

Maloney, Sean	Perry	Sewell (AL)
Marchant	Peters	Shuster
Matsui	Peterson	Sinema
McDermott	Pittenger	Slaughter
McGovern	Poe (TX)	Smith (MO)
McKinley	Poliquin	Stivers
McSally	Price, Tom	Thompson (CA)
Meehan	Ratcliffe	Thompson (MS)
Messer	Reed	Thompson (PA)
Miller (FL)	Renacci	Tiberi
Moore	Rice (NY)	Tipton
Mulvaney	Richmond	Turner
Murphy (FL)	Rigell	Valadao
Murphy (PA)	Rohrabacher	Vargas
Neal	Ros-Lehtinen	Veasey
Noem	Rouzer	Velázquez
Nolan	Roybal-Allard	Visclosky
Norcross	Ryan (OH)	Walberg
Nugent	Sánchez, Linda	Watson Coleman
Palazzo	T.	Weber (TX)
Pallone	Sarbanes	Woodall
Paulsen	Schakowsky	Yoder
Payne	Schiff	Yoho
Pearce	Schrader	Young (AK)

## ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2

Gohmert Tonko

## NOT VOTING—7

Adams	Pitts	Sires
Flores	Quigley	
Grijalva	Reichert	

□ 1433

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

## A MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 1314. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations.

## COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, June 10, 2015.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,  
The Speaker, U.S. Capitol, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on June 10, 2015 at 11:14 a.m.:

That the Senate passed S. 653.

That the Senate passed S. 611.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

## AUTHORIZING THE REPRINTING OF THE 25TH EDITION OF THE POCKET VERSION OF THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on House Administration be discharged from further consid-

eration of H. Con. Res. 54, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

## H. CON. RES. 54

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring),*

## SECTION 1. POCKET VERSION OF THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The 25th edition of the pocket version of the United States Constitution shall be reprinted as a House document under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing.

(b) ADDITIONAL COPIES.—In addition to the usual number, there shall be printed the lesser of—

(1) 285,400 copies of the document, of which 235,400 copies shall be for the use of the House of Representatives and 50,000 copies shall be for the use of the Senate; or

(2) such number of copies of the document as does not exceed a total production and printing cost of \$135,312, with distribution to be allocated in the same proportion as described in paragraph (1), except that in no case shall the number of copies be less than 1 per Member of Congress.

(c) DISTRIBUTION.—The copies of the document reprinted for the use of the House and the Senate under subsection (a) shall be distributed in accordance with—

(1) a distribution plan approved by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives, in the case of the copies printed for the use of the House; and

(2) a distribution plan approved by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, in the case of the copies printed for the use of the Senate.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## PERMITTING OFFICIAL PHOTOGRAPHS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES TO BE TAKEN WHILE THE HOUSE IS IN ACTUAL SESSION ON A DATE DESIGNATED BY THE SPEAKER

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on House Administration be discharged from further consideration of H. Res. 292, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

## H. RES. 292

*Resolved*, That on such date as the Speaker of the House of Representatives may designate, official photographs of the House may be taken while the House is in actual session. Payment for the costs associated

with taking, preparing, and distributing such photographs may be made from the applicable accounts of the House of Representatives.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## COUNTRY OF ORIGIN LABELING AMENDMENTS ACT OF 2015

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 303, I call up 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, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Agriculture, printed in the bill, is adopted, and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

## H.R. 2393

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

## SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

*This Act may be cited as the "Country of Origin Labeling Amendments Act of 2015".*

## SEC. 2. REPEAL OF COUNTRY OF ORIGIN LABELING REQUIREMENTS FOR BEEF, PORK, AND CHICKEN.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—Section 281 of the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 (7 U.S.C. 1638) is amended—

(1) by striking paragraphs (1) and (7);

(2) by redesignating paragraphs (2), (3), (4), (5), (6), (8), and (9) as paragraphs (1), (2), (3), (4), (5), (6), and (7), respectively; and

(3) in paragraph (1)(A) (as so redesignated)—

(A) by striking clause (i) and inserting the following new clause:

“(i) muscle cuts of lamb and venison;”;

(B) by striking clause (ii) and inserting the following new clause:

“(ii) ground lamb and ground venison;”;

(C) by striking clause (viii); and

(D) by redesignating clauses (ix), (x), and (xi) as clauses (viii), (ix), and (x), respectively.

(b) NOTICE OF COUNTRY OF ORIGIN.—Section 282 of the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 (7 U.S.C. 1638a) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(2)—

(A) in the heading, by striking “BEEF, LAMB, PORK, CHICKEN,” and inserting “LAMB,”;

(B) by striking “beef, lamb, pork, chicken,” and inserting “lamb,” each place it appears in subparagraphs (A), (B), (C), and (D); and

(C) in subparagraph (E)—

(i) in the heading, by striking “GROUND BEEF, PORK, LAMB, CHICKEN,” and inserting “GROUND LAMB,”; and

(ii) by striking “ground beef, ground pork, ground lamb, ground chicken,” each place it appears and inserting “ground lamb,”; and

(2) in subsection (f)(2)—

(A) by striking subparagraphs (B) and (C); and

(B) by redesignating subparagraphs (D) and (E) as subparagraphs (B) and (C), respectively.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY) and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PETERSON) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

## GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on the bill, H.R. 2393.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I rise in support of H.R. 2393, the Country of Origin Labeling Amendments Act of 2015.

Mandatory country of origin labeling is really a marketing program, a heavy-handed approach by this Federal Government to demand a marketing program that may or may not work.

Those were my words before this very Chamber, spoken more than 10 years ago today. It turns out that my doubts were well founded. The program has not worked, and it is time to put this failed experiment behind us once and for all.

