119TH CONGRESS 1ST SESSION



To require the establishment of a joint task force to identify and eliminate barriers to agriculture exports of the United States.

### IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. CASSIDY (for himself, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. BOOZMAN, and Ms. ERNST) introduced the following bill; which was read twice and referred to the Committee on \_\_\_\_\_\_

# A BILL

- To require the establishment of a joint task force to identify and eliminate barriers to agriculture exports of the United States.
  - 1 Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-
  - 2 tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

#### **3 SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.**

- 4 This Act may be cited as the "Prioritizing Offensive
- 5 Agricultural Disputes and Enforcement Act" or the "Ag
- 6 Disputes Act".

## 7 SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

8 Congress finds the following:

1 (1) Agricultural competitiveness through access 2 to international markets is a vital part of the econ-3 omy of the United States. 4 (2) A healthy, well-functioning, rules-based 5 trading system is the basis for the success of agri-6 culture exports of the United States. 7 (3) When foreign governments erect trade bar-8 riers, that makes it difficult for agricultural export-9 ers in the United States to compete in the global 10 marketplace and undermines the rules-based trading 11 system. 12 Those trade barriers can harm farmers, (4)13 ranchers, workers, and businesses in the United 14 States and can also lead to higher prices for con-15 sumers and a less resilient international trading sys-16 tem. 17 (5) Dispute settlement is available to the Presi-18 dent through trade agreements with 163 countries, 19 and there are protectionist trade barriers to agri-20 culture exports of the United States in many of

21 those countries.

(6) Many of those barriers are systemically important. For example, the use by the Government of
India of unrestrained price support programs vio-

lates the commitments by that government under
 the World Trade Organization.

3 (7) The Government of India recognizes that its 4 price support programs violate its commitments 5 under the World Trade Organization, so instead of 6 reforming its programs, it has repeatedly demanded 7 an exemption from disputes for those programs. 8 Moreover, the Government of India has tried to pre-9 vent discussions at the World Trade Organization of 10 any other significant agricultural trade issue unless 11 it gets a permanent exemption from disputes for 12 those programs.

13 (8) The Government of India has repeatedly 14 raised its minimum price supports, which has had 15 negative effects on several commodity markets and 16 most notably has led to its dominance of the global 17 rice trade, with a 40-percent share of the global 18 market since marketing year 2020 through 2021. 19 India is also the world's largest producer of pulses 20 and second largest producer of wheat, peanuts, and 21 cotton.

(9) The United States Trade Representative
submitted a counter notification at the World Trade
Organization in 2023 showing that price supports by
the Government of India for rice increased from

ROS25349 WWW

4

1 78.6 percent of the value of production in marketing 2 vear 2014 through 2015 to 93.9 percent of the value 3 of production in marketing year 2020 through 2021, 4 compared to the limit at the World Trade Organiza-5 tion on increased price supports of 10 percent of the 6 value of production. That counter notification also 7 showed price supports by the Government of India 8 for wheat increasing from 77.7 percent to 81.3 per-9 cent during the same period. Previous counter notifi-10 cations have shown similar violations by the Govern-11 ment of India for other commodities. For example, 12 in the marketing year 2016 through 2017, price 13 supports by the Government of Indian were 67.9 14 percent for cotton, 31.7 percent for chickpeas, 41 15 percent for lentils, and 47.4 percent for pulses over-16 all.

17 (10) Minor attempts to reform the agriculture 18 subsidy system in India in marketing year 2020 19 through 2021 failed to produce results. Reforms en-20 acted as a result of those attempts would not have 21 changed the policies that violate commitments under 22 the World Trade Organization, but would have 23 merely provided farmers in India with opportunities 24 to sell their products outside of the government-run

mandi system, but those reforms were ultimately re pealed.

3 (11) Dispute settlement is an effective way to
4 provide a neutral assessment of compliance with
5 terms of trade agreements and empower internal re6 formers who recognize a problem but have not been
7 able to overcome entrenched resistance.

8 (12) Global agriculture is uniquely susceptible 9 to trade barriers and requires special attention to re-10 solve myriad systemic and economically significant 11 trade violations that impede the development of a re-12 silient, sustainable, and rules-based agricultural 13 trading system.

#### 14 SEC. 3. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

15 It is the sense of Congress that—

16 (1) the President should accelerate efforts to
17 address foreign trade barriers that harm agriculture
18 exports of the United States;

(2) the United States Trade Representative and
the Secretary of Agriculture both have a critical role
in developing agricultural trade disputes;

(3) Congress and the private sector have key
roles to play in the development of disputes and agricultural trade enforcement strategy;

1 (4) in the case of price supports by the Govern-2 ment of India, the President has exhausted other op-3 tions available through the World Trade Organiza-4 tion short of requesting consultations under the Dis-5 pute Settlement Understanding of the World Trade 6 Organization; 7 (5) there should be a plan and definitive dead-8 lines in place for a request for consultations and es-9 tablishment of a panel under the Dispute Settlement 10 Understanding; (6) the United States Trade Representative and 11 12 the Secretary of Agriculture, in consultation with 13 Congress and the private sector, should jointly de-14 velop a proactive enforcement strategy for address-15 ing systemic and economically significant trade bar-16 riers in the agriculture sector; and 17 (7) the Office of the United States Trade Rep-18 resentative is the lead agency for trade policy of the 19 United States. 20 SEC. 4. AGRICULTURAL TRADE ENFORCEMENT TASK 21 FORCE. 22 (a) ESTABLISHMENT.—Not later than 30 days after 23 the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall 24 establish a joint task force to be known as the "Agricul-

