

The Court has allowed even more money into campaigns, and this threatens to drown out the voices of ordinary citizens.

Today's Supreme Court McCutcheon decision is the worst affront to democracy since Citizens United. Congress must take action.

COMPREHENSIVE IMMIGRATION REFORM

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

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, just give us a vote. Just give us a vote on comprehensive immigration reform.

The United States Senate passed a bill almost a year ago, in a bipartisan fashion, on comprehensive immigration reform. Americans want comprehensive immigration reform.

We have a bill, H.R. 15, which provides for comprehensive immigration reform. It would pass this House, but for some reason or another, the Republican majority will not bring it up. It will not allow the House to vote on it.

The Senate had the courage to vote on it. The House ought to bring this up and pass comprehensive immigration reform. It can be done this week or next week. Let's get it done. Just give us a vote.

FUNDING FOR THE NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH

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

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, the other week, I met with leaders of the San Diego medical research community, who had a unified message: we need to end the cuts in research that have slowed medical innovation for the last decade.

I am proud to be leading the bipartisan effort, along with nearly 200 of my colleagues, to push for over \$32 billion in Federal funding for the NIH.

This is a very personal issue. Almost all of us know someone who is struggling with a disease for which the National Institutes of Health funding is used to find a cure. That person could be a mother, a father, a family friend or, even more heart-wrenching, a child. The disease could be cancer, Alzheimer's, diabetes, MS, or any of the other diseases that people face every day.

It is more than a matter of scientific research; it is a matter of economics. For a generation, California has been a world leader in life sciences innovation, and our State is home to the most jobs, to the most companies, to the world's greatest concentration of top-tier research institutions. It is time to reverse the budget cuts that threaten this ecosystem and to increase the NIH budget to \$32 billion.

RAISE THE MINIMUM WAGE

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, all across America and around the world, the men and women in the United States military serve us and serve us well.

Would you wonder whether or not their families back home would be eligible for an increase in the minimum wage?

Their families may be blue-collar workers or workers in the service industries, and here they are, willing to sacrifice their lives, and we here in the United States Congress won't raise the minimum wage to \$10.10. What an outrage. Even the possible compromise that is percolating around has the audacity to suggest that \$7.25 is okay, that we will raise it just a little bit. But you don't understand the facts: \$10.10 is over a 3-year period.

Then today, on the floor of the House, a brilliant idea. H.R. 2575, I believe is the name. This one wants to eliminate the opportunity of those who are working 30 hours a week to get health care. Across the way, in the Budget hearing, the Republican budget is cutting trillions of dollars in social services and Medicaid.

Raise the minimum wage. Take the American people off of social needs, social assistance. Stop the tomfoolery of turning this country backwards.

□ 1230

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2575, SAVE AMERICAN WORKERS ACT OF 2014

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 530 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 530

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 2575) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the 30-hour threshold for classification as a full-time employee for purposes of the employer mandate in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and replace it with 40 hours. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Ways and Means now printed in the bill shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) three hours of debate 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.

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 the gentleman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), 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 may 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 530 provides for consideration of a critical piece of legislation passed out of the Ways and Means Committee designed to address a critical flaw in the Affordable Care Act, which is causing workers to lose hours at their job and thus lose wages to help put food on their tables and feed their families and pay their utility bills to heat their homes in the winter and cool their homes in the summer.

H.R. 2575, the bipartisan Save American Workers Act of 2014, fixes this flaw by changing the newly created labor rule in the Affordable Care Act, which defines full-time work at 30 hours per week and places that definition back where the American public has always believed it to be, at 40 hours per week.

The rule before us today provides for 3 hours of debate. That is triple the standard hour of debate that most bills before this body receive. This is done in order to fully discuss this important labor issue affecting so many Americans.

To maintain this targeted focus—the exact kind of fix that the President claims he is interested in discussing with Republicans in order to make his law more workable—no amendments were made in order. This allows the House to fully debate this crucial issue without the possibility of unrelated issues being brought into the debate.

Indeed, this bill is so targeted, dealing with one single provision in the Affordable Care Act, that it does not repeal the Affordable Care Act—a charge I have no doubt we will hear several times over today—but in fact simply changes a definition in the bill.

Moreover, during the markup of this legislation in the Ways and Means Committee, no amendments were offered by either the majority or the minority. As always, the minority is afforded the customary motion to recommit on the bill.

