

Lucas	Pearce	Shea-Porter
Luetkemeyer	Perry	Sherman
Lujan Grisham	Peters (CA)	Shimkus
(NM)	Peters (MI)	Shuster
Lujan, Ben Ray	Peterson	Simpson
(NM)	Petri	Sinema
Lummis	Pingree (ME)	Smith (MO)
Lynch	Pittenger	Smith (NE)
Maffei	Pitts	Smith (NJ)
Maloney,	Poe (TX)	Smith (TX)
Carolyn	Pompeo	Southerland
Maloney, Sean	Posey	Speier
Marchant	Price (GA)	Stewart
Marino	Radel	Stivers
Massie	Rahall	Stutzman
Matheson	Reed	Terry
McAllister	Reichert	Thompson (PA)
McCarthy (CA)	Renacci	Thornberry
McCaul	Ribbie	Tiberi
McHenry	Rice (SC)	Tierney
McIntyre	Rigell	Tipton
McKeon	Roby	Titus
McKinley	Roe (TN)	Turner
McMorris	Rogers (AL)	Upton
Rodgers	Rogers (KY)	Valadao
Meadows	Rogers (MI)	Vela
Meehan	Rohrabacher	Wagner
Messer	Rokita	Walberg
Mica	Rooney	Walden
Michaud	Ros-Lehtinen	Walorski
Miller (FL)	Roskam	Walz
Miller (MI)	Ross	Weber (TX)
Miller, Gary	Rothfus	Wenstrup
Mullin	Royce	Westmoreland
Mulvaney	Runyan	Whitfield
Murphy (FL)	Ryan (WI)	Williams
Murphy (PA)	Salmon	Wilson (SC)
Neugebauer	Sanford	Wittman
Noem	Scalise	Wolf
Nolan	Schneider	Womack
Nugent	Schock	Woodall
Nunes	Schrader	Yoder
Nunnelee	Schwartz	Yoho
Olson	Schweikert	Young (AK)
Owens	Scott, Austin	Young (IN)
Palazzo	Sensenbrenner	
Paulsen	Sessions	

NAYS—122

Andrews	Green, Gene	Pastor (AZ)
Bass	Grijalva	Payne
Beatty	Gutiérrez	Pelosi
Becerra	Hastings (FL)	Pocan
Bishop (GA)	Heck (WA)	Polis
Blumenauer	Higgins	Price (NC)
Bonamici	Hinojosa	Quigley
Brady (PA)	Holt	Rangel
Brown (FL)	Honda	Richmond
Butterfield	Hoyer	Roybal-Allard
Cárdenas	Huffman	Ryan (OH)
Carson (IN)	Jackson Lee	Sánchez, Linda
Castor (FL)	Jeffries	T.
Castro (TX)	Johnson (GA)	Sanchez, Loretta
Chu	Johnson, E. B.	Sarbanes
Clark (MA)	Kelly (IL)	Schakowsky
Clarke (NY)	Kennedy	Schiff
Clay	Kildee	Scott (VA)
Clyburn	Kind	Scott, David
Cohen	Larsen (WA)	Serrano
Conyers	Larson (CT)	Sewell (AL)
Courtney	Lee (CA)	Sires
Crowley	Levin	Swalwell (CA)
Cummings	Lewis	Takano
Davis (CA)	Lowenthal	Thompson (CA)
Davis, Danny	Lowey	Thompson (MS)
DeGette	Matsui	Tonko
DeLauro	McCollum	Tsongas
DelBene	McDermott	Van Hollen
Deutch	McGovern	Vargas
Dingell	McNerney	Veasey
Doyle	Meeke	Velázquez
Edwards	Meng	Visclosky
Ellison	Miller, George	Wasserman
Engel	Moore	Schultz
Eshoo	Moran	Waters
Farr	Nadler	Waxman
Fattah	Napolitano	Welch
Frankel (FL)	Negrete McLeod	Wilson (FL)
Fudge	O'Rourke	Yarmuth
Grayson	Pallone	
Green, Al	Pascarell	

NOT VOTING—19

Carter	Heck (NV)	Neal
Cleaver	Herrera Beutler	Perlmutter
Cooper	Jones	Ruiz
Gabbard	McCarthy (NY)	
Guthrie	McClintock	

Ruppersberger	Slaughter	Stockman
Rush	Smith (WA)	Webster (FL)

□ 1054

Messrs. LYNCH and SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. HAHN, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. SPEIER, and Mr. LANGEVIN changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 11, had I been present, I would have voted “yes.”

