



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 161

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, JANUARY 8, 2015

No. 3

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. JOLLY).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
January 8, 2015.

I hereby appoint the Honorable DAVID W. JOLLY to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 6, 2015, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

IMMIGRATION POLICY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GUTIÉRREZ) for 5 minutes.

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Speaker, if you live in Rhode Island, Texas, New York, New Jersey, or Florida, I am looking forward to seeing you in the coming weeks, and my friends in North Carolina and South Carolina, too.

When I am not here or in my district in Chicago, I have half a dozen events lined up over the next few weeks, and I am going to be going from town to town, State to State, talking with people about the President's immigration

executive actions and what it means for them, their families, and their communities.

In congregations and community centers and schools, and with local elected officials, I am going to be doing outreach to educate the community of immigrants and also to mobilize the multitude of allies at the State and local level who will help millions of our immigrant neighbors come forward and register with the government.

I will not be alone in this effort. Next week I will be with the distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island, DAVID CICILLINE, and with his mayor in Providence holding an event to get people the information they need so they can get ready to sign up with the government.

From Charlotte to Houston to Los Angeles, my colleagues here in the House are pulling together events to educate their own communities, and I hope to attend as many as I can.

Evangelical congregations across the Nation, the Catholic Church, and my own archdiocese in Chicago are stepping up to organize and host events and begin laying the groundwork for millions of people who work and live and raise families in the U.S. to come forward and pay to be temporarily spared from deportation.

Labor unions, corporations, small businesses that want to help families remain together, hey, they are preparing, too, and mayors, lots of mayors across the country. Apparently when Mayor Rahm Emanuel from the city of Chicago steps forward to say he will help facilitate the enrollment of families and individuals with the Federal Government, other mayors say, "Me, too," and good for them.

We can all help by playing a role in implementing the immigration executive actions taken by the President that will help millions of people. Congress refuses to pass laws that channel people into legal immigration with

visas, and Congress refuses to address millions of people who have lived and worked here for a decade or more, and they refuse to address any meaningful enforcement like E-Verify or at the borders and ports of entry because they would rather play politics and play to the talk radio audience.

But at the White House and on our side of the aisle, we are actually taking steps on immigration that will address the anxieties of the talk radio audience and not just inflame their frustration with the current mess. Remember, not doing anything, the Republican strategy, that is amnesty.

We are going to make sure that millions of American citizens can live with their family members and that we not place American citizen children in foster care by the thousands because we are deporting their parents.

We are going to make sure that more of the employment and tax base of the country is on the books, working legitimately for employers who have to follow the rules, and that employers will not get to pick between a legal job market and an illegal one that is not protected by labor laws, wage protection, safety regulations, and, yes, tax compliance.

We are getting accurate information out to people to tell them that what the President announced is not immigration reform, it is not a permanent but a small step in the right direction within the confines of current law.

As I said during the last Congress—and I am repeating it again today—I will work with anyone in either party who has a legitimate idea on how to make our immigration system more secure, more legal, more orderly. Most of my fellow lawmakers in this body support legal immigration, and to make progress we need to break with the group opposing legal immigration.

We need a modern visa system that takes America beyond the current system crafted in the 1980s and 1990s. We

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H107

need a modern enforcement with an electronic verification system that replaces a paper-based system of documentation. We need modern border security that works hand in hand with modern visa and enforcement systems so that we channel traffic through ports of entry where commodities, cargo, and people are inspected efficiently.

More militarization, more deportation, and narrower legal immigration channels have not given us greater control over the immigration process and have led us to a number of problems.

If you are serious about border security, legalization enforcement, legal immigration, then my door is always open. Tell me what you need to move forward. Do you need more fences? More high tech visas? More immigration judges? Tell me what it will take to get this Congress out of the current rut.

In the meantime, I and a lot of my colleagues are going to be out there around the country protecting American families from destruction and protecting millions from deportation.

AMERICA'S RELATIONSHIP WITH CUBA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) for 5 minutes.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, the recent concessions by President Obama to the Castro regime mark a drastic departure from one of the most consistent tenets of United States foreign policy and traditional American values, and sets a dangerous precedent for other rogue regimes to emulate.

The pardoning of convicted Cuban spies follows an ill-advised exchange with the Taliban in which the rhetoric emerging from the White House to justify its actions has been unnervingly similar. As predicted, the course of policy by this administration on caving to terrorist demands makes the United States more vulnerable.

We see those repercussions manifest themselves across the globe. Just recently, Venezuela's thug Nicolas Maduro jumped at the opportunity to request an exchange of a convicted criminal in the United States for the freedom of pro-democracy leader Leopoldo Lopez, whom Maduro has jailed in Venezuela.

This is not the way to protect U.S. national security interests throughout the world; this is a way of putting them in jeopardy.

When we equate unjustly imprisoned Americans to battle-hardened terrorists or convicted spies, we set a dangerous precedent for the world to follow.

The Cuban regime has already signaled strongly that it will not unclench its fist, despite recent developments.

On December 30, just 13 days after President Obama's announcement, the

Cuban regime arrested nearly 60 activists seeking to express themselves freely—this in addition to the arrest of more than 200 activists on Human Rights Day—ha, that is rich—just 7 days before the announcement normalizing relations.

Yet the administration proudly and openly touts the promised but yet unproven release of 53 dissidents as a major breakthrough when in reality the net result will mean hundreds more in Castro's gulags. Raul Castro will free 53 and arrest 60 more in the next months.

This shows the failure of the administration's argument and proves that there is no intention by the Castros to move in the direction of reform or freedom. Instead, President Obama has created an atmosphere that emboldens the regime to continue its violent tactics with no concern about consequences from this White House.

We must not forget that Cuba not only poses a threat to its people but also threatens us here at home. Cuba must remain a state sponsor of terrorism because it has not changed its terrorist ways.

For example, in the year 2013 Cuba was caught helping another dangerous regime, North Korea, evade U.N. Security Council resolutions of sanctions by shipping arms and munitions to the Kim Jong-un regime. At a time when many in Congress and even the White House are trying to punish the North Korean regime for its cyber attacks against the U.S., we cannot forget that those rogue regimes helped North Korea—like the one in Cuba.

The Castro regime continues to thumb its nose at the U.S. by harboring fugitives such as New Jersey State trooper killer Joanne Chesimard, by harboring Puerto Rican terrorist William Guillermo Morales and bank robber Victor Gerena and many others who have fled U.S. justice for the shores of Cuba.

These are just a few of the reasons, Mr. Speaker, why the administration must reexamine its relationship with Castro and impose strict sanctions against the thugs, not offer it concessions for all of these transgressions. Just like a zebra cannot change its stripes, the Castro regime cannot and will not change its anti-freedom, terrorist ways.

It is our duty to support democracy and be a voice for those 11 million Cubans oppressed throughout the island. By appeasing dictators, we have disappointed people all over the world who are struggling to achieve freedom, and the White House has betrayed core American values and principles: the respect for human rights and the right for people to choose their own destiny.

