

Tucson, Arizona, mass shooting that took place 4 years ago today.

On that bright winter day, a gunman struck directly at a cornerstone of American democracy by murdering six innocent people and wounding 13 others during a Congress on Your Corner event. Among the injured were our dear colleague and friend, Congresswoman Gabby Giffords, and her aide and future colleague, Ron Barber.

In spite of her near-fatal wounds and with the memory of her constituents and staff whom she lost that day guiding her, Gabby has moved this Congress, this Nation, and arguably the world with her remarkable recovery, her poignance, and her passion.

She has also channeled her poise, her strength, and her determination into an effort with her husband, Mark, by her side to ensure that similar episodes of violence do not befall other mothers, fathers, husbands, sisters, daughters, sons, friends, and neighbors. How very extraordinary, how very bold, and how very Gabby.

It is not easy work, and we all have our differences. Mr. Speaker, I know I am joined by so many of you in asking, hoping, and praying in Gabby's name that we can set aside some of our deeply-held differences and find a way to work together on this very challenging and difficult subject of gun violence and keeping people safe and make a commitment this Congress to find common ground finally.

In doing so, we will be more pragmatic, more thoughtful, and more engaged citizens in this great and enduring experiment that we call American democracy. It would be a fitting tribute to those individuals whose lives were lost and irreparably altered that Saturday in Tucson.

In that spirit, in the spirit of working together, in the spirit of reaffirming our commitment to American representative democracy, and defying against violence against this great institution, I ask you to please rise and join me for a moment of silence to honor the lives of Gabe Zimmerman, Dorwan Stoddard, Phyllis Schneek, Judge John Roll, Dot Morris, and Christina-Taylor Green.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker 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. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 244, noes 181, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 12]

AYES—244

Abraham	Amash	Barletta
Aderholt	Amodei	Barr
Allen	Babin	Barton

Benishak	Hartzler	Poe (TX)
Billirakis	Heck (NV)	Poliquin
Bishop (MI)	Hensarling	Pompeo
Bishop (UT)	Herrera Beutler	Posney
Black	Hice (GA)	Price (GA)
Blackburn	Hill	Ratcliffe
Blum	Holding	Reed
Bost	Hudson	Reichert
Boustany	Huelskamp	Renacci
Brady (TX)	Huizenga (MI)	Ribble
Brat	Hultgren	Rice (SC)
Bridenstine	Hunter	Rigell
Brooks (AL)	Hurd (TX)	Roby
Brooks (IN)	Hurt (VA)	Roe (TN)
Buchanan	Issa	Rogers (AL)
Buck	Jenkins (KS)	Rogers (KY)
Bucshon	Jenkins (WV)	Rohrabacher
Burgess	Johnson (OH)	Rokita
Byrne	Johnson, Sam	Rooney (FL)
Calvert	Jolly	Ros-Lehtinen
Carter (GA)	Jones	Roskam
Chabot	Jordan	Ross
Chaffetz	Joyce	Rothfus
Clawson (FL)	Katko	Rouzer
Coffman	Kelly (PA)	Royce
Cole	King (IA)	Russell
Collins (GA)	King (NY)	Ryan (WI)
Collins (NY)	Kinzinger (IL)	Salmon
Comstock	Kline	Sanford
Conaway	Knight	Scalise
Cook	Labrador	Schock
Costa	LaMalfa	Schrader
Costello (PA)	Lamborn	Schweikert
Cramer	Lance	Scott, Austin
Crawford	Latita	Sensenbrenner
Crenshaw	LoBiondo	Sessions
Culberson	Long	Shimkus
Curbelo (FL)	Loudermilk	Shuster
Davis, Rodney	Lucas	Simpson
Denham	Luetkemeyer	Smith (MO)
Dent	Lummis	Smith (NE)
DeSantis	MacArthur	Smith (NJ)
DesJarlais	Marchant	Smith (TX)
Diaz-Balart	Marino	Stefanik
Dold	Masie	Stewart
Duffy	McCarthy	Stivers
Duncan (SC)	McCaul	Stutzman
Duncan (TN)	McClintock	Thompson (PA)
Ellmers	McHenry	Thornberry
Emmer	McKinley	Tiberi
Farenthold	McMorris	Tipton
Fincher	Rodgers	Trott
Fitzpatrick	McSally	Turner
Fleischmann	Meadows	Upton
Fleming	Meehan	Valadao
Flores	Messer	Wagner
Forbes	Mica	Walberg
Fortenberry	Miller (FL)	Walden
Fox	Miller (MI)	Walker
Franks (AZ)	Moolenaar	Walorski
Frelinghuysen	Mooney (WV)	Walters, Mimi
Garrett	Mullin	Weber (TX)
Gibbs	Mulvaney	Webster (FL)
Gibson	Murphy (PA)	Wenstrup
Gohmert	Neugebauer	Westerman
Goodlatte	Newhouse	Westmoreland
Goodlatte	Noem	Whitfield
Gowdy	Nugent	Williams
Granger	Nunes	Wilson (SC)
Graves (GA)	Olson	Wittman
Graves (LA)	Palazzo	Womack
Graves (MO)	Palmer	Woodall
Griffith	Paulsen	Yoder
Grothman	Pearce	Yoho
Guinta	Perry	Young (IA)
Guthrie	Peterson	Young (IN)
Hanna	Pittenger	Zeldin
Hardy	Pitts	Zinke
Harper		
Harris		

NOES—181

Adams	Capuano	Courtney
Aguiar	Cardenas	Crowley
Ashford	Carney	Cuellar
Bass	Carson (IN)	Cummings
Beatty	Cartwright	Davis (CA)
Becerra	Castor (FL)	Davis, Danny
Bera	Castro (TX)	DeFazio
Beyer	Chu (CA)	DeGette
Bishop (GA)	Cicilline	Delaney
Blumenauer	Clark (MA)	DeLauro
Bonamici	Clarke (NY)	DelBene
Boyle (PA)	Clay	DeSaulnier
Brady (PA)	Cleaver	Deutch
Brown (FL)	Clyburn	Dingell
Brownley (CA)	Cohen	Doggett
Bustos	Connolly	Doyle (PA)
Butterfield	Conyers	Edwards
Capps	Cooper	Ellison

Engel	Levin	Richmond
Eshoo	Lewis	Roybal-Allard
Esty	Lieu (CA)	Ruiz
Farr	Lipinski	Ruppersberger
Fattah	Loeb	Rush
Foster	Loftgren	Ryan (OH)
Frankel (FL)	Lowenthal	Sanchez, Linda
Fudge	Lowey	T.
Gabbard	Lujan Grisham	Sanchez, Loretta
Garamendi	(NM)	Sarbanes
Graham	Lujan, Ben Ray	Schakowsky
Grayson	(NM)	Schiff
Green, Al	Lynch	Scott (VA)
Green, Gene	Maloney,	Scott, David
Grijalva	Carolyn	Serrano
Gutierrez	Maloney, Sean	Sewell (AL)
Hahn	Matsui	Sherman
Hastings	McCollum	Sinema
Heck (WA)	McDermott	Sires
Higgins	McGovern	Slaughter
Himes	McNerney	Smith (WA)
Hinojosa	Meeks	Speier
Honda	Meng	Swalwell (CA)
Hoyer	Moore	Takai
Huffman	Moulton	Takano
Israel	Murphy (FL)	Thompson (CA)
Jackson Lee	Nadler	Thompson (MS)
Jeffries	Napolitano	Titus
Johnson (GA)	Neal	Tonko
Johnson, E. B.	Nolan	Torres
Kaptur	Norcross	Tsongas
Keating	Pallone	Van Hollen
Kelly (IL)	Pascarella	Vargas
Kennedy	Payne	Veasey
Kildee	Pelosi	Vela
Kilmer	Perlmutter	Velázquez
Kind	Peters	Visclosky
Kirkpatrick	Pingree	Walz
Kuster	Pocan	Wasserman
Langevin	Polis	Schultz
Larsen (WA)	Price (NC)	Watson Coleman
Larson (CT)	Quigley	Welch
Lawrence	Rangel	Wilson (FL)
Lee	Rice (NY)	Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—4

Duckworth	Gosar
Gallego	O'Rourke

□ 1410

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.

SAVE AMERICAN WORKERS ACT OF 2015

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 19, I call up the bill (H.R. 30) 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, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 30

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Save American Workers Act of 2015”.

SEC. 2. REPEAL OF 30-HOUR THRESHOLD FOR CLASSIFICATION AS FULL-TIME EMPLOYEE FOR PURPOSES OF THE EMPLOYER MANDATE IN THE PATIENT PROTECTION AND AFFORDABLE CARE ACT AND REPLACEMENT WITH 40 HOURS.

(a) FULL-TIME EQUIVALENTS.—Paragraph (2) of section 4980H(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(1) by repealing subparagraph (E), and
(2) by inserting after subparagraph (D) the following new subparagraph:

“(E) FULL-TIME EQUIVALENTS TREATED AS FULL-TIME EMPLOYEES.—Solely for purposes of determining whether an employer is an applicable large employer under this paragraph, an employer shall, in addition to the number of full-time employees for any month otherwise determined, include for such month a number of full-time employees determined by dividing the aggregate number of hours of service of employees who are not full-time employees for the month by 174.”

(b) FULL-TIME EMPLOYEES.—Paragraph (4) of section 4980H(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(1) by repealing subparagraph (A), and

(2) by inserting before subparagraph (B) the following new subparagraph:

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘full-time employee’ means, with respect to any month, an employee who is employed on average at least 40 hours of service per week.”

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to months beginning after December 31, 2013.

SEC. 3. BUDGETARY EFFECTS.

The budgetary effects of this Act shall not be entered on either PAYGO scorecard maintained pursuant to section 4(d) of the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. YODER). Pursuant to House Resolution 19, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 30, the Save American Workers Act of 2015.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the first firm step on the ladder of opportunity is a full-time job, and for too many Americans, this first step is moving out of reach thanks to ObamaCare. Right now, the law says that every large employer must give health insurance to its full-time employees. Here is the catch: it defines full time as 30 hours or more.

So guess what is happening—businesses are cutting workers’ hours. They are keeping them below 30 hours to avoid the penalty. It is commonly known as the ObamaCare 29ers. And what is more, community colleges are laying off their professors and they are cutting their hours, so they have to cut their class offerings as well. In other words, the law is making it much harder to learn new skills and to find a better paying job. I can’t think of a worse way to support working families: taking opportunities away from them, cutting paychecks, cutting hours.

Who are the people who are most at risk with this 30-hour rule? Well, by and large, it is young people in low-paying jobs—probably their first jobs. One study said that over half of them have, at most, a high school degree.

□ 1415

These are the people who are just getting started in life, who need those extra hours, who want to move up the ladder of economic opportunity. ObamaCare is holding these people down. That is why we are here today.

This bill changes the law’s definition of full time to 40 hours a week. That is the way most people define full time. That is the way it has been done for decades in other parts of law. That way, businesses will no longer fear letting their employees work a full workweek. That way, people can get the experience they need. That way, we can get people working again and build a healthy economy.

Mr. Speaker, it is really clear. There are so many parts of this law that are holding back the country, that are raising health care costs, that are putting us further behind and deeper in the hole on fiscal responsibility. But this rule is costing people jobs; this rule is knocking people out of full-time work. It is no wonder that CBO is telling us the equivalent of over 2 million people will not work because of this law.

I urge adoption of this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Republicans say that with this bill they are trying to help or, as they put it, save workers. But their legislation will lead to many times more workers becoming part time, losing millions of hours of work.

The Republicans constantly talk about the threat of increased budget deficits, but their bill would increase the deficit by over \$50 billion. The Republicans like to say they care about the taxes people pay, but this bill would substantially shift responsibility for paying for health insurance from employers to taxpayers.

These are indisputable facts based on yesterday’s analysis from the non-partisan CBO and Joint Committee on Taxation. This chart helps to illustrate what this is really all about. Today, 7 percent, more or less, of workers work between 30 and 34 hours, while close to half work 40 hours. As you can see, the number working 40 hours overshadows dramatically those who are working less. This is the key point. So if you shift the basis of employer responsibility for health care to begin at 40 hours instead of 30 hours, the result will be a dramatic increase in the number of workers whose hours of employment will be reduced to less than 40 hours per week. You will be creating hundreds and hundreds and hundreds of thousands of 39ers.

CBO and Joint Task conclude, therefore, that 1 million workers will lose their employer-based health insurance, with half of them shifting to insurance through the health exchanges or through Medicaid—by the way, with some taxpayer support—and the other half—listen to this—losing health insurance coverage completely.

So when you take off the label of this Republican bill and look at the contents in the package, this is a bad deal, highlighting the need for a truth in labeling requirement for this Congress. When you go beyond the benign Republican rhetoric, this is a bad deal for American workers and the middle class and taxpayers. That has led even a conservative like Yuval Levin to say that today’s bill “is worse than doing nothing.”

This bill is brought up today without any committee consideration or discussion with Democrats—the minority leader is here, the minority whip—not a single minute of discussion. Unfortunately, contrary to the rhetoric we heard yesterday—again, from the majority—about the need to look for common ground, on this issue the Republican approach is scorched earth.

I urge a strong negative vote, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds simply to say that the gentleman’s criticism basically makes our point. The average workweek is 34.6 hours. So if you go to 30 hours, you are cutting people’s hours. If you go to 39, you are not. We don’t want to cut people’s hours. We don’t want people to work less. We want people to work more.

With that, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG), a distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee, the author of this legislation.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I would like to elaborate on the chairman’s retort to what we just heard about criticisms pertaining to this law.