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. CLEAVER. Mr. Speaker, due to a medical procedure, I was unable to vote the week of January 7th. On Tuesday, January 7, I would have voted “present” on rollcall vote No. 1 (Quorum).

On January 8, I would have voted “yes” on rollcall vote No. 2 (H.R. 721), “yes” on rollcall vote No. 3 (H.R. 3527), and “yes,” on rollcall vote No. 4 (H.R. 3628).

On January 9, I was also unable to vote. Had I been present, I would have voted “no” on rollcall vote No. 5 (Ordering the Previous Question), “no” on rollcall vote No. 6 (H. Res. 455), “yes” on rollcall vote No. 7 (Sinema Amendment No. 1), “yes” on rollcall vote No. 8 (Tonko Amendment No. 2), “yes” on rollcall vote No. 9 (Motion To Recommit with Instructions), and “no” on rollcall vote No. 10 (Final Passage of H.R. 2279).

On January 10, I would have voted “no” on rollcall vote No. 11 (Final Passage of H.R. 3811).

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER
AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 3550

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove my name as a cosponsor from H.R. 3550.

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

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. HOYER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend, Mr. CANTOR, for the purpose of inquiring of the majority leader the schedule for the week to come.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Maryland, the Democratic whip, for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, on Monday, the House will meet at noon for morning-hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business. Votes will be postponed until 6:30 p.m. On Tuesday and Wednesday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for morning-hour and noon for legislative business. On Thursday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business. Last votes of the week are expected no later than 3 p.m. On Friday, no votes are expected.

Mr. Speaker, the House will consider a few suspensions next week, a com-

plete list of which will be announced by the close of business today. In addition, the House will consider two bills next week to fund government operations.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, House and Senate appropriators are working towards a bipartisan agreement on an appropriations package to fund the government for the remainder of the fiscal year. I expect an agreement to be reached soon. The House will consider this package next week.

Mr. Speaker, to facilitate this, we will need to pass a short-term CR to allow the Senate time to process the bill. I expect to pass this under suspension of the rules early next week.

Finally, I expect the House to consider H.R. 3362, the Exchange Information Disclosure Act, sponsored by Representative LEE TERRY. This bill requires full transparency and accuracy from the administration on data reported from the ObamaCare exchange.

□ 1100

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for that information. I note that he indicates that we probably will not be able to accomplish the omnibus by the end of next week and, therefore, a CR may be required.

I know that all of us feel that that needs to be accomplished as quickly as possible. I would point out to the gentleman in conversations that he says it is going to be on suspension. I will support it on suspension, urge my colleagues to support it on suspension.

Can the gentleman tell me, however, how long that CR will go that will affect us somewhat?

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman in response to his question, the expected termination, if you will, expiration of the CR will be Saturday, January 18. So giving a week really, Mr. Speaker, for the Senate to act, because we will be acting next week in the middle of the week. We hope that they will finish their business by September—I mean January 18.

Mr. HOYER. I hope that was not a Freudian slip of our confidence in the ability to get that done as quickly as we would like.

In any event, I think that is appropriate, and I am hopeful that we can, in fact, accomplish that.

I want to tell the majority leader from my perspective that if we don't get that done in the short term, then I would be very reluctant to support continuing resolutions at the level which has now been substituted for the agreement that was reached in the bipartisan budget agreement.