As the first Cuban American-born Member of Congress who went from being a political refugee, fleeing the oppressive and brutal Castro regime, to a senior Member of this hallowed and cherished body, I will fight tooth and nail to ensure that the cause for free-

dom and democracy in Cuba is not forgotten. Until the oppressive yoke of tyranny installed by the Castro brothers has been lifted and the regime has been replaced by a representative democracy like the one we have here in our cherished Nation, I have a moral obligation to freedom-loving people everywhere, and I will not ever forget that responsibility.

BIPARTISANSHIP AND END OF LIFE CARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, as we begin the new Congress, America sees the two parties in both the House and the Senate, along with the White House, making statements that establish positions that distinguish one from another.

But what if we started not by defining our differences but with efforts that would bring us together?

We ended the last Congress with the passage of the Paul Simon Water for the World Act, something I have worked on with my friend and partner from Texas, TED POE, for years here in the House. There was extraordinary bipartisan leadership demonstrated by Congressmen CHARLIE DENT, AARON SCHOCK, Senator DICK DURBIN. It did take 6 years, but this bipartisan effort for a humanitarian cause, especially benefiting women and girls around the globe, was worth the time and effort.

The legislation focused and enhanced American efforts dealing with international water and sanitation. Today 152 million hours will be spent by women and girls traveling to get water, often dirty water, to meet the needs of their families in some of the poorest regions of the planet.

This legislation created more focused American leadership, and it was backed up by unprecedented increases in American aid for water and sanitation. It will pay benefits for generations to come for millions, making friends for America while it allows children to live longer and makes the lives of women and girls more bearable. And we did it together.

Are there other such candidates for legislation that will bring us together? Dr. PHIL ROE and I have been working on the Personalize Your Care Act with medical groups, advocacy organizations, experts in palliative care, hospitals, the community of faith.

This is an effort to make sure that at the end of life for our loved ones, they actually get the treatment they want, not health care on autopilot.

We have had tragic stories about how medical decisions by reflex and default have put people in isolated ICUs in painful and foreign settings when actually most of them, and in fact most of us, would rather be comfortable at home, surrounded by our loved ones.

□ 1015

There has been a brilliant and exhaustive report by the Institute of Medicine that deals with the problems and concerns and how we can do better. Dr. Atul Gawande's bestselling book, "Being Mortal," makes it clear that there are crying needs and simple, commonsense compassionate solutions.

There is a revolution taking place in health care today. What if, as part of that revolution, Congress started the new year with our bipartisan legislation, the Personalize Your Care Act, to make sure those families understand their choices, that their choices are known, and—most important—their choices are respected?

We had dozens of cosponsors and broad support across the medical establishment and the community of faith. Maybe we can pick up where we left off and have this legislation bring us together to protect our families and start the year on a united front, giving families the protection they want for the care they need.

There is no reason we in Congress need to spin our wheels and shout at and past each other. Mr. Speaker, I could have made this same presentation not about the water and sanitation, but about how this Congress came together in the final hours to help save the lives of Afghans and Iraqis who are now at risk from the tender mercies of the Taliban and al Qaeda because they helped Americans as guides and interpreters when we needed them.

These are some of my examples of bipartisan cooperation that are important which we have done in the past. I would invite my colleagues to share their agenda of bipartisan, low or no-cost legislation that allows us to work together.

It is not too late to start the year and this Congress right.

THE SAVE AMERICAN WORKERS ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BENISHEK) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BENISHEK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 30, the Save American Workers Act, and to urge all of my colleagues to join me in voting "yes" on this important initiative.

I have heard from many people across northern Michigan—from working moms and dads and small business owners to county government—that the President's health care law is stifling economic growth, job creation, and hours of work.

Mr. Speaker, one of the most burdensome and baffling regulations imposed by the President's health care law was the reclassification of what constitutes a full-time employee.

The Save American Workers Act will get rid of this rule, helping employees in Michigan and around the country create more opportunities in our area.

This simple and commonsense fix will be a good first step towards restoring the true definition of full-time employment and increasing jobs in northern Michigan.

I have joined with 147 of my colleagues—more than one-third of the entire House—in being an original cosponsor of this legislation. I am happy that this is one of the first bills that the House of Representatives will pass.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support this legislation.

THE KEYSTONE PIPELINE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. QUIGLEY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, a new Congress, but the sights are familiar: the same rhetoric with no regard for the truth.

Ahead of another ill-advised vote to approve the Keystone pipeline, the same myths are being spread pitting environmental protection against job creation.

Winston Churchill once said:

The truth is incontrovertible. Malice may attack it, ignorance may deride it, but in the end, there it is.

Let us separate myths from reality. It is time to decide: truth or scare. Approval of the Keystone pipeline will have very little impact in the way of job creation but a detrimental impact on the environment and hinder our promise of a clean energy future. That is the truth.

My question is: Why are we ignoring these facts and voting once again to approve the Keystone pipeline, which would carry one of the dirtiest energy sources on the planet? Perhaps it has something to do with the many myths associated with this project. Pipeline proponents are quick to point to the creation of jobs as the primary reason for the project's approval; however, the facts don't match up.

According to the only independent analysis by Cornell University's Global Labor Institute, these claims are not accurate. TransCanada's job claims are complete fabrications. The Cornell report concludes that Keystone will not be a major source of jobs, nor will it play any substantial role at all in putting Americans back to work.

The State Department says Keystone would only create 35 permanent jobs and 1,950 construction jobs for 2 years. Most of those jobs created by this project will be nonlocal and temporary.

In reality, we can and should be creating jobs by improving our existing infrastructure and investing in clean energy, education, and research. In fact, Keystone would make it much harder for the United States to invest in clean energy jobs and address global climate change. Our best bet at a clean energy economy lies far, far away from tar sands. That is the truth.

Proponents of the pipeline claim that Keystone will bring down gas prices for Americans, but in reality, prices at

Midwestern pumps could actually increase. According to its own documents, TransCanada expects the pipeline to increase gas prices in the Midwest up to 15 cents per gallon.

Currently, a surplus of gas in the region means that our prices stay stable. If the pipeline is built, oil companies will be able to send their product to the gulf coast for export, which will reduce the surplus and drive up costs for Midwestern consumers. That is the truth.

On top of all this, let's not forget TransCanada is the same company that operates the existing Keystone pipeline which spilled a dozen times in the first year of operation. The twelfth spill released 21,000 gallons of oil in North Dakota, contaminating the soil and water.

Across the country, about 3.2 million gallons of oil spill from pipelines every year. These spills pose a great threat to American drinking water, especially when you consider the proposed project route would cross 1,073 surface water bodies and affect 383 acres of wetlands.

Most Americans understand that oil spills in the past have had severe environmental impacts, but any Keystone spill would be truly catastrophic. That is the truth.

In the end, Keystone brings a whole lot of environmental risk and very little reward. It is time we stopped perpetuating the myths. It is time we heed the warnings. It is time we decide: truth or scare.

MOBILE COOPER RIVERSIDE PARK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BYRNE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, in Mobile's Cooper Riverside Park, there stands a statue of Pierre Le Moyne d'Iberville, the French founder of Mobile, a statue which is identical to another statue located in Havana, Cuba.

