

Let's finally create the jobs that politicians love to talk about. Get families back to work, where they want to be, and off unemployment.

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

(Ms. TITUS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, as of the new year, 1.3 million Americans, including 17,600 Nevadans, are without a critical economic lifeline—the emergency unemployment insurance that has helped men and women stay out of poverty and keep their families afloat as they look for a job.

By allowing this program to expire, those already struggling to make ends meet are now facing even greater hardship as they are left to wonder how to put food on the table, keep a roof over their families' heads, or put gas in the car.

Denying this vital lifeline is not only morally indefensible, it is also economically shortsighted. Unemployment insurance benefits not only help the individual and their families who receive them, but they also boost our economy. Failing to renew this program will weaken economic growth and cost our country 240,000 jobs, including almost 3,000 in Nevada.

So, for the thousands of Nevadans who lost emergency unemployment insurance at the beginning of the year and the 842 more who stand to lose their benefits at the end of this week, inaction is unacceptable. I urge Speaker BOEHNER to bring this to the floor and vote in favor.

TAKE ACTION ON EMERGENCY UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

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

Mr. MAFFEI. Mr. Speaker, I, too, rise to urge the Republican leaders to allow a vote on extending unemployment insurance benefits to the thousands of workers in my central New York district and the 1.3 million workers across the country who have lost these benefits.

Because Congress has failed to act, hundreds of thousands of families are not having a happy new year. This important relief provides a lifeline to people who worked hard, they played by the rules, and they are out of work through no fault of their own. By providing this vital but temporary assistance to unemployed workers, this program ensures workers and their families are able to make ends meet during their job searches.

Extending unemployment insurance should not be a partisan issue. In fact, this program was signed into law by President George W. Bush and has been reauthorized several times by members of both political parties during the time of economic recovery. If there are

reforms needed to help get people back to work, then let's make those reforms, but don't toss out the whole program.

Mr. Speaker, our economy is still recovering and thousands of hardworking central New Yorkers are still struggling to find a job. Failure to extend unemployment insurance hurts the economy across central New York and across this country. The Senate has already taken bipartisan action on extending unemployment insurance. It is time for the House to do the same.

Mr. Speaker, I just don't understand why we don't just have a vote. It would help the economy, and it would help our families.

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE EXPIRATION

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

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, for many people, a new year marks a time of hope and optimism. But millions of Americans are, instead, beginning this year with fear and worry. They are wondering how they are going to make ends meet, pay their rent, or put food on the table. That is because they woke up just a few days after Christmas to find that their emergency unemployment assistance had been terminated, cutting them off from a needed lifeline.

Now, that is just about the cruelest thing I can think of happening. It is mean. It is unnecessary. It is kicking people who are already down. It is just plain shameful. It is shameful. And it is not the kind of America I believe in.

Shouldn't we be embracing policies like unemployment insurance that keep families afloat? Shouldn't we be looking at our communities, our neighbors, and saying, yes, America will be there for you in your time of need?

Yes, we should say that.

To every one of my colleagues, I say join us in doing the right thing and restoring these needed benefits today. We need to do the right thing and not the wrong thing, and we need to do that now.

□ 1230

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FORTENBERRY) laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, January 9, 2014.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker, 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 January 9, 2014 at 9:42 a.m.:

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 667.

That the Senate passed S. 1171.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2279, REDUCING EXCESSIVE DEADLINE OBLIGATIONS ACT OF 2013; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3362, EXCHANGE INFORMATION DISCLOSURE ACT; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3811, HEALTH EXCHANGE SECURITY AND TRANSPARENCY ACT OF 2014

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 455 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 455

Resolved, That at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2279) to amend the Solid Waste Disposal Act relating to review of regulations under such Act and to amend the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 relating to financial responsibility for classes of facilities. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Energy and Commerce now printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 113-30. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final

passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 3362) to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to require transparency in the operation of American Health Benefit Exchanges. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate, with 40 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce and 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 3. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 3811) to require notification of individuals of breaches of personally identifiable information through Exchanges under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce; and (2) one motion to recommit.

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

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

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 455 provides for the consideration of three important bills which were reported by the Energy and Commerce Committee: H.R. 2279, the Reducing Excessive Deadline Obligations Act of 2013; H.R. 3362, the Exchange Information Disclosure Act; and H.R. 3811, the Health Exchange Security and Transparency Act of 2014.

H.R. 2279 is a bill to address the burdensome and outdated deadlines for certain rulemaking activities conducted by the Environmental Protection Agency under the Solid Waste Disposal Act and the Comprehensive Envi-

ronmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act. This provides flexibility for the Environmental Protection Agency in order to streamline a process critical to cleaning up sites contaminated with certain toxic or hazardous chemicals.

It further requires the Environmental Protection Agency to evaluate existing State or other Federal financial insurance requirements to determine whether additional requirements are, in fact, necessary.

Finally, it requires the owner or operator of a chemical storage site to report the presence of such chemicals to the State emergency response commissions.

It is a commonsense piece of legislation to help clean up areas that have been polluted and allows for their reclamation or development. This could bring jobs and economic benefits to neighborhoods which have been so affected.

As the two health care-related pieces of legislation, these are targeted bills to address just a few of the massive problems the American public has witnessed over the last few months pertaining to the calamitous rollout of the Federal www.healthcare.gov Web site. The data obtained by www.healthcare.gov is one of the largest collections of personal information ever assembled. It links information between seven different Federal agencies, State agencies, and government contractors.

In promising lower costs and widespread health coverage for Americans, President Obama failed to mention that the Affordable Care Act's mandates and requirements will create large-scale disruption of the entire health insurance market. The resulting cancelation of insurance plans and high cost for employers to continue providing insurance for their workers has left millions of Americans with no choice other than to purchase health insurance through the Affordable Care Act's exchanges, subjecting their personal information to the vulnerable security infrastructure.

The initial launch of www.healthcare.gov on October 1, 2013, was plagued with glitches and errors. Not only did the administration fail to establish basic functionality of the Web site, but the initial problems really only break the surface of the deeper security threats in the underlying law. A multitude of gaps remain in the Web site's security infrastructure, making the Web site a wide-open target for hackers and identity thieves. These flaws continue to pose a threat to the security of Americans' personal data.

Mr. Speaker, it wasn't that the administration was not alerted to these security concerns on the Web site prior to the launch. MITRE Corporation, a contractor for the Department of Health and Human Services, alerted the agency that 19 unaddressed security vulnerabilities plagued the Web site prior to its launch on October 1.

Top officials at the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, including the chief information security officer, Teresa Fryer, along with the Web site's project manager, Tony Trenkle, both refused to sign the Authority to Operate license that was necessary to actually launch www.healthcare.gov. Despite these known issues, the director of the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, Marilyn Tavenner, continued to launch the Web site.