Number one, this law is inherently unfair. Trying to finance health insurance for some Americans by cutting hours and wages for other Americans is just, frankly, not what we should be doing as a country. The Save American Workers Act would actually save most workers from a potentially massive loss in hours and wages, and I will walk the gentleman through that momentarily. It will also cause fewer workers to be directly impacted by this employer mandate.

Very briefly, let us start with saving most workers from a potentially massive cut in hours. Under current law, if you work between 40 to, say, 45 hours and your employer happens to not offer you employer-sponsored health insurance, you are in the minority. An employer is incentivized to offer these typically higher-wage, higher-skilled workers employer-sponsored health insurance, and that is why so many do. It is part of our normal functioning labor market.

So if one were to be moved hypothetically from 40 hours down to 29 hours, they would lose roughly \$270 a week or \$14,000 a year, according to the American Action Forum.

Under the Save American Workers Act, these 40- to 45-hour workweek individuals would no longer be at risk of such a massive cut in their wages or their hours.

Let's take someone working 30 to 35 hours, just above that new full-time employment threshold in ObamaCare. They tend to be lower-wage hourly workers, according to the Hoover Institution, and let's assume they had no employer-sponsored health insurance. There are 9.8 million Americans who fall into this category. They are vulnerable to a cut in their hours and wages.

Were one to move from 35 hours a week down to 29, they would lose on average \$148 per week, or \$7,694 a year—again, according to the American Action Forum.

Under the Save American Workers Act, these individuals, 30 to 35 hours a week, would no longer lose any hours or wages, just reinforcing the point that the good chairman made.

Well, this is why I introduced the Save American Workers Act. Let's restore the 40-hour workweek that so many people worked so hard to put in place, that has long been understood to be the gold standard of the workweek in this country.

Over the past few years, I have witnessed a strange phenomenon in our country. In Indiana, we have seen local school corporations announce they will limit the hours of substitute teachers, classroom assistants, cafeteria workers, custodians. We have seen retailers limit the hours of their cashiers. The list goes on and on, from hotels to manufacturers to colleges and universities.

I guarantee that every Member of this body back in their district has heard similar stories. This is happening because of the new 30-hour definition of full-time employment.

Now, there is no good reason to do this, other than, perhaps, to arbitrarily set this new definition of full-time employment to fund the massive cost of this national health care bill. It has ignored decades of practice in the labor market reality of our 40-hour workweek. It has distorted that market.

As a result, the Hoover Institution estimates that as many as 2.6 million American workers are at risk for lost hours.

Now, it is not just the lost hours that should concern us. Again, it is the lost wages. An employee losing 10 hours a week is also losing an entire week's paycheck each month. An employee going from 35 to 29 hours is seeing a 17 percent pay cut, courtesy of ObamaCare.

The people most affected by this provision are the people who can least afford it—89 percent of them do not have college degrees, 63 percent of them are women. Perhaps, ironically, it sounds a lot like the people ObamaCare was supposed to help.

CBO analysis indicates that it comes at the expense of up to \$105 billion in cash wages. Now, I defy anyone to say that it is fair to expand coverage to a half-million people—that number from the CBO—on the backs of 2.5 million people who can't afford it. How fun-

damentally inefficient is the health care system that potentially requires the loss of over \$200,000 in cash wages for each person it insures.

I authored H.R. 30, the Save American Workers Act, to help these hard-working Americans. And I introduced this bill jointly with the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI), who happens to be a Democrat. He, too, realizes that ObamaCare is littered with serious unintended consequences that need to be addressed.

In the Senate, we have seen a similar version of this bill introduced in a bipartisan manner.

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

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield the gentleman an additional 15 seconds.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Now, this isn't a Republican or a Democrat issue; this is a serious solution to a very real problem facing American workers.

I urge all my colleagues to support the Save American Workers Act.

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

To say this restores the 40-hour week is pure sophistry. What it does is undermine it for hundreds of thousands of workers in this country. That is the basis of the Joint Tax Committee report. It is pure sophistry to say otherwise.

I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), our distinguished whip.

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

Save American workers. Make sure they don't lose purchasing power. Let's make sure that those at the bottom end of the employment spectrum are saved. That is the message.

I presume the minimum wage bill will be on the floor next week. Perhaps you are going to want to extend unemployment insurance next week. Perhaps you are going to really want to do something that will save the workers and give them the purchasing power they had in 1968.

The chairman said it well: We go from creating 29ers to 39ers. This bill will allow you to work 10 more hours without health care. Isn't that wonderful? I am sure every American worker is saying: Thank God the Republicans are going to have me work 10 more hours before I can get health insurance. Aren't you generous?

The American worker needs help, not to be misled by a rhetoric which pretends to do something for them but leaves them stuck, not just for 5 years, but for 10, 15, 20 years, as those at the top of the ring get better and better off—and we are among most of those 10 percent.

Mr. Speaker, we are now in the first days of the new Congress, with an opportunity to turn the page and write a new chapter of bipartisanship and cooperation. We are not doing it today.

It is unfortunate that the Republican majority has instead chosen to replay the highlight reel from the last Con-

gress by bringing back to the floor a piece of partisan legislation that would undermine the Affordable Care Act and cause approximately 1 million Americans to lose their employer-sponsored insurance coverage. Not something that Mr. YOUNG says may happen or is extrapolated to happen, but there is no doubt that this would happen—1 million people.

Well, so what? This bill is a solution without a problem.

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

Mr. LEVIN. I yield the gentleman an additional minute.

□ 1430

Mr. HOYER. As of this time, without being timed, I really miss my magic minute; I want to tell you that, Mr. Speaker.

Since the Affordable Care Act became law, 10.8 million new jobs have been created in the private sector, and it has not led to a shift to part-time work. That is what the statistics tell us.

You want to save the worker, but under your economic policies in the last decade, we had the worst loss of jobs in this country in my lifetime. In fact, part-time workers, as a share of all workers in our economy, have fallen—have fallen—have decreased, are less since the enactment of the health care reform bill.

Unfortunately, this bill's sponsors have chosen to ignore these facts because they don't support their argument. Their legislation would allow employers to deny health care reach to those working even as many, as I have said, as 39 hours.

That means the slightest reduction in hours could be used to deny employees the coverage they ought to be earning through their work, so the rest of us do not have to pay their bill.

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

Mr. LEVIN. I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. As a result, up to half a million Americans would become uninsured, and this bill would increase the deficit by \$53 billion.

There is not enough time to really explain all the nuances of the adverse consequences of this bill. I ask my colleagues: let's have a decent and honest debate, let's have an honest debate and honest discussion so that, yes, Mr. YOUNG, we can protect those workers that we all should be able to protect, and then I will expect that to be accompanied with a minimum wage bill and the unemployment insurance extension.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, let me inquire about the distribution of time, the time remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin has 22 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Michigan has 22¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Kansas (Ms. JENKINS), a distinguished member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Ms. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding, wish the chair happy birthday, and I would like to honor the Congressman from Indiana, Congressman YOUNG, for his leadership on this important issue.

This effort to change the employer mandate definition of a full-time employee as one who only works 30 hours a week to 40 hours a week is a priority for folks all across the country, and it is appropriate that the House is taking action on H.R. 30 on this, only the third day of the 114th Congress.

I have heard from employees and employers alike about the negative consequences of the employer mandate penalty. The most complicating factor that I hear about is the definition of a full-time employee as someone who works only 30 hours or fewer per week.

This rule, which is not based in reality, and goes against every traditional measure of a full-time workweek, results in fewer jobs, reduced hours, and less opportunity for millions of working-class Americans. It effectively is a regressive tax on the folks who can least afford to have their hours cut.

The sticks that are used in the President's health care law to force employees into health care plans are hurting employees and employers, and unfortunately, the result is reduced hours and opportunity for hardworking Americans trying to support their families.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, would the Chair say again how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan has 22¼ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Wisconsin has 21 minutes remaining.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield 2½ minutes to the most to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. McDERMOTT).

(Mr. McDERMOTT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I associate myself with the remarks of the minority whip. He gave you all the facts and figures.

Let me tell you what this is really about. This is the 54th time that the Republicans have come out here to end the Affordable Care Act. This one is an assault on the employer mandate. You cannot have a bill without an employer mandate.

Now, we had to pick a time. Lots of employers in this country right now without any Federal law are giving insurance to their people down to 30 hours. So we said, "All right, let's make that full time." What the business community said they were supporting, they really weren't supporting, and they are in here to get rid of it.

This bill is the blueprint for business to shift all their employees on to the government, very simply. Close the building at 4 p.m. Now, everybody has only worked 39 hours, right? Go home.

Now, the office doesn't have to offer them any health insurance under the law. They have to go over to the exchange, get involved in Medicaid, get involved in the exchanges and getting subsidies and all of that, which you are going to pay for. You are going to pay for that by letting the employers get out from under paying it and shifting it on to the Federal Government. That is what this is all about.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Mr. RYAN for his generous step toward a single-payer system. When the American people find out that their business can now take their insurance away if they don't work 40 hours, they are going to say to themselves, "Well, then I am in this Federal Government thing. Why isn't everybody in that?"

You are heading down the road of a single-payer system because if you don't have a mandate for employers to cover their workers, you are simply saying, "Well, the employers don't have to care anymore." Who is going to care? Well, the Republicans certainly aren't going to care. You all know that without being told.

Ultimately, politically, this is going to come to bite you because what you are doing is excluding and telling big business, "You don't have to follow an employer mandate."

It is a bad bill. Vote "No."

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BOUSTANY), a member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, it has been demonstrated many times over that ObamaCare is a broken law. For example, under the law, full-time employment is classified at 30 hours a week, requiring these businesses to provide insurance to these employees.

Now, what is the consequence? This creates an incentive to limit hours. This will disproportionately affect 2.3 million low-income workers. It puts our economy in danger of creating a class of part-time employees where having two or three jobs is the norm. That is just unacceptable. That is not the answer for America.

Even major unions like the Teamsters say this law will destroy the very health and well-being of working families. That is not the promise of America. That is not the America we all aspire to. We should be encouraging businesses to hire more, to offer more pay, not to limit growth and employment. That is not the answer.

Today, the House is taking action to save the American worker by lifting this threshold to a more realistic 40 hours a week.

I could tell you real-life experience. Having talked to companies, they are going to be pushing more and more of these workers into part-time employ-

ment. I urge my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to talk to businesses in their districts and understand what is really happening as a consequence.

That is why we should pass this legislation. I encourage all Members to please support this bill.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS), another distinguished member of our committee.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my friend of many years for yielding time.

Mr. Speaker, here we go again, down the same unnecessary road. This bill is a deliberate and systematic attempt to undermine the Affordable Care Act. We are supposed to be here to help people and not to hurt people. So what is this all about?

This bill, call it what you may, would roll back protection for Americans who work at or near 40 hours a week. Before the Affordable Care Act, it was easy to discriminate against the sick, the elderly, and those who had lost their jobs through no fault of their own, but those days are over. We have come too far. We made too much progress to go back, and we will not go back.

I urge all of my colleagues to vote "no," so we can go forward and continue to provide comprehensive health care for all of our citizens. This is the right thing to do. It is the responsible thing to do. It is the fair thing to do.

Just vote "no." Just say "no."

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PAULSEN), a member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, in 1938, it was Franklin Roosevelt who signed the Fair Labor Standards Act, establishing full-time work as 40 hours, so for more than 70 years, that has been the accepted definition for government, for corporations, for small business; but in 2010, the President's health care law threw 70 years of precedent completely out the window.

This new 30-hour rule is forcing companies to scale back hours, with more part-time jobs and less full-time jobs, so now, many employees that were working full time—good full-time jobs—have seen their paychecks cut up to 25 percent.

One study recently found that regulations in the President's new health care law, like the 30-hour rule, are reducing small business wages to workers every year by \$22 billion and that employment in small businesses has been reduced by 350,000 jobs.

Mr. Speaker, Americans want more full-time opportunities, and they should get to choose to pursue those opportunities, not have their employers force to reduce them to part-time work. America's workers deserve better.

Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD a letter from The Associated General

Contractors of America supporting this legislation by Mr. YOUNG.

THE ASSOCIATED
GENERAL CONTRACTORS OF AMERICA,
Arlington, VA, January 7, 2015.

Re support H.R. 30, The Saving American Workers Act of 2015.

Hon. TODD YOUNG,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE YOUNG: On behalf of the Associated General Contractors of America (AGC), I am writing in support of the Saving American Workers Act of 2015, H.R. 30. The bill would repeal the 30-hour definition of "full-time employment" in the Affordable Care Act (ACA) by replacing it with the more traditional 40-hour definition.

The construction industry is typically project-based, transitory and seasonal, which distinguishes it from other professional industries with more predictable hours. As a result, many construction employers rely on part-time, seasonal and variable-hour employees. In addition, the construction industry consists of many smaller employers with limited human resource and administrative staff. These two issues alone add layers of difficulty for a construction firm that is required to use the complex formulas in the ACA to determine whether or not it is considered a large employer under the law.

Despite prior delay of the reporting and enforcement provisions of the ACA, the law continues to be an administrative burden for employers. Replacing the definition of a full-time employee to the more commonly accepted 40 hours per week will, at the very least, reduce some of the complexity associated with the ACA.

AGC hopes you will support H.R. 30 and provide some relief for construction employers across the country.

Sincerely,

JEFFREY D. SHOAF,
Senior Executive Director,
Government Affairs.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER), another active member of our committee.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, America's middle class is facing a crisis. Despite the fact that productivity has soared and profits have increased, these gains are not flowing to the vast majority of Americans.

In 81 percent of America's counties, median income today is lower than it was 15 years ago. After adjusting for inflation, today's average hourly wage has the same purchasing power as it did in 1979, this despite the fact that American workers are producing far more. Productivity has increased 74 percent since 1973.