This statue is just one example of the robust ties between the city of Mobile, located in my Congressional district, and Cuba. These ties go all the way back to Spanish colonization in the 18th century.

It is safe to say that I represent a district that stands to benefit from improved relationships with Cuba. In fact, the Port of Mobile is a straight shot to Cuba and could be an important economic hub, just as it was going back to the 18th century.

Under the right circumstances, I would gladly support lifting the trade embargo with Cuba and improving diplomatic relations. Unfortunately, now is not that time. The economic benefits should not come at the cost of enabling a ruthless regime that is unwilling to change.

Once again, the President seems to be more interested in a publicity stunt than in a substantive solution. The White House will tell you that this action is no different from previous efforts to improve relations with other

communist countries like Vietnam or China.

Here is the problem with that premise. In each of those cases, the President engaged with Congress in a serious conversation and debate about the best path forward. A plan was developed, serious concessions were agreed to, and each nation mutually benefited from these meaningful actions.

Unfortunately, in the case of Cuba, President Obama has again decided to cut Congress out of the process and act alone with no real plan to accomplish his stated goal. This approach is the wrong way for our government to operate, and it has once again resulted in a bad deal.

Columnist Charles Krauthammer put it best when he said:

Do you know how to achieve a breakthrough in tough negotiations? Give everything away.

Mr. Speaker, I can't help but ask what reforms Cuba will make as a result of this deal. Let's not forget that this is the same Cuba, under the same regime, who during the cold war had nuclear missiles on their soil aimed at the United States of America.

This is the same Cuba that refuses to let the church operate freely. This is the same Cuba that worked with Venezuela and North Korea against the interests of the United States. This is the same Cuba that has been accused again and again of egregious human rights violations. Nothing has changed in those areas at all, and the Castro brothers are still in power.

Now, there is a path forward for improved diplomatic relations and ending the trade embargo. The Castro regime must go. Political activity must be legalized. Public commitments to free and fair elections must be made. An independent judiciary must be established. Rights to free speech and freedom of the press must be guaranteed.

Cuba must renounce the policy of being a staging area against the United States. Political prisoners must be freed, and the Cuban citizens must be treated with respect and dignity and be provided with the basic freedoms we often take for granted here in the U.S.

Under those conditions and with a President willing to work with Congress, the embargo could be lifted and progress could truly begin.

Mr. Speaker, I find myself once again coming to this floor to implore President Obama to abandon his ill-conceived, independent executive action and, instead, come to the Capitol, work with this Congress, share ideas, and collaborate; and together, we can make a real, positive impact on behalf of the American people.

NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH FUNDING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call the Congress' attention to

what I think is our most important issue we face as a Congress and as a people, and that is preserving America's greatest asset, which is the health and lives of our citizens.

In doing so, I request, as I have done on many occasions, that my colleagues on both sides of the aisle join me in adequately funding our Nation's other department of defense—coequally important—the National Institutes of Health.

Yes, the Department of Defense is important, and we fund it more than adequately, more than they even ask for, and it protects us from ISIS and others that caused the great tragedy in Paris and has caused terror and havoc in Great Britain, Australia, and Canada and that I am sure will come to our shores sooner than we expect, but the National Institutes of Health protects us from disease, disease that threatens every American and every American's loved one.

The sequestration has cut billions from NIH's budget, and that is our country's foremost medical research center. It has helped billions of people across the country and across the world who suffer from heart disease, cancer, HIV/AIDS, diabetes, Parkinson's, Alzheimer's, you name it, but we have inadequately funded the NIH.

It has not kept up with the level of inflation over the last decade. Based on that level of inflation, the funding we have given the NIH has resulted in a 10 percent diminution in funding on the purchasing power of the National Institutes of Health.

The likelihood of any one of us dying from a terrorist attack or from some weapon fired from North Korea or Russia or Iran is very slim, but the odds of us suffering from the diseases which I have mentioned previously is likely in our loved ones. We need to fight those diseases. We can do it, and we can successfully come up with treatments and cures if we fund the National Institutes of Health.

Supporting the NIH used to be a bipartisan commitment, especially seeing that every dollar invested results in about \$2.21 in economic growth. I hope that this new American Congress will see that and that my Republican colleagues will agree with me that we need to put a focus on our individual capital, the personal capital of people, their health and their well-being.

I talked to Representative MARINO recently, and he is going to join me in founding an NIH caucus. I think there is nothing more important. In the past, many times, when I have brought up funding for the NIH, friends on the other side have said: "Well, we will have to pay for it. If we put more money in it, then our children and grandchildren will be paying for the debt for years to come."

That may be true, but nevertheless, the children and the grandchildren will be receiving the benefits of the treatments and cures more likely than any of us will, for research takes a long time.

We also need to change our course in stem cell research. We have had problems with allowing scientists to use this opportunity to come through with great medical breakthroughs.

Federal funding is currently prohibited by the 1996 Dickey amendment to the appropriations bill that funds the NIH, but researchers around the world have dived headfirst into the field using stem cells and producing incredible findings and progress.

In 2010, a gentleman named Darek Fidyka, a Polish man, was stabbed multiple times in a knife attack, and he was paralyzed from the chest down, but thanks to stem cell research in Poland, in collaboration with researchers and doctors there and in the United Kingdom, Darek can now walk again with the help of a walker.

Dr. Geoff Raisman, the chair of neurological regeneration at University College London's Institute of Neurology called this development—and I agree with him—"more impressive than man walking on the Moon."

□ 1030

We allowed a man who couldn't walk, couldn't stand to walk, and more will come from that research on stem cells and other scientific research. Darek otherwise would have been paralyzed for life, and now he is walking again thanks to private investment in stem cell research, but the government needs to participate.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for this Congress to adequately fund the National Institutes of Health, recognize its importance to our constituents who are important to us, and whose lives and health are the most important things that we can provide for them. It is time this country no longer turns a blind eye to research, and to stem cell research in particular. I urge my colleagues to seize the opportunities offered by this new Congress and join me in the efforts to fund the National Institutes of Health and to join the National Institutes of Health Caucus.

FIXING THE HEALTH CARE SYSTEM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. COSTELLO) for 5 minutes.

Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it is an exciting honor to address the people's House for the first time.

The 114th Congress carries with it a great opportunity to address the challenges our Nation faces. One priority of the new American Congress is fixing our broken health care system. We have all heard from small businesses and companies who have been forced to lay off workers due to the President's health care law, consequently slowing innovation that drives our Nation and slowing the pace at which that innovation can improve public health outcomes for all Americans.

This week I am proud to cosponsor H.R. 160 that will repeal the medical

device tax. In southeastern Pennsylvania, innovation, investment, and jobs at companies such as Neuronetics and Fujirebio Diagnostics are at risk because of this nearly \$30 billion tax hike. There are almost 600 medical device companies that employ over 20,000 Pennsylvanians in good, high-paying jobs. Due to this excise tax, we have seen thousands of jobs lost nationwide. If we fail to act, we are on track to see thousands more lost.

With my colleagues, I look forward to passing this legislation with bipartisan support.