This is much more than a faulty Web site. This is about the American people, who cannot trust their government to certify that their personal information will be safe on a government-run Web site.

The security threat goes beyond just an individual's primary application. Once an individual's personal information is entered into the system, the exchange has the ability to access information within the Department of Homeland Security, the Internal Revenue Service, Social Security, and the Treasury Department. The administration has opened numerous Federal agencies to data breaches and unauthorized access.

Just before the holidays, the entire Nation saw firsthand what a massive security breach looks like. Over 40 million Target customers, their personal data was compromised by computer hackers who pilfered personal financial information and identification.

Target has gone out of their way to alert customers of the security breach. Unfortunately, the Federal Government has no such obligation under the law. This is a point that I don't think most people are aware of. It is not required. It is not a mandate that you have a Target charge card or that you shop at Target, but it is certainly required and a mandate that you buy your insurance through www.healthcare.gov. This is a coercive Federal policy that now is pulling people into its Web site and refuses to provide them the very same protection that we demand that the private sector do for a voluntary purchase.

Instead of following the same requirements placed on the private sector, the Federal Government has gone out of their way to avoid imposing this basic due diligence in their own exchanges. Even when a notification requirement was specifically requested during the rulemaking process on the exchanges, the administration just simply refused.

In the March 27, 2012, Federal Register, Department of Health and Human Services responded, stating:

We do not plan to include the specific notification procedures in the final rule. Consistent with this approach, we did not include specific policies for investigation of data breaches in this final rule.

Furthermore, State laws required that many of the 14 State-run insurance exchanges, that they do disclose such information. No such law exists for the federally run exchange. Mr. Speaker, I would remind you that 36

States rely upon the federally run exchange.

Look, we have spent hundreds of millions of dollars, taxpayer dollars. The American people deserve to know that their personal information is protected and to be notified if that protection lapses.

Let's be honest: www.healthcare.gov is the most talked about Web site in years. The massive amounts of personal information that is collected through www.healthcare.gov and its ability to access multiple government databases creates the perfect environment for targeting by hackers.

Over 16 attempts to hack into the system have already been reported, not to mention the many stories that have been reported in the press on the mishandling and sharing of individuals' data. Identity theft is a threat not only to an individual's credit rating and personal finances but also to overall United States security. Most Americans would be shocked to learn that this level of protection is not already in place for an initiative the size of the Affordable Care Act. Well, today the House is working to correct this injustice, protecting Americans when the administration has refused to do so.

The Obama administration has consistently refused to disclose detailed data on how many Americans have actually completed the Obama Care enrollment process. Now it is more than 3 months after the launch of the exchanges, and we just simply do not know how many Americans are enrolled in the exchange plan.

It was the administration who initially defined the success of the exchange as the number of Americans who actually enroll in the program. The number of enrollments are the only way to evaluate whether the more than \$1 trillion that was spent on this thing by the administration is actually working.

The President's commitment to an open and transparent government, repeated so many times during the passage of the Affordable Care Act, represents yet one more broken promise in a long string of broken promises.

□ 1245

Where this administration has failed, the bill before us will require the Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services to provide detailed weekly reports to the American people about the enrollment number on healthcare.gov. The American people deserve to know what they are getting for their hard-earned tax dollars that they have spent on the demands of this administration.

It is the American people who are suffering because of the mismanagement and failures of this administration. Today—today—we have the opportunity to provide transparency and protect Americans' personal information.

The rule before us today provides for 1 hour of debate equally divided be-

tween the majority and the minority for each of the bills contained in the rule. The minority is further afforded the customary motion to recommit on each piece of legislation.

I want to encourage my colleagues to vote "yes" on the rule and "yes" on the underlying bills and stand with the millions of Americans who are asking and who are demanding that we protect their privacy.

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

Mr. POLIS. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I thank the gentleman, Mr. BURGESS, for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule today under which three bills are being brought to the floor: H.R. 3811, the Health Exchange Security and Transparency Act; H.R. 2279, the Reducing Excessive Deadline Obligations Act; and H.R. 3362, the Exchange Information Disclosure Act. You wouldn't know by their names what those bills actually do. I discuss that, and, more importantly, I plan to discuss, Mr. Speaker, what these bills fail to accomplish.

These misguided and superfluous bills were brought under a very restrictive process. Two of them are being brought to the floor under a completely closed rule that blocks all efforts by Members to improve the legislation. Democrats yesterday on the Rules Committee proposed an open rule for these bills allowing Members from both sides of the aisle to offer their ideas to make them better, and it was voted down in the Rules Committee in a partisan vote.

Instead of moving forward and tackling challenges like extending unemployment, which has been talked about, or passing a jobs bill or an infrastructure bill or fixing our broken immigration system or reforming our tax system, again, we are discussing bills relating to the Affordable Care Act that don't seek to improve the act and make it work better for the American people but only add more paperwork and bureaucracy and cost to the health care system we already have by putting additional requirements on Federal workers and others that are working hard to ensure that ObamaCare works for America every day. Of the 112 legislative days we have left this year, we need to ensure that we spend them wisely, and I don't think that these three bills are a good way for us to use 2 days of our time.

The first bill, H.R. 3362, calls on HHS to publish weekly reports on consumer interactions with healthcare.gov, including the details of all calls received by the call center. Now, much of this information is already available monthly. There are already reliable updates on enrollment numbers and numerous updates on the Web sites and issues consumers have encountered. Look, while you are fixing the Web site and getting it working is not the time

to put additional requirements on those that are laboring to ensure that Americans can sign up for affordable health care. Again, it is more information about who is calling and what they are doing weekly rather than monthly will provide an additional workload for those who are trying to make sure that the Web sites are functioning for America.

It will actually make it harder for the Web sites to function by having to divert some effort if this were to become law simply to building reporting requirements that were mandated by Congress. It is almost as if this bill was designed to make the Web site work worse, Mr. Speaker, by moving developers and others, without any additional resources, away from making the necessary improvements towards building entirely new reporting systems just so people can have information weekly instead of monthly.

It would be great, first of all, to have information weekly. I would love to have information daily. I would love to have information realtime. I used to run an Internet company. It would be wonderful to have that information. You have to weigh the costs and benefits and say, Is it worth building into this system realtime reporting? What are we forgoing by doing that? Is it worth it to say we want the information weekly instead of monthly?

Again, if you are building it from scratch and perhaps if the Republicans had offered this as an amendment into the original Affordable Care Act, maybe this could have been incorporated in 3 years ago and we could have built a system with either realtime or weekly reporting. But here where we are today, clearly the top priority needs to be that this Web site works well for the American people so they can get affordable health care for themselves and their family. That is what the American people want.