There is a reason why the wealth is concentrated at the top. There are a myriad of tiny little changes that have a cumulative effect on the vast majority of American workers. Refusing to raise the minimum wage, attacking the right to unionize, special tax benefits for a few, and today's legislation are all examples.

No doubt changing the definition of 40 hours for purposes of the Affordable Care Act will benefit a few businesses, but there are far more employees who work 40 hours a week or more than who work 30 to 40 hours, and as has been pointed out by the conservatives at the

National Review and The Weekly Standard, it is easier to drop employees to 39 hours a week than to 29 hours a week. This meaning this proposal is going to reduce far more hours of work and wages for whom it matters the most.

Wages aren't the only benefit at stake. As has been pointed out, according to the CBO, a million workers will lose health insurance through their employer, half of whom will lose it altogether. The other half will be shifted to the government through Medicaid, increasing spending by more than \$50 billion over the next decade.

Mr. Speaker, this would be one of the myriad of policies that further disadvantages America's middle class. This is another step by my Republican friends to deny more people the benefits of that work, widen the divide, and disadvantage not only families today but far into the future.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KLINE), the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman RYAN for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 30. It was noted not long ago that the President's health care law will "destroy the foundation of the 40-hour workweek that is the backbone of the American middle class."

Those aren't my words, of course, Mr. Speaker. Instead, those are the words expressed by leaders of some of the Nation's largest labor unions, including the president of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters. Echoing these concerns, members of the AFL-CIO endorsed a resolution that warned ObamaCare will lead to a "new underclass of less-than-30-hour workers."

We have all seen the headlines in recent years, headlines describing how employers are left with practically no choice but to cut workers' hours in order to avoid the health care law's punitive employer mandate. Put simply, the law punishes employers who provide workers with full-time jobs.

□ 1445

A small business owner and constituent of mine from Savage, Minnesota, wrote earlier this week that the President's health care law is "wreaking havoc on the American workplace." No doubt many Americans agree.

Unfortunately, the law is wreaking havoc in schools as well. According to a recent report, Louisiana school administrators are being forced to cut staff hours and hire more part-time teachers to avoid Federal penalties. Schools in New Jersey and elsewhere are facing similar tough choices. One superintendent described the costs associated with the health care law's mandates as "an unbelievable drain on school systems."

Don't America's teachers and students deserve better?

Mr. Speaker, let's tell our Nation's school leaders that we won't sit idly by while ObamaCare makes it more difficult to provide students the quality education they deserve. Let's tell our small business owners that we want to help make it easier, not harder, to create full-time jobs. Let's tell the country's union leaders that we share your concerns and are prepared to do something about it. And finally, let's tell workers that we won't let a flawed law deny them the wages that they need to provide for their families.

I urge my colleagues to stand with the American people by supporting this commonsense, bipartisan legislation.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND), another distinguished member of our committee.

Mr. KIND. I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, let me make sure I have got this straight. We have got a bill before us today, according to the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office, that will increase our budget deficit by \$53 billion because there are no offsets or pay-fors in this legislation; it will reduce the number of people receiving employment-based health care coverage by about 1 million workers; it will increase the number of people in Medicaid, the Children's Health Insurance Program, the health insurance exchanges, by more than 500,000 people; and it will increase the number of uninsured in our country by another 500,000 people—all at the same time when, again, the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office found in a recent analysis: "There is no compelling evidence that part-time employment has increased as a result of the Affordable Care Act."

What's not to like?

Happy New Year, American workers.

My good friend from Wisconsin recently said during the debate that he can't find a worse way to hurt working families. Well, you did with this legislation, and I encourage my colleagues to vote "no" on it.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY), the distinguished House majority leader.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, we all know that the employer mandate has resulted in lost wages and jobs in America. That point is just not debatable anymore. Numerous studies have said so and the Congressional Budget Office. Businesses are now reacting to ObamaCare's perverse incentive and scaling down.

But the impact of this mandate isn't on paper; it is in the people across this country in each and every district who feel the pain of ObamaCare. In my district, Kern County, firefighters, Department of Mental Health, probation facilities have been forced to reduce hours of extra-help employees, and that is just in county government.

But you know who the employer mandate hurts most of all? Women,

small business owners, low-income and unskilled workers. But we have an opportunity today to do something about it, passing Representative TODD YOUNG's Save the American Workers Act.

This bill is common sense. It is bipartisan. But the President has already threatened to veto it. The American people don't want that. They want to see solutions, not obstruction.

So, Mr. President, you say you care about those who have fallen on hard times. Show it; sign this bill.

You say you care about the youth of this country struggling with the debt and unable to find jobs. Show it; sign this bill.

You care about the low-income workers, about working women and small businesses. Show it, and sign this bill. Actions speak louder than words.

The employer mandate and ObamaCare as a whole are hurting the job market and are hurting America. Only a full repeal of this law will solve the problem. But this bill helps, and the President should sign it.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL), another active member of our committee.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in opposition to the Save American Workers Act. Look, we will not recognize the fact that in 1960 to 2013, this is the lowest increase in health care costs in the last 50, 60 years.

They don't want to admit it. You can't admit one positive thing about the ACA. But I want you to tell the people who you throw off health care insurance, I want them, through the Speaker, to tell them that no longer are you going to be covered if you have preconditions. You do it.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is nothing more than a tool for large employers to avoid providing their employees with health insurance, despite the fact they can afford to do so.

Now, look, this is not a perfect piece of legislation. We have never passed a perfect piece of legislation. Only God is perfect.

The bill will reduce the number of people receiving insurance through their employers. Simple fact. Been codified. Increase the number of people getting insurance through the Affordable Care Act. Put more burden on the Treasury and increase the number of people who will end up with no insurance.

Studies have shown that raising the threshold to 40 hours would nearly triple the number of workers at risk of having their hours just slightly reduced by firms looking to avoid requirements to provide their employees with health insurance.

My Republican colleagues love to extol the virtues of fiscal responsibility, so it is good to know that those concerns can be so easily cast aside for bills like this that not only add to the deficit, but also achieve their noble goal of resulting in more Americans going without health insurance.

Through the Speaker, I would like to give the manager 30 days to change his thoughts that were extended this week in the newspaper when he said that this bill will give more people more full-time work. Show us. Show us, please.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG).

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to stand here in support of the Save American Workers Act, legislation that helps my constituents in Michigan who are struggling under the President's health care law, regardless of the sophistry from the other side.

While Michigan has been hard-hit over the past few years for many reasons, the negative effects of the President's health care law have only amplified our struggles by eroding full-time work opportunities for hourly workers.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Workforce Protections, I am deeply committed to safeguarding workers and businesses from ObamaCare's damaging consequences. Restoring the traditional 40-hour workweek is an important reform that will protect employees and provide certainty for employers.

We need effective solutions that focus on getting people back to work rather than forcing people from their jobs, like Janet from Jackson, Michigan, who called my office in tears last September.

This 56-year-old single mother of three had just been told that morning by her employer that her home health care job was being moved from 36 hours to 28 hours because of the new requirements under ObamaCare. She asked: How am I going to pay my mortgage and insurance with only 28 hours?

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

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield the gentleman an additional 15 seconds.

Mr. WALBERG. Let's give Janet the opportunity to save her 36 hours, have it back, by passing the Save American Workers Act. Like Janet, everyone should have the chance to work, to succeed and prosper and be in control of their own health care issues.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS), another distinguished member of our committee.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 30, the so-labeled Save American Workers Act, which I call the "Sabotage the Affordable Health Care Act," and that is because the bill before us will help to do just that—sabotage affordable health care for millions of Americans.

It would make it easier for employers to not participate in providing health care assistance to their employees. It would drive low- and moderate-income workers back to the emergency rooms of public hospitals and clinics.

The CBO has said that passage of this measure would raise the deficit by \$53 billion over a 10-year period and put a

million people in government-sponsored health insurance, Medicaid, CHIP, and the exchanges. It would promote episodic care and take us back to yesteryears in health care delivery.

The Affordable Care Act is already working—and working well. On a daily basis, it is taking people off the uninsured rolls.

H.R. 30 is a step backwards. It is not good for workers; it is not good for health care delivery; and it is not good for America.

I would urge a "no" vote for H.R. 30.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BYRNE).

Mr. BYRNE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate your leadership on this very important issue.

Mr. Speaker, I support this bill. In fact, just this morning I was reading your op-ed from USA Today in which you make a great point. This law cannot be fixed. It is beyond repair. No quick legislative fix can fix this law and make it work for the countless American families who have already been negatively impacted, including people in my district.

Last November, the American people spoke loud and clear. They want to see bold legislative action that pushes back against the failed policies of this President.

I support this bill, but I want to do more, and we must do more. I look forward to working with the chairman and leadership of this House to move forward with the full repeal of this law.

Mr. Speaker, I will insert into the RECORD the position statement favoring this bill from the National Federation of Independent Business, the voice of small business of America.

NATIONAL FEDERATION OF
INDEPENDENT BUSINESS,

Washington, DC, January 6, 2015.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the National Federation of Independent Business (NFIB), the nation's leading small business advocacy organization, I am writing in support of H.R. 30, the Save American Workers Act of 2015. H.R. 30 will be considered an NFIB Key Vote for the 114th Congress.

This legislation would replace the new 30-hour per week full-time or full-time equivalent (FTE) employee definition created by the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (ACA) with a 40-hour per week definition. The ACA defines full-time employee for the purpose of the employer mandate as an employee who works an average of 30-hours per week (130-hours per month). The employer mandate is a requirement that businesses with 100 or more full-time or FTE employees offer qualified, "affordable" health insurance to 70 percent of full-time employees or pay costly penalties beginning in 2015. In 2016, businesses with 50 or more full-time or FTE employees must offer qualified, "affordable" health insurance to 95 percent of full-time employees and their dependents or pay costly penalties.

In early 2013, NFIB testified before the House Committee on Small Business that the new definition is "one of the most dangerous parts in the law." The ACA marks the first time that "full-time" is expressly defined in federal law. Prior to the ACA's enactment, the determination was left up to the employer.¹ Similarly, the Fair Labor

Standards Act has long dictated that overtime pay starts after 40-hours per week.² Thus, employers and employees have long understood “full-time” to be equivalent to 40-hours per week.

The 30-hour full-time definition is already resulting in less opportunities, fewer hours and lower incomes for employees. Small businesses are already being forced to shrink their workforce below and restricting workforce growth above the 50 FTE employee threshold in preparation for the costly mandate.

H.R. 30 would provide some immediate relief for small-business owners and employees. The bill would reduce taxes on employers by tens of billions of dollars. For employees, the bill would prevent decreases in take home pay.

NFIB supports H.R. 30 and will consider it an NFIB Key Vote for the 114th Congress. We look forward to working with you to protect small business as the 114th Congress moves forward.

Sincerely,

AMANDA AUSTIN,
Vice President,
Public Policy.

ENDNOTES

1 <http://www.dol.gov/dol/topic/workhours/full-time.htm>

2 http://www.dol.gov/whd/overtime_pay.htm

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, could I ask you for the available time now on both sides?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan has 11¾ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Wisconsin has 13¾ minutes remaining.

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

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CURBELO).

Mr. CURBELO of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Save American Workers Act of 2015 and would like to thank the gentleman from Indiana for reintroducing this important legislation.

I have only been a Member of Congress for 2 days now, but passing bills to help American workers and those who employ them, especially so early in the year, is exactly what our constituents sent us to Washington to accomplish.

The purpose of this legislation is simple: to increase the threshold of classifying a full-time worker under the Affordable Care Act from 30 hours to 40 hours a week.

Back in my south Florida district, I constantly hear from families who are frustrated by the burdens of the Affordable Care Act. The 30-hour workweek provision has limited the incomes of many Americans and their potential to grow in their jobs.

Defining 40 hours as a full workweek will provide relief to many families who are unfairly getting caught in these growth-crushing regulations. Working Americans want to get ahead and work as many hours as possible to provide for their families. The 30-hour workweek is limiting their ability to do so.

So, again, I want to reiterate my support for this bill. I look forward to

working with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to find common ground where we can make changes in the Affordable Care Act that will benefit our neighbors back home.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, it is a real pleasure to yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE), the ranking member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

□ 1500

Mr. PALLONE. I thank my colleague from Michigan.

Mr. Speaker, I was happy to see not the last speaker but the previous Republican speaker—I think he was the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BYRNE)—actually say that he wanted to repeal the Affordable Care Act because that is what this is all about.

I guess I could take some happiness in the fact that we are not having an outright repeal of the Affordable Care Act on the floor today, but I know that this effort is really about repealing the bill. It is a piece-by-piece approach, where the Republicans want to basically tear down what—in my opinion, and when I go home my constituents say—is an excellent program.

More and more people are signing up for the Affordable Care Act. More and more people are getting insurance at an affordable price with subsidies and the expansion of Medicaid. The Republicans know that they can't repeal it outright, so now, they are trying to do it piece by piece.

There is no kidding ourselves as to what this bill will do. It is going to increase the deficit, adding \$53 billion to our debt. It is going to increase the number of uninsured. It will shift more people onto public programs, and it will cause workers who are currently receiving employer-sponsored health coverage to lose that coverage.

My Republican colleagues claim this bill is necessary to protect jobs, but the fact of the matter is that the Affordable Care Act has strengthened the job market. Our economy and workforce are stronger now than before the law was passed.

Basically, what is happening here is if you are a large employer with more than 50 full-time workers—in other words, 96 percent of employers are unaffected by the law—for those 4 percent of larger employers who have the means, the law says they need to do right by their full-time workers and offer them health insurance.

The Republicans don't think businesses owe their employees anything at all. They think that bigger businesses should have the right to deny their workers health insurance. Even though the ACA says that that is what they should do—give them health insurance—they say, “No, they shouldn't have to do that.”

