when our country went to war in 1941. As men answered their Nation's call, millions of women left their homes for factory jobs, working as riveters, buckers, welders, and electricians.

Mae Krier, who is approaching her nineties, still beams with pride when she recalls her days as a riveter on Boeing's B–17 warplane assembly line. American women like Mae gained notoriety as Rosie the Riveters, and they remain a symbol of strength and confidence for our Nation.

In paying tribute to these American heroes who served our country during World War II, let us also gratefully acknowledge the women who served patriotically on the home front with continued recognition of a national Rosie the Riveter Day.

To all the Rosie the Riveters, on behalf of Pennsylvania's Eighth District, thank you for your contributions to our country and your role in the legacy of the Greatest Generation.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2685, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2016, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2393, COUNTRY OF ORIGIN LABELING AMENDMENTS ACT OF 2015

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 303 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 303

Resolved, That (a) at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2685) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. Points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI are waived.

(b) During consideration of the bill for amendment—

(1) each amendment, other than amendments provided for in paragraph (2), shall be debatable for 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent and shall not be subject to amendment except as provided in paragraph (2);

(2) no pro forma amendment shall be in order except that the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations or their respective designees may offer up to 10 pro forma amendments each at any point for the purpose of debate; and

(3) the chair of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read.

(c) When the committee rises and reports the bill back to the House with a recommendation that the bill do pass, the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 2393) to amend the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 to repeal country of origin labeling requirements with respect to beef, pork, and chicken, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Agriculture now printed in the bill shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Washington is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. NEWHOUSE. I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, the Committee on Rules met and reported a rule, H. Res. 303, providing for consideration of two important pieces of legislation: H.R. 2393, the Country of Origin Labeling Amendments Act of 2015, and H.R. 2685, the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2016.

The rule provides for consideration of H.R. 2393 under a closed rule and H.R. 2685 under the customary modified open rule process, which allows any Member to offer an amendment to the bill so long as the amendment complies with the rules of the House. The only restriction is on the amount of time that will be allotted for debating each amendment.

H.R. 2393 is an urgent and critical response to the World Trade Organization's ruling on May 18 of this year, which found country of origin labeling, or COOL, for muscle meat cuts to be in violation of the U.S. trade obligations with Canada and Mexico. H.R. 2393 will simply repeal the COOL meat cut provisions, making the U.S. compliant and prevent retaliation.

Critics of H.R. 2393 will say we have more time, but in truth, we don't. This final ruling is the fourth time the WTO has ruled against the U.S. for various versions of COOL, and on this final appeal, the WTO has given both Canada and Mexico the authority to impose more than $3 billion in combined retaliatory tariffs against U.S. products within 60 days of the ruling.

□ 1245

Today, Mr. Speaker, we are now down to just 37 days to respond before these tariffs are imposed. This could deal an enormous blow to U.S. companies and the workers they employ, just when our economy is beginning to rebound.

There is also an argument floating around that this will prevent all labeling or that a ''Made in North America'' label will satisfy our trade obligations. A North American label will not necessarily satisfy our obligations and can in no way, no matter how fast we try, be negotiated in the remaining 37 days to prevent retaliation.

Also, it is important to note that repealing mandatory COOL doesn't prevent voluntarily labeling, as some companies already do.

Finally, it is worth noting that some critics claim that this will weaken inspections for meat imports. Nothing can be further from the truth.

The United States Department of Agriculture has and will continue to provide the most rigorous, science-based import inspections, inspections of foreign plants which export to the United States. Whether or not the product has a mandatory country of origin label on it will not affect these rigorous inspections.

This legislation is desperately needed. Our manufacturers, pork producers, grape growers, confectionary exporters, and ranchers have repeatedly asked Congress to ensure that we repeal the COOL provisions and bring the U.S. back into compliance with our WTO obligations fully and quickly.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2393 is important to ensure our economy is protected and that the U.S. plays by the rules we agreed to with two of our biggest trading partners, which are by far our largest export markets.

This rule also provides for the consideration of H.R. 2685, the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, which funds our Nation's national defense and provides the resources necessary to continue our essential military efforts abroad, as well as the funding for health and quality of life programs for the brave men and women of our Armed Forces.

Overall, the bill provides $578.6 billion in discretionary funding, $800 million more than the President's request and $24.4 billion above the fiscal year 2015 funding level. Within this amount, $88.4 billion is appropriated for our war efforts in the global war on terrorism.

H.R. 2685 is an imperative measure that funds our critical national security programs and addresses the vital needs of our men and women in the armed services. An effective military, one that is well equipped and well trained, is indispensable to the common defense of our country and is in the best interest of all Americans. This bill includes vital funding for the U.S. military and intelligence community as they remain engaged in responding to instability abroad.

This bill contains $133 billion to provide for 1.3 million Active-Duty troops and 820,000 National Guard and Reserve troops; $219 billion is included for operations and maintenance, which provides for the funding of readiness programs that prepare our troops for combat and peacetime missions.

The Constitution charges the Congress to provide for our national defense, and this bill ensures we will fulfill that obligation. Our highest national priority should always be the protection of our country, and the funding levels in this bill will ensure our military remains the most capable, prepared, and exceptional armed force anywhere in the world.

Mr. Speaker, we must provide the resources necessary to fight America's enemies abroad. With the rise of ISIS, the continued presence of al Qaeda, the growth of terrorist groups in North Africa, instability throughout the Middle East, and Russian aggression in Ukraine, our military must be prepared for not only current threats, but for future ones as well.

We also need to support those willing to fight alongside us, which is why H.R. 2685 includes critical support for our allies who are also facing this unprecedented instability due to the aggression of nation-states and terrorist organizations alike.

This bill makes difficult budgetary choices without undermining the safety, security, and success of our servicemembers and their families. It uses every tax dollar responsible to give our Armed Forces the resources they need to stay prepared, safe, and in peak fighting form.

Supporting the men and women of our armed services—who, day in and day out, risk their lives in the service of our country—is one of the most important functions that we perform as Members of Congress, and this responsibility should not be taken lightly.

I am proud to support this bill and the important funding it provides for our Nation's military, security, and our courageous men and women in uniform.

Mr. Speaker, this is a good, straightforward rule, allowing for consideration of two very critical pieces of legislation that will protect our economy, provide necessary funding for our servicemembers and the defense of our country, and I support its adoption.

I urge my colleagues to support the rule, as well as the underlying bills, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NEWHOUSE) for the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. MCGOVERN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this grab bag rule and both underlying pieces of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, today marks the 18th time in this Congress that House Republicans have brought to the floor a grab bag rule, a single rule that governs floor debate for two or more unrelated pieces of legislation.

Since the Republicans took control of the House in 2011, the use of grab bag rules has dramatically increased by over 400 percent. Using one rule to govern multiple, oftentimes unrelated bills stifles debate, which I guess is the point of them merging all these bills under one rule on the House floor, and leads to disjointed and confusing discussion between two sides.

Ranking Member SLAUGHTER and my Democratic colleagues on the House Rules Committee have raised these concerns with Chairman SESSIONS, but unfortunately, we are back on the floor today to consider one rule for two completely unrelated measures.

Today's rule provides for consideration of H.R. 2393, the Country of Origin Labeling Amendments Act, also known as COOL, under a completely closed process. No amendments are allowed, none.

Clearly, this is an issue that we need to address sooner rather than later, but H.R. 2393 is not the answer. It was introduced just 2 days after the World Trade Organization ruled against the United States' country of origin labeling requirements for meat.

H.R. 2393 is a knee-jerk reaction to the WTO ruling that completely does away with labeling requirement for beef, pork, and chicken, which wasn't even addressed in the WTO ruling.

We know from past WTO disputes that there are several steps that need to occur before retaliation would take place. The arbitration panel takes at least 60 days, but in the U.S.-Brazil cotton case, it took 15 months to produce a ruling. The sky is not falling; we have some time to come up with a workable solution.

Instead of H.R. 2393, we ought to be working toward a more thoughtful approach that balances consumers' right to know where their meat comes from with our trade obligations.

More than 60 countries have successfully implemented COOL-like labeling requirements that comply with WTO standards, and we ought to look toward these programs for a workable solution.

Such an important issue that impacts the safety of food we eat and the health of American families deserves the most robust debate possible, but this closed rule from House Republicans prevents us from having that kind of debate. As I said, not a single Member, Democratic or Republican, is allowed to offer an amendment to this bill. It is completely closed.