Now, let's talk about security and safeguards for consumer information. Again, you have the germ of a good idea. Of course, when the government has our personal information, we need to make sure that there are adequate safeguards. That goes for the IRS, it goes for military personnel files, and it goes for the Affordable Care Act, just as we want to make sure that when the private sector and companies have our personal information that they institute the proper safeguards. And there are examples of failure. Mr. BURGESS mentioned Target as a private-sector example of failure.

We certainly hope that we have the infrastructure and security in place to ensure that there is not a failure of security with regard to the Affordable Care Act. But when we are talking about identity theft and how to address it, we need to look at where the real problem is. What is the leading cause of identity theft? Is it the IRS? Is it the Affordable Care Act? Is it the military? No. One of the biggest causes of breaches of personal information is our

broken immigration system, the fact that many immigrants in our country are here with fake paperwork, fraudulent Social Security numbers they have purchased or stolen—and H.R. 15, the bipartisan comprehensive immigration reform package, which in a very similar form has already passed the Senate, would address this.

So if we actually want to reduce identity theft and breaches of security and safeguard, Mr. Speaker, personal information for the American people, we should address the real problem rather than one of many hypothetical problems that, again, is no doubt worthy of discussion, but let's address where immigration—where identity theft actually occurs.

According to the Center for Immigration Studies, which has done a lot of work on identity theft from those who are here illegally, experts suggest that 75 percent of people who are here illegally and working use fraudulent Social Security cards to obtain employment. Again, Americans are the victims of this theft. Children are prime targets. Their report indicates that in Arizona it is estimated that there are thousands of children that are victims of identity theft. H.R. 15 contains mandatory E-Verify, which the Center for Immigration Studies says would curb and stop virtually 100 percent of child identity theft.

So, I mean, if we are serious, Mr. Speaker, about doing something about the fact that drivers licenses and Social Security numbers are being stolen, well, let's pass immigration reform. Let's make sure that people who are working in our country and have a role here have some kind of provisional work permit, some prospect of a pathway to citizenship over many years or decades, and that we have a mandatory E-Verify mechanism of checking, a way of verifying at the employer level that their paperwork is authentic and it is not, in fact, stolen from an innocent American, as it is today. So that would address identity theft. That would address fraud.

We have people today that actually, under our current laws, are incentivized to steal information—personal information—from American people. Our immigration system is clearly broken. We need to fix it. H.R. 15, the House's bipartisan, comprehensive immigration reform bill, would create a mandatory employment eligibility verification program. Currently, only 7 percent of employers in our entire country are enrolled in E-Verify to do workplace authentication of those who work here.

So, let's bring this bill to the floor if that is the issue we want to address rather than discuss something that is hypothetically of concern. Yes, of course, we care about secure information in the Affordable Care healthcare.gov site. We care about it in military records, and we care about it in the IRS. But, meanwhile, there are hundreds of thousands of identities

being stolen every day, and that is going to continue because this body refuses to bring H.R. 15 to the floor of the House, which would make that number almost zero.

Mr. Speaker, the final bill that this rule brings to the floor is H.R. 2279, the Reducing Excessive Deadline Obligations Act. It is really a package of three bills that would weaken hazardous waste laws like Superfund and the Resource Conservation Recovery Act. It would actually limit the EPA's oversight to ensure that the American people are safe and healthy.

Do we need to remind this body that the reason Congress enacted these safeguards and Superfund is because of tragedies like Love Canal where a residential neighborhood was built on top of 22,000 tons of hazardous waste, and due to the exposure, the residents suffered very high rates of miscarriages, cancers, and birth defects? The situation was so dire that the Federal Government wound up having to evacuate the entire community. That is not the America I want to live in, Mr. Speaker. I oppose H.R. 2279 because it could lead to more situations like Love Canal rather than making sure that the American people are safe and healthy in their homes.

Mr. Speaker, this debate is not really about reporting requirements. It is about making healthcare.gov function less effectively. It is not really about breaches of our personal information. We can solve a big chunk of that by bringing H.R. 15 to the floor of the House. It is not really about improving our competitiveness by removing unnecessary EPA regulations. It is about risking the health of our families.

We need to focus on rebuilding our infrastructure, fixing our broken immigration system, and making sure that we can protect the health of the American people, not jeopardize it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I now would like to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia, Dr. COLLINS.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, it is a new year. We come down and begin this week, and I have made a commitment, as I think many of us do, as resolutions on what are we going to do for the new year and you always try to learn something new, and today has been a busy day with meetings and other things. I have learned a lot, but I have actually come to the floor today to learn something that was amazing to me, and it was not only that a bill that we are talking about under this rule would actually be designed to make, that was accused of making the ObamaCare Web site worse. I didn't know that was possible. And undoubtedly, it can be, but I think it actually helps when we look at what we are doing for the country and what we are doing as we move forward protecting the interests of the people.

So it is with that I rise in strong support of the rule and the underlying pieces of legislation, and in particular,

H.R. 3811, the Health Exchange Security and Transparency Act of 2014.

Even before ObamaCare was signed into law, pundits and politicians alike have speculated on the impact it would have on American families. Skyrocketing premiums, loss of coverage, and poor quality of care were all correctly predicted by many on this side of the aisle.

We come here today, however, because Americans aren't just faced with unaffordable health care and broken Presidential promises—the security and privacy of our personal information is at great risk due to ObamaCare.

One of the things that I think is mentioned here and should be noted, that protecting the information that is being forced to be given should be of our utmost importance and it is not something that should be just said is we should be doing other bills. Believe me, I would want to be talking about other things too, but this is something important that is protecting Americans' interests, and we need to continue to do so.

I believe that the best health care system is one that is patient centered and as far removed from the flawed policies enshrined in ObamaCare as possible. Over the upcoming months, I look forward to debating the merits of ObamaCare versus true health care reform with my colleagues on the other side of the aisle. But today is not that day. Today we come to the floor simply to say that American families should know about breaches of personally identifiable information in the ObamaCare exchanges.

Regardless of the letter of your political affiliation, wouldn't you like to be notified if the security of your personal information has been compromised? If we get outside the politics of Washington and ask our constituents, I firmly believe that answer would be yes. It would actually be a resounding yes.

So as I come to speak in support of this rule, and speaking also with the underlying bills and especially when I believe something such as protecting the security of our personal information is so important, I believe it is also important for us to remember as we start a new year that when we come here, people listen, people are concerned about their lives, they are concerned about what has gone on.

And over the past few months, especially when it comes to health care, you can go to teachers in Georgia right now who have had their health care changed because of the ACA. That has just been an interesting mark everywhere I go in listening to people in what is now a health care system that they used to have their own insurance is now lost into something that they are struggling with; or whether it is the identifiable nature of the issues of their information on the Web site that possibly could be compromised, to just simply saying that we need regulations for our businesses and making sure our

environmental projects are the ones that are prioritized and not just simply at the whim of a certain administration priority.