Country of origin labeling, or COOL for short, was first enacted for meat products as a part of the 2002 farm bill. Implementation of the law was actually 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 market.

The WTO process has since progressed through the dispute settlement phase, a U.S. appeal to the WTO's appellate body, review by a WTO compliance panel, and an appeal by the U.S. of that decision. In all four instances, Mr. Speaker, the United States lost.

In the fourth and final decision, released on May 18, the WTO rejected the United States' argument and found that the U.S. COOL requirements for beef and pork are unavoidably discriminatory. The final rule kick-starts the process to determine the level of retaliatory tariffs Canada and Mexico can now impose on the U.S., which has widely been predicted to have effects in the billions of dollars.

During a hearing of 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 and its economy would be devastating.

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 repeal, but the fact is COOL has been a marketing failure. In an April 2015 report to Congress, USDA explained that COOL requirements result in extraordinary costs with no quantifiable benefits.

Although some consumers desire COOL information, there is no evidence

to conclude that this mandatory labeling translates into measurable increases in consumer demand for beef, pork, or chicken.

In response to those who argue that COOL enhances food safety, as I have maintained now for 10 years, that is simply not the case. If it were, then all meat served at restaurants would come with information regarding the meat's origin, but it doesn't. That is because retail food establishments are exempt from COOL requirements.

Meat sold in the U.S. will continue to be inspected for safety by the USDA Food Safety and Inspection Service. This bill does nothing to change that and will simply repeal a heavy-handed, government-mandated marketing program that has proven to be unsuccessful.

Here we are with a policy that imposes high costs, no benefits, and if we keep it in place, our national economy will suffer significant damage that can reach into the billions of dollars.

Secretary of Agriculture Tom Vilsack has been quoted numerous times acknowledging that repeal of the COOL requirements is a viable option for bringing the U.S. into compliance with its WTO obligations and avoiding retaliatory measures.

In a recent letter to Congress, Secretary Vilsack reaffirmed the need for Congress to repeal the disputed COOL requirements or develop a generic North American label. However, Canada and Mexico have previously rejected the North American label, rendering that option unacceptable.

In other words, if we go down this path which Canada and Mexico have already rejected, we will continue to face retaliation unless and until we can demonstrate we are in compliance with our trade obligations. Repeal is the only viable option before us to avoid this retaliation.

I urge all Members to support this simple, straightforward legislation so that we can, in the best bipartisan tradition of this House, avoid damage to our economy.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I rise in opposition to this bill. H.R. 2393 is a premature reaction to the WTO ruling against the U.S. country of origin labeling, or COOL, law. Rather than taking the time to find a workable solution, the committee passed a repeal just 2 days after the WTO issued a ruling. We understand that this needs to be dealt with.

My problem with this whole process is that it just is not giving people enough time to look at this and figure out what is a reasonable solution. Most other countries have labeling. The American people want to know where their ag products come from.

If we repealed this on meat, we wouldn't be able to know where meat comes from, but we would be able to know where your carrots, lettuce, and all these other things come from. They

all have mandatory country of origin labeling.

We understand that this needed to be worked on, and we understand that we can't get into a situation with the retaliation, but this is a rush to judgment that is not necessary because this retaliation process is going to take a while.

We had the Step 2 cotton case. It went 2 or 3 years before it got resolved; this is going to go faster, but the first thing that has to happen is they have to figure out what the damage is. That is going to take them a while, a month or two, and then they are going to have to have an arbitration panel to get everybody to agree that that is exactly what it is.

□ 1445

So this Canadian claim that there are \$3 billion in economic losses due to COOL is ridiculous and is based on unsubstantiated and not publicly available data. The U.S. studies, using USDA data, have found little, if any, economic harm.

As I said, more than 60 other countries, including Canada, have their own version of COOL. In fact, Canada has a host of protectionist agriculture laws in place that damage the U.S. dairy, poultry, and egg sectors.

The Canadian system puts U.S. products at a disadvantage every day. And yet, the Canadians take issue when we try to give consumers additional information on where their meat comes from, claiming it disadvantages Canadian producers.

Additionally, consumers are demanding more and more information about where their food comes from and how it is produced. The WTO has repeatedly ruled that COOL is a legitimate goal.

Rather than abandon our efforts to provide consumers with this information, we need to have the time so we will be able to find a reasonable solution to work this out without WTO sanctions. I believe it can be done, and it can be done in fairly short order.

So, as I said, my biggest problem is that this bill is premature. I urge my colleagues to oppose it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE), the former chairman of the House Agriculture Committee.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the chairman of the Agriculture Committee, Mr. CONAWAY, for his leadership on yet another important issue for agriculture this week in the Congress.

I rise in strong support of the Country of Origin Labeling Amendments Act of 2015, which would repeal mandatory country of origin labeling for meat and bring the United States back into international trade compliance.

I have always had concerns about mandatory country of origin labeling, and now the WTO's continued rulings against this practice, as well as Canada's and Mexico's threats to seek \$3

billion in retaliatory tariffs, make the hard and fast case for repeal.

For my home State of Virginia, it is estimated the potential economic impact of retaliation from Mexico and Canada could add up to tariffs of \$331 million worth of exports on products like paper, aluminum, and bread.

Mandatory COOL has failed and threatens our trade relationship with two of our strongest partners. Our markets, producers, and consumers cannot afford the cost of this failed policy. We will all benefit by its repeal.

Mandatory COOL for meat has been debated for almost 15 years. Within 5 months of its 2009 implementation, Canada and Mexico challenged COOL at the WTO, arguing that it had trade-distorting impact by reducing the value of cattle and hogs shipped to the U.S. market. The WTO ruled in favor of Canada and Mexico four times.