Today's rule also provides for the consideration of H.R. 2685, the Department of Defense Appropriations Act.

Mr. Speaker, with respect to the fiscal year 2016 Defense Appropriations Act, there is much to praise about the bill. It contains many important provisions and strong funding for suicide prevention and training, improved response to sexual assault and prevention, and medical research.

I applaud the hard work put into drafting this bill by Defense Subcommittee Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN and Ranking Member VISCLOSKY, along with Appropriations Committee Chairman ROGERS and Ranking Member LOWEY. However, this bill suffers from two major—I emphasize the word ''major''—flaws, which to my mind makes it difficult, if not impossible, to support.

First and foremost, this bill continues to use the overseas contingency operations account, or OCO, as a slush fund to get around parts of the Budget Control Act that Republicans don't like—namely, the caps on defense spending—while ignoring the damage the caps are doing to all our nondefense programs.

This bill, like the Defense Authorization bill before it, completely bypasses the caps set down by the BCA by increasing OCO funding by $38 billion above the President's request. The bill shifts $38 billion from the defense base budget and shoves those moneys into the off-budget OCO meant to cover the costs of our various wars.

Rather than wrestle with the hard question of how to get rid of the sequester and the budget caps and bring our spending back into regular order, the Republicans have decided to wallow in a slush fund. Quite simply, Mr. Speaker, it is a disgrace.

Mr. Speaker, don't you think it is about time that we found a way to provide for our national security needs without relying on war contingency slush funds to pay for the everyday expenses of the Department of Defense?

Members on both sides of the aisle have recognized that the sequester does not work. Shouldn't we be honest about that? Shouldn't we negotiate a workable plan, rather than play these games of smoke and mirrors that actually undermine the Pentagon's ability to budget and plan for the long term?

Second, Mr. Speaker, this bill continues to appropriate billions of dollars to carry out the war against the Islamic State in Iraq, Syria, and elsewhere; but Congress has not even debated, let alone authorized that war.

The leadership of this House continues to fail in carrying out its responsibilities under the Constitution and bring an AUMF before this body to authorize the military operations that have been ongoing since last August.

In fact, just last night, we learned that the U.S. presence in Iraq will increase even further, with the administration planning to establish a new military base in Anbar province and send hundreds of additional American military trainers.

This move is aimed at helping Iraqi forces to retake the city of Ramadi from the Islamic State, but it is clear our involvement is getting bigger and bigger and bigger and bigger—but still, no word from this leadership that it has the political will or intention to bring an AUMF to the House floor this month, next month, or the month after.

With Americans investing more and more in this conflict—we are told that we spend about $3.5 million an hour on this latest war against the Islamic State—there has never been a greater urgency for this Congress to debate and to vote on this war.

Time and again, bipartisan letters have been sent to the Speaker asking him to bring an AUMF to the House floor. Time and again, individual Members have sought to bring amendments up for debate that would authorize military operations in Iraq and Syria, only to have the Republican majority on the House Rules Committee reject them, depriving them of consideration and depriving them of debate.

Just last night, I offered an amendment that simply states that no funds in this act may be obligated or spent on military operations in Iraq and Syria in the absence of an AUMF for such operations. It was also rejected by the Republicans of the House Rules Committee.

Some stated that they voted to reject it because 10 minutes, which is the amount of time limiting debate on all amendments to the defense bill, is simply not enough time to debate a serious question. Well, I agree. Ten minutes is not enough time, but the Rules Committee has the power to increase that limit to as much time as it feels appropriate, and it failed to do so.

The Rules Committee could provide 2 hours of debate or 2 days of debate or 2 weeks of debate; that is the power of the Rules Committee. Don't hide behind this excuse as a reason for Congress not to live up to its constitutional responsibilities.

Mr. Speaker, it seems that we can always find the time and find a way to spend billions of billions of dollars to fund wars; we can always find a way to send our brave men and women overseas to fight and die in these wars, but we can't ever seem to find the backbone or the time to debate and authorize them.

Each night, each week, the Members of this House get to go home to their families and their communities, surrounded by loved ones and people who support them. If we don't have the stomach to take responsibility for sending our troops into danger, then the least we can do is bring them home to their families so that they might enjoy the same peace and privileges that we take so much for granted.

□ 1300

If we want to spend our Nation's treasure on these wars, if my colleagues believe that the war in Iraq and Syria is a priority for our Nation and our national security, then we should carry out our constitutional mandate and debate and vote on an AUMF.

Now, I welcome the fact that the House Appropriations Committee, in a bipartisan vote, supported an amendment by the honorable gentlewoman from California, Congresswoman BARBARA LEE, that says: ''Congress has a constitutional duty to debate and determine whether or not to authorize the use of military force against ISIL.''

That provision is in the Defense Appropriations bill. But the fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that we shouldn't just be saying that Congress has a constitutional duty; we should actually be carrying out our constitutional duty.

So I hope that every single one of my colleagues will remember that when they cast their votes for final passage of this bill, you are providing money and equipment and lives to carry out a war that this House doesn't even have the courage to debate and vote on.

The leadership of this House has to stop whining and stop trying to shift the responsibility on to anyone and everyone except to whom the responsibility really falls. It falls upon each of us to say to this leadership that the time has come to bring an AUMF before this body, and for the leadership to let us debate it and vote on it.

It is time that we stopped acting like cowards and started behaving like Members of Congress our constituents elected to make the tough decisions. So I ask my colleagues to join me in opposing this rule and the underlying legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, just let me say before I turn to some of my colleagues who have joined me on the floor that I agree with the gentleman from Massachusetts. These are important issues, especially when we are talking about appropriations for the Defense Department. We do need an AUMF, and I remain committed to work with the gentleman from Massachusetts to accomplish that; that we should have that open debate and that discussion through the committee system.

This is not the vehicle. But we will do that. We need to do that, and I agree with the gentleman.

Today, I am very happy to have with me several people who would like to speak on this issue. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. CRAWFORD), a member of the Agriculture Committee.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Washington for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support this rule and the underlying legislation to repeal country of origin labeling for meat products, and I believe this effort is long past due.

I thank the chairman of the Rules Committee for bringing this rule to the floor, and I appreciate Agriculture Committee Chairman CONAWAY'S expeditious response to the WTO's final ruling that sets the table for a huge hit to America's struggling economy.

Not only has COOL been a costly burden on our Nation's meat industry for more than a decade, but now massive retaliatory tariffs from Canada and Mexico will inflict pain on a vast amount of U.S. industries and jobs.

At a time when American GDP is actually shrinking, and U.S. farmers and manufacturers are desperately seeking export markets, the worst thing we can do is allow this policy to damage our ability to get American-made to market.

COOL represents yet another failed government mandate imposing heavy costs on private sector industry for no defensible purpose. While the primary goal of COOL is to give American-grown meat a competitive advantage, the result has been exactly the opposite.

Even the Department of Agriculture agrees that COOL has actually negatively impacted the industry that it was supposed to benefit. As a direct result of this policy, we have not only seen sharp increases in the cost of marketing and selling beef and pork, but looming trade retaliation is already costing American industries that contract for future delivery of goods into these export markets.

If we allow these retaliatory tariffs to go forward, our Nation's businesses will experience billions of dollars of market loss, which will kill jobs, harm our U.S. competitiveness, and have a long-term negative impact on America's economic health.

Fortunately, today we have a chance to end the harmful impact of this policy. I urge all of my colleagues to support this rule and the underlying legislation to repeal COOL once and for all.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Let me just say to my colleague on the Rules Committee, I am glad he supports my position that we ought to have a debate on an AUMF when it comes to these wars against the Islamic State in Iraq and Syria.

But my question is, what are we waiting for?

Eleven months ago, Congressman WALTER JONES, a Republican, Congresswoman BARBARA LEE, a Democrat, and myself actually brought a resolution to the floor saying that if we are going to be engaged in combat operations in Iraq, that we ought to have a vote on an AUMF, and that passed overwhelmingly.

We have been at war now for over 10 months. I mean, bombing every day. We have thousands of troops over

there. The President is going to send several hundred more over there. What are we waiting for?

We were told in the 113th Congress that we ought to wait till the 114th Congress. I don't know why, given the fact that the war began under the 113th Congress. But anyway, January came, and we are in the 114th Congress.

Then we were told we have got to wait for the President to submit a strategy or an AUMF. He did.