There are substantial differences, as you know, in the 302(a) allocation, the allocation of discretionary spending, one at \$1.012 trillion and one at \$986 billion, so that there is a substantial discrepancy between those figures.

We reached agreement on the higher number. The Senate came down about 45, the House went up about 45 and reached a compromise. I think America was pleased that we reached a compromise. I would want to be on the

record as saying that if we went to longer term CRs, I would want to have some serious discussions about the level of those CRs in terms of the operations of government.

The other issue I wanted to ask the gentleman about, as you know, we had a previous question yesterday. That previous question, had it been defeated, would have allowed the House to consider the extension of unemployment insurance for 3 months, consistent with what the Senate had proposed. Now, the Senate has not reached agreement on this issue, but unfortunately that has not been considered on the floor this week. As the gentleman knows, 72,000 people a week are losing their unemployment insurance. That adds to 1.3 million that have already lost their own insurance on December 28.

I know it is not listed on your sheet, nor did you mention it in your comments on the floor. Can the gentleman tell me whether there is any prospect of the unemployment insurance bill coming to this floor? Mr. TIERNEY has a bill that he has introduced that I think probably enjoys, at this point in time, well over 150 Democrats, and I think all Democrats will sign on to it. I would hope that we together, as we did when President Bush was President, and we did it five times, I would hope that we could extend unemployment for those people who were relying on it to put food on their tables.

I yield to my friend.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman and just for the record make clear that the bill, or the measure, that the gentleman is speaking to is a bill that would extend beyond the more than 6 months that unemployment benefits insurance is available now.

As the gentleman knows, we have been trying to focus this Congress on getting back to a more optimistic view of what the economy can do. It is about jobs; it is about growth.

Our focus is about wanting people to get a job. It is on employment, not unemployment. So I would say to the gentleman, if we could work together in trying to reject what unfortunately is seeming to become the new norm for many, instead, let's talk about the things that we do, maybe skills training.

Those who are chronically unemployed frankly could find a job if they had the skills necessary to do so. We would love to be able to work with the gentleman in a bipartisan fashion to perhaps do those kinds of things. Unfortunately, this Congress, this House has passed the SKILLS Act, and there was no bipartisan support for that.

We need to be focused on growing the economy, getting people back to work—and know that there is a lot of pain out there right now. The best response to the pain, in someone looking for some hope for the future, is a job.

And so I would respond to the gentleman, we are watching what the Senate is doing, and I think the reports

today indicate the Senate is going to have some difficulty in passing what was thought to have been an easy thing to pass a few days ago. So I would ask the gentleman to join us in looking towards a more optimistic future for this country and economy, focusing on employment and those who have been chronically out of work.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

First, I would say, there is nothing to disagree with in what the gentleman has said. We do want to focus on jobs. We do want to focus on creating jobs. We do want to focus on growing the economy. The gentleman is absolutely correct. As a matter of fact, as the gentleman knows, he and I have discussed the agenda that Democrats have been talking about for 2½ years, and it is called Make It In America.

That Make It In America agenda focuses on manufacturing and growing opportunities in this country for good jobs for skilled workers and unskilled workers, frankly, but mainly skilled workers in the new manufacturing environment in which we find ourselves. That ought to be our long-term objective.

I would say very candidly, Mr. Speaker, we ought not in the short term forget those who have been deeply damaged by the economic dislocation that has occurred in our society, in our country, and frankly globally over the past 5 years, or actually starting in December of '07. We ought not to forget those people, because while a future investment is very interesting to them, and I am sure important to them, their critical interest is in putting food on their table today, tomorrow, and the next day. I think the richest country on the face of the Earth could do both, I tell the gentleman. And I think that we ought to do both, and we have done both in the past.

We had some job figures that were out today, apparently 87,000 jobs in the private sector. That's not enough. We lost 13,000 in the public sector apparently for a net of 74,000 appreciation of jobs. That's not nearly enough. The gentleman would agree, I know, to solve the problem that we have.

