

hearings? Where is the testimony from individuals, businesses or agencies? We are operating with virtually no deliberation at all; and oftentimes, Members have mere minutes to evaluate the amendments.

Members have literally been working day and night for a reasonable compromise. We need a CR that gets us through these tough times and sets the stage for real fiscal reform.

I have such a proposal before you here today. My alternative CR requires a 4.7 percent, across-the-board reduction in domestic spending for the remainder of 2011. The only exception is the Census Bureau. My proposal strikes more appropriate reductions in military spending while at the same time protecting our warriors in the field. As the Secretary of Defense has stated, we need to eliminate costly weapons systems, way over budget, out-of-control civilian contracting and achieve much needed efficiencies in the agency. So rather than a 2 percent increase, we talk about a 1 percent increase.

This proposal, which I hope is taken as a beginning for a bipartisan compromise on the continuing resolution, makes real cuts of about \$20 billion in our current level of spending, enough to be meaningful, with 7 months remaining in our calendar year, or our fiscal year, but not enough to undermine the recovery. It's simple, it's serious, and it's real.

I urge its adoption.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Madam Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment because it proposes to change existing law and constitutes legislation in an appropriation bill and therefore violates clause 2 of rule XXI, which states in pertinent part: an amendment to a general appropriation bill shall not be in order if changing existing law. The amendment attempts to create a legislative formula for spending.

I ask for a ruling.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any Member wish to be recognized to speak to the point of order?

If not, the Chair is prepared to rule.

The Chair finds that this amendment seeks to establish a legislative formula for funding. The amendment therefore constitutes legislation in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI.

The point of order is sustained, and the amendment is not in order.

AMENDMENT NO. 89 OFFERED BY MR. KIND

Mr. KIND. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following new section:

SEC. . . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to provide payments (or to pay the salaries and expenses of personnel to provide payments) to the Brazil Cotton Institute.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of February 17, 2011, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KIND. I yield myself such time as I might consume.

Madam Chair, my amendment is very simple and straightforward. It would save the American taxpayers \$150 million a year by ending a new American taxpayer subsidy that is going to Brazilian cotton agribusiness. If this program sounds crazy, it's because it is. But it's also the truth.

How did we get to this point? Well, Brazil had a successful WTO challenge against our own cotton subsidy program under our own farm bill. They prevailed; and you would think that the logical, reasonable response from us would be to reform our cotton subsidy program. But that's not what happened.

Instead, a new program has been created to the tune of \$150 million per year to buy off Brazil cotton agribusiness so they won't pursue economic sanctions against our country. It's foolish, it's wasteful, and it speaks to the need for us to get into serious farm bill reform, especially under the title I subsidy commodity programs. We need to eliminate this new subsidy and then get onto the tough lifting of comprehensive farm bill reform.

I ask my colleagues to support the amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KINGSTON. I rise in opposition to the Kind amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KINGSTON. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chairman, in 2004, the WTO, the World Trade Organization, found the United States guilty of illegal subsidies to American cotton farmers. It's been a long process, but Brazil is a very important ally of ours. We get along fine. They are very important to us strategically in our own hemisphere, so we want to get along with Brazil. And because of that, we worked out this settlement which kept Brazil from putting retaliatory tariffs on us. That saved us money.

If we did not agree to this—which Mr. KIND has pointed out—\$147 million, we would have to pay \$829 million. This is less, and it only is in effect until the farm bill is passed. In the 2012 farm bill, we'll deal with that.

With that, I yield 1½ minutes to the chairman of the Agriculture Committee, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LUCAS).

Mr. LUCAS. I rise in opposition to this amendment.

This transfer of funds was established as part of an agreement negotiated between the U.S. and Brazilian Governments. As a result of this agreement negotiated by the USTR and USDA,

Brazil agreed to suspend retaliation against U.S. exports. If this amendment passes and the funds are not transferred in compliance with the agreement, then the U.S. will be in violation of the agreement. Brazil would then have the right to immediately impose punitive tariffs on U.S. exports. What Mr. KIND's amendment does is invite a trade war.