Now, I know you don't like it. I don't like it. Some people want it broader and bigger. Some of us want it more restrictive. But nonetheless, he did what he is supposed to do. What we are supposed to do is deliberate.

And here we are, 10 months later, and we are all told we will get to it. We will get to it. We will get to it.

We announced yesterday that we are going to establish a new military base in Iraq, and close to 500 more American troops are going to go over there. What are we waiting for?

We ought to be debating these AUMFs before we put people into harm's way, before we start getting engaged in hostilities.

So I have to tell you, I am frustrated not only by the inaction of the leadership of this House, the excuses of the leadership of this House. I am frustrated by my friends who say, I am with you, but we will just get to it at some other point. I mean, how many months, how many years have to go by before we do our job?

The gentleman talked about our constitutional duty to protect the people of the United States. We also have a constitutional duty when it comes to war, and we are not living up to that at all. We are failing miserably, and it really is a disgrace, and it is a disservice to the men and women whom we put into harm's way.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, on the COOL legislation, let me remind my colleagues that consumers, the American people, the people we are supposed to represent, are increasingly seeking more information and want more information about food source and production methods and want to make purchases from a trusted source.

A 2013 Consumer Federation of America study found that 90 percent of Americans strongly support mandatory COOL for fresh meat and strongly favor requiring meat to be labeled with specific information about where the animals were born, raised, and processed.

A 2010 Consumer Union study shows that 93 percent of consumers would prefer to have the country of origin label on the meat that they buy. That is what the American people want.

And yet, rather than trying to respond to that, the first inclination in the aftermath of this WTO ruling is to basically cave, saying, We don't really care what the American people want. We are just going to cave.

I think that is the wrong way to proceed, and I would urge my colleagues to vote against this COOL legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY), the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Washington State for giving me the opportunity to testify today regarding the rule governing debate on H.R. 2393, the Country of Origin Labeling Amendments Act of 2015.

Country of origin labeling, or COOL for short, was first enacted for meat products as part of the 2002 farm bill. Implementation of the law was delayed until 2008.

Less than 5 months after the COOL implementing rule was published, Canada and Mexico challenged the rule at the WTO, arguing that it had a trade-distorting impact by reducing the value and number of cattle and hogs shipped to the United States.

The process has since progressed through the dispute settlement panel phase and a U.S. appeal to the WTO's Appellate Body. In both instances, the WTO found that the way the regulations were implemented violated WTO obligations by discriminating against imported livestock.

The United States was given until May 13, 2013, to bring its COOL regulations into compliance. In response, USDA issued a revised COOL rule in May of 2013 which required that production steps—born, raised, and slaughtered by origin country—be included on meat labels. The revised rule also prohibited the commingling of meat from imported and domestic livestock.

At the request of Canada and Mexico, the WTO established a compliance panel to determine if the revised rule brought the United States into compliance with the previous ruling. Canada and Mexico claimed that not only did the revised rule fail to bring the United States into compliance, but certain parts, especially the prohibition on commingling, were even more onerous than the original rule.

A key criterion for current COOL implementation is that it requires ''segregation'' of animals by country of origin, which significantly raises the cost of utilizing imported livestock. The compliance panel report, released October 20, 2014, upheld the earlier findings of discrimination.

The United States appealed the compliance panel report and on May 18, 2015, the WTO rejected, again, the United States appeal, and found for the fourth and, believe it or not, final time that the U.S. COOL requirements for beef and pork were unavoidably discriminatory.

The final rule kick-starts the WTO process to determine the level of retaliatory tariffs that Canada and Mexico can now impose on the United States, which has been widely predicted to have effects in the billions of dollars.

During a hearing in the House Agriculture Committee's Livestock and Foreign Agriculture Subcommittee to examine the implications of potential retaliation against the U.S., witnesses made it clear that losing the final appeal to the WTO and the inevitable impacts of retaliation against the United States would have a devastating impact on our economy.

Witnesses included representatives from the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the National Association of Manufacturers, the National Confectioners Association, the Wine Institute of California, National Cattlemen's Beef Association, National Pork Producers Council, and the National Farmers Union.

Some have asked why we should act on the basis of a WTO decision. If COOL worked, perhaps there would be a response other than a repeal, but the fact is COOL is a marketing failure. In an April 2015 report to Congress, USDA explained that COOL requirements result in extraordinary costs with no quantifiable benefits.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. CONAWAY. In response to those who argue that COOL enhances food safety, I have also maintained for over 10 years now that is simply not the case. If it were, then all meat served at restaurants would come with an information label of the meat's origin. But it doesn't, and that is because retail food establishments are exempt from the COOL requirements.

In a May 1, 2015, letter to Congress, Secretary Vilsack reaffirmed the need for Congress to repeal the disputed COOL label requirements. In other words, if we go down this path with Canada to try to negotiate something they have no reason to negotiate on, it will fail as well.

Repeal is the only viable option for us to avoid these retaliatory statements. Canada and Mexico have both said they are uninterested in negotiation. We are now at a point of fixing this.

COOL repeal is the answer. This bill does that. I support the rule and the underlying legislation.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, at this time it is my pleasure to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I appreciate the gentleman's courtesy.

We have been involved with a long struggle in this Congress and Congresses before, dating back some 13 years, and even before that, about country of origin labeling. Do people have the right to know where their food comes from?

As the gentleman from Massachusetts pointed out, the American public supports this.

We have had a ruling from the WTO that does not prohibit country of origin labeling. To the contrary, the case upheld the country's right to require food labeling when it serves a broad

public interest that does not lead to treatment of a foreign product in a less favorable way than a domestic one.

We are rushing in a repeal that goes beyond just the disputed elements, adding poultry, and raising questions, I think, about our commitment to being able to give consumers what they want.

There are those that would attach cost to this, but it also is in terms of what people want.

And I think, we ought to take a deep breath. There is not going to be any retaliatory tariffs that are going to be actually inflicted quickly. This is a process that is going to take months.

The Brazilian cotton subsidies, about which I personally think Brazil was right—we had inappropriate cotton subsidies, and we are paying Brazilian cotton interests now because of our refusal to make our own cotton policies WTO-compliant.

□ 1315

That is another scandal, in my judgment, that we are giving $148 million to Brazilian cotton farmers, because we are giving inappropriate subsidies to American cotton farmers when we have other priorities.

But in this case, we have plenty of time in this Congress to follow regular order, to be able to carve out specific provisions that speak to the weakness in what the United States did. Because the United States, in enacting this for meat products, it was pretty convoluted, and the American Government had been told before that it would not be WTO compliant.

So this isn't a surprise. It is not an emergency. It is a responsibility we have to try to make these adjustments.

I don't want to have our other industries penalized with retaliatory tariffs, and they won't be, but we don't have to pass this bill. We ought to deal with the underlying problems, be narrow, be specific, and uphold the right of American consumers to have as much information as we can give them.

So I would strongly recommend that we reject the rule and the underlying bill. Let's have this conversation. Let's do it right. And let's make sure that we defend our right under WTO to have appropriate food labeling.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ALLEN), another member of the Agriculture Committee.

Mr. ALLEN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2393, the Country of Origin Labeling Amendments Act of 2015.

This very important legislation is a direct response to the fourth and final World Trade Organization ruling that mandatory country of origin labeling, or COOL, is anticompetitive and will allow Canada and Mexico to seek over $3 billion in tariffs on American products, directly placing American producers at a competitive disadvantage.

H.R. 2393 removes cattle, hogs, and chicken from COOL labeling to allow our producers to maintain access to two of our largest trading markets and protect U.S. exports from destructive sanctions.

Again, I urge my colleagues to adopt this combined rule and vote in support of the COOL Amendments Act. I encourage the Senate to move this legislation as quickly as possible so our producers can compete on a level playing field.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, country of origin labeling stands for the proposition that knowledge is power. The more knowledge you have, the better decisions that you can make. This is true about the food that you eat, and it is also true about the trade deals that we are being asked to swallow this week.

With Fast Track hurtling down on us for a vote the day after tomorrow, this recent World Trade Organization decision against the United States ought to serve as more than a blinking yellow light. It ought to be viewed as a giant red stoplight.

The World Trade Organization ruled that it just isn't ''cool'' to supply consumers more information. And while this decision may not actually overrule our law, what you are seeing today is the possibility—indeed, the probability—of expensive retaliation against American exports unless we yield to this WTO decision. If you support local decisionmaking, you need to consider the significance of our experience at the World Trade Organization.