Now that the U.S. has lost its final appeal, it is imperative that the Congress act quickly to avoid billions of dollars in retaliation.

In the case of cattle, hogs, and chicken, it has proved to be a failed experiment, imposing significant costs on producers, packers, and consumers with no quantifiable benefit.

United States Department of Agriculture Secretary Vilsack has stated the Department has no further options for administrative remedies. The issue has to be fixed legislatively through Congress, and this way of repeal is, by far, the best.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. COSTA).

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this measure to repeal the country of origin labeling.

I want to thank the chairman for bringing this measure up. I also want to thank the ranking member always for his efforts to be balanced and to try to solve problems.

But I have been saying—and he and I disagree on this measure—for years that this country of origin labeling has simply not worked. So I am pleased that we are here today to debate the legislation that, in fact, repeals the country of origin labeling for beef, pork, and chicken products. Hopefully we can move on to figure out a solution to this problem.

That said, let's be clear: I want to emphasize, this measure has nothing to do with food safety. Let me repeat. It has nothing to do with food safety. The inspection process by the United States Department of Agriculture and the Food and Drug Administration remains in place for all consumable products that the American public eats.

So what this has to do with is simply about how we market beef, pork, or chicken across the country.

Going further, to ensure that we act on this measure, we do not want to have to deal with a devastating blow to our economy through economic retaliation.

Last month, as has been noted by my colleagues, the World Trade Organization rejected the United States appeal. This was our last and final appeal. And for many of us, we felt it was predictable.

We now face harsh trade retaliations from two of our largest export markets, Canada and Mexico, against products that are produced in America. This especially impacts California, the number one agricultural State in the Nation. The Canadian Government has already published its list of commodities that will be subject to tariff increases and estimates the impact could reach in excess of \$3 million, with the direct effect in California being over \$1 billion.

This is real. They prepared the list, and it could be implemented as early as this fall.

For example, Canada imports 90 percent of its table wine from my home State of California. If the tariff is increased to 100 percent, that will mean customers in Canada will have to pay double for a bottle of good California wine. If consumers in Canada see that price double, I suspect they are going to buy their wine elsewhere.

This will be detrimental to U.S. trade, as an example, but to all products that are produced in America.

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

Mr. PETERSON. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. COSTA. The bottom line is, we don't want to see any retaliatory efforts made by Canada and Mexico, and I don't think they want to impose them.

This bill is our only option right now to satisfy the WTO compliance. In addition, as has been noted, the Secretary of Agriculture has stated a legislative fix is required to resolve this problem.

So I urge my colleagues to vote for this measure, and let's take action. And the Senate will need to then act, and then we have a chance to come together and fix this legislation.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ADERHOLT), the chairman of the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Agriculture.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon I also rise in support of H.R. 2393, which, as has been mentioned, provides a long-overdue repeal of the country of origin labeling requirements for beef, pork, and poultry products.

Over the years, this law has forced USDA to use limited resources to implement and enforce a program that has nothing to do with food safety, and there is little to no evidence that it has increased consumer demand, according to a USDA-commissioned survey.

Serving as chairman of the House Appropriations Agriculture Subcommittee, I am very aware of the economic harm that this burdensome law has already caused U.S. livestock producers, and more economic harm is on the horizon.

The World Trade Organization, the WTO Appellate Body, has ruled in favor of Canada and Mexico and found the U.S. country of origin labeling requirements are in violation of international trade obligations.

Both the Governments of Canada and of Mexico have clearly expressed their intent to seek authority from the WTO to retaliate. This could end up suffering economic impact in this country of almost \$4 billion.

The FY 2015 exploratory statement accompanying the omnibus appropriation bill directed the Secretary of Agriculture to provide a report with his recommendation for establishing a trade-compliant country of origin labeling program. In his response, repeal of this provision was a clear solution.

I know that there are some here in the Chamber this afternoon that will not agree with the answer, but there have been ample opportunities to craft another labeling program that meets our trade responsibilities.

This could have been addressed in the farm bill, or those individuals wanting a labeling program could have been working on it since last October, when the WTO ruled again that this law violated our trade obligations.

We are out of time, and the repeal is the only option that we have at hand. I urge my colleagues to support the bill that is before us today in order to prevent harm to U.S. jobs, to prevent harm to the United States economy, and to protect the trading relations with our Nation's strongest partners.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Maine (Ms. PINGREE).

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member for yielding me this time and for taking up this important issue and helping us to better understand the importance of it.

In my opinion, we shouldn't even be here today debating a repeal of this important consumer protection law. I don't know if this bill is a huge overreaction to the WTO decision or it is just an excuse to gut these common-sense country of origin labeling requirements.

For years, we have required labels on virtually everything imported into the United States. Every piece of clothing you wear has to have a label showing where it was made. Your smartphone has to have a label showing where it was manufactured. Even umbrellas and tablecloths have to list their country of origin.

But for some reason we are here considering a bill that would make it impossible for parents to know whether the chicken they are serving their family came from the United States or China. Think about that. What consumer, what parent would tell you they don't care what country the food came from that they are about to serve their children?

Let's just talk about the WTO ruling for a minute. First of all, the World Trade Organization ruling said that the

labels for ground beef were acceptable but doesn't even consider any complaints from Canada or Mexico about chicken. So why are we voting on a repeal of the labeling requirement for those products?

Secondly, the WTO has not even ruled about the extent to which country of origin labeling affects exports from Canada and Mexico. And it can't be much, since Mexico exports more beef into the United States than before this law went into effect.

We do not have to give in to the WTO this easily. These kinds of disputes are frequently settled by negotiations with Canada and Mexico, not by giving up and throwing out an entire set of consumer protections.