The U.S.-Brazil agreement is in place only until the 2012 farm bill is completed. This provides an opportunity for the U.S. to determine what adjustments to current law are necessary as a part of the next farm bill to bring the U.S. cotton program into compliance with the WTO ruling. This amendment should not be on this bill. It is a policy change.

Please join me in defeating this amendment.

Mr. KIND. Madam Chair, I respect my colleagues' position. The answer is not to create a new \$150 American subsidy program going to Brazil. The answer is to reform our programs now in the United States.

And with that, I yield 1 minute to my good friend from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK).

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Madam Chair, I think if we were to have a contest on your YouCut for the single stupidest thing the Federal Government could do, it would be to take \$120 million more of American tax dollars and send it to subsidize Brazilian cotton farmers so we can continue to subsidize American cotton farmers. That's what we're talking about.

I find it somewhat ironic that my friends who are the great believers in free enterprise and the free market think somehow there's an exception for agriculture. But whether you do or you don't, sending money to Brazilian cotton farmers at a time when we are making fundamental cuts here is problematic.

It also illustrates my problem with the structure of this bill. I was hard-pressed to find offsets so we could continue to fund enforcement of securities fraud or consumer protection. Where could we have gotten the money? Well, we could have gotten it from Brazil. Instead of sending it to Brazilian cotton farmers, we could have used it for our own law enforcement. But the bill is structured to protect this. At least we cannot waste it.

So let's be very clear. To protect our right to continue to subsidize American cotton farmers, we are going to subsidize Brazilian cotton farmers. Lunacy.

Mr. KINGSTON. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KIND. Madam Chair, at this time, I would like to yield 1 minute to my friend from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE).

Mr. FLAKE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I hope that nobody in this Chamber or watching here misses the irony of this, that we are spending money to subsidize Brazilian agriculture so that

we can continue to subsidize agriculture here. That is just incredible when you think about it.

And what this amendment will do is to force us back to the table. It won't spark a trade war. It will simply say, all right, stop subsidizing your own agriculture in a way that violates your trade agreements. That's what we want to do is force the issue where we can actually get out of these subsidy programs. We cannot continue to send money to Brazil so that we can continue to subsidize agriculture here. It just makes no sense at all. This is a great amendment. I hope that my colleagues will support it.

Mr. KINGSTON. Madam Chair, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Georgia has 3 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Wisconsin has 1¾ minutes remaining.

Mr. KINGSTON. Madam Chair, I yield myself 10 seconds. I just want to point out that I understand and hear what the folks are saying, but we are in a situation where we have an existing farm bill. If we do not do this, it is going to cost American taxpayers \$682 million. That was the WTO agreement.

With that, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California, the ranking member of the Ag Subcommittee on Appropriations, Mr. FARR.

□ 1210

Mr. FARR. I think that this is a problem. And I think Mr. KIND has a way of looking at trying to remove the money, but it's not going to make the problem go away.

I agree that this is a thing that needs to be addressed because there's going to be retaliatory implications if this money is just pulled, and those retaliatory implications are unknown to an awful lot of other agriculture who may even support this amendment. So it is an idea that we need to address. This is not the place to address it.

I oppose the amendment.

Mr. KIND. Again, the answer is not to invite a trade war. The answer is to fix our problem here in America by reforming the long overdue cotton subsidy program.

With that, I yield 1 minute to my friend from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

Mr. DEFAZIO. We've got everything but murder going on here.

We're being blackmailed by the Government of Brazil, and so we are giving precious U.S. taxpayer dollars, \$147 million, to Brazil for their cotton farmers while I have got small farmers going broke. Now, come on.