There have previously been some challenges to United States laws just like this, and the record of the United States at the World Trade Organization when it is challenged is not one to be really proud of. We have had 6 wins and 66 losses. These are losses that have been sustained when other countries challenge our laws.

Only recently, as my colleague from Connecticut ROSA DELAURO and I attempted to present an amendment to a bill to say that corporate deserters—those that leave our country and renounce their charters here in order to dodge taxes—ought not to be given government business paid for by our taxpayers, we had some organizations who came and said: You can't do that. You can't deny corporate deserters an opportunity to get money from other taxpayers for government work because the World Trade Organization wouldn't like it.

So there is already a range of threats being used based on existing trade laws. Consider now what will happen when the number of those who can challenge decisions in this Congress, at the State level, and at the local level is multiplied geometrically because of the fact that now, under an investor-state dispute settlement provision, thousands of foreign corporations can challenge our regulations and our laws. Taxpayers will be exposed to unprecedented amounts of liability because of our decision to protect the health, safety, and welfare of the people that we represent.

At least the World Trade Organization, the group that decided this case, has an appeal process. There is no such appeal process for these cases that will be brought by foreign corporations.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. DOGGETT. And the panels that will decide them are usually made up of a majority of private lawyers, who one day are litigating cases for multinationals and the next day are deciding these cases.

If you agree that foreign investors should not receive greater rights than American investors, if you support local and State decisionmaking to keep our air and water and our environment clean without having to pay foreigners for the privilege of doing so, then there should be great concern about these trade deals that are being fast-tracked this week.

We don't have to look far to see the damage that could occur, because only three months ago, in Canada, it happened when a local decision about expanding a quarry in an environmentally sensitive area was challenged successfully. That is an unfortunate decision.

We need to be wary of these Fast-Track proposals and insist that they put us on the right track for more trade without jeopardizing the health and safety of Americans. I tried to do that in the Ways and Means Committee, but, like every other amendment to put us on the right track, it was rejected. We need to reject that wrong track approach this week.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the good gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS).

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to voice my strong support for this rule and for the underlying bill, H.R. 2393, the Country of Origin Labeling Amendments Act. This bill repeals the country of origin labeling requirement for certain meat products because, as it currently stands, it threatens the economic livelihood of farmers and ranchers in northeast Georgia and, really, across the Nation.

Like so many other regulations that have been promulgated and upheld by this administration, it has achieved nothing but harm to our economy—not what it was ''intended to do.'' It does not improve food safety, and it now threatens to further devastate the ability of America's agriculture industry to provide for their families by violating our trade obligations and encouraging retaliation from two of our largest trading partners, Canada and Mexico.

I was sent to Washington to be the voice of 700,000 Americans who live in northeast Georgia. These hard-working Americans produce more chicken than any other district in the United States. And now, like so many other Americans, they are facing devastating financial harm because of the COOL requirement, which arbitrarily mandates that meat products have a label that shows what country they were produced in.

You see, the WTO has ruled on four separate occasions that mandatory COOL requirements violate our obligation to treat our trade partners fairly, just as we demand to be treated fairly by them. Now Canada and Mexico may seek to impose retaliatory tariffs against not only our meat exports, but exports on virtually every industry in the United States.

Now I can't imagine how knowing that a pork chop came from a pig that was born in Canada could possibly improve food safety, and I really can't imagine it when we already require that all meat imports be inspected by at least the same standards that the USDA uses to inspect meat here at home, but I can tell you that it takes no imagination to foresee how this will impact our economy. Our trade partners will retaliate against us by taxing our exports.

Retaliatory tariffs are expected on $493 million worth of Georgia exports alone. Nationally, tariffs will impact billions of dollars worth of exports. Chicken exports from my district will be taxed the moment they leave the country, and with 20 percent of chicken produced in the United States being exported, the impact will be overwhelming.

So what will happen if we fail to repeal these mandates? The hard-working farmers in my district and in districts across the country will be unable to compete in the international market.

We need to support this rule and the bill.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, again, let me say that this COOL repeal I think is a rash overreaction to the WTO ruling, and I think that we owe it to the American people to try to figure out whether there is a middle ground here.

And to answer my friend from Georgia, who was like: Well, why do people want to know? Well, maybe the American people want to support American farmers. Maybe they want to support the small- and medium-sized farms that are doing such incredible work all across this country. I don't think that that is an outrageous idea. As I mentioned before, there is overwhelming support for this. Ninety percent of the American people support this country of origin labeling.

Let me suggest to my colleagues, let's do something really radical. Let's actually give the American people something that they want.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, at this point, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BENISHEK), another member of the Agriculture Committee.

Mr. BENISHEK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2393, the Country of Origin Labeling Amendments Act of 2015, as well as the rule.

Mr. Speaker, we oftentimes hear the debate that the mandatory COOL label is about food safety and protecting our food supply. Let me be clear. Mandatory COOL labeling is not about food safety. No matter where our food comes from, regulations remain in place to ensure safety and traceability, regardless of origin. This debate is about the cost that a government-mandated marketing program is having on our economy.

The World Trade Organization has ruled against the United States four times in favor of Mexico and Canada, our largest trading partners. Over the next month, Canada and Mexico will begin seeking retaliatory damages against U.S. products from all over the country. In fact, Canada has already announced that it will seek more than $3 billion in retaliatory sanctions. These damages are real. They will affect farmers, manufacturers, and small-business owners in my State of Michigan and around the country.

Michigan's First District produces 70 percent of the tart cherries in the country. We export a lot of these cherries to Canada. Canada has placed cherries on the list for retaliatory sanctions.

We also produce other things in my district, like apples, pork, wine, maple syrup. Michigan is also famous for its auto and steel industry. Canada plans to target all of these things. These penalties are real. They will cost jobs, which is the last thing we can afford to lose right now.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

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

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. HARTZLER), another fine member of the Agriculture Committee.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas and the gentleman from California for their leadership in bringing this legislation to the House floor. I will make my remarks short and simple.

Country of origin labeling, or COOL, has been a 13-year failed experiment in public policy. It provides little to no value for the consumer, raises costs for all producers, and has created a significant trade dispute with our number one and number two trading partners, Canada and Mexico.

It is an embarrassment to our country that we have lost four times in the WTO court and now are facing significant retaliation from our two closest trading partners. This is particularly concerning when you consider that my home State of Missouri alone could face up to $623 million in economic losses from retaliation.

America should be a leader in creating free and fair trade around the world by focusing on removing tariff and nontariff trade barriers, not creating our own.

Americans expect labels on their meat and other food products to clearly state the health and safety information. COOL goes beyond that, though, and has amounted to nothing more than a government-mandated marketing program that provides little to no value to producers and consumers. The only solution to this failed experiment in public policy is full repeal of the country of origin labeling law.

I support the underlying bill and encourage my colleagues to vote for H.R. 2393.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I would just say to the gentlewoman from Missouri that a lot of small- and medium-sized farmers strongly disagree with her. There are a lot of consumers who would like to support American farmers. Nine out of 10 Americans support country of origin labeling. Repealing this law would restrict their access to critical information about the food they feed their families, making it impossible to avoid food from countries with poor safety records.

□ 1330

The WTO has repeatedly ruled that using country of origin labels to inform consumers about the source of the food that they eat is a legitimate goal. More than 60 other countries have done this successfully without sanctions. So instead of throwing out COOL entirely, we should study the successful models and develop an alternative system that still maintains our constituents' access to the information that they demand.

The legislation that we are talking about here today goes beyond the scope of the WTO case and repeals labeling requirements for ground beef, ground pork, and chicken, ultimately putting the interests of industrial meat processors above the concerns of 90 percent of the American public.

Again, it shouldn't be a radical idea around here to try to do what the American people want. They want to know where their food is grown, where their food is produced. Let's give it to them. Let's try to work a compromise out here rather than just this knee-jerk bill that kind of throws the baby out with the bathwater.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. I have no more speakers, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, how much time remains?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 6½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Washington has 11 minutes remaining.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, first of all, on the COOL repeal, I include for the RECORD a letter to Chairman CONAWAY and to Ranking Member PETERSON signed by hundreds of organizations—farm organizations, consumer groups, labor groups, food safety groups, and I could go on and on and on—basically saying that this legislation that we are considering here today is a bad idea.