□ 1300

What we have got to do here is to continue to look forward to doing the people's business and, in doing so, in such a way that matters to everyday Americans.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, again the gentleman said there is a risk of information being taken from the healthcare.gov site. There is potential risk from any site. But every day, there are tens of thousands of American identities being stolen because of this body's refusal to simply fix our broken immigration system now.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), the ranking member of the Rules Committee.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, the majority has passed so few bills into law that it is on pace to become the least-productive Congress in history. And, frankly, I think they are a little bit proud of that. The inability to govern is directly related to the closed legislative process the majority has pursued with vigor over the course of the last year.

At the beginning of the second session of the 113th Congress, the majority has practically shuttered the doors of every committee, save for the Rules Committee. It is a rare day when a bill proceeds through regular order from a committee of jurisdiction to the Rules Committee and down to the House floor. In fact, during the first session of the 113th Congress, major legislation repeatedly originated in the Rules Committee and was rushed to the House floor for an up-or-down vote.

Furthermore, during the first congressional session, the majority relied upon closed rules to shut out the minority and diminish the chance of any compromise. Under a closed rule, no amendments are allowed on the House floor. That cuts out, Mr. Speaker, more than half of the people in the United States of America who voted for Democrats.

During 2013, the majority set new records by approving 19 closed rules in a single week and an unprecedented 11 closed rules in a single day. Even those with no interest in, or knowledge of, the legislative process can understand the impact that such a closed process has on our ability to govern.

Every Member of this Chamber was sent here with a simple duty—to represent our constituents to the best of our ability. But, by closing down the legislative process, the majority is preventing 200 duly elected Members of Congress from being able to do just that. Collectively, we members of the minority represent more than 142 million Americans. Each one of us is entrusted to work on their behalf. How can we do that when the majority takes away our ability to participate

in marking up legislation, amending bills, and having a full and open debate?

The Rules Committee has the unique and powerful ability to open up the legislative process and get Congress working again. In our committee, we can amend bills, improve legislation, and set the terms of debate so every Member of the House can participate in the legislative process. That is why I am so dismayed and somewhat disgusted at the proposed rule the Rules Committee has carried to the floor today.

Before us is a single resolution for three bills. Under this resolution, two of those bills are considered under closed rules, which are not amendable, not discussable, and one is considered under a structured rule. And that one came up 2 days ago. It has had no committee action whatsoever.

The bill being considered under a structured rule tries to revoke virtually all regulatory powers from the EPA, the agency that protects our health, our rivers, our air, and our land.

At the same time, one of the bills being considered under a closed rule adds layers of red tape to the Department of Health and Human Services and demands that health care navigators provide everything but their blood type and family history to Congress on an almost daily basis. It is simply designed to slow up the work of signing up Americans for the health care that they want and deserve.

It is very clear this bill is not a serious attempt to serve the American people but is a tactic to keep health care navigators from doing their work. Instead of moving forward with these go-nowhere bills, we should be extending unemployment insurance to the millions of Americans struggling to find work. And without unemployment insurance, the economy is suffering every single day.

Just before we left for Christmas, the last day we were here, to end the debate on the rule of the budget, we had a vote that we could have done to extend the unemployment during the rules debate on the floor. That was under the previous question. The vote failed despite the fact that every Democrat and a Republican voted for it.

By the way, this bill was paid for. It was already taken care of by excess payments that we pay in agriculture subsidies. It was an extension for 3 months, but that was not good enough. So today, you are going to have another chance to do just that, to extend the unemployment insurance, and I strongly urge my colleagues to do it.

If my colleagues will join me in voting "no" on the previous question, a 3-month extension of unemployment benefits will come to the floor for an immediate vote. This is the same bipartisan bill that is moving forward in the Senate, and it deserves the same consideration here in the House.

Today, more than 1.3 million Americans and their families have lost access

to unemployment insurance. Soon, it will be over 2 million and, by probably the end of March or May, 5 million. For so many, it is their only source of income and the only way they can pay their heating bills and buy food during these cold winter days.

We have to stand up for the millions of Americans struggling to get by through no fault of their own, because, you remember, in order to be eligible for unemployment insurance, you have to prove that you are looking for work. So I strongly urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the previous question when it comes up so we can have an immediate vote to extend unemployment insurance and finally do something in this House and through this Rules Committee that will benefit Americans and make our constituents know that we count for something.

Mr. Speaker, The Majority has passed so few bills into law that it is on pace to become the least productive Congress in history. This inability to govern is directly related to the closed legislative process that the Majority has pursued with vigor over the course of the last year.

At the beginning of the 2nd Session of the 113th Congress, the Majority has practically shuttered the doors of every committee, save for the Rules Committee. It is a rare day when a bill proceeds through regular order—from a committee of jurisdiction to the Rules Committee and down to the House Floor. In fact, during the first session of the 113th Congress, major legislation repeatedly originated in the Rules Committee and was rushed to the House Floor for an up or down vote.

Furthermore, during the first Congressional session, the Majority relied upon closed rules to shut out the Minority and diminish the chance for compromise.

Under a closed rule, no amendments are allowed on the House Floor. During 2013, the Majority set new records by approving 19 closed rules in a single week and an unprecedented 11 closed rules in a single day!

Even those with no interest in, or knowledge of, the legislative process can understand the impact that such a closed process has on our ability to govern.

Every member of this chamber was sent here with a simple duty: to represent our constituents to the best of our ability.

Yet by closing down the legislative process, the Majority is preventing 200 duly elected Members of Congress from doing just that.

Collectively, we members of the Minority represent more than 142 million Americans. Each one of us has been entrusted to work on their behalf. How can we do that when the Majority takes away our ability to participate in marking up legislation, amending bills and having a full and open debate?

The Rules Committee has the unique and powerful ability to open up the legislative process and get Congress working again. In our committee we can amend bills, improve legislation, and set the terms of debate so that every Member of the House can participate in the legislative process.

That is why I am so dismayed at the proposed rule that the Majority in the Rules Committee has carried to the Floor today. Before us is a single resolution for three bills. Under this resolution, two bills will be considered

under closed rules and one will be considered under a structured rule.

The bill being considered under a structured rule tries to revoke virtually all regulatory powers from the EPA—the agency that protects our health, our rivers and our land.

At the same time, one of the bills being considered under a closed rule adds layers of red tape to the Department of Health and Human Services, and demands that healthcare navigators provide everything but their blood type and family history to Congress on an almost daily basis.

It is clear that this bill is not a serious attempt to serve the American people, but a tactic to keep healthcare navigators from providing millions of Americans with access to healthcare.

Instead of moving forward with these go-nowhere bills, we should be extending unemployment insurance to millions of Americans who are still struggling to find work.

Just before we left for Christmas, we had a vote on extending unemployment during a rules debate on the floor. That vote failed, despite the fact that every Democrat voted for it. As a result, more than 1.3 million Americans lost unemployment insurance on December 28th.