Mr. Speaker, as a result of the Affordable Care Act's requirement that businesses with 50 or more employees provide health insurance coverage to those employees working 30 or more hours a week, employers across the Nation—from schools to universities to municipalities to restaurants—are being forced to cut workers' hours or face unsustainable employment costs to their businesses and organizations.

As we are seeing—and indeed, as many on this side predicted prior to the controversial and contentious passage of the Affordable Care Act—the bill fundamentally changed labor law in this country, creating a new standard called the 30-hour workweek, a standard 30-hour workweek, a shorter workweek than even imposed by the country of France.

As a result, workers' hours are being cut and productivity in this country, a country that has always prided itself on the work ethic of its citizens, will decrease over time. This is what an onerous government regulation can and will do—suppress innovation and disadvantage our businesses.

Many members of the Democratic Party have been outspoken in clamoring for an extension to long-term unemployment benefits, which would extend government assistance to unemployed Americans well beyond a year's worth of benefits; yet there is something that can be done today which will have the actual, practical effect of putting more money into people's pockets.

We have heard story after story, from every State in the Union, that employers are dropping workers from even 39 hours per week to 29 or fewer hours, potentially 10 work hours a week that workers won't see in their paychecks, which could mean hundreds or more dollars that men and women won't have to feed their families or pay their bills. Increasing workers' hours increases the money that people have in their disposable income.

The Affordable Care Act fundamentally changed labor law in this country, and the repercussions of this might not be felt for years to come. This is indeed the prototype of the dangerous, slippery slope.

What other labor laws will be reinterpreted to define full-time employment at 30 hours per week? Do people intend to impose overtime rules on employers who employ people for over 30 hours per week? It is yet another regulation which would only result in businesses cutting more hours.

What will the National Labor Relations Board reinterpret, knowing that the very fabric of labor law is based on a 30-hour workweek, instead of that previously established standard of 40 hours per week?

Prior to the passage of the Affordable Care Act, employers were already overwhelmingly providing health insurance to their employees working 40 hours a week.

Making the change contained in Mr. YOUNG's legislation will cause the least amount of disruption in the labor market, and I would submit, with the economy as it is today, making the least disruptive change in the labor market would be desirable.

The Congressional Budget Office estimates that the Affordable Care Act will reduce the total number of hours worked by about 1.5 percent to 2 percent during the period from 2017 to

2024. This is almost entirely because workers will choose to supply less labor.

Because of this, the Congressional Budget Office projects a decline in the number of workers of about 2 million in 2017, rising to about 2.5 million in 2024, all as a net result of the Affordable Care Act.

The latest Congressional Budget Office figures show that the Affordable Care Act will increase spending by almost \$2 trillion—double the estimate from 2010. The Joint Committee on Taxation states that taxpayers will be on the hook for another \$1.1 trillion over the next decade.

Americans earning as little as \$25,000 a year will pay more because of the law, even after accounting for the \$1 trillion in premium cost-sharing subsidies.

Mr. Speaker, let's be clear about what is happening here today. This bill before us does not repeal the President's takeover of health care in this country. It does not undermine the Affordable Care Act.

It does not take health insurance from a single person in the country. It is a fix to a fatal flaw contained within the law, similar to the seven fixes that have passed both Houses of Congress and were signed into law by the President.

Does anyone miss the 1099 paperwork regulation, which was repealed early on after the passage of the Affordable Care Act? Does anyone legitimately miss the CLASS Act, which was repealed on the very last day of the last Congress?

I think not. Had I not reminded you of those two parts of the bill, I doubt you would remember them.

This is no different from those 37 unilateral fixes that the President and his Secretaries of Health and Human Services and Treasury have made on their own, with no input from either legislative body. It is a fix to stop legislation that will cause people to lose their work.

If all sides cannot agree to fix a provision within the Affordable Care Act that is preventing people from working, then it is simply empty rhetoric to claim that the President or the other body or this body is interested in any fixes at all.

I encourage my colleagues to vote "yes" on the rule and "yes" on the underlying bill.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise against the 52nd closed rule and the 52nd attempt to dismantle the ACA, the Affordable Care Act.

Once again, my colleagues in the Republican Party are standing on the wrong side of history. In 1935, President Franklin D. Roosevelt proposed an ambitious program called Social Se-

curity in order to ensure that America's seniors had a measure of financial safety in their old age, a floor through which they could not fall; yet as it was being debated in the halls of Congress, Republicans and their allies in the business community tried to portray Social Security as something far more sinister.