We don't back down this easily, and we shouldn't back down this easily.

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

Mr. PETERSON. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. PINGREE. So maybe the powerful special interests behind this repeal are really using this WTO ruling as an excuse to roll back basic right-to-know for American consumers. I don't think we should let them get away with it.

I doubt there is a single consumer in America who says, "I want to know less about the food I am eating." In fact, the opposite is true.

Now more than ever, Americans want to know where their food comes from, and they want to buy local food when they can. Buying local has created huge new markets for American farmers, great economic growth in States like mine, like Maine.

If this bill passes, it will be harder to know if the pork chop or hamburger you are buying came from around the corner or around the world.

Country of origin labeling is good for consumers; it is good for our farmers and ranchers. Please don't gut these commonsense requirements.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to clarify. We do not import chicken from China, period. And the economic impact estimated for the State of Maine will be something on the order of \$74 million every single year in imports that won't happen.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ROUZER), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Livestock and Foreign Agriculture.

Mr. ROUZER. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Livestock and Foreign Agriculture Subcommittee, I rise in support of this bill, the Country of Origin Labeling Amendments Act of 2015, which repeals the country of origin labeling law, also known as COOL.

After numerous failed attempts to make COOL compliant with the World Trade Organization, it has become apparent that full repeal of COOL is unquestionably the right thing to do.

That said, I am sure there are some who are concerned that repeal of COOL may compromise food safety. America had the safest, most trusted food sup-

ply in the world before COOL and, let me assure you, we will continue to have the safest food supply after this law is repealed.

□ 1500

Let me explain why. Regardless of origin, if an animal is imported as a live animal, it is harvested in USDA-inspected facilities. Additionally, cattle, hogs, and poultry are inspected prior to harvesting as live animals and throughout processing as a meat product.

If the animal originates and is harvested in a different country, the plant has to have equivalent U.S. safety inspection standards and must be regularly audited by the USDA. The U.S. only imports meat products from countries that meet our standards. Furthermore, a foreign plant that does not fully comply with our standards is not permitted to ship meat into this country.

In short, the fundamental protocols ensuring food safety are apart and separate from country of origin labeling. Suppliers in foreign countries will still be expected to comply with the same inspection standards as they have now.

In closing, I would like to thank Chairman CONAWAY, subcommittee Ranking Member COSTA, and the committee staff for their tremendous help and guidance on this important matter.

Mr. Speaker, I commend this legislation to my colleagues and appreciate their support.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BISHOP).

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Agriculture and the former co-chair of the Congressional Chicken Caucus, I rise in support of H.R. 2393, the Country of Origin Labeling Amendments Act of 2015.

More importantly, as a Congressman for a heavily rural district, with lots of poultry and beef production in middle and southwest Georgia, I rise to support ending this failed experiment and repealing this harmful government mandate.

Since its passage in 2002, the country of origin labeling law has caused severe tension between the United States, Canada, and Mexico. Canada and Mexico argue that country of origin labeling has hurt their livestock industries, and they have taken their argument to the World Trade Organization, which has ruled in their favor and against the United States four times. We are now out of appeals.

Because of the WTO rulings, Canada and Mexico can now request authorization to retaliate against the United States in order to repair the damages they claim our labeling law has caused to their economies.

Therefore, we must act decisively to repeal the current COOL regulations on beef, pork, and chicken. If we fail to do so, Canada and Mexico have made clear

that they will retaliate against a range of U.S. products within a matter of months by imposing onerous tariffs, resulting in higher costs and lost market share for U.S. producers up to \$3.5 billion a year. A hit of that magnitude would be devastating to the U.S. pork, beef, and chicken industries.

While some say we need to hold out for arbitration, I believe we need to repeal this harmful law and correct the situation ourselves before facing overwhelming retaliatory tariffs from Canada and Mexico.

By the way, it should be noted that this bill will not entirely undo the country of origin labeling law, only parts of it.

I urge support for H.R. 2393 because it will safely remove unnecessary burdens on our beef, pork, and poultry industries; bring us into compliance with our trade obligations; and ensure that we avoid damaging retaliatory tariffs.

Please join me in supporting H.R. 2393.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DAVID SCOTT), the ranking member on the Commodity Exchanges, Energy, and Credit Subcommittee.

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, let's make no mistake about it. I will just tell you this retaliation situation is real from Canada and from Mexico.

The question is: Why should we here put our agriculture foundation at such a tremendous risk? Canada and Mexico are right now moving to institute retaliatory tariffs against U.S. exports.

It is critical that Congress also take this corrective legislation and act on it right away before the August recess—it is just that important—so we can send a powerful, quick message because Canada has already issued a preliminary retaliation list, targeting our commodities and our manufactured products not just in one State, not just in two States, but in every State in the United States of America, totaling over \$3.5 billion in the first year alone. My own State of Georgia will have an impact of losing \$180 million.

Mr. Speaker, let's deal with this right. This country of origin labeling is not about food safety. Let's not scare the American people into thinking that; we don't need to make the American people confused or feel that we are doing something to make the food unsafe.

What we are doing is protecting our American economy. We are protecting our agricultural interests. More than anything else, at a time when America needs it the most, we are standing up for America for a change. Protect our farmers. Protect our agricultural economy. Protect our people.

Make sure we pass H.R. 2393. Send a powerful message that we are not going to stand for Mexico and Canada putting their tariffs on us. We are going to stand firm and protect American interests.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON).

Mr. THOMPSON of California. I thank the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PETERSON) for yielding and for all of his work on this issue. He has been great at trying to mitigate the problems.

Mr. Speaker, I rise as a strong supporter of the idea of country of origin labeling, and I think it is a good idea.