The gentleman talked about the SKILLS Act. That bill would freeze the Workforce Investment Act program funding for fiscal years 2014 to 2020. We would make no more investment in doing what the gentleman has said we want to do. It has already been cut by half since 2001 and would also consolidate or eliminate 35 programs, most of them the Workforce Incentive Act programs, into State block grants that they could spend on things of their choice.

I am not saying that some States wouldn't make good choices. I think they would. Other States would make different choices, and we may or may not agree with those. But I certainly tell the gentleman, and he and I have had the opportunity talking together, the Make It In America agenda, or a

jobs agenda, or whatever that agenda is called, is certainly something we ought to pursue.

Let me transition, if I might, Mr. Leader, to talk about another issue which analysis of almost every economist and the Congressional Budget Office say will help grow the economy, and that is comprehensive immigration reform. We continue to believe that that is one of the most important issues that this Congress in this second session of the Congress ought to deal with. Can the gentleman indicate whether there is any possibility of either, as I said in weeks past, bringing the four bills that came out of the Judiciary Committee or the border security bill that came out of the Homeland Security Committee, I might say, unanimously? None of those five bills have been brought to the floor.

The Speaker said just the other day, I am trying to find some way to get this thing done. "Thing" being immigration reform. He said, It is, as you know, not easy. Not going to be an easy path forward, but I made it clear since the day after the election, it is time to get this done.

The Speaker said that November 13, 2013, a couple months ago. We are very, very hopeful that the Speaker will pursue that, the House will pursue that, and the majority leader will put on the floor legislation on which we can act. We may or may not agree with the legislation brought to the floor, but we think it needs to be given attention, consistent with Speaker BOEHNER's observation, and CBO's assertion, that that would have a substantially positive effect on growing the economy and creating jobs.

I yield to my friend.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

If I could just revisit the issue of the SKILLS Act. The gentleman speaks to the amount of money called for in the bill; and I would say to the gentleman the thrust behind the SKILLS Act was to try and refocus the program on actual effectiveness and results. I think the gentleman will agree that the job picture right now is not as bright as it should be.

As I indicated earlier, a lot of the folks who are trying to access skills training are unable to do so. There is evidence that existing programs are not results oriented like we would like them to be. And the purpose behind that bill is to realign the focus of the skills and training programs across the country with job availability and openings in the different regions of the country.

So rather than insisting on spending more money on a one-size-fits-all Washington approach, we provided flexibility for the regions so it could be tailored. The skills training programs could be tailored to the job openings in these specific regions of the country. And they are different. They are different in my region of the country than they are in the Pacific Northwest.

They are different in the Midwest than they are in the Northeast. We know that there is diversity in this country, and we should allow for those differences and the improvement reforms necessary to make it so that we are not accepting the status quo. I would ask the gentleman to take a look at that again as something that perhaps we can work on together.

I would also say, again, the jobs numbers, the gentleman is completely correct that these job numbers, this latest report this morning reflects the lowest number of jobs added since January of 2011. That doesn't speak well about the track record of what is going on here. So let's focus on jobs together.

As for the question about immigration, Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman is right. Immigration reform could be an economic boon to this country. We have got to do it right; and along those lines, the Speaker has said that we are going to look for the release of a list of principles of our position in the majority here in the House of what we believe is an appropriate path forward for immigration reform.

There are plenty of things that we can agree on. As the gentleman knows, I have been a strong proponent of the KIDS Act that I am working with the chairman of the committee on, because I think all of us can agree that we shouldn't hold kids liable for the misdeeds or illegal acts of their parents. This country has never been about that. There are plenty of things like that, strong border security, and making sure that that occurs first so we don't see a continuing problem of illegal immigration.

I think there are plenty of areas for agreement. Hopefully, Mr. Speaker, we can see after the release of a set of principles of our side that there can be some productive discussions, bipartisan with the White House, so that it is not "my way or the highway," and then we can see a proper way forward.

□ 1115

Mr. HOYER. I thank the leader for his comments.

Certainly we are not proponents of "my way or the highway," and I am glad, I do believe, that hopefully the majority leader is not either.