ISSUES CONFRONTING CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, there are a number of issues that are confronting this Congress as it returns to serve the American people here in the United States Capital. What a wonderful place of democracy and freedom. It gives me a sense of ownership on these values on behalf of my constituents in celebration that we live in a nation that admires and respects and finds a way to disagree without being disagreeable but, more importantly, that we understand that violence against one another is not the solution.

Tragically, I stand to mourn with the people of France as they have experienced a heinous terrorist act, the first, I believe, in a decade that follows the tragedies in Canada and Australia. So we have to define ourselves in somewhat of a different way. The commentary indicated, How would we know?

As a senior member of the Homeland Security Committee, I challenge all of us to say we have to know. We must find a way to balance our civil liberties and the respect for our Constitution with protecting the American people, and in a two-road process, try to hinder those who would come to do this violent harm on our soil. But more importantly, we have to begin in a societal confrontation through diplomacy on stopping the radicalization of young people using sources such as the Internet. It is real and we must address it. I look forward as a member of the Homeland Security Committee to begin looking legislatively and pointedly at how we address this question to protect the American people.

I want to step aside for a moment and just speak on two local issues.

RIVERSIDE HOSPITAL, HOUSTON

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, Riverside Hospital, Houston, quite different from my earlier comments, is a local hospital in my community founded by the family of a deceased World War I veteran. It has a special place in the hearts of African Americans because it was the only hospital where Negroes could go in the 20th century. It has fallen on difficult challenges.

And so my question and my inquiry is to the new, incoming Governor for

the State of Texas, Governor Abbott, to find value in this medical facility because of its historic relationship. It once housed the only outside posttraumatic stress disorder center in Houston outside of the veterans hospital system. It was well attended by veterans who loved the idea of a center that was away from the massive hospital system. It serves people who are poor in the neighborhood and seniors. It has helped those who suffer from substance abuse, and I believe that it needs and deserves a new start.

I will be working with a variety of agencies to do that, and will not be ashamed that unfortunately tragic or, let me say, misbehavior of some caused this unfortunate turn in this hospital. Its history is worth saving. I thank the Cullinan family, whose son died in World War II, for providing the initial funds for us to be able to have this Negro hospital.

SALUTING WHEATLEY HIGH SCHOOL

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, then I want to salute Wheatley High School and those who have attended it. It was named after Phillis Wheatley. It was an African American high school in the great city of Houston in the fifth ward. Two of its many graduates were the late Congressman Mickey Leland and late Congresswoman Barbara Jordan, and obviously many other great Americans who went to that high school.

Unfortunately, the original Wheatley High School—over the valiant efforts of Wheatley graduates because “everything new” seems to be the direction we want to go—was torn down. But I believe there is a way to find common ground, and I am going to encourage HISD to meet with these valiant former alumni to find a common path of preserving that history in the new school and bringing the community together.

We look forward to meetings forthcoming, for HISD to lend a hand out to people who want to preserve history, to tell the story of a school that was built in 1927 out of a material that in fact actually lasted. And when African Americans could not go to any other school, when those who went off to World War II and Vietnam couldn't go elsewhere, they had the Wheatley High School that sits proudly in the fifth ward. There is a Wheatley High School that was modernized, but the original building of terra-cotta material—so beautiful if you had seen it—could have been restored.

I would like to stand here and say don't condemn those who wanted to hold that piece of history alongside of educating children today and give them the kind of technology they needed. We can do this together. I want to salute those who fought hard, and we can find a common path by working together.

LAW ENFORCEMENT APPRECIATION DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK) for 5 minutes.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of our Nation's law enforcement professionals—the first responders, the Capitol Police here in the Nation's Capital who keep us safe here, and those who answer the call of duty to serve and protect, families and friends throughout our great Nation.

Just after 7 p.m. on Sunday, December 14, Baltimore police officer Andrew Groman and his partner made a routine traffic stop outside a west Baltimore gas station. Moments later, three shots were fired from the backseat of the car, one striking Officer Groman in the abdomen, just below his bulletproof vest.

As other officers chased the suspect, Officer Groman's partner rushed him to the hospital where he was forced into emergency surgery. His family was called in from Pennsylvania to be by his side. You see, Officer Groman is a Bucks County native. His family still lives in my congressional district. A former Bucks County volunteer firefighter, Officer Groman had moved to Maryland to continue his service, this time in law enforcement.

While I am happy to tell you he is recovering well, it is terrible to think that he just as easily might have been killed in the line of duty, attacked while performing his duty, which was his passion to serve and protect, conjuring names from our area like Daniel Faulkner, Brian Gregg, and Brad Fox, who also gave the ultimate sacrifice.

While Andrew's Bucks County roots bring the story close to home for many in my district, the sad truth is that we know the service and sacrifice of law enforcement officers is a dangerous, and sometimes deadly, job and one that, sadly, often goes underappreciated.

Our Nation's blue line, the first responders, local, State, and Federal police and law enforcement professionals, often represent the height of both heroism and humbleness. While I take every opportunity I can to meet with and to hear from those who protect the communities in which we live, I am always left wishing that there is more to be said than a “thank you.”

This week we are proud to participate in Law Enforcement Appreciation Day, the effort of a number of partnering organizations committed to raising awareness and showing appreciation for the more than 780,000 officers who serve and protect our neighborhoods, friends, and families nationwide. This week, on National Law Enforcement Appreciation Day, there is opportunity for all of us to show our support for those who wear blue and to recommit ourselves to the ideals and laws of our Nation that they are tasked to uphold. Together we can address the challenges our Nation faces head-on without partisanship, division, or hate.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 40 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

We pause now in Your presence and acknowledge our dependence on You.

We ask Your blessing upon the men and women of this, the people's House, who are settling into new spaces and committees here on Capitol Hill.

As the new session begins, help them and indeed help us all to obey Your law, to do Your will, and to walk in Your way. Grant that they might be good in thought, gracious in word, generous in deed, and great in spirit.

Make this a glorious day in which all are glad to be alive and ready to serve You.

May all that is done this day be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Ms. ADAMS) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. ADAMS led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBERS-ELECT

The SPEAKER. Will the Representatives-elect please present themselves in the well.

Mr. NOLAN of Minnesota and Mr. COSTA of California appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office, as follows:

Do you solemnly swear that you will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that you will bear true faith

and allegiance to the same; that you take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that you will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which you are about to enter, so help you God.

The SPEAKER. Congratulations. You are now Members of the 114th Congress.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. Under clause 5(d) of rule XX, the Chair announces to the House that, in light of the administration of the oath to the gentleman from California and the gentleman from Minnesota, the whole number of the House is now 430.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain up to 15 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

GRANITEVILLE TRAIN WRECK 10TH ANNIVERSARY

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, Tuesday marked the 10th anniversary of the catastrophic train wreck in Graniteville, South Carolina, which sadly is remembered for the death of nine citizens and over 250 persons injured.

I appreciate the first responders of Aiken County and the State for their courageous efforts to help those in need. I commend Steve Seeling, who has promoted train safety after his son, Chris, died in the incident. I also appreciate the continued efforts in leadership of Phil Napier, the GVW volunteer fire chief and now Aiken County Council member.