I refute what some have said, that there is no benefit to this. There is great benefit to this. Area of origin labeling allows people to get to know from where their food comes, and that is, I think, incredibly important.

I don't think that repeal is the number one preference here. I don't think that is what we should be doing; we should be fixing the problem, but, because the majority hasn't been willing to work to fix the problem, we are in a real catch-22.

I rise today in support of this bill because, if it is not repealed, we are going to face tremendous retaliatory acts from both Mexico and Canada, and these are going to be of great fiscal impact to our economy.

My home State of California, for instance, it is estimated that we will be hit by \$1.8 billion worth of retaliatory action. A good part of that comes from my home industry, the wine community; they will be hit heavily. We know what happens. We have seen this movie before, and the end is not good.

When Congress put in place the trucking program to deal with the Mexican trucking problems, we were sued. The wine industry was hit with retaliatory actions, and we saw a 25 percent reduction in our business. That was financially devastating not only to California, but this is an industry that puts \$160 billion a year into the national economy. This hurt us all. That was bad enough, but it took us 3 years to get back that market share that we had lost.

It is important that we repeal this and then get on to fixing it right away. I ask that we vote in favor of this bill today.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, it is now my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING), who has worked really hard on this particular piece of legislation.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the chairman for yielding and for leading on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I just would remark that wine has informed the meat debate several times here today, and I am glad of that.

I rise in support of this legislation to repeal these components of country of origin labeling. I have long held the position that this is a North American market. We don't treat our best trading partners as well as we should, Mr. Speaker, and that includes Mexico, and it especially includes Canada.

I often have to go through the list of things we have done that turn out to be

something that looks like trade protection at least to them. We have done it with steel. We have done it with softwood timber. We have done it when we have BSE circumstances with beef, which did originate in Canada, spilled over to the United States, and they opened up their foreign trade before we did.

This is one of these examples of what happens when you go a little overboard in an effort to try to establish some trade protectionism. This was driven by the people, especially in the Northwest, that thought that they would get an advantage on their cattle industry in that part of the country.

Now, we are looking at these sanctions which, by my numbers, likely go to somewhere in the area of \$3.15 billion in sanctions between Canada and Mexico. Mr. Speaker, 85 percent of our consumers don't even look at the label to see where that comes from.

Consumers still have a choice. There is nothing that would prohibit in the aftermath of this legislation. The consumer is saying: I would like to know if this pig was born in Canada and fed in the United States.

To give you an example of how this is, there is a lot of U.S. capital that is invested also, especially in farrowing operations in Canada. When the exchange rate was even more advantageous than it is today, a lot of U.S. dollars went into Canada to establish farrowing operations to raise pigs up there because they could isolate in order to do disease prevention and because it was a good investment; then those isowean pigs came down to the United States.

The numbers that I had was 6 million pigs coming down; 4 million of them came to Iowa. A third of the pork raised in the United States is from my State, and they are at a disadvantage because of this country of origin labeling. It penalizes, Mr. Speaker, the very people we are trying to help.

I urge the adoption of this bill.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CUELLAR).

Mr. CUELLAR. I thank the ranking member for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I am an original cosponsor of H.R. 2393, the Country of Origin Labeling Amendments Act.

As it has been discussed in this debate, the WTO has made its fourth and final ruling against the United States. Farmers and ranchers in my district in Texas will be hit with tariffs if we don't act right away. COOL has already put a burden on the beef, chicken, and pork producers in the State of Texas.

For example, Texas cattlemen are required to spend another \$35 to \$45 per animal just to comply with complex cattle identification requirements mandated by COOL. This cost will only get worse if retaliatory tariffs are implemented on our exports, tariffs which are completely legal under the World Trade Organization agreement that we have.

For example, I have spoken to my friends on the other side of the river, on the Mexican side, and they said that the American products that will be hit by tariffs include beef, wine, corn, corn syrup, furniture, dairy products, machinery, and a range of fruits and vegetables. That doesn't even include the tariffs that the Canadians will put, which probably includes jewelry, bread, beef, tomato products, and other goods.

Again, we cannot afford these tariffs, and we should pass the amendments to this COOL bill that we have to remove the threat of those tariffs completely.

In Texas, we raise beef, chicken, and pork that is "made in the U.S." We only ask that this be voluntary labeling. We should act quickly to avoid those tariffs, so we don't punish those farmers and ranchers in the State of Texas.

I thank the ranking member and the chairman for all the good work they have done.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time is left on each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has 16 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Minnesota has 16 minutes remaining.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, it is now my pleasure to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOH).

Mr. YOH. Mr. Speaker, I congratulate Chairman CONAWAY for his leadership in bringing the repeal of the COOL amendments to the House floor so quickly.

I would like to thank my fellow Ag Committee colleagues for their bipartisan support in passing the repeal of the COOL amendments out of the committee.

The COOL amendments, or country of origin labeling, has nothing to do with food safety. It is a mandatory marketing program. The USDA stamp of inspection ensures consumers the meat we eat is safe and wholesome, not COOL.

Mr. Speaker, here are the facts. The U.S. has lost its last three appeals in the WTO to Canada and Mexico regarding COOL. Both countries are ready to retaliate against us, as we have heard, to the tune of billions of dollars, thus hurting our ag sector and American jobs.

Agriculture Secretary Thomas Vilsack has said that only a legislative fix of COOL would bring the U.S. back into compliance.

Again, I thank and congratulate Chairman CONAWAY and urge all of my fellow colleagues to vote in favor of this amendment.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 6 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

□ 1515

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this bill.

Let me first point out the irony that we are considering this bill in what

could be a matter of days before we will vote on the administration's request for trade promotion authority.