The bill the Republicans have presented today would say that big businesses could deny health coverage to someone working 39 hours a week, 52 weeks a year. That is not a part-time

worker. Their employers should provide them with health coverage. That is all that we are asking.

Giving big businesses a green light to drop coverage for their workers is not the way to move the country forward. Workers have the right to decent health care, and businesses should help them get it. That is the fair thing. That is the right thing.

This bill simply takes us in the wrong direction. I keep hearing from my colleagues on the other side of the aisle as to how terrible the Affordable Care Act is. The fact of the matter is it is working and it is working for working people.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY), a member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I thank the chairman.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 30.

I am amazed as to how many times we let politics interfere with policy. I want to tell you who you are really hurting. You are not hurting the Republican Party by your remarks. What you are doing is hurting the American people by your remarks.

This is America's Congress. It is not a Republican Congress, and it is not a Democrat Congress. It is America's Congress. Who have you hurt the most with this policy? Women. Lower-income people and lower middle-income people have suffered greatly.

How do I know that? It is because I am actually in the job market. I have actually hired people. I know the dignity of labor, and I know the harm that is being done by this care act that is totally unaffordable and uncaring.

It is unbelievable that we would come to the floor of this House and somehow make the other political party look bad and turn our backs on the people who sent us. It is not working, gentlemen. We don't have to dismantle it. It is falling apart on its own.

In fact, it is so bad that the President won't even enforce the full law until after an election. Please tell me politics didn't have anything to do with that. Let's do what is right for the American people for a change and quit trying to posture on some kind of a political stance that is just based on fantasy.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), who is now the ranking member on Education and the Workforce.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the gentlemen from the other side of the aisle have already voted over 50 times to roll back the Affordable Care Act. This is one more attempt.

More than 150 million Americans get their health coverage through their jobs or through a family member's job. As for the Affordable Care Act, when

we passed it, at that time, 96 percent of all businesses with over 50 employees provided health insurance for their full-time employees.

So that we wouldn't dismantle the President's system—rather, that we would build on it—we established a mandate. Those employers—those businesses—with over 50 employees would be mandated to provide insurance for their full-time employees. Ninety-six percent were already doing it without a mandate, and those with under 50 employees weren't subject to the mandate.

This bill would change the ACA's definition of "full-time employee" for somebody who works 30 hours a week to 40 hours a week. That puts a lot of Americans at risk of having their hours cut to just under the 40-hour threshold, so that a few employers—just a few, as 96 percent were already doing it—can escape their responsibility of providing the insurance.

They are less likely to suffer a job loss today because most people work a 40-hour week. Cutting below 30 is very unlikely because people would start quitting. Ninety-six percent were already being provided their insurance.

Now, if you are working from 9 to 5, with an hour off for lunch, suddenly, you are no longer a full-time employee. That is only 35 hours. If the employer sends everybody home at 4 on Fridays, that is 39 hours. You are no longer a full-time employee.

As a result, many people—those currently working between 30 and 40 and those who will have their hours cut—will suddenly be part-time employees, not entitled to employer-provided health insurance. According to the Congressional Budget Office, that is about a million people who will lose their employer-based health coverage.

Mr. Speaker, this is just another attack on the health security of American families. It is an attack that families do not want, but it will help that handful of businesses that just wants to deny hardworking employees their health insurance.

I want to put one thing on the record. We have had more consecutive months of 200,000-plus job growth than anytime in recent history, so the job-killing aspect of it can't be doing too badly—a lot more than there were under the previous administration.

We ought to be building on the ACA, not diminishing it. We ought to be working to strengthen it, including fully expanding Medicaid to all 50 States. We can do better. This hurts families.

It might help a few businesses that want to deny hardworking Americans their health coverage that has been mandated, although 96 percent of businesses already were doing it.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, let me inquire as to the time distributions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BYRNE). The gentleman from Wisconsin has 11¼ minutes remaining, and the

gentleman from Michigan has 6¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Tennessee, Dr. ROE.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Save American Workers Act. I am pleased that the first vote we are going to do is a bipartisan bill of the 114th Congress.

Everywhere I go, I hear concerns about the lack of jobs and the need for job creation. Tennessee's unemployment rate is far too high at 6.8 percent. We have got to do everything we possibly can to encourage employers not only to create jobs but to maintain the jobs they currently offer.

Employers are already struggling to make their budgets work in an uncertain economy, and we know that these employers will have to respond one of two ways, either by cutting hours or by hiring fewer workers. It is already happening. Public school systems in my State and community colleges across the country are cutting hours or are reducing class sizes taught.

I have spent my entire adult life as a physician, taking care of people from all walks of life. I want every American, including those with preexisting conditions, to have access to affordable medical care.

That is why I have worked in Congress to develop patient-centered solutions that help people afford health care, like the American Health Care Reform Act. In the meantime, we must do what we can to protect the American people from the unintended consequences of the Affordable Care Act.

That is why I encourage my colleagues to support this bill.

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

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I have 13 minutes remaining, and the gentleman has 11 minutes remaining. Is that where we are right now?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin has 10¼ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Michigan has 6¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HOLDING), a new member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. HOLDING. Mr. Speaker, we have already seen the disastrous effects of the President's health care law, from the increased premiums and deductibles to workers' hours being reduced.

While the President refuses to make commonsense changes to this health care law that is destroying opportunities for work in this country, my colleagues and I in Congress have been committed to taking action.

I am happy to be a cosponsor of the bill before us, and I look forward to restoring the ability for working students, single parents, single mothers, women, and other Americans desiring to log more hours to do just that, to work more hours.

Mr. Speaker, hard work is a cherished value in North Carolina. Let's pass the Save American Workers Act today to protect workers' hours and their wages.

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

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. COSTELLO).

Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, restoring the 40-hour workweek is an important reform that will provide relief and certainty for employers in my district, and it will help protect their hardworking employees.

The ACA's unprecedented modification from 40 to 30 hours has forced many jobs creators to scale back business growth, to force them to cut employee hours, and/or to reduce the take-home wages of hardworking Americans.

Mr. Speaker, let's focus on what this legislation is designed to do and who it is designed to help. Those making under \$30,000 a year, disproportionately women and young Americans, who need the hours and jobs the most, are the ones most at risk of having their hours and wages cut under existing law.

Small businesses and restaurants in my district, such as Victory Brewing Company in Downingtown, Pennsylvania, have suffered. For example, Victory has faced difficult decisions about employee hours and has been plagued with chronic underemployment just to make ends meet.

I am proud to cosponsor the Save American Workers Act. This will help so many businesses not just in southeastern Pennsylvania, but across the Nation.

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

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ROSKAM), a senior member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. ROSKAM. I thank the chairman.

Mr. Speaker, there is an opportunity here for us to do a good thing, and that is to take a law that was well-intentioned but poorly executed and fix it and make some improvements. There has been all kinds of discussion over the past couple of months—highly-charged political discussion, really, on both sides, that makes false claims about different people's motives.

I will tell you the motive of the sponsor of this bill, Mr. YOUNG from Indiana, is to do this: to lift a burden off of people who find themselves not served by a law that they were told was going to serve them.

They were told: "Oh, this is going to be great. There is going to be no adverse effect on your job opportunities. In fact, it is all going to be terrific. Just sign up for it."

As it turns out, Mr. YOUNG recognized that that wasn't working out for

people who were at the lower end of the economic spectrum, Mr. Speaker, so he decided to do something about it. He decided to introduce this bill.

What it does is simply lifts a burden. It says we are not going to create a downward pressure on jobs. Instead, we are going to create an environment in which jobs are more buoyant, and they are more abundant, and there is more of them.

Enough with the false claims and the straw man argument that this is somehow insidious and is taking something away. No, no, no. This isn't taking away. This is adding, and this is empowering, and this is life-giving, and we ought to support it.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, it is now my pleasure to yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE), a distinguished member of Energy and Commerce.

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, this bill purports to solve a problem that does not exist.

The Republicans keep claiming that this provision of the Affordable Care Act is affecting workers' hours, but despite these claims and despite a lot of anecdotal evidence that I have heard from the business community, the labor and employment experts have detected no such impact.

In fact, our economy has created 10.8 million new jobs since the passage of the Affordable Care Act. Almost 10 million of those jobs are full-time jobs.

What this proposal would actually do is put more workers into the kind of jeopardy that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle say they are trying to prevent.

Only 7 percent of Americans work in jobs that place them close to the current 30-hour-a-week threshold. Far more Americans—about 44 percent of them—actually work 40 hours a week, so even slight changes to their work schedules are going to deny them access to the health insurance that they so desperately need.

I have been sitting here. I am really touched by the concern that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have for women and for young people, people who really are at the lower end of the employment spectrum and who the Republicans say are going to be harmed by this.

Let me tell you, for the 4 percent of the large corporations that are subject to these provisions of the Affordable Care Act—people who have 50 employees or more—here is the way it is going to work for the young people and for the women.

□ 1515

These people are going to be people working for large corporations, making just barely above minimum wage. If they work 40 hours a week, they get insurance.

Under this proposal, all their employer has to do is cut 1 hour a week out of that—39 hours a week—and suddenly they lose their health insurance.

And that is what is going to put those people at risk. Those women in clerical jobs, women with little kids, those young people in their twenties coming into the job market, trying to do the right thing and have health insurance, now they are going to have to pay for that insurance out of their own pockets, and for no reason.

The consequences of this misguided proposal don't stop there. The Congressional Budget Office estimates that H.R. 30 would raise the deficit by \$53 billion in the next decade while also keeping a million American workers from getting health insurance through their jobs.

I actually agree with my friend from Illinois (Mr. ROSKAM). I think the intentions behind this bill are good intentions. But I think the effect of this bill is going to be to deny insurance for a whole lot of Americans who are at risk—women and young people, exactly the people we should be giving insurance to.

Vote “no.”

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1½ minutes.

There are a couple of points I would like to make. I have been listening to this debate. I think what is happening here is that it is the fantasy land of ObamaCare.

The proponents of the ObamaCare law, on the other side of the aisle, speaker after speaker are coming to the well with this fantasy of what ObamaCare ought to be, what they think it is. It is this mythical idea in their minds, which was all the rhetoric that was used to sell the law in the first place on all these good things it is going to do. The problem is: reality. Look at what is actually happening in the real world.

This is the problem with ObamaCare, when the myth of ObamaCare clashes with the reality of what is going on in America. People are losing their hours. People are getting jobs cut back. It is not big corporations; it is small businesses.

Look, I talked to a retailer in the First Congressional District of Wisconsin who was telling me—tears coming down her face—of how she had to cut back hours, about how she had to take all of her full-time employees at her retail business and knock them down to part time. Why? Because her competitors are doing the same thing.

This is happening throughout America. The last speaker basically proved the point by saying, if you go to 40, they will go down to 39. Well, 39 is a lot better than 29. And guess what? The majority of Americans are at 34 hours. Going to 40 puts them above that; going to 30 puts them below that, putting people out of work.

The fantasy land of ObamaCare, the fatal conceit of the central planning behind this law is that, in reality, it just doesn't work. Let's give people relief.

At this time, I yield 1 minute to the gentlelady from Indiana (Mrs. WALORSKI).

Mrs. WALORSKI. I thank the chairman.

Mr. Speaker, I, too, am pleased to stand here today to support the Save American Workers Act.

I also want to thank my colleague and fellow Hoosier, Representative TODD YOUNG, for sponsoring this bill.

This bipartisan legislation would restore the traditional 40-hour workweek and help employers and employees. Right now, the Affordable Care Act defines full-time employees as those who work 30 hours or more a week, not the standard, more traditional 40 hours.

My district is the RV capital of the world. Businesses are ripe for growth. Expansion is on the horizon. They are afraid to hire and be forced to lay off if this 30-hour definition is not changed.

Our businesses, like the School City of Mishawaka that educates kids, need permanent relief from the burdensome and costly requirements of ObamaCare.

The Save American Workers Act will create jobs in my State and in my district for Hoosiers.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce a letter of support from the Precision Machined Products Association, which employs many machinists in my district—real jobs for real people.

PRECISION MACHINED
PRODUCTS ASSOCIATION,

January 6, 2015.

Hon. TODD YOUNG,
Longworth House Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE YOUNG: On behalf of the Precision Machined Products Association (PMPA), our members and the roughly 100,000 employees nationwide in our industry, thank you for your introduction of H.R. 30, the Saving American Workers Act, and your continued efforts to address the issues facing businesses manufacturing in America.

Like many other manufacturers and small businesses across the country, we are concerned about the potential negative impacts caused by the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act's 30-hour threshold for full-time employee classification.

Manufacturing businesses, especially companies with fewer than 500 employees, already face significant disadvantages when competing with foreign manufacturers in the global market and this “30-hour rule” is counter-productive to the goal of expanding access to affordable healthcare for employees of small businesses. Rather than providing additional employees with healthcare, the 30-hour rule will force employers to cut their part-time employees' hours in order to prevent their healthcare costs from skyrocketing.

Your leadership and efforts to repeal the 30-hour rule and standardize the definition of a “full-time” employee to 40 hours per week would save manufacturers like us from having to reduce their employees' hours and, rather, would allow them to invest in more employees and grow their businesses. At such a crucial time in our nation's economic recovery, the Affordable Care Act's incentive for businesses to cut their employees' hours to avoid the “full-time” classification and dramatic increases in healthcare costs will be damaging to small businesses and to the employees' it purports to help.

Thank you for your consideration and your leadership on this issue on behalf of the metalworking industry.

Sincerely,

MILES FREE,
Co-interim Executive Director,
PMPA.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI). Mr. LIPINSKI. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I will first enter into the RECORD a letter from the Illinois Restaurant Association in support of the Save American Workers Act.