JUNE 8, 2015.

Hon. K. MICHAEL CONAWAY,
Chairman, House Agriculture Committee, 1301 Longworth House Office Building, Washington, DC.

Hon. COLLIN PETERSON,
Ranking Member, House Agriculture Committee, 1301 Longworth House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN CONAWAY AND RANKING MEMBER PETERSON: The undersigned 283 farm, rural, faith, environmental, labor, farmworker, manufacturer and consumer organizations respectfully urge you to reject the repeal of the Country-of-Origin Labeling (COOL) law and support commonsense food labeling. Polls show that nine out of ten Americans support COOL. Consumers continue to demand more information about their food and producers want to share that information.

Although the World Trade Organization (WTO) Appellate Body has issued its decision on COOL, the United States has a sovereign right to allow the dispute process to proceed to its completion and then decide how and whether to implement the adverse ruling. Our organizations remain steadfast in their opposition to any efforts to undermine COOL through repeal or any other measures.

It is premature for the Congress to unilaterally surrender to saber-rattling from our trading partners in the midst of a longstanding dispute. COOL opponents have highlighted Mexico and Canada's threats of retaliation as if their aspiration to seek billions of dollars in penalties were already approved by the WTO. But these unapproved, unrealistically high retaliation claims are merely aggressive litigation tactics designed to frighten the United States—a standard practice in WTO disputes. Congress should not fall for it.

The WTO can only authorize penalties based on the extent to which COOL caused a reduction in the volume and price of livestock imports. But the economic recession was the driving factor behind declining livestock imports, not the application of a simple label.

Cattle imports are higher today than when COOL went into effect and hog imports are rapidly rebounding, even with COOL in place. This straightforward logic is buttressed by a recent economic report from Auburn University that demonstrates that COOL has not impacted the livestock trade and that any harm to our trading partners has in fact been negligible at most.

Moreover, retaliation is only relevant if the United States, Canada and Mexico cannot reach an agreement after the parties have undergone the full WTO arbitration process. In past WTO disputes that the United States has lost, the United States has waited for the process to conclude and then has successfully avoided WTO-authorized trade sanctions by negotiating a settlement with the other country in the dispute.

Finally, the proposed COOL repeal legislation is particularly extreme in that it would roll back commonsense labels that the WTO actually supported or that never even were raised in the WTO dispute. The legislation would repeal COOL for ground beef and ground pork as well as for chicken, but the WTO explicitly ruled that the COOL label on ground meat was WTO-legal, and the dispute never addressed chicken or other covered commodities (including seafood, fresh and frozen fruits and vegetables, goat, venison and some nuts).

COOL is extremely important to our organizations and to the American public. We oppose any legislation that would repeal any portion of the COOL law. We urge Congress to stand up for America's consumers, farmers and ranchers by rejecting any effort to unilaterally repeal a popular food label even before the WTO process has concluded. Thank you for your consideration of this request.

Sincerely,

AFL–CIO; AFL–CIO of Nebraska; Alabama Contract Poultry Growers Association; Alabama State Association of Cooperatives; Alaska Farmers Union; Alianza Nacional de Campesinas; Alternative Energy Resources Organization (AERO) (MT); American Agriculture Movement; American Corn Growers Institute for Public Policy; American Federation of Government Employees (AFL–CIO), Local 3354, USDA-St. Louis; American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees Local 2748 (WI); American Grassfed Association; American Indian Mothers, Inc. (NC); American Raw Milk Producers Pricing Association; Angelic Organics Learning Center and Farm (IL); Arkansas Farmers Union; Ashtabula, Geauga, Lake County (OH) Farmers' Union; Berks (PA) Gas Truth; Berkshire Organics (MA); BioRegional Strategies;

Bold Nebraska; Boots on the Ground, LLC; Boston Food & Farm PBC (MA); Buckeye Quality Beef Association (OH); Buffalo Mountain Coop (VT); California Dairy Campaign; California Farmers Union; Campaign for Contract Agriculture Reform; Campaign for Family Farms and the Environment; Caney Fork Headwaters Association (TN); Carbon County Resource Council (MT); Carolina Farm Stewardship Association (NC); Catholic Charities of Central and Northern Missouri-Social Services Office/Diocese of Jefferson City; National Catholic Rural Life Conference; Cattle Producers of Louisiana; Cattle Producers of Washington; Center for Earth Spirituality and Rural Ministry (MN); Center for Family Farm Development (GA); Center for Food Safety; Center for Foodborne Illness Research & Prevention;

Center for Media and Democracy's Food Rights Network; Center for Rural Affairs; Central Co-op (WA); Chicago Consumer Coalition; Church Women United in New York State; Citizen Action Coalition of Indiana; Citizens for Sanity.Com, Inc. (FL); City Market Onion River Co-op (VT); Cleanwater Action Council of Northeast Wisconsin; Coalition for a Prosperous America; Colorado Independent CattleGrowers Association; Communication Workers of America; Communication Workers of America Nebraska State Council; Community Alliance for Global Justice (WA); Community Farm Alliance (KY); Community Food and Justice Coalition (CA); Connecticut Families Against Chemical Trespass; Consumer Action; Consumer Assistance Council, Inc.; Consumer Federation of America; Consumer Federation of California;

Consumers Union; Contract Poultry Growers Association of the Virginias; Cooperative Grocer Network; The Cornucopia Institute; Cornucopia Network NJ/TN Chapter; Cottonwood Resource Council (MT); Crawford Stewardship Project (WI); Cumberland Countians for Ecojustice (TN); Dakota Resource Council; Dakota Rural Action of SD; Dawson Resource Council (MT); Detroit Coalition Against Tar Sands; East New York Farms!/United Community Centers; EcoHermanas; Ecological Farming Association (CA); The Ecology Center (CA); The Ecology Party of Florida; Endangered Habitats League (CA); Equal Exchange; Fair World Project (OR);

Family Farm Defenders (WI); Farm Aid; Farm and Ranch Freedom Alliance; Farmworker Association of Florida; Federation of Southern Cooperatives/Land Assistance Fund; Federation of Southern Cooperatives/Rural Training and Research Center (AL); Fiddleheads Natural Food Cooperative (CT); Florida Alliance for Consumer Protection; Food & Water Watch; Food Chain Workers Alliance; Food Democracy Now!; Food for Maine's Future; Friends of the Earth U.S.; Global Justice Ecology Project; GMO Free New Jersey; GMO Free Pennsylvania; GMO-Free Florida; Grand Forks County Citizens Coalition (ND); Grassroots International; Grow Youngstown (OH);

Hanover Consumer Cooperative Society, Inc. (NH); Hawaii Farmers Union United; Hmong National Development, Inc.; Hunger Action Los Angeles; Idaho Organization of Resource Councils; Illinois Farmers Union; Illinois Stewardship Alliance; Independent Beef Association of North Dakota (I-BAND); Independent Cattlemen of Nebraska; Independent Cattlemen of Wyoming; Independent Cattlemen's Association of Texas; Indian Nations Conservation Alliance; Indiana Farmers Union; Institute for Agriculture and Trade Policy; Institute for Rural America (IA); Interchurch Ministries of Nebraska; International Brotherhood of Teamsters; Intertribal Agriculture Council; Iowa Citizens for Community Improvement; Iowa Farmers Union; Johns Hopkins Center for a Livable Future (MD);

Kansas Cattlemen's Association; Kansas Farmers Union; Kansas National Farmers Organization; Kansas Rural Center; LabeIGMOS.org; Land Stewardship Project (MN); Leverett Village Coop (MA); Local Futures/International Society for Ecology and Culture; Long Beach Food Policy Council (CA); Lowcountry Local First (SC); MA Right to Know GMOs; Maine Fair Trade Campaign; Maine Organic Farmers and Gardeners Association (MOFGA); The Manufacturers Association of Central New York; Massachusetts Consumers' Council, Inc.; Michael Fields Agricultural Institute (WI); Michigan Farmers Union; Michigan Food & Farming Systems; Michigan Organic Food and Farm Alliance; Middlebury Natural Foods Co-op (VT);

Midwest Organic Dairy Producers Association; Midwest Environmental Advocates, Inc. (WI); Milwaukee Fair Trade Coalition (WI); Minnesota Farmers Union; Minnesota National Farmers Organization; Mississippi Assoc. of Cooperatives; Missouri Farmers Union; Missouri National Farmers Organization; Missouri Rural Crisis Center; Missouri's Best Beef Cooperative; Monadnock Food Co-op (NH); Montana Farmers Union; Montana Women Involved in Farm Economics; Montgomery Countryside Alliance; Murray County (OK) Independent Cattlemen's Association;

