

that is about everyone—and obviously the farm community, which is the producers of food and do an extraordinary job for our Nation. They have always taken a long time on the floor to debate—weeks, usually. And they have always been open for amendments, which is totally reasonable because of the complexity of the bill. They have often brought in issues such as the death tax, immigration, labor, and how you get migrant labor, global warming, and in the case of New England, for example, they brought in the question of these subsidies, which we find a little difficult to tolerate, which are now being expanded to asparagus. There is a crop that needs a subsidy or the walking-around money that has been put in this bill for the purpose of disasters or the fact that there is probably \$20 billion of gimmicks put in this bill that are budgetary games or the fact that they have moved mandatory spending over to tax expenditures.

What an outrage on the budget process. They opened a \$3 billion add-on in mandatory spending so they could go out and spend that on various interest groups by creating a tax credit. The list goes on and on and on and on.

Why should we not on this bill get into a debate over the issue of tax policy? Because tax policy underlines the way this bill is paid for. The Senator from Arizona has an extraordinarily good proposal on the death tax. Why should that not be on the table here?

The whole issue of AMT should be on the table, in my humble opinion, because there are a number of farmers, by the way, who pay the AMT tax, a number of them. There are going to be a lot more when we bump up to 20 million people paying that tax next year. These are all relevant to this bill, in my humble opinion, of what relevant is.

By the way, in the Senate, relevance is everything when it comes to the open amendment process. We are not functioning under postcloture rules here. Relevant is irrelevant when it comes to a bill on the floor of the Senate. Anything can be amended in any way, and it is an open bill. That is the concept of the Senate.

If somebody wants to put on this bill policies relative to Nicaraguan housekeepers, they can put that amendment on traditionally. That has no relevance at all to the average American looking at it, but it is the Senate's prerogative.

So we are undermining the fundamental prerogative of the Senate and every Member of the Senate, I think in a very damaging way. I am disappointed in the decision by the majority.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. KYL. I had hoped to ask the majority leader a question here, but I think my question has already been answered, so I will simply make this point.

There may be extraordinarily unique circumstances where once in a blue

moon it is important to move a very focused piece of legislation in a very hurried period of time so that the majority is warranted in setting up a process such as that which has been established for this bill, where there are no amendments unless the majority leader says so. But that is not the situation with this bill. It never has been with the farm bill. This is the bill we are debating that we are taking up. And to suggest that the Senator's prerogative to offer any amendment—a lot of times they get voted down because they do not have the support—but the Senator's prerogative to offer an amendment is going to be eliminated through the gatekeeper of the majority leader or any other member of the Senate who can object, is to derogate the basic rule of the Senate and eliminate a basic right of Senators.

I recall not long after I got here, my colleague from Arizona objected to the then-majority on this side establishing a process that was not this drastic, but in some respects limited the right of amendments. He said: The Senate is the body in which any Member has a right to offer an amendment. It will be wrong for us to do that. Our leadership relented, and there were amendments allowed on the other side that got us over that impasse. That is what our minority leader was referring to a moment ago. You cannot impose a sort of dictatorial process where one person gets to decide whether you offer an amendment in the Senate.

Sooner or later that process is going to break down. And on a bill as big as this bill, with as many diverse interests as the Senator from New Hampshire was talking about, it is not right that Senators not be allowed to offer amendments. Again, if they are not good amendments, they are going to be defeated, and they can always be tabled at any time, so they do not have to take up time. If I offered a silly, nongermane amendment, any of my colleagues could immediately move to table that amendment. Assuming it was simply nongermane, that motion to table would presumably pass. That whole thing would transpire in less than half an hour.

So it is not about Republicans trying to take too long or offer silly amendments; it is about the regular process which ordinarily allowed us to offer amendments of our choice, not the choice of another Member of the body. I would hope the majority would reconsider, and that we could, after lunch, proceed with the process that is more amenable to all Senators being able to offer amendments they choose to offer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. SALAZAR. Mr. President, I only hope that both the minority and the majority can figure out a way of moving forward with what has been a labor that has taken up both Republican and Democrats for the last 2 years to develop what is a very good farm bill. What the majority leader is attempting

to do is to get us into a process where we will ultimately get a farm bill to cross the finish line, which is good for America. I hope the Republican minority can work with us to try to figure out a way forward to get us across the finish line.

I yield the floor.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, at 12:31 p.m., the Senate recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. CARPER).

FARM, NUTRITION, AND BIOENERGY ACT OF 2007—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who seeks recognition?

The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. What is the status of the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Amendments submitted to the bill.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. I am sorry?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Amendments are pending to the bill.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. I ask unanimous consent that three speakers—Senator SALAZAR for 20 minutes, ALEXANDER for 15 minutes, and DORGAN 20 minutes—go in that order.

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

The Senator from Colorado is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. SALAZAR. Mr. President, I rise in strong support of the 2007 farm bill. Before I go to the specifics of the bill, I wish to acknowledge those who have worked so hard in getting us where we are today.

This has been a huge undertaking spread out over several years, starting under the leadership of Senator CHAMBLISS and his work in the Agriculture Committee. The hearings he held around the country, the hearings he held in the West and the Southeast, all over, contributed greatly to the bipartisan product that is before the Senate today. In addition, the leadership of our chairman, Senator HARKIN, a man from farm country whose heart and soul are about making sure agriculture and rural America thrive—his leadership and the help of his staff in getting us to this point today is something we all must acknowledge and something for which I am grateful and something for which the farmers and ranchers in rural Colorado are grateful.

I also acknowledge both Senators BAUCUS and GRASSLEY and their leadership on the Finance Committee. The energy and specialty crops and conservation pieces of the farm bill have been significantly enhanced by the actions taken by the members of the Finance Committee. Without the leadership and bipartisan example of Senator BAUCUS and Senator GRASSLEY, we would not be where we are today.