

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

the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that 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 that was declared in Executive Order 13405 of June 16, 2006, is to continue in effect beyond June 16, 2015.

The actions and policies of certain members of the Government of Belarus and other persons to undermine Belarus's democratic processes or institutions, to commit human rights abuses related to political repression, and to engage in public corruption continue to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States. For this reason, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13405 with respect to Belarus.

BARACK OBAMA.
THE WHITE HOUSE, June 10, 2015.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2016

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 2685 and that I may include tabular material on the same.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 303 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 2685.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1545

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the 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, with Mr. POE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

The gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN) and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCOSKY) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

As I rise to present the House Appropriations Committee's recommendation for the fiscal year 2016 Department of Defense Appropriations bill, there

are nearly 200,000 servicemen and women serving abroad, doing the work of freedom on every continent, and there are many more at home who are serving in every one of our States—Active, Guard and Reserve—all volunteers. We are grateful to them and their families.

They are certainly not all experts in some of the language and terms that will be part of our vocabulary during this debate over the next 24 hours—phrases like “sequester” and “continuing resolution,” “Budget Control Act,” “overseas contingency account,” and the “global war on terrorism account”—but they have every expectation that they will have our united, bipartisan support for this bill whether they serve aboard a ship, fly through airspace, or provide overwatch on land to support a military mission. This legislation was developed after 12 hearings, many briefings, travel to the Middle East and Europe, and countless staff hours, with those who serve us, military and civilian, very much in mind.

This is a product of a very bipartisan and cooperative effort, for which I thank my good friend, the ranking member, PETE VISCOSKY. It has been a pleasure to work with him. We are both fortunate to have committee members who are engaged and committed so much to this product. We are grateful for the support of Chairman ROGERS and Ranking Member LOWEY.

In total, the bill provides just over \$578 billion in discretionary spending, an increase of \$24.4 billion over the fiscal year 2015 enacted level. This topline includes \$88.4 billion in the global war on terrorism funding for war efforts, and it is at the level assumed in the House-Senate budget conference agreement. I would point out that our House total is very close to the number President Obama submitted in his fiscal year 2016 budget request for national defense. Of course, the base funding recommendation is just over \$490 billion, which reflects the budget caps enacted in 2011 as part of the Budget Control Act, signed by President Obama.

To reach our reduced allocation, we reviewed in detail the President's submission and found areas and programs where reductions were possible without harming military operations, warfighter readiness, or critical modernization efforts. Please be assured we made every dollar count. To do so, we have taken reductions from programs that have been restructured or terminated, subject to contract or schedule delays, contain unjustified cost increases or funding requested ahead of need, or because of historical under-execution and rescissions of unneeded funds.

Of course, our bill keeps faith with our troops and their families by including a 2.3 percent pay increase, a full percentage above the President's own request. It also provides general funding to their benefits and critical defense health programs. In another key

area, this package contains robust funding to counter serious worldwide cyber threats—now an everyday occurrence.

But I think we would all agree that the world is a much more dangerous, unstable, and unpredictable place than it was in 2011 when the Budget Control Act was signed into law by President Obama. The budget caps developed back then could never have envisioned the emerging and evolving threats that we are seeing today in the Middle East, North Africa, Asia, Eastern Europe, and elsewhere.

So, to respond to current and future threats and to meet our constitutional responsibilities to provide for the common defense, we developed, in a bipartisan way, a bill that adheres to the current law and provides additional resources to end catastrophic cuts to military programs and people. These additional resources are included in title IX, the global war on terrorism account. That account has been carefully vetted to assure its war-related uses.

Our subcommittee scrubbed the President's base budget for this year and past budget requests, and it has identified those systems and programs that are absolutely connected to our ongoing fight against threats presented by ISIL, al Qaeda, al-Nusrah, the Khorasan Group, Boko Haram, and other radical terrorist organizations, including the Iranian Quds Force.

We also projected what resources the military and intelligence community will need to meet ongoing challenges of nation-state aggressors like Russia, China, Iran, North Korea, and others. Not surprisingly, we have heard objections about the use of title IX to boost our topline national security spending in this bill. Frankly, I do not believe there is anyone on either side of the Capitol who believes this should be our first go-to option. Rather, it is a process we undertake as a last resort to make sure our troops can answer the call amid a worsening threat environment around the world.

Again, we have been very careful about what went into this global war on terrorism account. We resisted the temptation to simply transfer large portions of the base bill's operations and maintenance accounts into the global war on terrorism account. We painstakingly worked to provide needed resources for the preparation of our forces in the field whenever a crisis may exist or develop in the future, like the current unfolding disaster which is Iraq.

In a recent Statement of Administration Policy, the White House asserted that the global war on terrorism funding—the old OCO account, the overseas contingency account—in their words is a “funding mechanism intended to pay for wars.” I could not agree more, and that is why we enforce that account to provide President Obama with the funding resources he needs to lead us as Commander in Chief. Within that