This disaster had devastating impacts on Graniteville, including the closing of a major employer, Avondale Mills. However, new businesses have emerged, and the expansion of Bridgestone Corporation with the establishment of MTU America has created nearly 1,500 jobs.

While we are grateful for the new jobs in Graniteville and look forward to its continued growth, we will never forget those lost in the railroad tragedy 10 years ago.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and the President, by his actions, must never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism. As an American grateful for French heritage, our prayers are with the people of France fighting terrorism.

PROVIDING FUNDING FOR BORDER CROSSINGS

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

Mr. HIGGINS. Madam Speaker, there are 329 ports of entry across the United

States, four of which are located in my district of western New York. These border crossings provide opportunity for trade and commerce, require sufficient levels of security, and provide enormous economic benefits to our Nation.

Today, I asked the Subcommittee on Homeland Security of the Committee on Appropriations to include funding for the programs necessary to ensure the free flow of people and goods at the northern border.

Specifically, funding is needed to sustain the recent increase in Customs and Border Protection officer staffing levels. This increase offers significant economic benefits by reducing wait times.

Also, I asked for funding to support the Preinspection Pilot program, which will expedite the flow of traffic by moving primary cargo inspections to Canada at crossings in Buffalo, New York, and Blaine, Washington.

Madam Speaker, I will continue to push for these and other measures to integrate the economies of our border communities with our Canadian neighbors. I urge the committee to support them as well.

IN MEMORY OF KETA SODREL

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

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the life and legacy of Keta Sodrel.

Keta, who passed away 1 week ago today, was married for 47 years to Congressman Mike Sodrel, who represented Indiana's Ninth Congressional District for several years. I know I speak for countless Hoosiers in paying our respects to Keta and offering our thoughts and prayers to Mike and his family.

If you talk to anyone who knew them, you will quickly learn that Mike was able to serve our district with distinction because of the love and support of his wife. Keta, I am told, was a model congressional spouse because she loved southern Indiana, she loved the Lord, and she loved Mike deeply.

Most of us who serve in this body are only able to do so because of the same sort of love and support from our own spouses. As we all remember the Sodrel family during their time of loss, may Keta remind us of the loving, loyal, and invaluable service and sacrifice our spouses make for our Nation.

FREEDOM OF SPEECH

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

Mr. HIMES. Madam Speaker, now that you have yielded me time, I can say anything I want. I can offer any

idea and I can criticize anything. No police force, not the greatest military in the world can stop me from speaking my mind.

This is true not because I am a particularly regular source of good ideas or because we are particularly gracious to one another around here; it is true because we are humble about what we know for sure.

We used to know for sure in this Chamber that women should not vote and that racial discrimination was okay. Opposing those ideas used to be offensive and provocative.

In Paris yesterday, several courageous journalists were murdered because their ideas were provocative to some. They were murdered by cowards who know that their ideas and visions would and will be rejected by civilized humans everywhere. There is no courage in killing the unarmed.

To those who committed these atrocities yesterday: bring your ideas to a forum like this one or to forums like this one all over the democratic world, bring your ideas to be examined and debated—that is the path of courage and honor.

HOW OBAMACARE AFFECTS CARDIACASSIST

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

Mr. ROTHFUS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to tell a story about lost opportunity.

Pennsylvania is the country's fourth highest producer of medical devices. One company in my district, CardiacAssist, makes devices that treat heart failure and employs over 40 people.

CardiacAssist's devices improve quality of life, and they significantly reduce the cost of care for cardiac patients. The company's mission is to develop products that are both easier to use and less expensive to make, but ObamaCare's onerous medical device tax is stifling growth at CardiacAssist.

Since this \$30 billion tax took effect, CardiacAssist has backed off from hiring five new employees to just one. It has also reduced its research and development efforts.

When we tax the very innovation that is the solution to the cost crisis in this country, it directly affects how quickly CardiacAssist gets its affordable therapies out to the world. Sadly, it also costs jobs and, in this case, four jobs at a company trying to grow in western Pennsylvania.

The Protect Medical Innovation Act repeals this tax and allows companies like CardiacAssist to get back to growing and creating jobs. I am a proud co-sponsor of this legislation and look forward to its passage.

BARBARA BOXER WILL RETIRE IN 2016

(Mr. LOWENTHAL asked and was given permission to address the House

for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Madam Speaker, I learned just a few minutes ago that my wonderful Senator from the State of California, Senator BARBARA BOXER, will not be seeking reelection in 2016, and although we do have this wonderful Senator for 2 more years, I just wanted to say a few words about my great admiration for Senator BOXER.

I have been a great admirer of her since the 1980s when she was in the House. I helped to work when she ran for the United States Senate in 1992.

She has been a great leader. She has been a champion voice for the environment. She spoke out about climate change before anyone else spoke out about it. She was one of the first to really speak out for all progressive causes. She has fought for workers.

I want her to know that California will miss her. We will count on her leadership for the next 2 years here in Congress, and then after that, I just want to say it will be a great loss. I will miss her greatly.

TARGETED SPENDING CUTS

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

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, I am rising today in support of H.R. 39. This is a bill I filed yesterday, and it calls for a 1 percent across-the-board spending reduction for all discretionary spending except for Homeland Security, Defense, and Veterans Affairs. That is 1 percent out of the 2015 budget.

The Federal Government is over \$18 trillion in debt. That is why I filed this bill, because it is not fair to hard-working taxpayers and to future generations to be saddled with this debt.

Do you know, right now, \$56,600 is each individual's share of the debt? I have a nephew who just recently turned 1 year old; Worth Hunter has \$56,600 worth of debt. Is that fair? No, indeed, it is not.

It is important that we begin to cut that 1 penny out of every dollar in discretionary spending to get our fiscal house in order. I urge consideration of H.R. 39.

HONORING SHANDA LAVIE MCALLISTER

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

Ms. ADAMS. Madam Speaker, I come to the floor of the U.S. House today to pay tribute to the memory of Shanda LaVie McAllister, a native North Carolinian, admired daughter, sister, and friend who departed this life suddenly on December 12, 2014, in Cumberland County, where she lived and worked as a teacher.

Shanda was an outstanding educator of more than 20 years, a well-respected

advocate for children, a leader in her church and community, and someone who valued all people.

Genuinely concerned for the welfare of each student, she truly believed that if given the opportunity and resources, every child could succeed. She had a good heart, glowing personality, and she left an indelible impression on her community and her State.

For her many tireless efforts on behalf of children, I join with her parents, Freddie and former State Representative Mary McAllister, and all the citizens of our State in honoring Shanda's memory and her legacy.

TERROR ATTACK IN PARIS

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

Mr. DOLD. Madam Speaker, today, I stand in solidarity with the people of France, and my thoughts and prayers go out to the families of the victims of the ruthless terrorist attack that happened in Paris yesterday.

This rampage was perpetrated by terrorists who seek nothing but death and destruction for all of us who embrace something as basic as the freedom of speech. While we did not need it, this only reinforces and strengthens our resolve in the fight to defend our freedoms and our way of life.