National Center for Appropriate Technology; National Co-op Grocers; National Consumers League; National Family Farm Coalition; National Farmers Organization;

National Farmers Union; National Hmong American Farmers, Inc.; National Latino Farmers & Ranchers Trade Association; National Organic Coalition; National Sustainable Agriculture Coalition; National Young Farmers Coalition; Nature Abounds; Near East Side Cooperative Market (OH); Nebraska Alliance for Retired Americans; Nebraska Easement Action Team; Nebraska Farmers Union; Nebraska League of Conservation Voters; Nebraska Sierra Club; Nebraska State Grange; Nebraska Sustainable Agriculture Society; Nebraska Wildlife Federation; Nebraska Women Involved in Farm Economics; Nebraskans for Peace; Neighboring Food Co-op Association (MA); Network for Environmental & Economic Responsibility of United Church of Christ;

Nevada Live Stock Association; New England Farmers Union (CT, MA, ME, NH, RI, VT); New York National Farmers Organization; New York Women Involved in Farm Economics; NH Right to Know GMO; North Carolina Consumers Council; North Dakota AFL–CIO; North Dakota Farmers Union; Northeast Organic Dairy Producers Alliance; Northeast Organic Farming Assoc.—MA; Northeast Organic Farming Assoc.—NH; Northeast Organic Fanning Assoc.—NJ; Northeast Organic Farming Assoc.—NY; Northern New Mexico Stockman's Association; Northern Plains Resource Council (MT); Northern Wisconsin Beef Producers Assoc.; Northwest Atlantic Marine Alliance (MA); Northwest Farmers Union; Oglala Sioux Livestock and Land Owners Association (SD); Ohio Ecological Food and Farm Association;

Ohio Environmental Council; Ohio Environmental Stewardship Alliance; Ohio Farmers Union; Oklahoma Black Historical Research Project; Operation Spring Plant, Inc. (NC); Oregon Rural Action; Oregon Rural Action Blue Mountain Chapter Food & Ag Policy Team; Oregonians for Safe Farms and Families; Organic Consumers Association; Organic Farmers' Agency for Relationship Marketing (OFARM); Organic Seed Alliance; Organic Seed Growers & Trade Association (OSGATA); Organizacion en California de Lideres Campesinas, Inc.; Organization for Competitive Markets; PCC Natural Markets (WA); Peach Bottom Concerned Citizens Group (PBCCG) (PA); Pennsylvania Farmers Union; Pennypack Farm and Education Center (PA); Pesticide Action Network North America;

Powder River Basin Resource Council (WY); Progressive Agriculture Organization (PA); Provender Alliance (OR); Public Citizen; R-CALF United Stockgrowers of America; Raritan Headwaters Association (NJ); Real Food Challenge (MA); Real Food for Kids—Montgomery (MD); Real Pickles Cooperative, Inc. (MA); Right to Know Minnesota; River Valley Market (MA); Rocky Mountain Farmers Union; Roots of Change (CA); Rosebud Protective Association (MT); Rural & Agricultural Council of America; Rural Advancement Foundation International—USA (RAFIUSA); Rural Coalition/Coalicion Rural; Rural Development Leadership Network (NY); Rural Vermont;

Rutland Area Food Co-op (VT); Sacramento Natural Foods Co-op (CA); Seacoast Eat Local (NH); Slow Food Nebraska; Slow Food USA; Small Planet Institute; Socially Responsible Agricultural Project; Society of Professional Engineering Employees in Aerospace, IFPTE Local 2001 (WA, KS); South Agassiz Resource Council (ND); The South County Food Co-op (RI); South Dakota Farmers Union; South Dakota Livestock Auction Markets Association; South Dakota Stockgrowers Association; South Dakota Women Involved in Farm Economics; Southwest Nebraska Women Involved in Farm Economics; Springfield Food Co-op (VT); Stone Valley Coop & Café (VT); Texas Farmers Union; Tilth Producers of Washington;

Tooling, Manufacturing and Technologies Assoc. (MI); Toxics Information Project; U.S. Cattlemen's Association; U.S. Public Interest Research Group (USPIRG); United Church of Christ Justice and Witness Ministries; United Steel Workers Local 1188 (ME); United Steel Workers Local 900 (ME); Vermont National Farmers Organization; Virginia Association for Biological Farming; Virginia Citizens Consumer Council; Walter's Signs (NJ); Waterkeeper Alliance; Western Colorado Congress; Western Organization of Resource Councils (WORC); Western Sustainable Agriculture Working Group; Western Wisconsin AFL–CIO; Wild Oats Market (MA); Willimantic Food Coop (CT); Wisconsin Fair Trade Coalition; Wisconsin Farmers Union; Women Involved in Farm Economics; Women's Environmental Institute; World Farmers; Yellowstone Valley Citizens Council (MT).

Mr. MCGOVERN. Again, I would just say to my colleagues on this legislation, the American people do not want a total repeal. Nine out of ten Americans support country of origin labeling. We ought to work out a good compromise so the American people can get what they want and have access to the knowledge about their food that they want. I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the rule with regard to this and ''no'' on the underlying bill.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to say a few words about the Defense Appropriations bill. And for the viewing public who are watching this and who are trying to figure out what does country of origin labeling have to do with a Defense Appropriations bill, I would again remind them that the Republican leadership and the Republicans on the Rules Committee have this new technique of bunching diverse pieces of legislation together under one rule to stifle debate and to make it more difficult for people to have their say on these important bills and to try to confuse things.

But I do think that it is important that people understand that the Defense Appropriations bill is given a role under this rule, and I would urge my colleagues to think long and hard before they vote. I would urge them to vote ''no'' on the Defense Appropriations bill for a whole number of reasons, notwithstanding the slush fund, the so-called OCO account, that is playing fast and loose with the numbers so that my Republican colleagues don't have to deal with the issue of sequestration. But I would also urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this, because this bill will appropriate billions of more dollars for a war in the Middle East that Congress hasn't had the guts to debate and vote on.

It has been 10 months—10 months—thousands of our troops have been deployed into harm's way. The President announced last night we are establishing a new base in Iraq. Close to 500 more American troops are going to be deployed in Iraq, and not a single debate in this Congress, not a single vote on whether this is the best strategy.

The President has submitted his AUMF. I think it is too broad; some people think it is too restrictive. But it is up to the Congress to fashion an AUMF that gets 218 votes or to vote to bring our troops home. That is the choice. But doing nothing is not a choice. That is an abrogation of our constitutional responsibilities.

Every single Member should be ashamed of the fact that 10 months into this war we haven't done a thing. How do you explain that to your constituents whose sons and daughters have been placed into harm's way? How do you explain that to your constituents that we are mostly borrowing $3.5 million an hour to pay for these wars, but we don't have the time to debate it or to vote on it?

Mr. Speaker, I will include for the RECORD two articles. The first one is an Associated Press article, entitled, ''U.S. to Send More Troops to Iraq for Expanded Training Mission''; and the other is a New York Times article, entitled, ''U.S. Embracing a New Approach on Battling ISIS in Iraq.''

[From the Associated Press, Jun. 10, 2015]

U.S. TO SEND MORE TROOPS TO IRAQ FOR EXPANDED TRAINING MISSION

(By Robert Burns and Lolita C. Baldor)

JERUSALEM.—An expected White House decision to send several hundred more troops to Iraq to expand training of Iraqi forces in Anbar province is not a shift in U.S. strategy but is aimed at helping Iraq retake the provincial capital, Ramadi, and eventually blunt the Islamic State's battlefield momentum.

The decision, which could be announced as soon as Wednesday, would increase the number of U.S. training sites in Iraq from four to five and enable a larger number of Iraqis—mostly Sunni tribal volunteers, in this case—to join the fight against the Islamic militant group. It is consistent with the overall U.S. approach of building up Iraqi forces while simultaneously conducting aerial bombing of Islamic State targets.

U.S. officials have said repeatedly that getting the Sunnis more deeply involved in the war is critical to ousting IS from Anbar.