Today, we will give this chamber another chance to extend unemployment insurance—and I strongly urge my colleagues in doing just that.

If my colleagues will join me in voting “no” on the previous question, a 3-month extension of unemployment benefits will come to the floor for an immediate vote. This is the same bipartisan bill that is moving forward in the Senate, and it deserves the same consideration here in the House.

Right now, more than 1.3 million Americans have lost access to unemployment insurance in the last few weeks. For many, it is their only source of income and the only way they can pay their heating bills and stay warm during these cold winter days.

We must stand up for the millions of Americans who are struggling to get by in these tough economic times. I strongly urge my colleagues to vote “no” on the previous question so that we have an immediate vote to extend unemployment insurance and finally provide for the millions of Americans in need.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to the time remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has 16 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Colorado has 13 minutes remaining.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, it is often said those who don't remember their history are doomed to repeat it.

The Rules Committee is an important function of this House. It is an important function of this body. Prior to 3 years ago, the Rules Committee was under the jurisdiction of the Democrats. They controlled the Rules Committee throughout the entirety of the 111th Congress. You may recall, that was the first 2 years of the first Obama term. In those 2 years under Speaker PELOSI, this was the first Congress in history—the first Congress in the history of the Republic—not to have a single bill considered under an open rule process.

Now, since Republicans resumed the majority at the beginning of 2011, 31 bills have come under an open rule. The track record may not be perfect, but it is inestimably better than what preceded it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I would remind the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) that this particular rule has two closed rules on two of the three bills.

With that, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I want to join the Rules Committee and thank Members on both sides of the aisle for their hard work, but I want to associate myself with Ranking Member SLAUGHTER for recognizing that we represent millions of people, and the constant closed-rule approach for bills that have not even been heard by committee makes it difficult to represent your constituents. So I associate myself with her plea for equity and comity.

I also ask that we recognize that 1.3 million and growing, 3.6 million, 4,000 a week, of the individuals who worked and invested in this Nation have received letters, like my constituent in Houston, letters with no offer of assistance but simply that your unemployment benefit, insurance benefit, has been canceled. Cancel your life, cancel your housing, cancel your food, cancel your medicine, cancel taking care of your children, cancel your life.

And so I believe that it is extremely important that we vote today—again—and we hope that we will draw bipartisan support, to avoid the loss of some 200,000 jobs, to avoid the loss of serving 20,000 military veterans who are in fact beneficiaries of unemployment insurance, 1.3 million Americans, 2 million children impacted, to avoid the loss to the American economy. Mr. Speaker, \$1.55 is generated by this insurance, millions of dollars to be lost.

And then I would say that it is important to be able to have a rule structure, more than a structured rule, more than a closed rule, because the bills that are before us today, the underlying bills, I am opposed to because my district is impacted by the Superfund.

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

Mr. POLIS. I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I thank the gentleman.

The three Superfund bills, no involvement of the Federal Government, taking authority away from the Federal Government, having the States override the Federal Government on Superfunds. There are neighborhoods that are still suffering.

And then with respect to this issue of privacy, I support the idea; but what I would say to my friends, and this privacy with healthcare.gov, what I would

say to my friends is that we cannot continue to chip away at a bill, the Affordable Care Act, where millions of people have received health care. Let's work to ensure privacy for all of the sites of the Federal Government. Let's not pick away at the Affordable Care Act, which has been documented that it is secure, healthcare.gov.

If Republicans wish to help make all of government secure, we are ready to do that, but what I would suggest is that this bill is not going in the right direction. I ask for a “no” vote on the rule and on the underlying bills.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I tire of going through this history lesson every time we come down to the floor, but may I remind you that when the now-Affordable Care Act was passed into law, this was a bill that came over to the House from the Senate. Sure enough, the House had sent the bill over to the Senate in July of 2009, H.R. 3590. It was a bill that dealt with housing. The bill that dealt with housing was amended. The amendment read, “Strike all after the enacting clause and insert,” and the health care language, which was de novo, the health care language was inserted.

Now, to be sure, the House had considered a health care reform bill, H.R. 3200. H.R. 3200 has gone to the ether of history. H.R. 3590 passed in the Senate, a 60-vote margin on Christmas Eve in 2009, and then was thrown over to the House of Representatives. Did we have a hearing on H.R. 3590 in the Committee on Energy and Commerce? No, we did not. Did they have a hearing in the appropriate subcommittee of Ways and Means on H.R. 3590, as amended? No, they did not.

The bill came to the Rules Committee. It came to the Rules Committee. I attempted to offer amendments. I was told, No, thank you. The bill was perfect the way it is, doesn't need any changes. This bill that affects every man, woman, and child in this country for the next three decades in a very unfavorable way was passed without any input from the then-minority, the Republicans in the House of Representatives.

So it is beyond comprehension that we can continue to have these arguments about closed processes. This, after all, is the granddaddy of all closed processes. And the consequence, the drafting errors, the problems embedded in the structure, could not be dealt with during the normal legislative process, which is why so much authority has been transferred to the executive branch, to the agencies, and why they are now essentially writing the laws that affect so many Americans.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1315

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY).

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding.

I was listening as a student of history myself to our friend from Texas. In that little last bit about affordable health care, he left out one little piece of history, which was that the Republicans of both the Senate and the House, to a person, decided it a priority to oppose the health care reform act no matter what was in it.

To now come back and say we weren't given an opportunity to amend something that we decided we were going to oppose—remember Jim DeMint's words: if we can defeat this bill, it will be President Obama's Waterloo, no matter what is in it. So we need to remember history in its full context.

And speaking of history, knowing of my distinguished friend's love of it, it was almost 35 years ago when the 96th Congress answered the cries of communities across the country facing the life-threatening effects of hazardous toxic waste. Who can forget, speaking of history, the Love Canal disaster in New York or the Valley of the Drums in Kentucky, the unexplained increase in the incidence of cancer, birth defects, and miscarriages?

In an overwhelmingly bipartisan effort then, that Congress did the right thing by creating the Superfund program, offering communities a way to remediate contaminated sites, to protect public health, and hold polluters accountable.

The success of the Superfund is clear: according to the EPA, as of April of last year, remedial actions have been completed at more than 1,145 national priority list sites, and an additional 365 have been completely cleaned up and deleted from the list. That is called success. That is called a program that is working. That is 70 percent of the sites that had been added to the priority list.

Today, human exposure is under control at 1,361 priority sites and contaminated groundwater under control at 1,069 sites.

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

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

Mr. CONNOLLY. Yet, despite that success, with communities still in need, in process, the House majority wants to peel back that progress and repeal what we have done.

Can the Superfund be improved? Of course. We are committed to do that. But the answer isn't letting industry off the hook and leaving families exposed to hazardous waste and high cancer rates.

I urge defeat of this bill.