ILLINOIS RESTAURANT ASSOCIATION,
Chicago, IL, January 7, 2015.

Hon. DAN LIPINSKI,
Congressman, Illinois 3rd Congressional District, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LIPINSKI: I am writing you on behalf of the Illinois Restaurant Association to express my full support of your efforts to restore the traditional definition of full-time employee to 40 hours per week with your sponsorship of H.R. 30, the Save American Workers Act of 2015. This legislation will encourage a business environment where employers in the restaurant and hospitality can focus on creating more jobs, expanding their businesses, and contributing to a robust economy.

The restaurant and hospitality industry is the largest private sector employer in the state of Illinois, employing over 517,000 people. As President & CEO of the Illinois Restaurant Association, I represent over 25,000 restaurants operating in the state who have expressed the urgent need to redefine the full-time work week definition of 30-hour-per-week.

Because of the Affordable Care Act's arbitrary 30-hour-per-week definition of a full-time employee, restaurants are being forced to restructure their workforce by reducing their employees' hours. Employees are losing the mobility and flexibility in their schedules they normally would enjoy when working at a restaurant. Opportunities are decreasing for young and inexperienced workers to gain entry-level employment and advance into a fulfilling career in the restaurant and hospitality industry.

The implications of this issue cannot be overstated. Nationally, restaurants employ over 13.5 million people, and our industry is a major driver of the economic recovery. If Congress does not act to address this issue, thousands of jobs will be lost and businesses will suffer. I encourage you and your colleagues in Congress to pass the Save American Workers Act of 2015, a piece of common sense legislation that will protect jobs and strengthen the American economy.

Sincerely,

SAM TOIA,
President & CEO,
Illinois Restaurant Association.

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Save American Workers Act, which I join the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG) in introducing again this year.

I have not supported and I do not support the repeal of the ACA, but some commonsense changes need to be made. The administration has already acknowledged difficulties in implementing the employer mandate by instituting delays and substantial administrative changes.

One problem is that the ACA defines full-time work as 30 hours a week,

causing small businesses, local governments, and schools to cut the hours of workers and limit workers' scheduling flexibility. The CBO has confirmed that shifting to a 40-hour full-time definition—Americans' common understanding of full-time work—would lead to some workers seeing an increase in their take-home pay.

Even the President's former senior adviser, David Axelrod, has suggested that the President consider this change. So let's do right by America's part-time workers, family businesses, local governments, and schools. Let's pass this bill and fix this broken part of the ACA.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY).

Mr. PERRY. I thank the chairman.

Mr. Speaker, I also am proud to cosponsor this bill and thank the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG) for his hard work on it.

I think it is fascinating that we hear from my colleagues from the other side that they are so interested in how much money the Federal Government would lose—the Federal Government. I wonder who they came here to work for. Are they interested in how many dollars their hardworking taxpayers are losing by the implementation of this ill-founded law?

I just got off of the phone with one of my employers in the district who has about 500 employees. It is a good, hardworking, family-run business, and he tells me, the number one issue that he is dealing with is poring over spreadsheets day in and day out, trying to figure out how he can put one employee in a place where that employee wants to work in his business because that employee might want more hours because he wants to make his own or her own choice about health care or how much money he or she has. Maybe that employee is retired, their husband or wife is retired, and they just need the extra hours, want the extra hours, but he can't provide them.

Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to me that some folks on the other side said, just help us fix it. Yet when we try to fix it, they say, no, it is fine; it is perfect the way it is.

Mr. Speaker, central planning did not work in the USSR. It does not work in Cuba. And I wish you would quit trying to place it in the United States.

Mr. LEVIN. How much time do I have, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan has 2¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, you know, there has been some discussion here. The gentleman from Illinois said there isn't anything being taken away. That is simply not true. The basis for the Joint Tax and CBO estimate is that there will be the loss of hours for hundreds of thousands of people. And as a result, 1

million people will no longer be enrolled in employment-based coverage, and of those, 500,000 will have no insurance. So that statement is not correct.

And, if I might say so, when the chairman said the House will take up a bill to define full time as 40 hours per week so more people can work full time, the basis of the CBO estimate is that fewer people will be working 40 hours or more. That is the basis for their conclusions.

So let me just, if I might, emphasize what has been said by a conservative, Yuval Levin—not related:

Putting the cutoff for the employer mandate at 40 hours would likely put far, far more people at risk of having their hours cut than leaving it at 30 hours. That would make for a worse effect on workers and on the economy.

That is just a fact.

The ACA has eliminated discrimination in terms of preexisting conditions. It has dramatically reduced the uninsured rate—now 12.9 percent, the lowest since that began to be tracked. It has increased Medicare benefits, and it has held health care cost growth to record lows.

If you don't like the ACA despite all of these achievements, continue to try to repeal it. But don't punish people who are working 40 hours or more with this bill. That is what this does. And it leaves 500,000 with no insurance whatsoever. This is worse than a terrible bill.

And I will now enter into the RECORD letters of opposition from the Consumers Union, the AFL-CIO, AFSCME, SEIU, and the Teamsters.

CONSUMERS UNION,
January 6, 2015.

Hon. SANDER M. LEVIN,
House of Representatives, Longworth House Office Building, Washington, DC.

Consumers Union urges you to oppose changing the Affordable Care Act's (ACA) definition of full time work from a 30-hour per week threshold to 40 hours. The Affordable Care Act's current 30-hour threshold for classification as full-time employee for purposes of the employer "mandate" in the ACA discourages employers from easily circumventing penalties that incentivize employers to provide health insurance coverage to their workers. Raising the full-time threshold to 40 hours per week would reduce access to employer-provided insurance coverage.

Under the ACA, employers with at least 50 full-time equivalent employees who do not provide health insurance to their full-time workers must pay a penalty. This makes it fairer for employers who do provide insurance and have to figure that into their costs. More importantly, it helps reduce the cost of providing care to the uninsured that would otherwise be picked up by public programs, such as Medicaid, and, hence, ultimately passed on to taxpayers. In fact, the Congressional Budget Office and Joint Committee on Taxation estimate that changing the threshold to 40 hours would increase budget deficits by \$25.4 billion over the 2015-2019 period and by \$73.7 billion over the 2015-2024 period.

Currently the ACA penalty is applied to employers who do not offer insurance to full-time employees defined as those who work at least 30 hours a week. Raising the threshold to 40 hours per week would make it much easier for employers to avoid covering millions of Americans who work between 30 and

40 hours a week by cutting their hours slightly. Thus, raising the threshold to 40 hours will jeopardize access to employer coverage for many people who get their insurance through an employer.

Consumers Union strongly supports retaining the current 30-hour threshold and urges you to oppose efforts to increase it.

Sincerely,

DE ANN FRIEDHOLM,
Director of Health Care Reform.

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR
AND CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL OR-
GANIZATIONS,

Washington, DC, January 6, 2015.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the AFL-CIO, I urge you to vote against the misnamed Save American Workers Act. This bill will result in lost work hours for 6.5 million workers, and it will cause many to lose their employment-based insurance coverage, resulting in higher costs for government-subsidized health coverage.

When the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) and the Joint Committee on Taxation (JCT) scored this legislation in July 2014, they found it would increase budget deficits by \$45.7 billion due to a decrease in employer penalty collections and an increase in government-funded health coverage. CBO and JCT found that reductions in employment-based coverage would increase spending for marketplace premium subsidies by \$12.7 billion and for Medicaid and Children's Health Insurance Program coverage by \$6.9 billion.

The Affordable Care Act (ACA) extends coverage to the uninsured by allocating responsibility for the costs among individuals, employers, and government. Under this shared responsibility framework, employers with 50 or more full-time equivalent employees must pay their fair share by offering health care coverage to employees who work 30 or more hours a week or paying a penalty if these workers access exchange subsidies instead. To ensure the success of the ACA, an employer responsibility requirement is needed to preserve current levels of employer-based coverage. However, the 30-hour "cliff" created by the law has motivated some employers to reduce workers' hours to avoid providing coverage. This has been a particular problem for workers employed at retailers, restaurants, public schools, and institutions of higher learning.

Proponents of the Save American Workers Act claim they want to help part-time workers by moving the threshold for employer penalties from 30 to 40 hours. But raising the threshold will only move the cliff and actually increase employers' incentive to reduce workers' hours. According to experts at the UC Berkeley Center for Labor Research and Education, moving the threshold to 40 hours will result in lost work hours for 6.5 million workers. That is nearly three times the number that are vulnerable to employers cutting their hours under the current threshold (2.3 million). The researchers also found that the policy would essentially eliminate the employer responsibility requirement, since employers' costs in moving workers from 40 to 39 hours per week are negligible compared to the costs of offering coverage or paying the employer responsibility penalty.

Congress should strengthen the employer shared responsibility requirement and eliminate the hours cliff, not simply move it. The employer responsibility requirement should be strengthened by lowering the threshold, requiring employers to provide coverage for workers who work 20 hours a week or more or risk a penalty, and by applying a pro rata penalty if workers with fewer than 20 hours are not offered coverage. This is the only way to protect groups of workers that will lose wages under the existing incentive to reduce hours.

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF STATE,
COUNTY AND MUNICIPAL EMPLOYEES,
Washington, DC, January 7, 2015.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the 1.6 million members of the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees (AFSCME), I am writing to express our strong opposition to the Save American Workers Act (H.R. 30), scheduled for a vote in the House on Thursday. Rather than building upon the employer-based system, the bill would undermine it. Despite claims that the bill would restore the 40-hour work week, it would put millions of workers at risk of a reduction in hours below the 40-hour threshold.

Under the Affordable Care Act, large and mid-size employers are required to provide coverage to employees who work 30 or more hours per week. Employers who do not provide coverage must pay a penalty when a full-time worker obtains a tax credit through a health insurance exchange. H.R. 30 would raise the threshold, from 30 to 40 hours, at which point employers are required to either offer coverage or pay a penalty. According to an analysis by researchers at the UC Berkeley Center for Labor Research and Education, moving the threshold from 30 to 40 hours would result in lost work hours for 6.5 million workers, nearly three times the number vulnerable to losing their hours under the current 30-hour threshold (2.3 million).

In addition to causing a loss of work, H.R. 30 would cause a loss of employer-sponsored health coverage and increase the federal deficit. In a report issued today, the Congressional Budget Office estimates that one million people would lose employer-sponsored health coverage under this bill. While some would remain uninsured, the CBO estimates that at least 500,000 would obtain coverage through Medicaid, the Children's Health Insurance Program or health insurance exchanges. Coupled with the loss of penalty revenue, this increased spending would increase the federal deficit by \$53.2 billion over 10 years.

H.R. 30 would effectively eliminate the employer responsibility requirements of the Affordable Care Act (ACA), shifting costs onto workers and to taxpayers. Rather than weakening the employer-based health care system, AFSCME encourages Congress to strengthen it by asking employers to do more of their share, not less.

Sincerely,

SCOTT FREY,
Director of Federal Government Affairs.

SERVICE EMPLOYEES
INTERNATIONAL UNION,
Washington, DC, January 7, 2015.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: The Service Employees International Union (SEIU) strongly opposes H.R. 30, the supposed Save American Workers Act of 2015. Under current law, large employers must provide health coverage to all full-time employees, defined as those employees who work an average of 30 hours or more per week. H.R. 30 would increase the "hours threshold" used to determine full-time employment for ACA purposes from 30 to 40 hours—and, in so doing, hurt working families by putting their benefits and wages at risk.

This bill would jeopardize more workers' full-time status, allow businesses to shift the costs of healthcare to taxpayers and the government, and reduce the availability of employer-sponsored coverage overall. Contrary to proponents' claims, raising the ACA's threshold for full-time work from 30 hours a week to 40 would make a shift towards part-time employment much more likely—not less so. An independent analysis conducted by the University of California Berkeley

Center for Labor Research and Education found that increasing the threshold from 30 to 40 hours would result in nearly three times as many workers, about 6.5 million in total, being vulnerable to hour reductions than under current law.

This ill-conceived bill not only worsens the situation it purports to solve, but will increase costs to the government. As a result of about 1 million workers losing employer-sponsored coverage, the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) estimates that changing the hours threshold would increase the deficit by \$53.2 billion. This bill will allow more businesses to evade their responsibility to provide health insurance, forcing taxpayers and the government to make up the difference.

Finally, while forcing workers from full-time to part-time work is a serious issue, the Affordable Care Act is not the cause. Recent research has shown that transitioning workers to part-time follows historical trends that preceded the ACA and that the transition from part-time back to full-time is slow due to the ongoing recovery from the great recession.

We can work together to improve the law and find policies that help protect working people while ensuring everyone has access to quality, affordable healthcare. However, rather than improving the law, H.R. 30, only serves to undermine the ACA by making a complicated situation worse. For these reasons, SEIU urges you to vote no on H.R. 30, and will include this vote on our Legislative Scorecard, located at www.seiu.org. If you have any questions, contact Ilene Stein, Assistant Legislative Director.

Sincerely,

MARY KAY HENRY,
International President.

INTERNATIONAL BROTHERHOOD
OF TEAMSTERS,
Washington, DC, January 7, 2015.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: The International Brotherhood of Teamsters opposes H.R. 30, the so-called "Save American Workers Act." We urge you to vote against H.R. 30 when it comes to the House floor this week. This legislation will cause millions of workers to lose work hours and it will cause many employees to lose their employment-based health insurance coverage.

The Affordable Care Act requires employers (with 50 or more full-time equivalents) to either offer healthcare coverage to employees who work more than 30 hours a week or to pay a penalty if those workers get healthcare coverage via exchange subsidies. H.R. 30 would raise that threshold (or "cliff") from 30 hours to 40 hours. However, the current 30 hour threshold created by the law has motivated some employers to reduce workers' hours to avoid providing coverage.

