses that are not peaceful. This section seeks to ensure U.S. compliance with our NPT obligations.

Section 108 requires annual Presidential certifications that India is meeting its commitments under the July 2005 Joint Statement, its Separation Plan, New Delhi's Safeguards