Representative Daniel Reed of New York predicted that, under Social Security, Americans would feel "the lash of the dictator," while Republican Senator Daniel Hastings of Delaware declared that Social Security would "end the progress of a great country."

Republican Congressman John Taber even said of the proposed law:

Never in the history of the world has any measure been brought here so insidiously designed as to prevent business recovery and to enslave workers.

Thirty years later, these same arguments are being used to decry the creation of Medicare as the beginning of socialized medicine, and it was strictly with the votes of Democrats that the legislation to create Medicare was passed out of the Ways and Means Committee and the Rules Committee before being brought to the floor.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, we have been through this same story many times. A cynical person might believe that one of the reasons that the ACA has been fought so hard, as this is the third time Republicans failed to come up with any program that would help Americans either achieve independence or security in their old age, is that since every one of them voted against it, it is in their best interest that it fail.

All those claims that were made were absolutely untrue; and today, despite the current majority's attempts to portray the Affordable Care Act as another law that will steal personal freedoms, destroy the economy, and hurt American workers, the facts are once again proving them wrong.

Instead, it is quickly becoming clear that the Affordable Care Act will stand alongside Social Security and Medicare as an enduring commitment to the welfare of our fellow citizens.

Mr. Speaker, when we passed the Affordable Care Act in 2010, our Nation had reached the depths of a crisis that was decades in the making.

In fact, Presidents dating back as far as Harry Truman, including Republicans like Richard Nixon and Democrats like Bill Clinton, saw the urgent need to reform our health care system and expand coverage to every American, yet each time that a President tried to act, their efforts failed.

As a result, by 2010, our Nation was spending 17.6 percent of the Nation's gross domestic product on health care, and yet a record high number of 49.9 million Americans had no care at all.

With the health care crisis more acute than ever, President Obama and Democrats in Congress decided that we had to act. In fact, the percentage of GDP that health care was consuming

was rising beyond 18 percent, causing a serious threat to our economy. Thus began one of the most comprehensive legislative debates in history, a debate that included the views of both Democrats and Republicans, since they occupy all committees, and a debate conducted in full view of the American people.

The House held nearly 100 hours of hearings and 83 hours of committee markups. We heard from 181 witnesses, and 239 amendments from both Democrats and Republicans were considered in the three committees of jurisdiction, and 121 of them were adopted.

□ 1245

Finally, the bill was available for 72 hours before Members were asked to vote on it on the House floor. Despite this thorough and collaborative process, not a single member of the Republican Party on this floor voted for the historic law, true to their pattern of decades.

Today, thanks exclusively to the votes of Democrats, the numbers of Americans with access to health care is going up, and most importantly, the cost to providing health care to our citizens is slowing down. We have seen the slowest growth in the rise of health care in these last 2 years than we have in 50 years.

We all know that 7.2 million Americans registered for health insurance this year through the online health care exchanges—and even more in State exchanges, and we don't have that number yet. Indeed, RAND put out a report this week stating that 20 million Americans are benefiting, including the number of children under 26 who are on their parents' health care insurance. So, this week, in addition to that, the Los Angeles Times said at least 9.5 million previously uninsured Americans now have health insurance because of the ACA.

For those of us who have been carrying health insurance and been lucky enough to have it from our employers, each of our policies have cost \$1,000 more because of what we were having to pay for uncompensated care for those who had no health insurance. That alone is one measure that is going to reduce the cost of insurance.

In the face of its success, it is not surprising the majority has come here today with a 52nd attempt to undermine the Affordable Care Act. After unanimously opposing its passage, spending millions of dollars campaigning against it, the majority has firmly planted their feet on the wrong side of history. Their only way forward is to dismantle the ACA as quickly as possible and prevent the American people from seeing more benefits under the law.

Mr. Speaker, even though the majority may claim that today's legislation is an attempt to fix the Affordable Care Act, it is, in fact, a fiscally irresponsible attempt to undermine the law. First, the legislation is not paid for,

which flies in the face of the rules of all the Republicans in the House. The bill costs \$74 million, and there is no hint at all of how that is going to be paid for. In fact, the Rules Committee last night, as it may, waived the rules of the House that require a pay-for, despite denying countless similar waiver requests in the past.

According to analysis by the Congressional Budget Office, this legislation would increase the deficit by \$74 billion and force 1 million people to lose their sponsored health care coverage and increase the number of uninsured. It is not true that under this piece of legislation no one would lose their health care.