It leaves open, however, the larger question of whether the Shiite-led Iraqi government will make the troop commitments necessary to oust the Islamic State from Ramadi, which the militants captured last month, and Fallujah, which they have held for more than a year. Up to now, Iraqi officials have chosen to deploy most U.S.-trained Iraqi troops in defensive formations around Baghdad, the capital.

President Barack Obama has ruled out sending U.S. ground combat forces to Iraq.

There now are slightly fewer than 3,100 U.S. troops there in training, advising, security and other support roles. The U.S. also is flying bombing missions as well as aerial reconnaissance and intelligence-gathering missions to degrade the Islamic State's forces, while counting on Iraqi ground troops to retake lost territory.

A U.S. official said Wednesday that the extra U.S. training site will be at al-Taqqadum, a desert air base that was a U.S. military hub during the 2003–2011 war. Establishing the training camp will require between 400 and 500 U.S. troops, including trainers, logisticians and security personnel, the official said, speaking on condition of anonymity because a final administration decision had not been announced.

The U.S. already is training Iraqi troops at four sites—two in the vicinity of Baghdad, one at al-Asad air base in Anbar province and one near Irbil in northern Iraq.

The addition of one training site is a modest tweak to the existing U.S. approach in Iraq. It was unclear Wednesday how many more Iraqi troops could be added to the fight against IS in coming months by opening one new training base. One official said the training at al-Taqqadum is likely to being this summer.

Over the past year the U.S. has trained approximately 9,000 Iraqi troops.

The new plan is not likely to include the deployment of U.S. forces closer to the front lines to either call in airstrikes or advise smaller Iraqi units in battle, officials said. One official, however, said the adjustment may include a plan for expediting the delivery of arms and military equipment to some elements of the Iraqi military.

On Tuesday, Gen. Martin Dempsey, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, said in Jerusalem that he has recommended changes to President Barack Obama but he offered no assessment of when decisions would be made and announced. He suggested the president was considering a number of questions, including what adjustments to U.S. military activities in Afghanistan and elsewhere in the world might be needed if the U.S. does more in Iraq.

Dempsey said the Pentagon also is reviewing ways to improve the effectiveness of its air campaign, which is a central pillar of Obama's strategy for enabling Iraqi ground forces to recapture territory held by the Islamic State.

Obama said Monday that the United States still lacks a ''complete strategy'' for training Iraqi forces. He also urged Iraq's Shiite-dominated government to allow more of the nation's Sunnis to join the campaign against the violent militant group.

Dempsey said Obama recently asked his national security team to examine the train-and-equip program and determine ways to make it more effective. Critics have questioned the U.S. approach, and even Defense Secretary Ash Carter has raised doubts by saying the collapse of Iraqi forces in Ramadi last month suggested the Iraqis lack a ''will to fight.''

The viability of the U.S. strategy is hotly debated in Washington, with some calling for U.S. ground combat troops or at least the embedding of U.S. air controllers with Iraqi ground forces to improve the accuracy and effectiveness of U.S. and coalition airstrikes. Dempsey was not specifically asked about that but gave no indication that Obama has dropped his resistance to putting U.S. troops into combat in Iraq.

''What he's asked us to do is to take a look back at what we've learned over the last eight months of the train-and-equip program, and make recommendations to him on whether there are capabilities that we may want to provide to the Iraqis to actually make them more capable . . . whether there are other locations where we might establish training sites,'' and look for ways to develop Iraqi military leaders, he said.

Dempsey said there will be no radical change to the U.S. approach in Iraq. Rather, it is a recognition that the effort has either been too slow or has allowed setbacks where ''certain units have not stood and fought.'' He did not mention the Ramadi rout specifically, but Dempsey previously has said the Iraqis drove out of the city on their own.

''Are there ways to give them more confidence?'' This, he said, is among the questions Obama wanted Dempsey and others to answer.

[From the New York Times, June 10, 2015]

U.S. EMBRACING A NEW APPROACH ON BATTLING ISIS IN IRAQ

(By Michael R. Gordon)

WASHINGTON.—In a major shift of focus in the battle against the Islamic State, the Obama administration is planning to establish a new military base in Anbar Province, Iraq, and to send up to 450 more American military trainers to help Iraqi forces retake the city of Ramadi.

The White House on Wednesday is expected to announce a plan that follows months of behind-the-scenes debate about how prominently plans to retake Mosul, another Iraqi city that fell to the Islamic State last year, should figure in the early phase of the military campaign against the group.

The fall of Ramadi last month effectively settled the administration debate, at least for the time being. American officials said Ramadi was now expected to become the focus of a lengthy campaign to regain Mosul at a later stage, possibly not until 2016.

The additional American troops will arrive as early as this summer, a United States official said, and will focus on training Sunni fighters with the Iraqi Army. The official called the coming announcement ''an adjustment to try to get the right training to the right folks.''

The troops will set up the training center primarily to advise and assist Iraqi security forces and to engage and reach out to Sunni tribes in Anbar, a senior United States official said. The focus for the Americans will be to try to accelerate the integration of Sunni fighters into the Iraqi Army, which is dominated by Shiites. That will be an uphill task as many of the Sunni fighters in the area do not trust the Iraqi Army.

But the Obama administration hopes is that the outreach will reduce the Iraqi military's reliance on Shiite militias to take back territory from the Islamic State. ''The Sunnis want to be part of the fight,'' the official said, speaking on the condition of anonymity. ''This will help empower them, creating more recruits and more units to fight ISIL,'' he added, using another acronym for the Islamic State.

He said the arms and equipment sent will go to the Iraqi government forces in Anbar, not directly to the Sunni tribes, adding that the new strategy was not a change in policy to directly arm Sunnis, but rather a faster way to get equipment and arms to the battlefield, which the Iraqi government had requested.

The United States Central Command's emphasis on retaking Mosul depended critically on efforts to retrain the Iraqi Army, which appear to have gotten off to a slow start. Some Iraqi officials also thought the schedule for taking Mosul was unrealistic, and some bridled when an official from the Central Command told reporters in February that an assault to capture the city was planned for this spring.

Now, pending approval by the White House, plans are being made to use Al Taqqadum, an Iraqi base near the town of Habbaniya, as another training hub for the American-led coalition.

Alistair Baskey, a National Security Council spokesman, said that the administration hoped to accelerate the training and equipping of Iraqi security forces, and that ''those options include sending additional trainers.'' The United States now has about 3,000 troops, including trainers and advisers, in Iraq. But the steps envisioned by the White House are likely to be called half-measures by critics because they do not call for an expansion of the role of American troops, such as the use of spotters to call in airstrikes.

There has long been debate within the administration about what the first steps in the campaign should be. Led by Gen. Lloyd J. Austin III, the Central Command has long emphasized the need to strike a blow against the Islamic State by recapturing Mosul, Iraq's second-largest city, which was taken by the group in June 2014. Mosul is the capital of Nineveh Province in northern Iraq and was the site of a sermon that Abu Bakr al-Baghdadi, the leader of the Islamic State, defiantly delivered in July. The Baiji refinery, a major oil complex, is on a main road to Mosul.

While General Austin was looking north, State Department officials have highlighted the strategic importance of Anbar Province in western Iraq.

Anbar is home to many of Iraq's Sunni tribes, whose support American officials hope to enlist in the struggle against the Islamic State. Ramadi, the provincial capital of Anbar, is less than 70 miles from Baghdad, and the province borders Saudi Arabia and Jordan, two important members of the coalition against the Islamic State. The differing perspectives within the administration came to the fore in April when Gen. Martin E. Dempsey, the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, asserted that Ramadi was not central to the future of Iraq. The Islamic State's capture of Ramadi last month also punctured the administration's description that the group was on the defensive.

Iraqis are ISIS, are Sunni, are Shia. But we'll train whomever shows up and give them weapons and air support. At what point does U.S . . . .

Suddenly, it appeared that the Islamic State, not the American-led coalition, was on the march. Prime Minister Haider al-Abadi of Iraq scrambled to assemble a plan to regain the city.

The Islamic State now controls two provincial capitals, as well as the city of Falluja. With the help of American air power, the Iraqis have retaken Tikrit, northwest of Baghdad, but so many buildings there are still rigged with explosives that many of its residents have been unable to return.

To assemble a force to retake Ramadi, the number of Iraqi tribal fighters in Anbar who are trained and equipped is expected to increase to as many as 10,000 from about 5,500.

More than 3,000 new Iraqi soldiers are to be recruited to fill the ranks of the Seventh Iraqi Army division in Anbar and the Eighth Iraqi Army division, which is in Habbaniya, where the Iraqi military operations center for the province is also based.