| 1  | tural Trade Enforcement Task Force" (in this section re- |
|----|--|
| 2  | ferred to as the "Task Force").                          |
| 3  | (b) Membership.—The Task Force shall be com-             |
| 4  | prised of the following members:                         |
| 5  | (1) Employees of the Foreign Agricultural Serv-          |
| 6  | ice of the Department of Agriculture, who shall be       |
| 7  | appointed by the Under Secretary of Agriculture for      |
| 8  | Trade and Foreign Agricultural Affairs.                  |
| 9  | (2) Employees of the Office of the United                |
| 10 | States Trade Representative, who shall—                  |
| 11 | (A) be appointed by the General Counsel                  |
| 12 | and the Chief Agricultural Negotiator; and               |
| 13 | (B) have appropriate expertise in agricul-               |
| 14 | tural trade policy and trade enforcement.                |
| 15 | (3) Employees from other Federal agencies as             |
| 16 | determined by the United States Trade Representa-        |
| 17 | tive or the Secretary of Agriculture.                    |
| 18 | (c) DUTIES.—   |
| 19 | (1) IN GENERAL.—The Task Force shall—                    |
| 20 | (A) identify trade barriers to agriculture               |
| 21 | exports of the United States that are vulnerable         |
| 22 | to dispute settlement under the World Trade              |
| 23 | Organization or other trade agreements to                |
| 24 | which the United States is a party;                      |

| 1  | (B) develop and implement a strategy for            |
|----|---|
| 2  | enforcing violations of trade agreements related    |
| 3  | to those trade barriers;                            |
| 4  | (C) identify like-minded trading partners           |
| 5  | that could act as co-complainants or primary        |
| 6  | complainants on disputes relating to specific       |
| 7  | trade barriers that are systemically or economi-    |
| 8  | cally important to the United States; and           |
| 9  | (D) report to Congress pursuant to sub-             |
| 10 | section (d).  |
| 11 | (2) Consultation.—In carrying out the duties        |
| 12 | under paragraph (1), the Task Force shall regularly |
| 13 | consult, to the extent necessary and appropriate,   |
| 14 | with the following:                                 |
| 15 | (A) Relevant stakeholders in the private            |
| 16 | sector, including the agricultural trade advisory   |
| 17 | committees.   |
| 18 | (B) Federal agencies that are not rep-              |
| 19 | resented on the Task Force.                         |
| 20 | (C) Like-minded trading partners that are           |
| 21 | similarly concerned with trade barriers and are     |
| 22 | potential participants in a dispute settlement      |
| 23 | process.  |
| 24 | (d) Reports.—                                       |

| 1  | (1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after          |
|----|---|
| 2  | the date of the enactment of this Act, and not less   |
| 3  | frequently than quarterly thereafter, the Task Force  |
| 4  | shall submit to Congress a report on the progress of  |
| 5  | the Task Force in identifying and addressing trade    |
| 6  | barriers to agriculture exports of the United States. |
| 7  | (2) ELEMENTS.—Each report submitted under             |
| 8  | paragraph (1) shall include the following:            |
| 9  | (A) The systemic and economically signifi-            |
| 10 | cant trade barriers that have been identified by      |
| 11 | the Task Force.                                       |
| 12 | (B) A justification for including those               |
| 13 | trade barriers in the report.                         |
| 14 | (C) The progress that has been made in                |
| 15 | developing dispute settlement cases and an as-        |
| 16 | sessment of whether further information is re-        |
| 17 | quired.   |
| 18 | (D) The current status of ongoing disputes            |
| 19 | and the implementation of panel decisions, arbi-      |
| 20 | tration decisions, or decisions by the Appellate      |
| 21 | Body of the World Trade Organization.                 |
| 22 | (3) Confidential information.—                        |
| 23 | (A) IN GENERAL.—The Task Force shall                  |
| 24 | remove from each report submitted under para-         |

2

10

graph (1) any information determined by the Task Force to be confidential.

3 (B) BRIEFING.—For each report required 4 to be submitted under paragraph (1), the 5 United States Trade Representative and the 6 Secretary of Agriculture shall provide to mem-7 bers of Congress, congressional staff, and 8 cleared advisors a briefing on the information 9 determined by the Task Force to be confidential 10 and removed from the report pursuant to sub-11 paragraph (A).

12 (e) CONSULTATIONS WITH INDIA.—

13 (1) IN GENERAL.—The Task Force shall in-14 clude as part of the first report required under sub-15 section (d)(1) a plan for filing a request for con-16 sultations under the World Trade Organization with 17 respect to the price supports implemented by the 18 Government of India with respect to agricultural 19 products, which shall include other members of the 20 World Trade Organization that have been identified 21 and approached as potential co-complainants.

22 (2) ELEMENTS.—The plan required under23 paragraph (1) shall include—

24 (A) specific claims that the United States
25 Trade Representative intends to make during

| 1  | the consultations requested pursuant to the  |
|----|--|
| 2  | plan; and                                    |
| 3  | (B) a timeline for—                          |
| 4  | (i) requesting those consultations; and      |
| 5  | (ii) requesting the establishment of a       |
| 6  | panel under the World Trade Organization     |
| 7  | in the event that the Government of India    |
| 8  | fails to provide a satisfactory path to com- |
| 9  | pliance by the date that is 60 days after    |
| 10 | the date of receipt of the request for con-  |
| 11 | sultations.                                  |