Proponents of the bill claim they want to help part-time workers by moving the threshold for employer penalties. However, raising the threshold will increase employers' incentive to reduce workers hours. It will result in nearly tripling (from 2.3 million to 6.5 million) the number of workers vulnerable to having their hours cut, according to experts at UC Berkeley. Researchers have also found that the cost to employers in moving workers from 40 hours (the proposed threshold under H.R. 30) to 39 hours per week are negligible compared to the costs of offering coverage or paying the employer responsibility penalty. Thus, this policy would essentially eliminate the employer responsibility requirement.

Proponents of this legislation claim that they want to help part-time workers. However, the bill would exacerbate the problem it purports to solve. The "Save American

Workers Act" will actually hurt millions of workers and the U.S. economy. The International Brotherhood of Teamsters urges you to vote no on H.R. 30.

Sincerely,

JAMES P. HOFFA,
General President.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, may I ask how much time I have remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin has 3¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG) for the closing on his legislation.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I thank you so much for this opportunity to try to advance legislation to improve the Nation's health care law in a bipartisan fashion.

You know, I don't understand the visceral resistance to trying to lighten the load on our Nation's hourly workers. The wage earners, the people who need it most—our cafeteria workers, our substitute teachers, our people at retail centers all across the country—they are the ones during this still-recovering, seemingly dormant recovery for so many of my constituents, they are the ones who are demanding these sorts of changes.

Much has been made of the evidence here. There is plenty of evidence in every congressional district across the country that people are hurting on account of this 30 hours is full time provision in the Affordable Care Act. And this all comes before the employer mandate had kicked in, and it has followed in the recent days since it officially kicked in on January 1.

This was just implemented. It will be amazing to see the evidence come in, should we not change the definition of full-time employment up to 40 hours, once people figure out that they are going to be paying a big old tax for not buying every single employee above that 30-hour threshold government-sanctioned health insurance.

More evidence: there are over 300 groups that have associated themselves with this legislation and ask that we pass it. Among those groups is the More Time for Full Time coalition, which includes such groups as the Indiana Chamber of Commerce, Indiana Grocery and Convenience Store Association, Indiana Restaurant & Lodging Association, the Michigan Chamber of Commerce, the Michigan Grocers Association, the Michigan Lodging and Tourism Association, the Michigan Restaurant Association.

For more examples, I will enter this document into the RECORD.

MORE TIME FOR FULL TIME,
January 6, 2015.

Hon. MITCH MCCONNELL,
*Senate Majority Leader,
Washington, DC.*

DEAR LEADER MCCONNELL: The More Time for Full-Time Coalition (www.moretimefor

fulltime.org) greatly appreciates your steadfast support for restoring the traditional definition of full-time employee to 40 hours per week and urges you to move Senate consideration of legislation to do so as early as possible in the 114th Congress.

Many employees are being hurt by lost wages and hours because the 30-hour-per-week definition in the Affordable Care Act is forcing employers to restructure their workforce by reducing their employees' hours to alleviate the burden of compliance. Harmonizing the definition of full-time employee in the ACA with the traditional 40-hour definition would benefit both employees through more hours and income, and employers now able to focus on growing their business and creating jobs rather than restructuring their workforce.

In this is not addressed soon, our country will experience significant workforce disruptions and individuals as well as companies will lose valued workforce flexibility. We urge you to work in a bipartisan way to restore the traditional definition of full-time employment by changing the Affordable Care Act's 30-hour-per-week definition.

Many Americans are drawn to part-time jobs with flexible hours to suit their personal needs. Further, employers with variable-hour workforces and flexible scheduling have been appealing and critical for students, single parents, and other individuals struggling to balance various obligations and commitments. This critical flexibility will be lost if employers are forced to abandon current practices in order to avoid significant financial penalties.

Aligning the law's definition of full-time employee status with current levels would help avoid any unnecessary disruptions to employees' wages and hours, and would provide significant relief.

Thank you for considering our concerns and for your leadership in addressing a fundamental challenge employees and businesses face in implementing this law.

Sincerely,

NATIONAL ASSOCIATIONS: American Hotel & Lodging Association, American Rental Association, Asian American Hotel Owners Association, Associated Builders and Contractors, College & University Professional Association for Human Resources, International Franchise Association, National Association of Convenience Stores, National Association of Manufacturers, National Association of Theatre Owners, National Association of Truck Stop Operators, National Club Association, National Council of Chain Restaurants, National Grocers Association, National Restaurant Association, National Retail Federation, Society for Human Resource Management, U.S. Chamber of Commerce.

STATE AND LOCAL ASSOCIATIONS: Adirondack Regional Chamber Commerce (NY), Alabama Grocers Association, Alabama Restaurant & Hospitality Alliance, Alaska Chamber (AK), Alaska Hotel & Lodging Association, Alaska Restaurant & Hospitality Alliance, Albany-Colonie Regional Chamber (NY), Alexander City Chamber of Commerce (AL), Ames Chamber of Commerce (IA), Angel Fire Chamber of Commerce (NM), ARA of Alabama, ARA of Arizona, ARA of Arkansas, ARA of California, ARA of Colorado, ARA of Connecticut, ARA of Florida, ARA of Georgia, ARA of Idaho, ARA of Illinois, ARA of Indiana, ARA of Iowa, ARA of Kentucky, ARA of Louisiana, ARA of Maine, ARA of Maryland, ARA of Massachusetts, ARA of Michigan, ARA of Montana, ARA of Nebraska, ARA of New Jersey, ARA of New York, ARA of North Carolina, ARA of Ohio, ARA of Oklahoma, ARA of Oregon, ARA of Pennsylvania, ARA of Tennessee, ARA of Vermont, ARA of Virginia;

ARA of Washington, ARA of Wisconsin, Arizona Food Marketing Alliance, Arizona

Lodging & Tourism Association, Arkansas Grocers and Retail Merchants Association, Arkansas Hospitality Association, Arkansas State Chamber of Commerce (AK), Ashland Area Chamber of Commerce (OH), Associated Industries of Massachusetts, Inc. (MA), Baltimore Washington Corridor Chamber of Commerce (MD), Bangor Region Chamber of Commerce (ME), Barrow County Chamber of Commerce (GA), Beaver Dam Chamber of Commerce (WI), Boca Raton Chamber of Commerce (FL), Brownsville Chamber of Commerce (TX), California Grocers Association, California Hotel & Lodging Association, California Restaurant Association, Campbell County Chamber of Commerce (WY), Cape May County Chamber of Commerce (NJ);

Carolinas Food Industry Council, Catawba County Chamber of Commerce (NC), Central Chamber of Commerce (LA), Central Delaware Chamber of Commerce (DE), Chester County Chamber of Business and Industry (PA), Clearwater Regional Chamber of Commerce (FL), Cobb Chamber of Commerce (GA), Colorado Hotel & Lodging Association, Colorado Restaurant Association, Committee of 100 Louisiana (LA), Connecticut Food Association, Connecticut Lodging Association, Corning Area Chamber of Commerce (NY), Council Bluffs Area Chamber of Commerce (IA), Dakota County Regional Chamber of Commerce (MN), Delaware Restaurant Association, Delaware State Chamber of Commerce (DE), Denver Metro Chamber of Commerce (CO), Des Plaines Chamber of Commerce & Industry (IL), Dublin-Laurens County Chamber of Commerce (GA);

Fairfax County Chamber of Commerce (VA), Florida Chamber of Commerce (FL), Florida Restaurant & Lodging Association, Fox Cities Chamber of Commerce (WI), Fresno Chamber of Commerce (CA), Fullerton Chamber of Commerce (CA), Galesburg Area Chamber of Commerce (IL), Garrett County Chamber of Commerce (MD), Georgia Food Industry Association, Georgia Hotel & Lodging Association, Georgia Restaurant Association, Glendale Chamber of Commerce (AZ), Goshen Chamber of Commerce (IN), Grand Junction Area Chamber of Commerce (CO), Grand Rapids Area Chamber of Commerce (MI), Grapevine Chamber of Commerce (TX), Greater Burlington Partnership (IA), Greater Durham Chamber of Commerce (NC), Greater Flagstaff Chamber of Commerce (AZ), Greater Green Bay Chamber (WI);

Greater Louisville, Inc. (KY), Greater North Dakota Chamber of Commerce (ND), Greater Phoenix Chamber of Commerce (AZ), Greater Providence Chamber of Commerce (RI), Greater Shreveport Chamber of Commerce (LA), Greater Springfield Chamber of Commerce (VA), Greater Topeka Chamber of Commerce (KS), Greece Chamber of Commerce (NY), Hardy County Chamber of Commerce (WV), Harford County Chamber (MD), Harlan County Chamber of Commerce (KY), Harrisburg Regional Chamber & CREDC (PA), Hawaii Lodging & Tourism Association, Hotel Association of New York City, Inc., Hotel Association of Washington DC, Hueneme Chamber of Commerce (CA), Idaho Lodging & Restaurant Association, Idaho Retailers Association, Illinois Chamber of Commerce (IL), Illinois Food Retailers Association;

Illinois Hotel & Lodging Association, Illinois Restaurant Association, Indiana Chamber of Commerce (IN), Indiana Grocery and Convenience Store Association, Indiana Restaurant & Lodging Association, Iowa Chamber Alliance (IA), Iowa Chamber Alliance

(IA), Iowa Grocery Industry Association, Iowa Restaurant Association, Irving Hispanic Chamber of Commerce (TX), Jacksonville-Onslow Chamber of Commerce (NC), Jefferson Chamber of Commerce (LA), Kansas Food Dealers Association, Kansas Restaurant & Hospitality Association, Kentucky Association of Convenience Stores, Kentucky Chamber of Commerce (KY), Kentucky Grocers Association, Kentucky Restaurant Association, Lemoore Chamber of Commerce (CA), Licking County Chamber of Commerce (OH);

Long Beach Area Chamber of Commerce (CA), Loudoun County Chamber of Commerce (VA), Louisiana Association of Business and Industry (LA), Louisiana Hotel & Lodging Association, Louisiana Restaurant Association, Louisiana Retailers Association, Lubbock Chamber of Commerce (TX), Maine Innkeepers Association, Maine Restaurant Association, Maine State Chamber of Commerce (ME), Marshall Area Chamber of Commerce (MN), Maryland Chamber of Commerce (MD), Maryland Hotel & Lodging Association, Maryland Retailers Association, Massachusetts Food Association, Massachusetts Lodging Association, Michigan Chamber of Commerce (MI), Michigan Grocers Association, Michigan Lodging and Tourism Association, Michigan Restaurant Association;

Mid-America Grocers Association, Mid-Atlantic Hispanic Chamber of Commerce (MD), Minnesota Grocers Association, Minnesota Lodging Association, Minnesota Rental Association, Minnesota Restaurant Association, Miramar Pembroke Pines Regional Chamber of Commerce (FL), Mississippi Hospitality and Restaurant Association, Missouri Grocers Association, Missouri Restaurant Association, Mobile (AL) Area Chamber of Commerce, Monroe Chamber of Commerce (LA), Montana Chamber of Commerce (MT), Montana Lodging & Hospitality Association, Montana Manufacturing Council (MT), Murphysboro Chamber of Commerce (IL), Myrtle Beach Area Chamber of Commerce (SC), Nebraska Chamber of Commerce & Industry (NE), Nebraska Grocery Industry Association, Nebraska Hotel & Motel Association;

Nebraska Restaurant Association, Nevada Hotel & Lodging Association, New Hampshire Equipment Rental Association, New Hampshire Lodging & Restaurant Association, New Hampshire Restaurant & Lodging Association, New Jersey Food Council, New Jersey State Chamber of Commerce (NJ), New Mexico Restaurant Association, New York Hospitality & Tourism Association, New York State Food Merchants Association, New York State Restaurant Association, Newberry County Chamber of Commerce (SC), Nome Chamber of Commerce (AK), North Carolina Chamber (NC), North Carolina Restaurant & Lodging Association, North Carolina Retail Merchants Association, North Country Chamber of Commerce (NY), North Dakota Grocers Association, North Myrtle Beach Chamber of Commerce (SC), North Shore Chamber of Commerce (MA);

Northern Kentucky Chamber of Commerce (KY), Ohio Chamber of Commerce (OH), Ohio Grocers Association, Ohio Hotel & Lodging Association, Ohio Restaurant Association, Oklahoma Grocers Association, Oklahoma Hotel & Lodging Association, Oklahoma Restaurant Association, Orange County Business Council (CA), Oregon Restaurant & Lodging Association, Oshkosh Chamber of Commerce (WI), Overland Park Chamber of Commerce (KS), Oxnard Chamber of Commerce (CA), Ozark Empire Grocers Association, Palm Desert Area Chamber of Commerce (CA), PennSuburban Chamber of Greater Montgomery County (PA), Pennsyl-

vania Chamber of Business and Industry (PA), Pennsylvania Food Merchants Association, Pennsylvania Restaurant & Lodging Association, Portland Chamber of Commerce (TX);

Rathdrum Chamber of Commerce (ID), Rensselaer County Regional Chamber of Commerce (NY), Retail Grocers of Greater Kansas City, Rhode Island Hospitality Association, Rochester Business Alliance (NY), Rocky Mountain Food Industry Association (CO/WY), Rome Area Chamber of Commerce (NY), Roseburg Area Chamber of Commerce (OR), Rowan County Chamber of Commerce (NC), Salt Lake Chamber of Commerce (UT), Santa Clara Chamber of Commerce & Convention—Visitor's Bureau (CA), Santa Clarita Valley Chamber of Commerce (CA), Schuylkill Chamber of Commerce (PA), Simi Valley Chamber of Commerce (CA), South Baldwin Chamber of Commerce (AL), South Carolina Restaurant & Lodging Association, South Carolina Retail Association, South Dakota Retailers Association Restaurant Division, South Padre Island Chamber of Commerce (TX), Springfield Area Chamber of Commerce (MO);

State Chamber of Oklahoma (OK), Tempe Chamber of Commerce (AZ), Tennessee Grocers & Convenience Store Association, Tennessee Hospitality Association, Texas Association of Business (TX), Texas Food & Fuel Association, Texas Hotel & Lodging Association, Texas Rental Association, Texas Restaurant Association, Texas Retailers Association, The Business Council of New York State, Inc. (NY), The Chamber of Reno, Sparks, and Northern Nevada (NV), The Greater Cedar Valley Alliance & Chamber (IA), The Greater Hartsville Chamber of Commerce (SC), Thibodaux Chamber of Commerce (LA), Tucson Metro Chamber (AZ), Upper Tampa Bay Chamber of Commerce (FL), Utah Food Industry Association, Utah Hotel & Lodging Association, Utah Retail Merchants Association;

Valley Industry & Commerce Association (CA), Vermont Chamber of Commerce, Vermont Retail and Grocers Association, Virginia Chamber of Commerce (VA), Virginia Hospitality & Travel Association, Virginia Hospitality & Travel Association, Virginia Retail Merchants Association, Washington Food Industry Association, Washington Lodging Association, West Chambers County Chamber of Commerce (TX), West Virginia Chamber of Commerce (WV), West Virginia Hospitality & Travel Association, West Virginia Oil Marketers and Grocers Association, Western DuPage Chamber of Commerce (IL), Wichita Metro Chamber of Commerce (KS), Wilsonville Area Chamber of Commerce (OR), Wisconsin Grocers Association, Wisconsin Hotel & Lodging Association, Wisconsin Manufacturers and Commerce (WI), Wisconsin Restaurant Association, Wyoming Lodging & Restaurant Association, Wyoming Restaurant & Lodging Association, Yuba-Sutter Chamber of Commerce (CA).