It may be an uncomfortable truth, but the reality is that we cannot stick our heads in the sand and hope that threats from radical extremists will go away on their own.

Nowhere are the stakes bigger today, Madam Speaker, than in Iran. Iran and its nuclear weapons program, I believe, pose the number one threat to our national security.

Our resolve in confronting the Iranian challenge must never waver, and I call on this new Congress to act right away in ratcheting up pressure and sanctions on Iran. This is not a left versus right issue. This is a right versus wrong issue.

□ 1215

CONGRATULATING PACIFIC NORTHWEST NATIONAL LABORATORY

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

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Madam Speaker, as a newly elected Congressman from the State of Washington, I rise to mark the 50th anniversary of the Pacific Northwest National Laboratory in my congressional district. I congratulate all current and former lab workers and their families. Their commitment to excellence is apparent from the contributions the lab has made both to the local community and to our Nation.

This world-class facility is key to the long-term growth of the Tri-Cities because of the leading role the lab plays

in national security, clean renewable American energy, efforts to clean up our Nation's defense nuclear waste, chemistry, and more.

Originally created for the Manhattan Project, the lab has adapted to address our Nation's most pressing needs. I look forward to visiting the lab in the coming weeks to congratulate them in person, and I am committed to providing the support the lab needs to continue serving our Nation for another 50 years.

Congratulations to the PNNL family.

CONGRATULATING BISHOP GUILFOYLE HIGH SCHOOL

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

Mr. SHUSTER. Madam Speaker, today I recognize the Bishop Guilfoyle Marauder football team, who capped off an undefeated season, beating the Clairton Bears in the Pennsylvania Division A State championship.

Led by Coach Wheeler, BG's offense plowed through their opponents, posting 715 points this season. While I don't hold it against them, it became obvious that BG was destined for a championship when I watched them defeat my nephew, Michael Shuster, and the Camp Hill Lions.

But defense wins championships, and in the final minutes of the State championship, BG's defense held the goal line, defending multiple Clairton scoring attempts, securing a 1-point lead, a 19-18 victory to the title.

The character displayed by these young men gives us another reason to be proud of the central Pennsylvania that we call home.

I would like to recognize the seniors who played their last games: Berger, Chadbourn, Gormley, Kitt, Livoti, Luther, McCloskey, Miller, Price, and Wolf, and especially the Marauder's honorary captain, who truly exemplifies the spirit of BG football, Jorden McClure.

Congratulations to Coach Wheeler and all of Bishop Guilfoyle for bringing home the State championship. If you are watching today, take notice; I have the team colors on.

MAINTAINING SSI BENEFITS

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, as I come to the floor—I had been on the floor earlier today—I offer again my deepest sympathy to the people of France and mourn with them for the heinous tragedy yesterday, and I know all Americans also do so.

I come, however, to talk about an issue that will draw bipartisan recognition of the importance of ensuring the support in the lack of reductions of SSI benefits. There are 300-million-plus Americans in this country. Madam Speaker, 5.81 million Americans re-

ceive SSI; 4.6 million of them are disabled, and 1.3 million are children.

My office is in the Federal building in Houston, Texas. I watch individuals come to our Social Security office. They don't look rich. They don't look fraudulent. They don't look like they are trying to take advantage of the system of help that America is giving them.

I am sending out an SOS alert to all the families who have loved ones on SSI or the children who are receiving death benefits because their parents are dead. I am asking that we commit to ensuring and providing the support for the SSI account, not reducing it, not reducing benefits, because these are the neediest Americans who I would be in utter shame to point out that they are fraudulent.

We will be having a teach-in in my district. We will ask them to come and tell their stories because I am insisting and refusing to allow their benefits to be cut.

HONORING NEW HAMPSHIRE NATIONAL GUARD

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

Mr. GUINTA. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor and recognize the 3rd Battalion, 197th Field Artillery Regiment of the New Hampshire Army National Guard. This week, they deploy to the Central Command area of responsibility in support of Operation Spartan Shield.

To the 370-some Granite Staters who are deploying, and also your families who are constantly supporting you, thank you for your service, your commitment, and your sacrifice.

As the first Army National Guard unit to support this artillery mission, you carry forward the National Guard's mantra, "Always Ready, Always There."

As my two children, Colby and Jack, join me on the House floor, I am reminded of how grateful I am to you—and the rest of our soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines—for protecting our country, our safety, and our liberties. You are the very best our Nation has to offer. The Granite State and our Nation are forever indebted to you.

REFORM BLOATED CORPORATE TAX CODE

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

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, should we reward American companies and entrepreneurs for their hard work and productivity, or should we reward them for having the best lobbyists in Washington? Well, unfortunately today, with our bloated corporate Tax Code full of special interest loopholes, we effectively reward companies that have the best lobbyists in Washington rather

than corporations that are creating jobs or profits for their shareholders. That is why we need to work together, Republicans and Democrats, with the administration to reform our bloated corporate Tax Code, eliminating loopholes in tax expenditures and bringing down the rates.

Did you know, Madam Speaker, we have the highest nominal corporate tax rate of the industrialized countries in the world at 35 percent? We can work together to bring that down to 28 percent, maybe even 25 percent, in a revenue-neutral basis by getting rid of special interest provisions that lobbyists have inserted in the Tax Code and finally rewarding Americans for hard work and productivity rather than simply being good at working Congress to get a special interest advantage.

STANDING IN SOLIDARITY WITH LAW ENFORCEMENT

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Madam Speaker, last week on the evening of New Year's Day, I had the honor and privilege of being invited to attend the Fallen Officers Memorial in Chico, California, where I joined members of our community in paying tribute to members of our law enforcement who had made the ultimate sacrifice in the previous year.

In the U.S., we lost 118 officers nationwide, 14 in California. We are still mourning and feeling the sting of the loss of Officer Davis and Officer Oliver in a horrific crime spree in Placer County in northern California.

Yet what we hear in the news isn't really consistent with how we value our law enforcement—at least, how we should. Nearly 50,000 officers in 2013 were physically assaulted in the line of duty, but all we hear about is the other way. Madam Speaker, less than 1 in 1,000 contacts officers have result in any kind of physical need with the public. Indeed, that is less than half of 1 percent of an estimated 44 million contacts our officers have.

Now, in light of what we saw in Paris yesterday where their officers, in many cases, are disarmed, and what it looks like is happening in America, we are disarming the confidence in our officers and our law enforcement, we better change our attitude really quickly and value what our men and women in blue do for us so we don't have a worsening situation like we see going on around the world.

I stand today in solidarity with our brothers and sisters in law enforcement and ask that all Americans do the same as we do our business.

SUPPORTING KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE

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

Mr. EMMER. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the Keystone pipeline and on behalf of the people of Minnesota's Sixth Congressional District. I am honored and I would like to thank my constituents for the opportunity to serve as their representative.