Last month, President Obama said in his speech at Nike: "Critics warn that parts of this deal, the Trans-Pacific Partnership, would undermine American regulation—food safety, worker safety, even financial regulations. They're making this stuff up. This is not true. No trade agreement is going to force us to change our laws."

Country of origin labeling was passed by the Senate, passed by the House. It is the law of the land. Yet today, the House of Representatives is getting ready to repeal country of origin labeling. Why? Because the World Trade Organization ruled against it, a trade agreement ruled against it.

Contrary to what the President has said, trade agreements have a direct effect on our sovereignty. They have the ability to uproot domestic laws here in the United States. Members and the public need to know what we are opening ourselves up to when we sign these trade agreements. Literally no area of United States law is safe: food safety, drug safety, consumer protection, environmental protection, health care, label rights, Dodd-Frank, even the minimum wage.

In fact, today's trade agreements, including the TPP, go further than the WTO rules. They allow challenges to U.S. laws not only by governments, but also by foreign and domestic multinational corporations who can circumvent U.S. courts and seek a remedy in an independent tribunal.

Today, the casualty is country of origin labeling. I was conferee on the farm bill in 2008 with my colleague Ranking Member PETERSON. I helped to work to author the language that expanded the country of origin labeling. I have worked on this issue for many years as a member and a former chair of the Agriculture Appropriations Committee. I am proud of that record.

People deserve to know where their food comes from. American farmers and ranchers deserve the opportunity to distinguish their products. It is an economic truism that complete and accurate information is one of the cornerstones of a free market. More than a decade of polling data proves that American consumers consistently and overwhelmingly want country of origin labeling, and frequently by majorities of more than 90 percent.

The World Trade Organization itself has repeatedly ruled provision of information to consumers to be a legitimate goal for domestic regulations. In light of that ruling, I agree that we should seek to protect American exporters by avoiding retaliatory sanctions, but that has not yet become necessary. It has been less than a week since Canada and Mexico filed their retaliatory tariff requests. The WTO Dispute Settlement Body will not consider it for another week.

We do not know whether retaliation will be approved. Canada and Mexico

have asked for \$3 billion, but they must prove that they have been harmed, and that could be difficult.

A study by Dr. Robert Taylor of Auburn University found that in the case of Canada, COOL had no significant negative impact on either imports of cattle or the price of imported cattle relative to domestic cattle. Instead, Dr. Taylor concluded the decrease in exports was likely the result of the global recession and a weak recovery. Even if harm is found and retaliation is approved, it will probably not go into effect for several months.

There is plenty of time to look for a reasonable resolution, as we have done previously. More than 60 other countries have mandatory labeling requirements. So it seems there is a scope to find an acceptable way forward without compromising U.S. sovereignty. It is much too early for outright appeal, but that is what this bill does. Indeed, it is unprecedented for Congress to intervene so early in the WTO process.

Moreover, this bill goes well beyond the scope of the WTO ruling. It would repeal country of origin labeling on chicken, which is not addressed in the ruling, and on ground beef and ground pork, which the tribunal explicitly found compliant.

Why are we rushing to judgment on this issue? I am forced to conclude that this bill is, in fact, a veiled attempt by the meatpacking industry to deny consumers their right to know where their meat and poultry is coming from. Is it coming from China? Is it coming from Australia? Is it coming from New Zealand? Where is it coming from?

Earlier this week, a broad coalition of 283 agricultural organizations wrote to Chairman CONAWAY and to Ranking Member PETERSON urging them to reject the repeal of country of origin labeling. Farmers, rural advocates, faith groups, environmentalists, labor unions, farmworkers, manufacturers, consumer groups all oppose this ill-conceived and premature repeal. Why are we not listening to them?

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

Mr. PETERSON. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 1 minute.

Ms. DELAURO. As I mentioned at the outset, the context for this bill is a failure of U.S. trade policy. The administration tells us that trade agreements do not alter domestic laws. Clearly, this is false.

I admonish my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, beware of the road that you go down today. Beware of a trade agreement that puts American sovereignty at risk.

I hope that Members will bear that in mind and in that context as we vote on this bill today and, in addition to that, when we come to debate the Trans-Pacific Partnership agreement and grant fast-track authority on that agreement.

In the meantime, I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

The gentlewoman referenced a letter opposing what we are trying to do here today. As you look through that list of organizations that is cited, it is not surprising to find that several have consistently advocated for policies that are intentionally destructive to animal agriculture. So it is no wonder that these groups support a policy that imposes a heavyhanded financial burden on livestock producers, processors, and, ultimately, consumers.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. BOST).

Mr. BOST. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I rise today in support of H.R. 2393, the Country of Origin Labeling Amendments Act.

In my home State of Illinois, we are a rich agricultural State, and we have a rich agricultural heritage. Illinois is a national leader in corn and soybean, but also beef and pork production. If Congress does not act to address this issue of labeling, products in my State could face higher tariffs from Canada and Mexico to the tune of \$880 million worth of goods.

I urge my colleagues to stand with American agriculture and support the underlying legislation in order to avoid this harmful measure.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR).

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I thank Ranking Member PETERSON for yielding me this time, and I rise in support of maintaining food labeling for the American people.

Polls show 9 out of 10 Americans overwhelmingly support country of origin labeling. I certainly look for those labels when I go to the store. It ensures that the public knows the source of their food. What could be more important? In fact, American producers want to share that information because it is a way to differentiate their products in an increasingly international marketplace.

Country of origin labeling is strongly supported by America's farmers and ranchers, who are proud of what they produce. Restoring local food markets, in fact, is a growing trend across the Midwest and the whole country. Farmers and ranchers know that people are demanding more and more information about their food. Restaurateurs are putting on their menus "local beef," "local pork," and "local chicken."