Over the next few hours, we will surely hear many claims about how much we care about the American worker. And I have no doubt that each claim contains a measure of truth because, after all, those American workers are our constituents. Words, no matter how moving, are only as powerful as the actions that are taken to back them up. It is the vote we take, not the speeches we make, that will show how much we care for the well-being of the American people.

Will we continue the progress being made under the Affordable Care Act, progress that is providing millions of Americans with access to health care for the very first time, or will we vote to try and undermine the progress with a bill that is before us today?

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on today's rule and the underlying legislation. The facts become clearer every day. The Affordable Care Act is delivering on its promise of lower cost, greater access to lifesaving health care for millions of Americans. Millions, Mr. Speaker, for the first time, have health care because they had been born with a preexisting condition which no longer hampers their having health care.

It is time the majority stop playing political games and start supporting the historic law that will benefit Americans now and for generations to come. As I have pointed out many times on the floor during a rule, running the House of Representatives of the Congress costs \$24 million a week. This is again another week where we do nothing to earn that.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds for a response.

Of course, the President did come out for a big photo op and press conference in the Rose Garden yesterday and talked about a number of 7 million. Discounted in that is the 6 million people who lost their health insurance in October, November, and December of last year who have now, thankfully, reclaimed insurance.

So, the actual numbers, we will see those posted later in the year; but isn't it interesting, the President can have a press conference, but they cannot provide our committee with the actual detail on those numbers, which we have been asking for for months.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS).

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my friend from Texas for yielding.

I rise in strong support of the rule and on, also, the underlying bill, the Save American Workers Act.

Four years after ObamaCare's passage, this law's implementation is a patchwork of delays stitched together with miles of bureaucratic red tape. Unfortunately, the arbitrary delays and the exemptions this administration has granted help only a small segment of workers and businesses. Part-time workers have been among those most deeply affected by ObamaCare, yet this administration has shown little interest in providing the relief to these folks that is extended to unions and favored business entities.

It was said just a moment ago that this is the 52nd time that we are doing something like this, but I will say this: I will stand on the side of history that says for 52 times it will stand to stand against something that is wrong. I will stand in this well 52 more times when it is wrong and hurting the American people. Right is right, and this bill is wrong.

The underlying bill seeks to help moms and dads, businesses understand what we have always known. ObamaCare's 30-hour definition of full-time employee demonstrates how little the authors of the bill know about running a business. The vast majority of American employers and employees have understood full time as being 40 hours a week for nearly a century. It is time to replace ObamaCare's definition of full-time employee with one that makes sense and will help American workers meet their financial goals.

As an original cosponsor of the Save American Workers Act, I stand with all those in Georgia's Ninth District whose livelihood has been impacted by ObamaCare's definition of a full-time employee. These include employees of the City of Gainesville, which is limiting workers' hours to avoid ObamaCare's employer mandate. Reduced hours make a tremendous impact on the household budgets of the men and women serving the people of Gainesville. While many of these folks have had the option of working additional hours to make ends meet in the past, they must now seek employment elsewhere or find a second job.

Mr. Speaker, this is a situation that is not unique. We have heard similar stories from both the private and public sector told in this Chamber. It is time for this administration and its allies to stop writing off these realities as lies or untruths being circulated for political purposes.

Those who still stand by ObamaCare need to spend some time face-to-face with the workers whose hours have been cut because of this law. It is time for them to look in the eyes of a mom and dad who won't have as much time with their children this year because

they will have to take on yet another job to make ends meet.

I hope my fair-minded colleagues on both sides of the aisle will come together to support this commonsense legislation and provide some relief to the folks who deserve it most—America's working men and women.

The gentlewoman from New York is right; it is about our votes, not our speeches. The American people can look to the Republican majority and they can see whom we stand with. We stand with the people who have been hurt, who are suffering, who are having to work extra jobs. It is about those moms and dads. It is not about the exemptions and special privileges given to friends of this administration on the delays and a whim and a notice.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my fellow New Yorker, Mr. BISHOP.

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Mr. Speaker, I wish to speak with respect to the previous question. I would urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question so we could vote on H.R. 1010, a bill that would raise the minimum wage to \$10.10 per hour over a 3-year period.

Frankly, Mr. Speaker, I don't get it. I don't understand what the problem is. We are the people's House. More than 70 percent of the American people have indicated that they support an increase in the minimum wage. This isn't a partisan issue. Majorities of Republicans, Democrats, and unaffiliateds all support an increase in the minimum wage by overwhelming numbers.