I thank my colleague for giving me the extra time.

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

I would point out this bill before us today does not—does not—change the Superfund, but it does allow States the flexibility to deal with problems in their States as they see fit.

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, on this 50th anniversary of the war on poverty, 1.4 million Americans have lost emergency unemployment insurance and thousands more stand to lose it each day, each week, that Congress fails to act. If we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule that will allow the House to consider legislation that is identical to the bipartisan measure being considered in the Senate and would restore unemployment insurance to those who have lost it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE), a leader in the effort to restore unemployment insurance, to discuss our proposal.

Mr. KILDEE. Thank you, Mr. POLIS, for the time.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in defeating the previous question, as my colleague said, so that we can immediately take up the question of the extension of emergency unemployment to millions of Americans who have lost their job and who are seeking to find their next opportunity to contribute to our economy and to support their families.

I am part of the freshman class. We just began our second year in Congress. Something about the 2012 class that I think defines us is that we believe that we were sent here by the electorate of 2012 not to posture, but to get things done, to take action, to solve problems. That is why myself and the rest of the Democratic freshman class yesterday sent a letter to Speaker BOEHNER asking that he immediately bring up an extension to the unemployment compensation for so many Americans.

Let's be clear about something, though. Unlike what I have heard from so many on the other side, being unemployed is not a choice; it is not a lifestyle to be sought. It is a condition that is often unanticipated, and it is one that nobody in my district that I know of who is unemployed would ever seek to try to maintain.

I can only speak for the people I represent, but I suspect this is true of my colleagues. Folks that we represent back home that are out of work would gladly, today, trade unemployment compensation for a job that puts them to work and gives them the dignity of work and the ability to meet their obligations to their family and their community. It is about survival. It is about making your rent payment. It is about being able to pay your car payment, to put food on the table for your kids. It is about being able to keep the house warm. It is not a lifestyle to be sought.

I think the notion that somehow people who are unemployed want to be there is condescending and offensive.

I urge my colleagues to join me in defeating this previous question so that we can immediately take up the work that the American people are asking us to take up.

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

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

Mr. KILDEE. And that is to make sure that 1.3 million Americans have a chance to support their families until they can find meaningful work. Eleven million people since 2008 have been saved from poverty because of unemployment compensation. That unemployment extension was supported by the vast majority of Members of this House, signed by President Bush, with no strings attached.

What is different about 2014 than what was experienced in 2008? Nothing, except that we have the same obligation to those same Americans to make sure that they don't go broke, that they don't lose their house, that they don't lose their car, that they don't lose their family, as a result of the lack of basic decency.

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the Democratic whip.

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

I appreciate this opportunity to comment not only upon this rule which provides, of course, for mostly closed rules—no amendments, no ability to change or modify, particularly two bills that had no hearings, went to no committees, and were reported out doing stuff that we did for 2013 almost without exception—but what I really rise to say is that I want to urge every Member to vote against the previous question.

Mr. Speaker, I know the American public will hear “previous question.” What does that mean? The previous question, if defeated, will give us the opportunity to put on this floor what the overwhelming majority of the American people want on this floor, which I understand the gentleman from Michigan, as I just was walking in, I think was talking about. That is to deal with the most pressing issue confronting this country right now today. That is that we have 1.3 million Americans who have simply been dropped through whatever safety net we thought we had constructed.

So, Mr. Speaker, the American public understands, the previous question will give us the opportunity, if it is defeated, to put that legislation on the floor now, to extend for those 1.3 million people the help of the American people who want to do it. In every poll they say, no, we ought to have this help.

When George W. Bush was President of the United States, five times we extended unemployment insurance for long-term unemployed—five times—without paying for it.

And make no mistake about it; the vote on the previous question is whether or not you want to give long-term unemployed who have lost their insurance and are having trouble putting food on their tables, if you want to give

them help, you will vote “no” on the previous question. Don’t hide behind a procedural issue. This is a substantive issue. This is an issue of whether we are going to give help now.

The American public that is for this ought to be looking at it. And every Member who votes “yes” on the previous question is voting not—not—to give help to those folks, 1.3 million of them, 20,000 veterans who can’t find a job. And there is only one job available for every three people that are looking for a job.

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

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

Mr. HOYER. That is why George W. Bush extended unemployment. That is why we ought to do it. And we can do it. We have the ability to do it. Vote “no” on the previous question. It is a substantive vote on whether or not you want to help the long-term unemployed who have lost, as of December 28, 3 days after Christmas, the season of giving and caring, whether you want to give them the unemployment insurance that they count on to feed themselves and their families and have their heads above water.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose this rule and urge a vote instead to bring to the floor a bill introduced by the ranking member of the ways and means committee, my friend Mr. TIERNEY.

His bill will do what Congress ought to have done before we left for the holidays: extend the emergency unemployment insurance benefits that were cut off so suddenly for 1.3 million of our fellow citizens who are looking for work.

It is shameful that Republicans continue to block an extension of this lifeline for so many who are struggling to find jobs and are facing an extremely difficult job market, where in some places there are three job seekers for each open position.

Democrats will continue to put pressure on our colleagues across the aisle to work with us in a bipartisan way to extend these emergency benefits while our jobs recovery continues.

Representative TIERNEY’s bill would extend these benefits for three months to allow Congress time to work on a long-term solution.

There is no reason why 1.3 million people—a number that will grow by an average 72,000 a week for as long as Congress fails to act—should have to go without the emergency income that supports them and their families.

We need to promote job creation and get our people back to work, while at the same time ensuring that we’re helping people stay out of poverty.

I call on my Republican friends to join with us in extending these emergency benefits right now and then working together to invest in the economic competitiveness that will create the jobs we need.

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE).

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

In the last 12 days, nearly 1.4 million Americans have been cut off from their

emergency unemployment benefits. Thousands more Americans will lose their benefits every week without congressional action.

It is unforgivable that this Congress will adjourn tomorrow without addressing this crisis. Instead of offering a solution to extend emergency unemployment benefits, this rule does not allow us to address this critical issue of extending unemployment insurance immediately.

The longer we wait to fix this problem, the more serious it becomes for the long-term unemployed and their families. Punishing unemployed Americans and their families who have been hit hard in this tough recession through no fault of their own is just plain wrong.

My home State Senator, Senator JACK REED, has offered a proposal in the Senate. It is a critical step in the right direction to preserve this critical lifeline while we work on a long-term solution, and we should do the same thing here.

Surely my colleagues on the other side of the aisle want the opportunity to vote on extending unemployment insurance. So I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on the previous question, to defeat the previous question, so we can take up the issue of extending unemployment insurance for many Rhode Islanders and Americans all across this country who desperately need these benefits.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire, does the gentleman have any other speakers? If not, I am prepared to close.

Mr. POLIS. I am prepared to close.