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Why wait? We know we are headed off a cliff here. This is a fiscally irresponsible provision within the Affordable Care Act. Who would imagine that we would try to insure 500,000 additional new workers at the expense of up to \$105 billion in cash wages? It is unfair. We ought not try to finance health insurance for some Americans at the cost of hours and wages for other Americans.

And finally, the Save American Workers Act will remedy these defects in the current law, resulting in zero workers who work 40 or more hours being put at risk of a possible massive

cut in their hours and wages down to 29 hours. And it will enable those who work 30 to 35 hours to no longer be at risk of cuts in their much-needed hours and wages.

□ 1530

For those reasons and so many others, I just encourage my colleagues to have an open mind here and work with us for the good of the country to improve our Nation's health care laws.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. CLARKE of New York. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to oppose H.R. 30, the highly irresponsible Save American Workers Act. This legislation weakens employees' access to health insurance, threatens employer based insurance coverage, and increases the budget deficit by 45.7 billion dollars due in part to the resulting increase in the number of uninsured.

I have always believed that access to quality healthcare is a right, not a privilege! The Affordable Care Act's current 30-hours per week threshold for classification as a full-time employee was designed to discourage employers from circumventing penalties that support the successful implementation of the law. Raising the threshold to 40 hours per week would limit access to employer-provided insurance coverage, and thereby impede a person's right to access healthcare.

Some businesses argue that the Affordable Care Act's classification of a full-time employee adversely impacts a business' hiring and its ability to offer other employee benefits. However, the facts just don't bear this out.

According to the San Francisco Federal Reserve, when the Affordable Care Act's provisions are fully implemented, the overall increase in the incidence of part-time work is likely to be "small, on the order of a 1 to 2 percentage point increase or less." Other organizations' analyses have also found little evidence that health reform has increased part-time work. In fact, since President Obama took office, the overall full-time employment rate has consistently increased, so much so that the current U.S. unemployment rate is 5.8 percent.

The Republican majority is offering the American people a solution in search of a problem. This bill does not save American jobs, nor does it help the American worker. Rather, this bill relegates American workers to the second class status of the "uninsured" and in doing so denies them, what I believe, is their right to affordable, quality healthcare, which is something that all Americans deserve.

Mr. SCHOCK. Mr. Speaker, nearly 160 million Americans receive health insurance coverage from their employers. Before Obamacare, employers were free to tailor their benefit plans to meet the needs of their workers. Once Obamacare was enacted, however, employers with more than 50 full-time employees were required to offer government-mandated plans to their employees or face steep tax penalties. In many cases, this penalty could range from \$2,000 to \$3,000 per employee.

Obamacare mandated that a "full-time employee" is someone who is employed an average of 30 hours per week. As the administration has written new regulations to implement Obamacare's mandates, the costly administrative complexities have forced many employers

to shift more workers to part-time status. According to a 2013 study by the University of California, Berkeley, as many as 2.3 million workers—or roughly 2 percent of the American workforce—are “vulnerable” to lost employment and reduced wages due to Obamacare’s mandate. In Illinois, an employee earning the state’s minimum wage of \$8.25 an hour stands to lose up to \$330 a month if the definition of full-time employment remains at 30 hours.

Additionally, Obamacare’s 30-hour rule has caused great harm to school districts, colleges and universities. As many as 225,000 workers in the education sector are at risk of seeing their hours cut, hitting bus drivers, teachers’ aides and cafeteria workers the most. Meanwhile, the rule creates a new burden for institutions of higher learning that seek to hire adjunct faculty to meet the demands of their students’ course requirements. Not only will these additional burdens place limits on the services that institutions of higher learning offer to their students, but in many cases will cause the schools to dramatically raise tuition.

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 30, the so-called Save American Workers Act. I continue to have high hopes for bipartisanship and working across the aisle, but am very disappointed that the Republican majority brought up another partisan bill to undermine the Affordable Care Act, just when this landmark law is finally delivering for Americans. In fact, we just saw real evidence of the success of the law—the uninsured rate dropped to 12.9 percent in the fourth quarter of 2014, down from 17.1 percent in 2013.

The Affordable Care Act is not perfect, but H.R. 30 is not the way to fix it. While it might seem like common sense idea to raise the threshold for ACA employer coverage to 40 hours a week from 30 hours a week, this misguided legislation would give employers a greater incentive to cut workers hours. Experts at UC Berkeley estimate that this policy would result in 6.5 million workers being vulnerable to cuts in their work hours. Furthermore, this legislation would increase the deficit by \$45.7 billion. We need to build off the successes of the Affordable Care Act, not roll them back.

I hope the 114th Congress can come back soon to consider real reforms to our health care system that increases access to care, reduces costs, and decreases the deficit. H.R. 30 does none of those things, so I urge my colleagues to join me in opposing it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 19, the previous question is ordered on the bill.

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

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

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. BECERRA. I am opposed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Becerra moves to recommit the bill, H.R. 30, to the Committee on Ways and Means with instructions to report the same

back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

At the end of the bill add the following:

SEC. 4. ADDITIONAL CONDITIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The amendments made by section 2 shall not take effect if they could be expected to result in any of the following:

(1) PROHIBITION ON LOSS OF WORK HOURS OR WAGES.—A reduction in hours worked, and subsequent loss of wages, in order to skirt requirements to help pay for employee health care costs.

(2) ENSURING FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY AND A LOWER DEFICIT.—Any increase in the Federal deficit.

(b) PROTECTING HEALTH INSURANCE FOR VETERANS AND WOUNDED WARRIORS.—The amendments made by section 2 shall not apply to veterans or their families.

(c) BEING A WOMAN MUST NOT BE A PRE-EXISTING CONDITION.—Nothing in this Act shall be construed to authorize an employer to—

(1) eliminate, weaken, or reduce health coverage benefits for current employees;

(2) increase premiums or out-of-pocket costs;

(3) deny coverage based on pre-existing conditions; or

(4) discriminate against women in health insurance coverage, including by—

(A) charging women more for their health care than men;

(B) limiting coverage for pregnancy and post-natal care; or

(C) restricting coverage of preventive health services, such as mammograms and contraception.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I reserve a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A point of order is reserved.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk continued to read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion.

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, this is the final amendment to the bill, H.R. 30. This amendment will not kill the bill or send it back to committee. If adopted, the bill will immediately proceed to final passage, as amended.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues, H.R. 30 is nothing more than a sucker punch to the middle class. People who live off of their inheritance aren’t hurt by H.R. 30. People who live off of their investments aren’t hurt by H.R. 30. Even people who are destitute and need our help to make it through the day aren’t hurt by H.R. 30. The only people who are hurt are workers who earn a paycheck. They are the losers under H.R. 30.

Now, it wouldn’t surprise me one bit if you have been watching or listening to this debate to say to yourself, I don’t understand a thing that went on. One said orange, one said apple. One said tomato, one said tomato. One said it helps, one said it hurts.

That is what the debates are all about: Americans get to make decisions. We start this new Congress having made decisions as American voters, and you would think that we would then come to Congress as representatives of the people to try to now move forward together. If we can’t agree it is an orange or an apple, let’s figure out what we can agree with.

Whom do we typically turn to to tell us what we should at least agree with if we still think it is an apple or an orange? We typically turn to the non-partisan, neutral body that guides this Congress that is named the Congressional Budget Office. The Congressional Budget Office doesn’t represent Democrats and it doesn’t represent Republicans. It represents the American people and is here to guide Congress, this House, to make sure we are making decisions based on the facts.

What are the facts according to the Congressional Budget Office—not Republicans, not Democrats? According to the Congressional Budget Office, this bill would increase the taxpayers’ burden by \$53 billion over the next decade because this bill is unpaid for. This bill would result in 1 million Americans losing their employer-sponsored coverage. That is not Democrats saying that or Republicans. That is the Congressional Budget Office.

This bill would increase the number of people who obtain their coverage by government-sponsored health care because they would have lost their employer-sponsored health care. And that is why the American taxpayer would have to foot the bill of close to \$53 billion.

This bill would also, according to the Congressional Budget Office, increase the number of Americans who end up with no health insurance up to 500,000. That is not my number; that is CBO’s. I think it is higher, but CBO says 500,000. I will be guided by CBO.

CBO tells us as well that there are some five to six times as many American workers who are at the 40-hour-a-week threshold than there are Americans who work at about 30 hours. So when this bill says that now the threshold will be 40 hours, any employer who decides to cut 1 hour—the time of this debate, 1 hour—from the paycheck of an American worker has escaped responsibility to provide health insurance for all those workers under their employ—1 hour. Six times more American workers are working 40 hours a week than 30 hours a week. That is why H.R. 30 costs the American taxpayer money. That is why it is bad for Americans and their paychecks.

Now, Americans really don’t care much about these debates. At the end of the day, they want to know we are doing something and getting something done. They want to know we are working together to solve some problems. They want us to boost job growth. They want us to boost an economy that works for all Americans, not just the privileged few. We have some pretty good news for them over the last few years. Nearly 11 million new jobs, 57 consecutive months of job growth, the longest streak in our country’s history. Thanks to the Affordable Care Act which is being debated today, 10 million more Americans today have health insurance, and that means health security that they didn’t have before.

The deficit has been cut by two-thirds, gas prices cut by half—good news. So you are probably not surprised to learn a couple of other things. During that same time, the economy has grown 12 percent, corporate profits have grown 46 percent, and the stock market 92 percent. What is the missing element in all of that growth? Paychecks. The paychecks of the average American worker have stagnated over that time. Everybody else is doing well at the top, but the guys at the middle, they are hurting.

What does H.R. 30 do? It sucker punches that same American worker who has to earn a paycheck—not the guy who has an inheritance, not the guy who has investments to live off of—the guy who lives off of a paycheck.

My motion to recommit says stop that. We have our final chance to do that. Vote for the motion to recommit. Vote against H.R. 30, and let's work on behalf of Americans and their paychecks.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of the point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The reservation is withdrawn.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I claim the time in opposition.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I don't know what to say. Paychecks. Guess what. It is happening across America today. Even before the employer mandate kicked in, businesses across America are cutting workers' hours down to 29. That doesn't help a paycheck.

So think about what is going on in America today and look at what has already been happening, and this is before this costly employer mandate even took place. It is happening in every congressional district. We heard about cafeteria workers, firefighters, teachers, community colleges, retailers, restaurateurs, all of them being forced to cut the hours of their employees down to part-time work. If you want to help a person's paycheck, give them the opportunity to have a full-time job. That is what this does.

It is really kind of amazing. I hear a lot of talk about the CBO and the Joint Committee on Taxation and the costs and the costs of this bill. Here is the bulk of the costs. What we are saying is don't impose these costly, punitive mandate taxes on hardworking taxpayers.

So by removing these mandate taxes, yes, I suppose it costs the government some money. It puts that money back into the paychecks and back into the pockets of the hardworking taxpayers who give us the money in the first place. It says to businesses: Go ahead and hire, add hours, and increase wages. That is the so-called cost of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, we want more people working. We want the people who are in 30- to 40-hour jobs, hourly wages,

high school educations, just getting started in life, we want them to keep climbing that ladder of life. This law puts a huge roadblock in front of people working. What this motion to recommit does is it is just designed to kill the bill.

With respect to the veterans issue, we solved that yesterday with our Hire More Heroes Act, which we passed in a big, bipartisan vote. So make no mistake. This recommit is nothing more than a thinly veiled attempt to simply kill this bill.

Look, if you want to impose this mandate, if you want to knock people into part-time work, and if you love ObamaCare, then vote against the bill. But if you want more jobs, if you want more hours, if you want more people working, if you want more people having better opportunities, and if you want to give some relief on these mandate taxes, then vote for this bill.