And now we hear from the gentleman from Georgia, well, that's what the law says. Hey, you just repealed health care. You can change the farm bill. We can do away with these obscene subsidies, \$3.4 billion bilked from U.S. taxpayers going to subsidize cotton farmers, who use subsidized water on top of that, whose total crop value was \$4 billion. So \$3.4 billion of it is our taxpayer subsidy. This is indefensible.

Take this step now, and then next week you can repeal the farm bill and replace that.

Mr. KINGSTON. I would remind the gentleman from Oregon we are going to reauthorize the farm bill next year, which is what this is all about.

I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY).

Mr. CONAWAY. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

While far from perfect, this agreement was arranged by the Obama administration and the country of Brazil. This will incite a retaliatory trade war against the United States' intellectual properties. It won't have anything to do with tariffs on U.S. agriculture, but it will hurt other segments of our economies.

The 2008 farm bill was a contract with American farmers. They have put business processes in place based on that 5-year contract. We will renew and renegotiate that contract in 2012. It makes no sense to unwind this on a piecemeal basis right now.

This is a smokescreen by the other side who wants to go after the farm bill. Madam Chairman, they have gone after it time and time again. But the contract with American farmers, which allows Americans to enjoy the cheapest, most affordable, most abundant and safest food and fiber supply in the world, is on the backs of this farm bill. Reopening it now on an ad hoc piecemeal basis is the wrong policy for this country. Voting for this is a vote to institute a trade war with Brazil, no matter what the rhetoric is from the other side.

Oppose this amendment.

Mr. KIND. Madam Chair, what is really ironic in this debate is that cotton prices are at an all-time high in the marketplace, and yet it shows the built-up resistance in this institution to get to the hard work of reforming these farm subsidy programs, which is long overdue. They claim they are going to do it in the next farm bill, but there is no assurance when that is going to come up. It could be 3 years from now. That could be an additional half billion dollars from the American taxpayer for subsidies flowing to Brazil. The answer is to do it now rather than waiting next year or 3 years from now, or maybe never at all.

I have been around here long enough to know the powerful special interests that resist farm reform. We should do it and save taxpayer dollars at the same time.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KINGSTON. Madam Chair, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY), the chairman of the Trade Subcommittee, who will explain why this saves \$682 million and complies with WTO laws.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Madam Chair, I am sympathetic to this amendment. The United States should live up to its WTO obligations, particularly if we expect other countries to do the same.

Paying Brazil about \$12 million a month rather than complying with the

WTO decision regarding cotton subsidies isn't the best way to resolve this dispute. I acknowledge that. But this settlement is necessary to prevent Brazil from imposing almost \$1 billion in retaliation against American goods and services, as it's entitled to do.

This retaliation could take many dangerous and costly forms, including high tariffs on our American sales abroad and allowing Brazil to no longer protect American intellectual property rights. Such retaliation would be devastating. It would cost U.S. jobs and harm thousands of innocent workers who have nothing to do with this case.

As a result, I must oppose this amendment and urge its defeat.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. KIND. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 88 OFFERED BY MR. KIND

Mr. KIND. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. . . None of the funds made available by division A of this Act may be used to research, develop, test, evaluate, or procure any of the following:

- (1) Expeditionary Fighting Vehicle.
- (2) Surface-Launched Advanced Medium-Range Air-to-Air Missile program.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the order of the House of February 17, 2011, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KIND. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chair, my amendment is pretty straightforward and simple. It would eliminate two weapons programs that the Defense Department, Secretary of Defense, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the bipartisan fiscal commissions all say are not necessary, they are not needed, they don't go to improve military readiness, and they are redundant. It's the Expeditionary Fighting Vehicle as well as the Surface Launch Medium Range Air-to-Air Missile System, the SLAMRAAM for short.

Now, I am not going to get into the details as to why these weapons programs should be defunded. Those serving on the committee have heard these arguments for years. But what I want to make is a larger point here today; that if we're going to be serious about true deficit reduction, the defense aspect of the Federal budget also has to