There are studies that indicate that if we increase the minimum wage, we will pump \$35 billion into the economy over a 3-year span of phasing it in. That is \$35 billion worth of economic activity without spending a dime of Federal money. That economic activity, it is estimated, would create 85,000 jobs.

Again, I will say, I don't get it. This Congress ought to be about creating jobs. Here is an opportunity to do that without spending a dime of Federal money, and yet we can't even get a vote.

While we're here in this Chamber, the so-called Ryan budget, the Republican budget resolution, is being marked up. That budget resolution seeks to cut \$135 billion out of the SNAP program over the next 10 years. In order for that cut to be effective, if it were to ever take on the force of law, millions of people would lose their SNAP eligibility.

But get this, if we raise the minimum wage, it has been estimated that we would save \$4.6 billion a year, in other words, roughly \$50 billion over 10 years in SNAP costs because people would be making more money and, thus, have their eligibility for SNAP reduced. Isn't it preferable to help people earn more money and reduce their dependence on Federal programs?

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman another 1 minute.

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Mr. Speaker, wouldn't it be vastly preferable to reduce Federal expenditures for a safety net program by virtue of lifting the economic status of the people that received them? Isn't that what we should be doing, trying to lift people up and give them opportunity as opposed to taking away from them benefits that they very badly need and benefits that they need because the jobs they have are such low-wage jobs?

All we are asking for is a vote. We simply want a vote. The previous speaker said that we were sent here to vote. That is right. We were sent here to vote. This is a very simple, straightforward provision. It used to get passed with bipartisan support. All we are asking for is a vote. If Members don't support the measure, vote against it. Let the American people know where they stand. But if Members do support it, they should have the opportunity to vote for it; and hopefully, giving us that opportunity, we will pass it so that we can help lift people up without spending a dime of Federal money.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS), the chairman of the Rules Committee.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, really, today's legislation is simple. It is about protecting American workers from job-destroying regulations contained in the Affordable Care Act. As written, ObamaCare establishes a definition of full-time employees as anyone working 30 hours per week and requires that business provide each of these workers with employer-sponsored health care or to pay a penalty.

Mr. Speaker, what we are here for is not the minimum wage today; that is another time. I am sure that as the other body debates this and as the administration trots around the country opportunities to sell their end of that, the American people will get that message. Today, this is about a group of people who are arbitrarily losing and having diminished from 40 hours down to 30 hours their work, their job, directly as a result of ObamaCare.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday, in testimony before the House of Representatives, there was discussion about a Hoover Institution study that was done by Dr. Chen. Dr. Chen specifically went and looked at the impact that the Affordable Care Act was having upon employers and employees. This really was put into context when we realized that this is a net \$74 billion change in the law—\$74 billion that the administration was counting on American people paying into the Affordable Care Act to support this by diminishing the amount of hours that a person works.

So, what did Dr. Chen say? Dr. Chen took just one part of our marketplace—education. Here is what he said:

The final reason I argue the 30-hour rule must be addressed is because of the negative impact it is having—in this case—on school districts, colleges, and universities. The analysis of vul-

nerable workers referenced earlier was that we focused on 225,000 workers who have a history of working in the education industry.

And they found out that, because of the 30-hour rule, that over 100 school districts across the country, including dozens in Indiana, which is where the study took place, would have either cut workers' hours or outsourced jobs to avoid the Affordable Care Act's employee mandate.

□ 1300

What we are saying is that the Federal law—which is not a mistake; it is on purpose—was specifically designed to bring \$74 billion to the Affordable Care Act by diminishing the hours that the American worker can have. And when we bring this to the floor, they are arguing, oh, my gosh; Republicans, they want to have a \$74 billion higher deficit. It could not be further from the truth. This is money that comes from American workers, \$74 billion. And this commonsense legislation that we are handling today will say that we are going to turn back the clock to where there will not be a penalty for having a 40-hour workweek in America.

Today, the Democratic Party and President Obama want to reduce the number of hours that an American worker will have and take \$74 billion off, diminishing what would be in their pockets, to move it directly to the Federal Government.

No doubt you will see other Democrats come to the floor, just as we saw the gentleman from New York, arguing not about the substance of this bill but talking about why we ought to do a minimum wage bill. Yet their same arguments are, we should have a government that allows people to keep more money in their pockets. Mr. Speaker, that is what we are doing today.