Briefly, on the SKILLS Act, we have legislation, of course, on our side of the aisle, a number of pieces of legislation which deal with training, job skills, and we are certainly prepared to work on those. Unfortunately, as the gentleman knows, that bill passed out in a partisan way. There were two Democrats who voted for it. But I am certainly willing to work with the gentleman, and I think our side of the aisle is willing to work with the gentleman to invest and to give flexibility so that we can recognize, obviously, that what may be needed in my district or the gentleman from Virginia's district is different from a district in Washington State or California or

Texas or Florida or Maine. So I want to assure the gentleman that we are prepared to work on that.

Next, can I ask you when those principles that you talked about might be expected, because I think that would be a very positive step forward. But, in my view, if we wait long, comprehensive immigration reform will not get accomplished, as I believe it should be, in the next few months.

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CANTOR. I would say to the gentleman, Mr. Speaker, that there is an expectation that the list of principles will be released in the near future, and that is about as definite as I can be. But again, the sense is that there is common agreement on certain issues.

I think that, unfortunately, thus far, given the track record around this town, there is very little room for discussion, negotiations, and hopefully this can be different. But thus far, Mr. Speaker, all I can say is that we are looking for the release of those principles in the near future.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman.

And in conclusion, let me simply say, Mr. Leader, that we welcome moving ahead on the omnibus. We think that is very critical. We hope that we can address the unemployment insurance issue, not as a substitute for focusing on growing jobs and growing the economy, which is essential, but in recognition that some 1.3 million people—growing by 72,000 people a week—are in deep distress, and we want to help them. We think that is the right thing to do. And we think America can do both, grow the economy and help those who have been hurt by the decrease in the availability of jobs available.

Lastly, I might say, that we also hope that we can get to immigration reform as quickly as possible, and we look forward to seeing those principles.

I yield back the balance of my time.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, JANUARY 13, 2014

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet on Monday next, when it shall convene at noon for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BRIDENSTINE). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

WEB SITE SECURITY

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, although the www.healthcare.gov Web site launch was a severe disappointment, an even greater concern has been expressed regarding the Web site's security vulnerabilities, including the security of personal and medical information.

What is most concerning is that it appears to be more important for this administration to avoid political fallout than to conduct a thorough evaluation of the Web site's security. Unfortunately, it has become very clear that the rushed implementation of the launch has affected the site's ability to perform on both accounts.

Mr. Speaker, if the administration wants the confidence of the American people, they should make every effort to ensure private information is kept private. The bill we passed today with significant bipartisan support, the Health Exchange Security and Transparency Act, would require the Department of Health and Human Services to notify individuals if their personal information has been stolen or unlawfully accessed through an ObamaCare exchange. This is a simple, common-sense reform that will go a long way to help stem the fears that Americans have with the online exchanges and the security of their personal information. Mr. Speaker, the American people deserve as much.

SAFE CLIMATE CAUCUS

(Mr. PETERS of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PETERS of California. Mr. Speaker, in southern California and across the American West, 2013 was another year of extremely dry conditions. And as of today, snowpack in the Sierra Nevada mountain range, which is our water storage facility, is well below its seasonal average.

In 2011 and 2012, drought and heat waves cost the United States \$90 billion in economic damages, further evidence of the economic harm we are enduring due to climate change and increasingly extreme weather. 2012 saw the worst drought in the country in 50 years, with more than 80 percent of the country designated a drought disaster-affected area by late November. Since the year 2000, there have been nine droughts that have each cost more than \$1 billion in damages.

Research from the Scripps Institution of Oceanography, sponsored by the Climate Initiative at The San Diego Foundation, has shown that in San Diego the main effects of climate change are rising sea levels, more intense wildfires, and increased pressure on water supplies.

It is time to get serious about climate change so that we can protect our scarce water resources that hydrate our farms and our families.

Go, Chargers.

HONORING OUR FIRST RESPONDERS AND EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT OFFICIALS

(Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Indiana's