I am a proud supporter of the Keystone XL pipeline, which will be an efficient and safe means of transporting up to 830,000 barrels of crude oil from Canada to the United States daily. The construction of this pipeline will support thousands of jobs and increase our GDP by nearly \$3.4 billion. Keystone will continue to reduce our dependence on Mideast oil. In the fastest growing region of Minnesota, this pipeline will alleviate rail and road congestion currently plaguing cities like Anoka and Elk River. This pipeline will also bring stability to our energy system and help stimulate growth in our economy.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE
CLERK OF THE HOUSE

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

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, January 8, 2015.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
The Speaker, U.S. Capitol, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on January 8, 2015 at 9:24 a.m.:

That the Senate adopted Senate Resolution 19, relative to the death of Edward W. Brooke, III.

With best wishes, I am
Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION
OF H.R. 3, KEYSTONE XL PIPE-
LINE ACT, AND PROVIDING FOR
CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 30,
SAVE AMERICAN WORKERS ACT
OF 2015

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 19 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 19

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 3) to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided among and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy

and Commerce; and (2) one motion to recommend.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House 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. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means; and (2) one motion to recommend.

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

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

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, House Resolution 19 provides for the consideration of two important pieces of legislation to help the American economy, both of which passed in the 113th Congress with bipartisan support. H.R. 30, the Save American Workers Act, is designed to address a critical flaw in the Affordable Care Act which is causing workers to lose hours at their jobs and, thus, lose wages—those wages that help put food on their tables, those wages that help feed their families, pay their utility bills, heat their homes during the winter, and cool their homes during the summer. H.R. 30 fixes this flaw by changing the newly created labor rule in the Affordable Care Act which defines full-time work at 30 hours a week and places that definition back where the American public has believed it to be for the last 100 years, that is, at 40 hours.

The second bill contained in today's rule is H.R. 3, the Keystone XL Pipeline Act, and that would put an end to what has been a 6-year process for approving a pipeline that should have simply been common sense for America's economy a long time ago.

□ 1230

The rule before us today provides for 1 hour of debate for each of the bills. This allows the House to fully debate these crucial issues. These bills are targeted pieces of legislation dealing with one single provision in the Affordable

Care Act and one single pipeline, respectively. No one is trying to repeal the Affordable Care Act today. For that, stay tuned. But I have no doubt that Members of the minority will claim that this bill is an attempt to repeal the Affordable Care Act. But, in fact, it simply makes changes to a definition and interpretation by the Department of Labor in the bill. As always, the minority is also afforded the customary motion to recommend on each of the bills.

Madam Speaker, as a result of the Affordable Care Act's requirement that businesses with 50 or more employees provide health insurance coverage to those employees working 30 hours per week, employers across the Nation—from schools to universities to municipalities to restaurants—are being forced to cut workers' hours or face unsustainable employment costs to their businesses and to their organizations. As a result, we are seeing—and this is what Republicans predicted prior to the controversial and contentious passage of the Affordable Care Act—but what we are seeing is the bill has fundamentally changed labor law in this country, creating a new, standard 30-hour workweek. As a result, workers' hours are being cut, and productivity in this country—a country that has always prided itself on the work ethic of its citizens—will decrease over time. This is what onerous government regulations do—suppress innovation and hamper businesses.

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

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

The Affordable Care Act fundamentally changed labor law in this country, and the repercussions of this may not be felt for years to come. This is a dangerous, slippery slope. What other labor laws will be reinterpreted now to define "full-time employment" as 30 hours per week? Do people intend to impose overtime rules on employers who employ people for over 30 hours per week? This is yet another regulation which would only result in businesses cutting more hours. What will the National Labor Relations Board interpret, knowing that the very fabric

of labor law is now based on a 30-hour workweek instead of the 100-year standard of the 40-hour workweek?

Prior to the Affordable Care Act, employers were already overwhelmingly providing health insurance to their employees working 40 hours per week. Making the change contained in Mr. YOUNG's legislation will cause the least amount of disruption to the labor market, and that is an important thing.

The Congressional Budget Office estimates that the Affordable Care Act will reduce the total number of hours worked, on net, by about 1.5 percent during the period from 2017 to 2024, almost entirely because workers will choose to supply less labor. Because of this, the Congressional Budget Office projects a decline in the number of workers of about 2 million in 2017, rising to 2.5 million in 2024, as a result of the Affordable Care Act. The latest Congressional Budget Office figures show that the Affordable Care Act will increase spending by almost \$2 trillion, double the estimate from 5 years ago. And the Joint Committee on Taxation says that taxpayers will be on the hook for over another \$1 trillion over the next decade. Americans earning as little as \$25,000 annually will pay more because of the law, even after accounting for the \$1 trillion in premium cost-sharing subsidies.

H.R. 3, the Keystone XL Pipeline Act, is an issue that Congress and the American people have been supportive of for the past several years. It has now been over 6 years since TransCanada first submitted its application for a Presidential permit to cross the United States-Canadian border with a pipeline bringing oil to refineries in Houston, Texas. The President's own State Department, in a several thousand-page document, stated that the pipeline would be cleaner and more environmentally friendly. It is a way to transport oil than other means, namely, with trucks, trains, and ships. This is common sense. The issue has been debated here in the House I don't know how many times over the past several years. Enough is enough. It is time to approve this application and put men and women to work who will be building this pipeline.

Madam Speaker, let us be clear about what is happening today. We are not repealing the Affordable Care Act. We are not undermining the Affordable Care Act. The bill does not take health insurance from a single person in this country. It is a fix to a fatal flaw in the legislation, a fix similar to the seven other fixes that have passed both Houses of Congress and, in fact, been signed by the President. It is similar to the 37 unilateral fixes that the President and his Secretary of Health and Human Services have made on their own. This is a fix to stop this legislation from resulting in people losing work. If Democrats can't agree to fix a provision in the Affordable Care Act that is preventing people from working, then it is simply empty rhetoric to

claim that they are interested in any fixes at all.

I will encourage my colleagues to vote "yes" on the rule and "yes" on the underlying legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the rule and both of the underlying bills. Let's talk a little bit about how these bills got before us, what the process of this body is, as well as the content of these two bills.

I ask my colleague from Texas: Did either of these bills go through committee here in this 114th Congress, this new Congress?

I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BURGESS. Both bills were before the Committee on Rules yesterday, and you were present.

Mr. POLIS. Let's talk a little bit about what that means. The Rules Committee is not the committee of jurisdiction for these bills. Now, that sounds complicated, but what does that mean? We have specialists here in Congress, specialized staff. Members who really roll up their sleeves and get to know about natural resources: what is this pipeline, what does it do about health care. They know far more than I might know or Mr. BURGESS might know or you might know, Madam Speaker, on a particular topic. We all try to learn about those in our committees.

The Rules Committee simply packages these bills for the floor. All the Rules Committee did yesterday was say no one can amend these bills. That is this rule that is before us. The Rules Committee simply said: These bills—which nobody who has any expertise actually got to vote on in committee, they just appeared—the Rules Committee said—and, by the way, no Republican or Democrat can even try to improve these bills, even Republicans and Democrats who serve on the committees of jurisdiction.

Now, we are supposed to have something called regular order around here. What does that mean? It means a bill, somebody has an idea. Let's have an idea: 40 hours, 30 hours—let's have an idea. Let's talk about whether this pipeline should be built or where it should be built. Okay. Well, that goes to a committee, which has Democrats and Republicans on it. They have the chance to amend that bill, to change that bill. They report out that bill.