COOL allows farmers and ranchers the ability to market their products with pride because the label has integrity. The widespread support for country of origin labeling is what led to its enactment and implementation in the 2002, 2008, and 2014 Farm Bills. The trend is very clear.

Current efforts in Congress to repeal country of origin labeling are simply veiled attempts to gut these laws for meat—for beef, for pork, for chicken, three arenas that are completely controlled by a few processing companies. It is just like the book that Upton Sinclair wrote at the beginning of the 20th



century. We are back to the jungle. We are back to the jungle.

Opponents are pressing for less information for consumers, not more. They want to hide the product's origin.

H.R. 2393 is a premature attempt to undermine food labeling. They argue it is necessary because of the World Trade Organization decision that puts Canada and Mexico at a disadvantage. Well, this bill, as such, was never even raised in the WTO dispute, and labeling is supported by the WTO. The WTO dispute never addressed chicken. It has explicitly ruled U.S. labeling requirements for pork and beef are legal. And more importantly, Canada's claims of \$3 billion in economic loss due to COOL are absolutely unfounded. The data is not even publicly available, and they are unsubstantiated.

The bottom line is the rationale behind this bill is a clear example of what is wrong with our trade policy. Congress should not let a few meatpacking companies use trade disputes as an excuse to gut important consumer protections and the rights of farmers in this country. It is our duty to protect American consumers, American farmers, and American ranchers, not the trade interests of any other country. Our people deserve a right to know where their food is produced and where it comes from.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds.

The previous speaker made reference to the current animal agriculture businesses as being associated with those horrible circumstances of the Upton Sinclair book. My guess, Mr. Speaker, is they would be vehemently opposed to that comment because their practices today do not remotely reflect those in Upton Sinclair's book.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. MOOLENAAR), a valued member of the committee.

Mr. MOOLENAAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bill.

Agriculture is the backbone of many communities in Michigan's Fourth Congressional District. With over 10,000 farms and 15,000 farm operators, approximately \$1.7 billion in products from our area are sold across the country and around the world.

The law on the books right now that mandates country of origin labeling threatens the success of agricultural exports. It is unnecessary. It imposes a heavy burden on our farmers. It puts our agricultural exports at risk, and it needs to be repealed.

Recently, based on the ruling from the World Trade Organization, it is apparent that severe consequences could result and that our trading partners and neighbors could penalize American-made products sold in those countries with steep tariffs.

Already, Canada has announced that it will put tariffs on beef, pork, and cherries if the current labeling law is not repealed. Manufactured goods, including office furniture, would also be subjected to tariffs.

H.R. 2393 passed the Agriculture Committee on a bipartisan vote of 38-6. It is a good bill, and it repeals the current labeling law. It will eliminate the possibility of steep tariffs and let Michigan farmers and manufacturers focus on creating jobs and growing their businesses without worrying about more regulations or retaliation.

I am pleased to cosponsor this bill, and I urge my colleagues to vote "yes."

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. SCHRADER).

□ 1530

Mr. SCHRADER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member.

COOL was perhaps a worthwhile effort at the time but, unfortunately, has outlived its usefulness and its appropriateness. Country of origin labeling, well intended, has started to cause irreparable harm to producers in the Pacific Northwest. Beef and hog producers are facing serious problems trying to work things through the packing plant.

We have international trade now; we have a global market. That needs to be recognized. It is harming not just Canada and Mexico, but Pacific Northwest producers. That point has to be driven home.

We are now facing huge retaliatory tariffs in the Pacific Northwest. Some of our premier crops are wine, cherries, apples, cheese, potatoes.

COOL may have been well intended, but we lost four times at the WTO. We tried to fix it. We worked on it in the farm bill last go-around last year—couldn't get it done. We are facing these retaliatory tariffs right now. Let's repeal it, and let's move on.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. BLUM).

Mr. BLUM. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank you and your committee for your hard work on this most important legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to offer my support to the passage of H.R. 2393, the Country of Origin Labeling Amendments Act of 2015.

This important legislation repeals country of origin labeling requirements for muscle cuts of beef and pork. Unfortunately, the World Trade Organization issued the final judgment of a long-running case brought by Canada, ending all doubt that COOL violates U.S. trade obligations.

Now, America's two largest export markets, Canada and Mexico, are moving to institute retaliatory duties against U.S. products, including \$1.3 billion of products from Iowa. Canada has published their list of retaliatory targets, including those aforementioned meat cuts, but also corn, fructose, cereals from my district, along with products from districts all across the United States.

Mexico has not yet published their list, but is likely to include some of the same corn-based products and perhaps even include ethanol.

It is critically important that COOL requirements be repealed to comply with existing trade obligations as soon as possible. Implementations of these tariffs would negatively affect a great deal of farmers and processors in my district and across Iowa.

I urge the House to pass this legislation today and the Senate to act swiftly to avoid these potentially devastating economic consequences.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. NOLAN).

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I want to join my colleagues in rising in opposition to this important consumer and farmer protection legislation. Someone said it earlier; knowledge is power. When people know where something comes from, it gives them some very clear ideas about what the content of it may be.

Furthermore, the legislation, as has been pointed out here, is really quite, quite, quite premature. We need to let this process play itself out. There may very well need to be a fix here on this whole matter, but right now, it hasn't really been conclusively proven that the Canadian and the Mexican claims are valid. There has been some suggestions that perhaps they are not. Of course, this legislation goes way beyond the scope of the dispute at hand here.

I want to thank my ranking member, Mr. PETERSON, and all my other colleagues for standing up in opposition to this legislation. Let's let the process play itself out, and then, when and if it is necessary, we can fix things at that time.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Again, I don't think anybody on our side wants to have retaliation, but, again, we believe this is premature right at this moment.