We are with a commonsense bill on the floor of the House of Representatives. The gentleman from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG) carefully, thoughtfully went and sold this bill across this body, a bipartisan bill to say that the \$74 billion impact on the middle class of this country—in particular, universities, those in education, those workers who needed jobs—will lose, in essence, one-fourth of the hours that they have worked because of the Affordable Care Act, President Barack Obama, NANCY PELOSI, and HARRY REID, who jammed this bill down the American people's throats. And now Republicans are taking it on one at a time. This is our 51st slice at explaining to the American people why this is a bad bill.

Mr. Speaker, the \$74 billion belongs to the American worker, not to bigger government. The \$74 billion is exactly why the Republican Party is here today. And I want to thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS), who has worked not only on the Rules Committee but also in Energy and Commerce, for taking his private sector experience as a doctor to Washington, D.C. Having a doctor in the House, as

Dr. BURGESS has done, makes a huge difference. That is why the Republican Party is on the floor today saying, let's pass this piece of legislation.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN).

Mr. COHEN. I thank the gentlewoman for the opportunity to speak.

Mr. Speaker, the Affordable Care Act hit a significant milestone yesterday: over 7 million people signed up for health care. I was very proud of it. I voted for the Affordable Care Act.

I suffered a debilitating illness when I was 5 years old, and my father was a doctor, but, beyond that, just knowing human beings and the need for health care, it was so important for me to see that people got health care. Fifty million Americans don't have it.

It was a great day when we gave the opportunity to these 7 million people, plus the many people that got Medicaid extended to them in States where the Governors were responsible and are accepting money to provide health care to people who needed it, while some other States are not, and the children who are able to stay on their parents' health care until they are 26. We are talking over 7 million people. When you add in the children and the Medicaid folks, it is a lot more people. It is a day America should be celebrating. It boggles my mind to see the other side bringing, for the 51st or 52nd time, a bill to repeal what is an effort to give 10 million Americans, or more, health care. We should be celebrating.

What you do unto the least of these, you do unto me. Health care is an essential basic element of life, and if you don't have health care, you are not going to have a fruitful and long life.

So I celebrate the passage of the bill and am in bewilderment at the fact that the Republicans are proudly having a 51st or 52nd opportunity to attack what is a bill that gives health care to people; gives parents the knowledge that their children are getting health care; gives children the relief that their parents, when they have illnesses, will be treated; and that nobody will be shut out because they have a pre-existing condition. Being a woman won't be treated as a preexisting condition, and insurers will not be allowed to deny them health care because of their gender. The doughnut hole will be filled. This is a day to celebrate.

Above the Speaker's rostrum, DANIEL WEBSTER says: Let's do something great in our time here. Well, we did it, and we need to be proud of it.

Mr. BURGESS. I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, a very important point of what we are doing here today—look, when the junior Senator from my State stands up back home and says that he wants to repeal every syllable of ObamaCare, I will stand on my chair and cheer because I think that is the right approach.

But that is not what we are doing today. We are fixing a problem, as it

exists in the body of the law, that is redefining full-time work as 30 hours per week. We are fundamentally reestablishing the relationship that occurs with America's working class.

Now, I would submit that in Politico magazine, on March 26, 2014, there was an opinion piece written, "How to Fix the Affordable Care Act." And who was this opinion piece written by? Well, it was written by Members of the other body, Democratic Senators who had voted in favor of the passage of the Affordable Care Act in the first place. But they have proposals that they put forward in an opinion piece on how to fix the Affordable Care Act.

One of the things they say is, maybe we ought to allow selling across State lines. Maybe we ought to allow for a catastrophic policy to be sold again because that has, after all, been prohibited under the Affordable Care Act. They are valid suggestions. They are trying to fix the problems contained within the Affordable Care Act because they recognize it is unsustainable and unmanageable. Perhaps they are a little bit embarrassed because each one of them was the 60th vote that allowed the Affordable Care Act to come back over to the House and be passed.

Now, today we are talking about a fix to a problem within the Affordable Care Act that allows full-time employment to be reestablished and redefined at 40 hours per week.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire if my colleague has more speakers?

Mr. BURGESS. Your colleague always has more speakers as long as he is seated in the House. But I see no one else waiting, so we can proceed.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Then I am prepared to close and yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, we heard, again, today that the Affordable Care Act has caused a lot of job loss, which simply flies in the face of reality because since the bill was passed, 8.6 million new jobs have been created in the United States. And every time we see one of those ads where somebody says, oh, I couldn't do this, I couldn't do that because of the health care bill, we have discovered that, generally, oftentimes people have been paid to say that on ads or that they have, unfortunately, been mistaken.