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment in the RECORD, along with extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote “no” and defeat the previous question.

The Senate has passed a bipartisan, comprehensive immigration bill, and the Senate is debating unemployment insurance. Meanwhile, the House hasn’t dedicated a single second of legislative floor time to any immigration reform bill that would address identity theft.

Let’s move forward and pass bills that matter to the American people rather than political bills that aren’t going anywhere.

I urge a “no” vote on the rule, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, one of the questions for people who have been watching this debate, I’m sure one of the questions that they have, is there any difference as to

how the private sector is treated if and when a data breach occurs versus a Federal agency? The simple fact of the matter is there is a difference.

□ 1330

The private sector is governed under State laws and, yes, by some Federal regulations as well.

In fact, earlier this month, in a publication called *The Hill*, entitled, “Target’s data breach sparks calls for action,” there was significant discussion about, perhaps, there being more activity on the part of the Federal Trade Commission in protecting consumers who have been exposed to a data breach.

What are the protections for people harmed with a data breach by the Federal Government?

In fact, for that, there is not legislation, there is not a law that was signed by any administration, but there is an executive order of the President’s, dating from May 22, 2007, a so-called OMB Circular.

The OMB Circular dealing with data breaches under the section “Timeliness of the Notification” reads:

Agencies should provide notification without unreasonable delay following the discovery of a breach, consistent with the needs of law enforcement and national security and any measures necessary for your agency to determine the scope of the breach and, if applicable, to restore the reasonable integrity of the computerized data system compromise. Decisions to delay notification should be made by the agency head.

You get the impression that this is, perhaps, a rather open-ended or diffuse or poorly defined timeliness of notification for our constituents who are harmed by a data breach by a Federal agency. So that is one of the problems that we are here today to correct.

Today’s rule provides for the consideration of a critical jobs bill and critical security bills to clean up our environment and to protect Americans’ personal data.

I certainly want to thank Mr. GARDNER, Mr. TERRY and Chairman PTTTS for their thoughtful bills.

I urge my colleagues to support both the rule and the underlying pieces of legislation.

The material previously referred to by Mr. POLIS is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 455 OFFERED BY
MR. POLIS OF COLORADO

At the end of the resolution, add the following new sections:

Sec. 4 Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3824) to extend emergency unemployment benefits. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill

are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommend with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

Sec. 5. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of the bill as specified in section 4 of this resolution.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the Democratic minority to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives (VI, 308-311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as "a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge." To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that "the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

The Republican majority may say "the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever." But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: "Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment."

In Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled "Amending Special Rules" states: "a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate." (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: "Upon re-

jection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon."

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I urge an "aye" vote on the previous question. I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of adoption.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 226, nays 191, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 5]

YEAS—226

Aderholt	Duncan (SC)	Kelly (PA)
Amash	Duncan (TN)	King (IA)
Amodei	Ellmers	King (NY)
Bachmann	Farenthold	Kingston
Bachus	Fincher	Kinzinger (IL)
Barletta	Fitzpatrick	Kline
Barr	Fleischmann	Labrador
Benish	Fleming	LaMalfa
Bentivolio	Flores	Lamborn
Bilirakis	Forbes	Lance
Bishop (UT)	Portenberry	Lankford
Black	Fox	Latham
Blackburn	Franks (AZ)	Latta
Boustany	Frelinghuysen	LoBiondo
Brady (TX)	Gardner	Long
Bridenstine	Garrett	Lucas
Brooks (AL)	Gerlach	Luetkemeyer
Brooks (IN)	Gibbs	Lummis
Broun (GA)	Gibson	Marchant
Buchanan	Gingrey (GA)	Marino
Bucshon	Gohmert	Massie
Burgess	Goodlatte	McAllister
Byrne	Gosar	McCarthy (CA)
Calvert	Gowdy	McCauley
Camp	Granger	McHenry
Campbell	Graves (GA)	McKeon
Cantor	Graves (MO)	McKinley
Capito	Griffin (AR)	McMorris
Carter	Griffith (VA)	Rodgers
Cassidy	Grimm	Meadows
Chabot	Hall	Meehan
Chaffetz	Hanna	Messer
Coble	Harper	Mica
Coffman	Harris	Miller (FL)
Collins (GA)	Hartzer	Miller (MI)
Collins (NY)	Hastings (WA)	Miller, Gary
Conaway	Hensarling	Mullin
Cook	Herrera Beutler	Mulvaney
Cotton	Holding	Murphy (PA)
Cramer	Hudson	Neugebauer
Crawford	Huelskamp	Noem
Crenshaw	Huizenga (MI)	Nugent
Culberson	Hultgren	Nunes
Daines	Hunter	Nunnelee
Davis, Rodney	Hurt	Olson
Denham	Issa	Palazzo
Dent	Jenkins	Paulsen
DeSantis	Johnson (OH)	Pearce
DesJarlais	Johnson, Sam	Perry
Diaz-Balart	Jordan	Petri
Duffy	Joyce	Pittenger

Pitts	Runyan	Tiberi
Poe (TX)	Ryan (WI)	Tipton
Pompeo	Salmon	Turner
Posney	Sanford	Upton
Price (GA)	Scalise	Valadao
Radel	Schock	Wagner
Reed	Schweikert	Walberg
Reichert	Scott, Austin	Walden
Renacci	Sensenbrenner	Walorski
Ribble	Sessions	Weber (TX)
Rice (SC)	Shimkus	Webster (FL)
Rigell	Shuster	Weststrum
Roby	Simpson	Westmoreland
Roe (TN)	Smith (MO)	Whitfield
Rogers (AL)	Smith (NE)	Williams
Rogers (KY)	Smith (NJ)	Wilson (SC)
Rogers (MI)	Smith (TX)	Wittman
Rohrabacher	Southerland	Wolf
Rokita	Stewart	Womack
Rooney	Stivers	Woodall
Ros-Lehtinen	Stockman	Yoder
Roskam	Stutzman	Yoho
Ross	Terry	Young (AK)
Rothfus	Thompson (PA)	Young (IN)
Royce	Thornberry	