We don't know how much damages are going to be found, if any. We just feel that repeal is not where we are going to end up and where we should end up. We understand this needs to be fixed, but I think there is another way to do it short of repeal.

At this point, because of that, I encourage people to vote against the bill. I kind of understand where this is going, but, as it gets over to the Senate, we will figure out a way to work through this so that we end up not having any retaliation.

We still have a system where people can figure out where their food is coming from. It would be ironic, if this repeal would happen to get through the Senate and signed by the President, you wouldn't be able to find out where your chicken or beef or pork came from, as I said earlier, but you will be able to find out where all the other ag products come from, which I think most consumers would see as kind of ridiculous.

I encourage my colleagues to oppose the measure, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, it is gratifying to know that no one wants the retaliatory measures to be put into place. A “yes” vote on this bill that we will take up on the floor here shortly will assure that of happening.

Arguments that it is premature fall on deaf ears. Four years of arguing with the Canadians and the Mexicans in the world court in this deal has left ample time to have come to some sort of conclusion if, in fact, there was a deal out there.

Quite frankly, if we had won a trade issue as decisively and resoundingly as Canada and Mexico did, we wouldn’t negotiate either. We have no leverage; we have none to leverage against Mexico and Canada to get some sort of a deal that might fix this without the repeal.

Frankly, this is not about the merits of country of origin labeling; it is not about the merits of people knowing where their food comes from. We are beyond that point. We lost four straight times.

If those merits or those arguments upheld in the court in our trade obligation, then it would have prevailed, but it didn’t. This isn’t about people knowing where their food comes from. This is about avoiding the retaliatory measures that will be implemented by Canada and Mexico.

The argument that folks want to know where their food comes from, if you walk up to a normal person on the street and ask them that question, I am surprised it is not 100 percent of Americans who would say: Yes, I want to know where that food comes from.

But, if you follow that person into the grocery store and they go up to the meat counter, they buy based on price and quality of the meat and what it looks like. They are not looking at the label; 85 percent of them couldn’t care less.

If you go into every single restaurant and you order chicken or beef or pork or fish or whatever, you have no clue where that came from. You trust the safety network that we have in place at USDA to make sure that that beef or that chicken, that pork, that whatever, is, in fact, safe for you.

The argument that we are somehow depriving the American people of information that they desperately need in order to make informed consumer decisions, again, falls on deaf ears.

Mexico is not a stranger to retaliatory measures. As my colleague from California mentioned earlier, they implemented those measures in 2011 as a result of a trucking case that we also lost in that regard, and it took the wine industry 3 years to recoup and get back to where they were when those retaliatory measures went in.

If you are not a wine connoisseur, pork rinds were also targeted. We had testimony from an individual from New Mexico that said they lost 15 percent of their business as a result of Mexico in-

cluding pork rinds on the retaliatory measure. Somewhere between pork rinds and wine, you have got some products that are going to be impacted by this.

These retaliatory threats that are going to come happen are already having a chilling effect on commerce between our three countries. If you are a wine distributor in Canada, you are not going to make any kind of long-term deals with the United States until you know whether or not what the impact is going to be. Commerce right now is being affected; hence, time is of the essence to get this behind us and move forward.

I would also argue that most Members down here would be very quick to argue and demand, quite frankly, that our trading partners around the world live up to their obligations, and we demand that. We get on our high horse, and we thump our chest like crazy, demanding that other folks live up to their agreements. That is what this is.

We have lost the appeals every step of the way. We have an agreement that says we will treat our trading partners certain ways. We crafted a law that broke that deal. We are now being demanded and required to live up to our trade obligations. This is no different than us trying to force all the other countries around the world to live up to their obligations as well.

This is about protecting American exports from these retaliatory measures that are unnecessary to happen. If consumers want their business and want to know where their food comes from, we can certainly craft a voluntary program that allows the market to exploit that information if, in fact, consumers want that.

Nothing that we are doing today will prevent us from creating some sort of a voluntary program that would, in fact, give consumers that information without being in violation of our trade agreements with our partners.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill, avoid these retaliatory measures, which are totally unnecessary, if we would, in fact, do the work we are supposed to do.

I also want to thank my team that put together the work on this. They have been incredibly diligent. I know the folks on the other side as well have worked hard on this.

We have tried to come to a bipartisan agreement; we just couldn’t get there, but I want to thank my team for the great work that they have done in getting us to that point.

I urge my colleagues to vote for the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. NOEM. Mr. Speaker, consumers deserve greater access to information about where their meat comes from, which is why I have always believed Country of Origin Labeling (COOL) is a critical tool for American families and ranchers.

I join many South Dakotans in being deeply disappointed by the World Trade Organization’s recent ruling against COOL. While I

don’t necessarily concur with the WTO’s conclusions, I agree with my colleagues that something ought to be done to make COOL workable and prevent any damages against our agriculture industry. After all, it is essential that South Dakota farmers and ranchers can continue to be competitive in the export market.

The COOL repeal bill that the House is considering today, however, is premature. By moving on this legislation just weeks after the WTO ruling, we do not have the time necessary to explore what other options may be available. We owe it to consumers and producers to thoroughly consider alternatives. For these reasons, I am voting against the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOLDING). All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 303, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

Mr. PETERSON. 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, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Brian Pate, one of his secretaries.

CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO THE ACTIONS AND POLICIES OF CERTAIN MEMBERS OF THE GOVERNMENT OF BELARUS AND OTHER PERSONS TO UNDERMINE BELARUS’S DEMOCRATIC PROCESSES OR INSTITUTIONS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 114-42)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to