Now, today's rule grants 3 hours of debate on a bill going nowhere because we don't have anything else to do. We all know that the Senate will never take up this legislation, and if it did, the President has already said he would veto it. So instead of wasting 3 hours of debate on a 52nd attempt to undermine the Affordable Care Act, I urge my colleagues to finally hold a vote to reform our immigration system, renew unemployment benefits, raise the minimum wage, or create jobs.

This economy would be roaring if we could pass some of our bills. We have 48

bills ready to go that would create new jobs that we can't put on the floor because of our single occupation here of trying to dismantle the Affordable Care Act.

So if we defeat the previous question today—and I hope everybody will vote "no" on it—it will give us a chance to do something that cries out to be done.

Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up legislation to raise the minimum wage to \$10.10 an hour. The American people are calling for an economy that works for everyone, not just for those at the top.

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 gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" to defeat the previous question, vote "no" on the underlying bill, and yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, to the issue of jobs created in the last 5 years, let me point out that the State of Texas has been responsible for the creation of about one-third of those jobs. It is our robust oil and gas business and the manufacturing sector in the State of Texas that have been responsible for that job growth.

So when the President comes in front of a joint session of Congress for the State of the Union address and wants to talk about the jobs created since he became President, my belief is, he should say in the next statement, May God bless Texas, because Texas is responsible for that job growth, and it had nothing to do with the Affordable Care Act.

Let me talk briefly about why we are here today. Of course the gentlewoman mentioned about the passage of the Affordable Care Act. She mentioned the detailed analysis that was done by Democrats, who were then in the majority, how they pored over every word in the legislation.

Let me read you the paragraph that is under question today. I am reading from section 1513 of the consolidated Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act: "The number of full-time employees for any month otherwise determined include for such month a number of employees determined by dividing the aggregate number of hours of service of employees who are not full-time employees for the month by 120." Period, end of sentence.

What does that mean, Mr. Speaker? Well, fortunately, we don't have to wonder what it means because we have a rule that was promulgated by the Department of the Treasury which came out this past February. It is about a 55-page rule based upon what I just read

to the House. It is a long recitation. It contains a lot of things, but here is the bottom line: For employees who average at least 30 hours of service per week during a measurement period, who thus must be treated as full-time employees during an associated 6-month stability period. That is the bottom line.

I don't know how we went from 120 per month to 30 hours per week, but they figured it out at the Department of Treasury at some great expense, I rather suspect, because here is this rule that came to the American people in February of this year when the actual law was passed almost 4 years prior. Nevertheless, we have the rule, and people are welcome to read it in the Federal Register. It was published on Wednesday, February 12, 2014, 2 days before Valentine's Day. We love you, America.

Mr. Speaker, the rule that governs the debate on this bill before us today keeps that fundamental contract with employers and their workers that full-time employment will be 40 weeks. If you accept the definition from the Department of Labor that it is now 30 weeks and an employer is trying to reduce the cost of providing employment, they may make the logical assumption that if someone only works 28 or 29 hours, then they are not full-time; therefore, they do not need to be providing health insurance.

And what we have done is, we have shifted that entire equation and robbed people of 10 hours of employment every week. That is a significant change in their take-home pay.

Mr. Speaker, today's rule provides for consideration of a critical bill to ensure that Americans are not forced to work fewer hours than they otherwise would without these draconian labor laws included in the Affordable Care Act.

□ 1315

I want to thank Mr. YOUNG for his thoughtful legislation, working across the aisle to offer a bill that both Republicans and Democrats have accepted in the committee by passing it through the committee with no amendments. He has bipartisan cosponsors, and he has public support.

I urge my colleagues to support both the rule and the underlying bill.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 2575, the so-called "Save American Workers Act of 2014," which represents the 52nd attempt by House Republicans to impede the Affordable Care Act and deny Americans the security that comes from having access to affordable, high-quality health care.

I oppose this bill because its effect would be to deny employer provided health insurance to hard working employees who work more than 30 hours but less than 40 hours per week.

If this bill were to become law in its current form, the health security of 10.2 percent of the workforce, or approximately 19.8 million workers, would be placed at risk.

I offered two amendments to H.R. 2575 that would prevent this travesty but regrettably nei-

ther was made in order by the Rules Committee.

Jackson Lee Amendment #1 would have improved this bad bill by amending the bill's 40 hour work week definition to include the employee's average commuting time in the computation of hours worked for purposes of determining "full-time employment."

Commuting time has become a major issue for those who work hourly wage jobs because their workday is much longer.