This bill is the right way to go. And I have just got to tell you that, at the end of the day, we haven't even seen the full force of this punitive move because the employer mandate is just beginning to kick in. All of these things have happened in anticipation of this new mandate. We haven't even seen the worst of it yet. That is why we should pass this now and prevent this from happening and getting worse before this mandate kicks in.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

Mr. BECERRA. 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 passage.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 179, nays 244, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 13]

YEAS—179

Adams	Carson (IN)	Davis, Danny
Aguilar	Cartwright	DeFazio
Ashford	Castor (FL)	DeGette
Bass	Castro (TX)	DeLauro
Beatty	Chu (CA)	DelBene
Becerra	Cicilline	DeSaulnier
Bera	Clark (MA)	Deutch
Beyer	Clarke (NY)	Dingell
Bishop (GA)	Clay	Doggett
Blumenauer	Cleaver	Doyle (PA)
Bonamici	Clyburn	Edwards
Boyle (PA)	Cohen	Ellison
Brady (PA)	Connolly	Engel
Brown (FL)	Conyers	Eshoo
Brownley (CA)	Cooper	Esty
Bustos	Costa	Farr
Butterfield	Courtney	Fattah
Capps	Crowley	Foster
Capuano	Cuellar	Frankel (FL)
Cárdenas	Cummings	Fudge
Carney	Davis (CA)	Gabbard

Garamendi	Lowey	Ryan (OH)
Graham	Lujan Grisham	Sánchez, Linda T.
Grayson	(NM)	Sanchez, Loretta
Green, Al	Luján, Ben Ray	Sarbanes
Green, Gene	(NM)	Schakowsky
Grijalva	Lynch	Schiff
Hahn	Maloney,	Schrader
Hastings	Carolyn	Scott (VA)
Heck (WA)	Maloney, Sean	Scott, David
Higgins	Matsui	Serrano
Himes	McCollum	Sewell (AL)
Hinojosa	McDermott	Sherman
Honda	McGovern	Sires
Hoyer	McNerney	Slaughter
Huffman	Meeks	Smith (WA)
Israel	Meng	Speier
Jackson Lee	Moore	Swalwell (CA)
Jeffries	Moulton	Takai
Johnson (GA)	Nadler	Takano
Johnson, E. B.	Napolitano	Thompson (CA)
Kaptur	Neal	Thompson (MS)
Keating	Nolan	Titus
Kelly (IL)	Norcross	Tonko
Kennedy	Pallone	Torres
Kildee	Pascrell	Tsongas
Kilmer	Payne	Van Hollen
Kind	Pelosi	Vargas
Kirkpatrick	Perlmutter	Veasey
Kuster	Peters	Vela
Langevin	Pingree	Velázquez
Larsen (WA)	Pocan	Visclosky
Larson (CT)	Polis	Walz
Lawrence	Price (NC)	Wasserman
Lee	Quigley	Schultz
Levin	Rangel	Watson Coleman
Lewis	Rice (NY)	Welch
Lieu (CA)	Richmond	Wilson (FL)
Lipinski	Roybal-Allard	Yarmuth
Loeback	Ruiz	
Lofgren	Ruppersberger	
Lowenthal	Rush	

NAYS—244

Abraham	Duncan (TN)	Kelly (PA)
Aderholt	Ellmers	King (IA)
Allen	Emmer	King (NY)
Amash	Farenthold	Kinzinger (IL)
Amodei	Fincher	Kline
Babin	Fitzpatrick	Knight
Barletta	Fleischmann	Labrador
Barr	Fleming	LaMalfa
Barton	Flores	Lamborn
Benishek	Forbes	Lance
Bilirakis	Fortenberry	Latta
Bishop (MI)	Fox	LoBiondo
Bishop (UT)	Franks (AZ)	Long
Black	Frelinghuysen	Loudermilk
Blackburn	Garrett	Love
Blum	Gibbs	Lucas
Bost	Gibson	Luetkemeyer
Boustany	Gohmert	Lummis
Brady (TX)	Goodlatte	MacArthur
Brat	Gowdy	Marchant
Bridenstine	Granger	Marino
Brooks (AL)	Graves (GA)	Massie
Brooks (IN)	Graves (LA)	McCarthy
Buchanan	Graves (MO)	McCaul
Buck	Griffith	McClintock
Bucshon	Grothman	McHenry
Burgess	Guinta	McKinley
Byrne	Guthrie	McMorris
Calvert	Hanna	Rodgers
Carter (GA)	Hardy	McSally
Chabot	Harper	Meadows
Chaffetz	Harris	Meehan
Clawson (FL)	Hartzler	Messer
Coffman	Heck (NV)	Mica
Cole	Hensarling	Miller (FL)
Collins (GA)	Herrera Beutler	Miller (MI)
Collins (NY)	Hice (GA)	Mooleenaar
Comstock	Hill	Mooney (WV)
Conaway	Holding	Mullin
Cook	Hudson	Mulvaney
Costello (PA)	Huelskamp	Murphy (FL)
Cramer	Huizenga (MI)	Murphy (PA)
Crawford	Hultgren	Neugebauer
Crenshaw	Hunter	Newhouse
Culberson	Hurd (TX)	Noem
Curbelo (FL)	Hurt (VA)	Nugent
Davis, Rodney	Issa	Nunes
Delaney	Jenkins (KS)	Olson
Denham	Jenkins (WV)	Palazzo
Dent	Johnson (OH)	Palmer
DeSantis	Johnson, Sam	Paulsen
DesJarlais	Jolly	Pearce
Diaz-Balart	Jones	Perry
Dold	Jordan	Peterson
Duffy	Joyce	Pittenger
Duncan (SC)	Katko	Pitts

Poe (TX) Ryan (WI) Turner
 Poliquin Salmon Upton
 Pompeo Sanford Valadao
 Posey Scalise Wagner
 Price (GA) Schock Walberg
 Ratcliffe Schweikert Walden
 Reed Scott, Austin Walker
 Reichert Sensenbrenner Walorski
 Renacci Sessions Walters, Mimi
 Ribble Shimkus Weber (TX)
 Rice (SC) Shuster Webster (FL)
 Rigell Simpson Wenstrup
 Roby Sinema Westerman
 Roe (TN) Smith (MO) Westmoreland
 Rogers (AL) Smith (NE) Williams
 Rogers (KY) Smith (NJ) Wilson (SC)
 Rohrabacher Smith (TX) Wittman
 Rokita Stefanik Yoho
 Rooney (FL) Stewart Yoder
 Ros-Lehtinen Stivers Woodall
 Roskam Stutzman Womack
 Ross Thompson (PA) Woodall
 Rothfus Thornberry Young (IA)
 Rouzer Tiberi Young (IN)
 Royce Tipton Zeldin
 Russell Trott Zinke

NOT VOTING—6

Duckworth Gosar O'Rourke
 Gallego Gutiérrez Whitfield

□ 1607

Messrs. NEUGEBAUER, FRELING-HUYSEN, MCHENRY, REED, WALKER, STUTZMAN, Ms. STEFANIK, Messrs. PALAZZO and EMMER changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Messrs. BEYER, ISRAEL, CARNEY, GRIJALVA, ASHFORD, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, and Mr. SERRANO changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. 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 252, noes 172, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 14]

AYES—252

Abraham Bucshon DeSantis
 Aderholt Burgess DesJarlais
 Allen Byrne Diaz-Balart
 Amash Calvert Dold
 Amodei Carter (GA) Duffy
 Ashford Chabot Duncan (SC)
 Babin Chaffetz Duncan (TN)
 Barletta Clawson (FL) Ellmers
 Barr Coffman Emmer
 Barton Cole Farenthold
 Benishek Collins (GA) Fincher
 Bera Collins (NY) Fitzpatrick
 Bilirakis Comstock Fleischmann
 Bishop (MI) Conaway Fleming
 Bishop (UT) Cook Flores
 Black Costa Forbes
 Blackburn Costello (PA) Fortenberry
 Blum Cramer Foy
 Bost Crawford Franks (AZ)
 Boustany Crenshaw Frelinghuysen
 Brady (TX) Cuellar Garrett
 Brat Culberson Gibbs
 Bridenstine Curbelo (FL) Gibson
 Brooks (AL) Davis, Rodney Gohmert
 Brooks (IN) Delaney Goodlatte
 Buchanan Denham Gowdy
 Buck Dent Graham

Granger Graves (GA) Massie
 Graves (LA) McCauly
 Graves (MO) McClintock
 Griffith McHenry
 Grothman McKinley
 Guinta McMorris
 Guthrie Rodgers
 Hanna McSally
 Hardy Meadows
 Harper Meehan
 Harris Messer
 Hartzler Mica
 Heck (NV) Miller (FL)
 Hensarling Miller (MI)
 Herrera Beutler Moonen (WV)
 Hice (GA) Mooney (WV)
 Hill Mullin
 Holding Mulvaney
 Hudson Murphy (FL)
 Huelskamp Murphy (PA)
 Huizenga (MI) Neugebauer
 Hultgren Newhouse
 Hunter Noem
 Hurd (TX) Nugent
 Hurt (VA) Nunes
 Issa Olson
 Jenkins (KS) Palazzo
 Jenkins (WV) Palmer
 Johnson (OH) Paulsen
 Johnson, Sam Pearce
 Jolly Perry
 Jones Peters
 Jordan Peterson
 Joyce Pittenger
 Katko Pitts
 Kelly (PA) Poe (TX)
 King (IA) Poliquin
 King (NY) Pompeo
 Kinzinger (IL) Posey
 Kline Price (GA)
 Knight Ratcliffe
 Labrador Reed
 LaMalfa Webster (FL)
 Lamborn Wenstrup
 Lance Westerman
 Latta Rice (SC)
 Lipinski Rigell
 LoBiondo Roby
 Long Roe (TN)
 Loudermilk Rogers (AL)
 Love Rogers (KY)
 Lucas Rohrabacher
 Luetkemeyer Rokita
 Lummis Rooney (FL)
 MacArthur Ros-Lehtinen
 Marchant Roskam
 Marino Ross

NOES—172

Adams DeFazio Johnson, E. B.
 Aguilar DeGette Kaptur
 Bass DeLauro Keating
 Beatty DelBene Kelly (IL)
 Becerra DeSaulnier Kennedy
 Beyer Deutch Kildee
 Bishop (GA) Dingell Kilmer
 Blumenauer Doggett Kind
 Bonamici Doyle (PA) Kirkpatrick
 Boyle (PA) Edwards Kuster
 Brady (PA) Ellison Langevin
 Brown (FL) Engel Larsen (WA)
 Brownley (CA) Eshoo Larson (CT)
 Bustos Esty Lawrence
 Butterfield Farr Lee
 Capps Fattah Levin
 Capuano Foster Lewis
 Cárdenas Frankel (FL) Lieu (CA)
 Carney Fudge Loebach
 Carson (IN) Gabbard Lofgren
 Cartwright Garamendi Lowenthal
 Castor (FL) Grayson Lowey
 Castro (TX) Green, Al Lujan Grisham
 Chu (CA) Green, Gene (NM)
 Cicilline Grijalva Lujan, Ben Ray
 Clark (MA) Gutiérrez (NM)
 Clarke (NY) Hahn Lynch
 Clay Hastings Maloney,
 Cleaver Heck (WA) Carolyn
 Clyburn Higgins Maloney, Sean
 Cohen Himes Matsui
 Connolly Hinojosa McCollum
 Conyers Honda McDermott
 Cooper Hoyer McGovern
 Courtney Huffman McNerney
 Crowley Israel Meeks
 Cummings Jackson Lee Meng
 Davis (CA) Jeffries Moore
 Davis, Danny Johnson (GA) Moulton

Nadler Ruppertsberger Takano
 Napolitano Rush Thompson (CA)
 Neal Ryan (OH) Thompson (MS)
 Nolan Sanchez, Linda Titus
 Norcross T. Tonko
 Pallone Sanchez, Loretta Torres
 Pascarella Sarbanes Tsongas
 Payne Schakowsky Van Hollen
 Pelosi Schiff Vargas
 Perlmutter Scott (VA) Veasey
 Pingree Scott, David Vela
 Pocan Serrano Velázquez
 Polis Sewell (AL) Visclosky
 Price (NC) Sherman Walz
 Quigley Sires Wasserman
 Rangel Slaughter Schultz
 Rice (NY) Smith (WA) Watson Coleman
 Richmond Speier Welch
 Roybal-Allard Swallow (CA) Wilson (FL)
 Ruiz Takai Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—5

Duckworth Gosar Whitfield
 Gallego O'Rourke

□ 1616

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HONORING THE TUCSON VICTIMS

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

Ms. MCSALLY. Mr. Speaker, 4 years ago, our community was shaken to its core by an act of senseless violence that took the lives of six of our own and wounded 13 others. They were our friends, neighbors, and loved ones. Our community still carries the enduring pain of their loss but also the bright recollection of their lives and memories.

We remember the victims and what they came to do that day: speak with their elected Representative. We remember the selfless acts of bravery and love by those who put themselves in harm's way, even giving their own lives to save others. We remember how the city of Tucson came together, in grief and consolation, to move forward with a spirit of compassion and strength that was felt across the Nation.

Our thoughts and prayers continue to be with the families and loved ones of those lost or wounded who carry the pain of what happened on that quiet Saturday each and every day. We are inspired by their courage. We are made stronger by their strength.

Today, as the bells rang out from the University of Arizona and during that moment of silence that followed, our community, united and strong, proclaimed with one voice that we will never forget those we lost: Christina-Taylor Green, Dorothy Morris, Judge John Roll, Phyllis Schneck, Dorwan Stoddard, and Gabriel “Gabe” Zimmerman.

HIRE MORE HEROES ACT

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

Mrs. ELLMERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to applaud the House of Representatives on unanimously passing