NAYS—191

Andrews	Garcia	Murphy (FL)
Barber	Grayson	Nadler
Barrow (GA)	Green, Al	Napolitano
Bass	Green, Gene	Neal
Beatty	Grijalva	Negrete McLeod
Becerra	Gutiérrez	Nolan
Bera (CA)	Hahn	O'Rourke
Bishop (GA)	Hanabusa	Owens
Bishop (NY)	Hastings (FL)	Pallone
Blumenauer	Heck (WA)	Pascrell
Bonamici	Higgins	Pastor (AZ)
Brady (PA)	Himes	Payne
Braley (IA)	Hinojosa	Pelosi
Brown (FL)	Holt	Perlmutter
Brownley (CA)	Honda	Peters (CA)
Bustos	Horsford	Peters (MI)
Butterfield	Hoyer	Peterson
Capps	Huffman	Pingree (ME)
Capuano	Israel	Pocan
Cárdenas	Jackson Lee	Polis
Carney	Jeffries	Price (NC)
Carson (IN)	Johnson (GA)	Quigley
Cartwright	Johnson, E. B.	Rahall
Castor (FL)	Kaptur	Rangel
Castro (TX)	Keating	Richmond
Chu	Kelly (IL)	Roybal-Allard
Ciциlline	Kennedy	Sanchez, Loretta
Clark (MA)	Kildee	Sarbanes
Clarke (NY)	Kilmer	Schakowsky
Clay	Kind	Schneider
Clyburn	Kirkpatrick	Schrader
Cohen	Kuster	Schwartz
Connolly	Langevin	Scott (VA)
Conyers	Larsen (WA)	Scott, David
Cooper	Larson (CT)	Serrano
Costa	Lee (CA)	Sewell (AL)
Courtney	Levin	Shea-Porter
Crowley	Lewis	Sherman
Cuellar	Lipinski	Sinema
Cummings	Loeb sack	Sires
Davis (CA)	Lofgren	Slaughter
Davis, Danny	Lowenthal	Smith (WA)
DeFazio	Lowey	Speier
DeGette	Lujan Grisham	Swalwell (CA)
Delaney	(NM)	Takano
DeLauro	Lujan, Ben Ray	Thompson (CA)
DelBene	(NM)	Thompson (MS)
Deutch	Lynch	Tierney
Dingell	Maffei	Titus
Doggett	Maloney,	Tonko
Doyle	Carolyn	Tsongas
Duckworth	Maloney, Sean	Van Hollen
Edwards	Matheson	Vargas
Ellison	Matsui	Veasey
Engel	McCollum	Vela
Enyart	McDermott	Velázquez
Eshoo	McGovern	Visclosky
Esty	McIntyre	Walz
Farr	McNerney	Wasserman
Fattah	Meeks	Schultz
Foster	Meng	Waters
Frankel (FL)	Michaud	Waxman
Fudge	Miller, George	Welch
Gallego	Moore	Wilson (FL)
Garamendi	Moran	Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—15

Barton	Guthrie	McClintock
Cleaver	Heck (NV)	Ruiz
Cole	Jones	
Gabbard	McCarthy (NY)	

Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)

Sánchez, Linda
T.
Schiff

□ 1356

Messrs. JEFFRIES, VELA, and NADLER changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 5, had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 223, noes 186, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 6]

AYES—223

Aderholt	Foxx	McAllister
Amash	Franks (AZ)	McCarthy (CA)
Amodei	Frelinghuysen	McCaul
Bachmann	Gardner	McHenry
Bachus	Garrett	McIntyre
Barletta	Gerlach	McKeon
Barr	Gibbs	McKinley
Benishek	Gibson	McMorris
Bentivolio	Gingrey (GA)	Rodgers
Bilirakis	Gohmert	Meadows
Bishop (UT)	Goodlatte	Meehan
Black	Gosar	Messer
Blackburn	Gowdy	Mica
Boustany	Granger	Miller (FL)
Brady (TX)	Graves (GA)	Miller (MI)
Bridenstine	Graves (MO)	Miller, Gary
Brooks (AL)	Griffin (AR)	Mullin
Brooks (IN)	Griffith (VA)	Mulvaney
Broun (GA)	Grimm	Murphy (PA)
Buchanan	Hall	Neugebauer
Bucshon	Hanna	Noem
Burgess	Harper	Nugent
Byrne	Harris	Nunnelee
Calvert	Hartzler	Olson
Camp	Hastings (WA)	Palazzo
Campbell	Hensarling	Paulsen
Cantor	Herrera Beutler	Pearce
Capito	Holding	Perry
Carter	Hudson	Petri
Cassidy	Huelskamp	Pittenger
Chabot	Huizenga (MI)	Pitts
Chaffetz	Hultgren	Poe (TX)
Coble	Hunter	Pompeo
Coffman	Hurt	Posey
Collins (NY)	Issa	Price (GA)
Conaway	Jenkins	Radel
Cook	Johnson (OH)	Reed
Cotton	Johnson, Sam	Reichert
Cramer	Jordan	Renacci
Crawford	Joyce	Ribble
Crenshaw	Kelly (PA)	Rice (SC)
Culberson	King (IA)	Rigell
Daines	King (NY)	Roby
Davis, Rodney	Kingston	Roe (TN)
Denham	Kinzinger (IL)	Rogers (AL)
Dent	Kline	Rogers (MI)
DeSantis	Labrador	Rohrabacher
DesJarlais	LaMalfa	Rokita
Diaz-Balart	Lamborn	Rooney
Duffy	Lance	Ros-Lehtinen
Duncan (SC)	Lankford	Roskam
Duncan (TN)	Latham	Ross
Ellmers	Latta	Rothfus
Farenthold	LoBiondo	Royce
Fincher	Long	Runyan
Fitzpatrick	Lucas	Ryan (WI)
Fleischmann	Luetkemeyer	Salmon
Fleming	Lummis	Sanford
Flores	Marchant	Scalise
Forbes	Marino	Schock
Fortenberry	Massie	Schweikert

Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southernland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman

Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)

NOES—186

Andrews
Barber
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
Green, Al

Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsock
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Luján, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney,
Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matheson
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano

NOT VOTING—23

Barton
Becerra
Cárdenas
Castro (TX)
Cleaver
Cole
Collins (GA)
Fattah
Gabbard
Guthrie
Heck (NV)
Jones
McCarthy (NY)
McClintock
Nunes
Rogers (KY)

□ 1406

So the resolution was agreed to. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascarell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)

Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Schiff
Turner

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 6, had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

REDUCING EXCESSIVE DEADLINE OBLIGATIONS ACT OF 2013

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 2279.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 455 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. 2279.

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

□ 1409

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. 2279) to amend the Solid Waste Disposal Act relating to review of regulations under such Act and to amend the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 relating to financial responsibility for classes of facilities, with Mr. YODER 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 Ohio (Mr. JOHNSON) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to rise in support of the amendment to H.R. 2279, the Reducing Excessive Deadline Obligations, or REDO, Act of 2013, which also includes my legislation, H.R. 2226, the Federal and State Partnership for Environmental Protection Act, and Mr. LATTA's bill, H.R. 2318, the Federal Facility Accountability Act of 2013.

Our goal with all three of these bills is to modernize some of the environmental laws that we oversee and make sure that the States are playing a significant role in implementing them. To do that, we began this Congress with a hearing on the role of the States in protecting the environment. State environmental protection officials shared their experience and expertise with us and helped us better understand the complex partnership between the States and the Federal Government as States implement Federal laws, such as the Solid Waste Disposal Act, and the EPA implements the Comprehensive