According to the Bureau of the Census nearly 8.1% of American workers commute 60 minutes or longer.

In 2011, almost 600,000 full-time workers had "mega-commutes" of at least 90 minutes and travel 50 miles or more from their homes. The daily average one-way travel to work for employees nationally is 25.5 minutes, and 1 out of 4 workers cross county lines to reach their jobs.

Jackson Lee Amendment #2 would have amended the bill by delaying the effective date of the bill until the first month after there has been two consecutive quarters in which the national unemployment rate is below 5 percent, which would indicate the nation has reached a full employment economy.

Our nation has taken a momentous step in creating a mindset that health insurance is a personal responsibility with the enactment of the Affordable Care Act. The law did not automatically enroll all citizens into the program because it was specifically designed to be an opt-in process.

This week all over the nation, over 4 millions of Americans took the first step toward taking control of their lives by purchasing their first personal or family health insurance policy.

Over the course of the sign-up process for the Affordable Care Act tens of thousands of visitors each day shopped the website and over 7.1 million people were added to private insurance roles as customers or have enrolled into Medicaid.

Despite problems with the initial rollout of the online health insurance registration process, people were patient and persistent about getting coverage for themselves and their families.

I have held many events in my District to inform and connect people with Navigators and Community Health Centers to support the message that it was time to get health insurance for yourself and your family.

Why with 60 legislative days remaining in the Second Session of the 113th Congress before the end of the 2014 fiscal year, we are still seeing attempts to end the Affordable Care Act is a mystery to the American public who are voting with their own healthcare dollars for Obamacare.

H.R. 2575 proposes to amend the Internal Revenue Code by redefining a full time employee for purposes of providing health insurance to only those workers who work a 40-hour workweek.

Mr. Speaker, few hourly workers in low-wage jobs work a 40-hour work week. These employees often rely on government assistance, which amounts to a hidden tax break to employers.

Low wageworkers often rely upon public housing assistance, SNAP, WIC or Medicaid to make ends meet.

Health insurance should not be used as a status symbol, but a basic right for people who live in the world's most prosperous nation.

I know that many predicted that the Affordable Care Act would cause havoc on the nation's health care system, but it is not the ACA that is causing havoc—it is a small vocal minority within the majority part that is causing headaches and heartaches to doctors and their patients.

I ask that my colleagues to join me in protecting workers by voting down this rule and the underlying bill.

The material previously referred to by Ms. SLAUGHTER is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 530 OFFERED BY
MS. SLAUGHTER OF NEW YORK

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

Sec. 2. 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. 1010) to provide for an increase in the Federal minimum wage. 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 Education and the Workforce. 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 recommit 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. 3. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 1010.

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 rejection 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. 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.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered. The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on adoption of House Resolution 530, if ordered, and approval of the Journal.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 229, nays 194, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 152]

YEAS—229

Aderholt Bishop (UT) Burgess
Amash Black Byrne
Amodei Blackburn Calvert
Bachmann Boustany Camp
Bachus Brady (TX) Campbell
Barletta Bridenstine Cantor
Barr Brooks (AL) Capito
Barton Brooks (IN) Carter
Benishek Broun (GA) Cassidy
Bentivolio Buchanan Chabot
Bilirakis Bucshon Chaffetz

Coble
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fox
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt

NAYS—194

Barber
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Ciilline
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Clever
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
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
Fattah
Poster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego

Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
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
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

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
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham
Lujan, Ben Ray
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O’Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
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
Vislosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—8

Capuano
Clark (MA)
Coffman
Conyers
Lynch
McAllister
Miller, Gary
Peters (MI)

□ 1347

Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. SINEMA, Messrs. CARNEY, OWENS, CROWLEY, and SCHRADER changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Messrs. STIVERS and SESSIONS changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

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

Stated for: Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 152 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOLDING). The question is on the resolution.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered. The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 236, nays 186, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 153]

YEAS—236

Aderholt Brady (TX) Chabot
Amash Bridenstine Chaffetz
Amodei Brooks (AL) Coble
Bachmann Brooks (IN) Coffman
Bachus Broun (GA) Cole
Barber Buchanan Collins (GA)
Barletta Bucshon Collins (NY)
Barr Burgess Conaway
Barton Byrne Cook
Benishek Calvert Cotton
Bentivolio Camp Cramer
Bilirakis Campbell Crawford
Bishop (UT) Cantor Crenshaw
Black Capito Culberson
Blackburn Carter Daines
Boustany Cassidy Davis, Rodney