But to the frustration of critics like Senator John McCain, Republican of Arizona, who say that the United States is losing the initiative to the Islamic State, the Obama administration has yet to approve the use of American spotters on the battlefield to call in airstrikes in and around Ramadi. Nor has it approved the use of Apache helicopter gunships to help Iraqi troops retake the city.

General Dempsey alluded to the plan to expand the military footprint in Iraq during a visit to Israel on Tuesday, saying that he

had asked war commanders to look into expanding the number of training sites for Iraqi forces. The United States is not the only country that is expanding its effort.

Britain's prime minister, David Cameron, said this week that his country would send up to 125 additional troops to train Iraqi forces, including in how to clear improvised bombs.

Italy is also expected to play an important role in training the Iraqi police.

Helene Cooper contributed reporting from Jerusalem.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, this House, this Congress, is not working. The fact that we can be in the middle of a new war, spending all these resources, committing all these young lives into harm's way, and we can't even bring an AUMF to the floor to have a debate, it is appalling. I don't know how we can face our constituents, look them in the eye, and say we are doing our job here. We are not. I don't know anything more important that we should debate and deliberate on than war. I mean, war is a big deal. The unfortunate thing in this institution, war has become too easy. I am tired of the excuses, and I am tired of the whining. The President has done what he is supposed to do. Everybody has done what they are supposed to do except us. I am not going to vote for any bill that appropriates more money for a war that we don't even have the guts to authorize.

So, Mr. Speaker, again I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this grab bag rule, vote ''no'' on this ridiculous COOL repeal, and vote ''no'' on the defense appropriations bill. Let's vote these down and come back and do our job the way the American people expect us to do our job.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time, and let me say thank you to the gentleman from Massachusetts and the points he raises. I enjoy serving on the Rules Committee with Mr. MCGOVERN.

Let me just say, this Congress, we are on track to be one of the most productive Congresses in many, many years, and part of the reason is the use of the compound rule, which provides for separate consideration of each underlying measure under a single rule. It helps expedite legislative business. Consideration of one rule allows the House more time to debate the underlying measures. It has given us the opportunity to achieve that efficiency and that effectiveness and productivity.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Will the gentleman yield for a 10-second question?

Mr. NEWHOUSE. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts for a 10-second question.

Mr. MCGOVERN. How does this rule give us more time to debate the COOL repeal? It is a pretty straightforward, limited debate that we are given. I would argue that what you are doing is denying us the right to debate appropriately these important issues. We are not saving time. What the Republican majority is doing is limiting our opportunity.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Reclaiming my time after that 10-second question, the Agriculture Committee has had ample time for debate on that question. We are bringing forward what is a very critical decision that has to be made in a very limited timeframe, and so it is an appropriate approach to addressing this issue.

Mr. Speaker, the issues we are considering today have serious consequences for the security and economic well-being of our country, which is why I am urging my colleagues to support this rule and the underlying bills.

H.R. 2685 is an important measure that funds our Nation's national defense and its critical national security programs. It provides the resources needed to continue our essential military efforts abroad and addresses the vital needs of our men and women in uniform.

An effective, well-equipped, well-trained military is in the best interest of all Americans and is indispensable to the common defense of our country. This bill includes vital funding for the U.S. military and intelligence community as they remain engaged in responding to these challenges abroad. This bill also makes difficult budgetary choices that will help us save taxpayer dollars wherever possible, but it does so without undermining the safety, the security, and the success of our troops and their families.

With the rise of ISIS, the continued presence of al Qaeda, the emergence and growth of terrorist groups in North Africa, near systemic instability across the Middle East, and the ongoing situation in Ukraine, our military must remain strong and ready to address evolving threats both at home and abroad.

Our highest national priority should always be the protection of our country, and the funding levels in this bill will ensure our military remains the most capable, prepared, and exceptional armed force anywhere in the world. To me the choice is clear. What side are we on? We choose to be on the side of our troops, and I am proud to support this bill and the important funding it provides our Nation's military, security, and our courageous men and women in uniform.

This rule also provides for the consideration of H.R. 2393, the Country of Origin Labeling Amendments Act, a measure that warrants immediate and serious consideration by both Houses of Congress, because the ramifications of doing nothing will be severe and could imperil many sectors of our country, from ranchers and grape growers to manufacturers and exporters.

With only 37 days left to respond, the threat of retaliation is very real. My friends on the other side of the aisle may argue that we have more time to address this issue, but the reality is time is simply running out. For over 7 years, we have been trying to rectify this issue. WTO's latest verdict, handed down on May 18, is our fourth and final loss in the court proceedings. Now both Canada and Mexico have publicly stated they will retaliate against the United States, and the official request for retaliation is set to occur on June 17. This is not an idle threat. It is not saber rattling. Last week, Canada announced that it will seek $3 billion in retaliatory measures, and Mexico stated it will be seeking tariffs totaling $635 million.

Even before retaliation, COOL has had a negative economic impact in many areas across the country. Tyson Foods has a plant in my district, and given the proximity to Canada, this plant in Pasco depends on Canadian cattle. However, under COOL, the plant cannot commingle U.S. and Canadian cattle. They have to be run in separate lines, and the plant has to use multiple labels depending on the origin of those cattle. COOL has increased the Pasco facility's operating costs due to the requirements and inefficiencies involved with the segregation of the cattle; and with less animals available across the Pacific Northwest, the plant is currently operating at less than 40 hours per week, leading to less money being put into the local economy from less compensation from employers.

Mr. Speaker, COOL threatens the trade relationships we have with two of our biggest markets for the export of U.S. meat and agricultural products. If we don't repeal the requirements of COOL, we are in violation of our WTO obligations. As I said, we could face billions of dollars in retaliation that would hurt farmers and ranchers, small businesses, and, yes, American consumers. We need this legislation now in order to prevent those retaliatory actions and to bring the United States into compliance with our WTO obligations, which can only be done by repealing these provisions.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the discussion we have had over the last hour. Although we may have some differences of opinion—we usually do—I believe this rule and the underlying bills are strong measures that are important to the future of our country. I urge my colleagues to support House Resolution 303 and the underlying bills.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, today I rise against yet another closed rule on an issue that deserves weeks of open, transparent debate: trade.

This House is debating whether or not to repeal a consumer protection measure that 9 in 10 Americans support—country of origin labeling on meat in our grocery stores. This essential provision could be reversed in one fell swoop all because the World Trade Organization has decided that those labels hurt Mexico and Canada, our so-called ''Trading Partners,'' who have threatened the United States with billions of dollars in sanctions if we don't capitulate.

The WTO's ruling highlights yet another example of a trading system that benefits foreign competitors and global corporations at the expense of the American consumer.

I hope my colleagues will remember this vote when the House turns its attention to fast track and the Trans-Pacific Partnership free trade agreement.

Advocates of fast track are selling the American people a flawed trade deal which has been negotiated in secret by multi-national corporations. This trade deal, which proponents will tell you will reinvigorate the middle class, create jobs, and strengthen the American economy, will do just the opposite. What's more, the president wants to circumvent congressional authority by stopping debate and using fast track to ram a bad deal through this chamber.

Not only will fast track and the Trans-Pacific Partnership cause serious harm to the American worker, they threaten American sovereignty, and this repeal bill is a prime example of that.

Not only does this silence the voice of the American people, it cuts out the People's House and would topple even more consumer protections.

From changing fuel efficiency standards, limiting access to prescription drugs, weakening the Clean Air Act, and more, the TPP is not simply about trade, it puts every facet of our daily lives at risk.

I urge my colleagues to reconsider their path forward and work for the American people, not against them.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on adoption of House Resolution 303 will be followed by 5-minute votes on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to H. Res. 295 and agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 244, nays 187, not voting 2, as follows:

[Roll No. 330]

YEAS—244

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costa
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NAYS—187

Aguilar
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Massie
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—2

Adams
Flores

□ 1411

Mr. CLEAVER changed his vote from yea to nay.

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUPPORTING LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas). The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 295) supporting local law enforcement agencies in their continued work to serve our communities, and supporting their use of body worn cameras to promote transparency to protect both citizens and officers alike, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 421, nays 6, answered ''present'' 1, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 331]

YEAS—421

Abraham
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Ashford
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bera
Beyer
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bost
Boustany
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)