Then it is supposed to go to the Rules Committee, and the Rules Committee hopefully will say: By the way, we want other good ideas from other Members of Congress that aren't on that committee. Let's allow a discussion on this amendment and that amendment. Mr. COURTNEY had a great amendment that he offered yesterday. Rules Committee said: No, we can't even vote on

it here on the floor of the House. It doesn't mean it will pass, but it means that Members have the opportunity to offer new ideas to improve legislation.

Well, guess what? Guess what, Madam Speaker? This bill didn't have any hearing or markup in any of the committees of jurisdiction—neither of them: Energy and Commerce, Natural Resources, Transportation—all bypassed for this bill that then went directly to Rules Committee. And the Rules Committee said: By the way, nobody can change these bills that no committee has even looked at.

So that is how we got to where we are today. That is the wrong process. A vote against this rule today is a vote for regular order, a vote for making sure that Members of this body—Democrats and Republicans—both on the committees of jurisdiction and in the general body can have their say on bills. That is why it is so important to defeat this very first rule here today.

Because if this passes, it is very dangerous. It can become the precedent for all the bills this Congress. This starts with an innocuous bill. This is the 50th-something repeal of ObamaCare. I don't know how many times the Keystone pipeline has been passed. So it seems innocuous. I am not for the policies. We will talk about them in a minute. Some people are. There is nothing new under the Earth here. We have seen these are in different forms, different versions, but they haven't passed through committee.

But the procedure here is saying: Guess what? No committee of jurisdiction can look at these bills. Rules Committee is not going to allow any amendments from Democrats or Republicans. If this rule passes, that has the danger of becoming the precedent for this entire Congress. The committees of jurisdiction will be avoided and overruled and gone around, and Members will have no opportunity to even offer their ideas here on the floor of the House to improve bills.

Now, let's talk a little bit about the content of these two bills before us today.

First, the so-called Save American Workers Act. Mr. BURGESS says that it changes labor law in this country, somehow defines full-time workers and full-time work, and that is simply not what it does. It simply addresses the benefits and whom companies will need to provide benefits to.

And, frankly, if this bill were to be the law, a company could very easily say: By the way, Mr. or Ms. full-time worker who works 40 hours a week, you now get off Friday at 4 o'clock. Sorry, you are 39 hours a week, you don't get any health care. And they are going to do it. That is why some companies want this to pass. Most companies provide benefits to all their employees, and it is not an issue.

But the folks that might be lobbying Members of Congress about it, of course that is their intention. They want to cut people from 40 hours a

week to 39 hours a week and not give them health care benefits. Ask them questions, Democrats or Republicans. If you are thinking of voting for this, ask them why they want it. That is why, of course, they want this bill. Right now, they would have to cut them all the way down to 30 hours, which is a much more complicated endeavor, because they probably would have to add new employees and have to manage that from an HR perspective. It is probably just worth it to let people continue working 40 hours and give them their benefits.

But if this very dangerous provision were to become law, many, many Americans would find themselves cut from 40 to 39 hours, 39½ hours, go home at 4:30 on Friday. Sorry, no health care. Sorry, no health care.

Now, look, if there is a real discussion about how to improve health care in this country, Democrats and Republicans, we are happy to be part of that. Let's talk about what health care should look like. When we have an idea to change something, to remove part of the Affordable Care Act, let's talk about what replaces it. This is simply a bad idea. It is a disincentive for companies to even provide health care to their employees.

Not only that, it is a deficit buster. It not only cuts the deficit by \$53 billion. Is the first bill that we are looking to pass under a rule a bill that didn't even come through a committee, that no Member of Congress can even offer a pay-for on? If we allowed an open rule here, I would love to offer a pay-for for that. How are we going to pay for this \$53 billion that this costs?

If you want to do this bad policy, that is one thing. I don't think we should do it. But if you want to do this policy and risk having companies cut their employees from 40 hours to 39 hours, if it is going to cost \$53 billion, I want to know how we are going to pay for it. I don't think that we should go to our Federal deficit and debt and leave that to the next generation to pay for. How many times does Congress do that? Oh, we will just have somebody else pay for it. Our kids will pay for it, our grandkids will pay for it. That is exactly what is going to happen with this bill, like so many others.

Several third-party economic analyses have found that five times as many employees would be at risk of having their hours reduced to part-time status under this bill than under current law. That is right. Five times as many are at risk of being cut from 40 to 39 hours than are currently at risk of being cut from 40 to 30 hours. Oh, so endanger the benefits of more employees—that is exactly what this bill does.

This bill is no way to create jobs. It is a way to prevent many Americans from having the health care through their employer that they already enjoy, forcing them to get taxpayer subsidized health care through the exchange instead.

□ 1245

That is why it costs money. That is what the \$53 billion is. It is a fact that what Republicans are saying is: Sorry, I don't think you should pay for your own health care. I think taxpayers should pay for it. They are trying to force you and me to pay for your health care, rather than getting your own health care, paying your employees' share.

It is simply bad for the country, bad for the deficit, bad for the next generation, and as I said, just as importantly, a bad precedent for the way that this Congress works.

Let's talk about the Keystone pipeline. This is really a phantom pipeline because yesterday in committee I asked, "Does anybody actually want to finance or build this pipeline?" I haven't seen any evidence that there is, at the current rate of oil.

Mr. BURGESS, have you heard? Yesterday, I asked in committee if anybody had any evidence that could go out on the floor that anybody wanted to pay for or build this pipeline. Have you had the opportunity to hear if anybody wants to build a pipeline?

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BURGESS. The pipeline, in fact, exists between Cushing, Oklahoma, and Houston, Texas, this very day.

Mr. POLIS. Reclaiming my time, if it exists already, I don't know why you are passing this bill. The truth is it does not exist to move the oil from the tar sands of Canada to our ports for export. That is what we are talking about here.

As far as I can tell, there is nobody who wants to pay to build it because it doesn't make economic sense with oil at \$52 a barrel. It might be a different discussion when oil is \$110, \$100, or even \$90 a barrel.

We had statistics that about 90 percent of the tar sands production requires oil at \$75 a barrel and about 100 percent of it requires oil at \$65 a barrel. When oil is about \$52 a barrel, nobody is going to pay for this pipeline.

It is a phantom pipeline. We are talking about issues that might have made sense to talk about if somebody actually wanted to do this pipeline, but before we waste the deliberative efforts of this body on a topic like this, we would like to see some evidence that somebody actually wants to build a pipeline there in the first place, not to mention that the other reason it is a phantom is nobody knows what the routing is going to be.

It is still in flux. There is a lawsuit. Where is the final routing going to be? Not only are there serious doubts about who will finance the pipeline, but in addition, we don't even know where it is going to be.

By the way, the costs of the pipeline have gone up. Transcorp says the pipeline will cost \$8 billion—up from their estimates of \$5.4 billion just a couple of years ago—not to mention that we are being asked to approve a pipeline that we don't even know the final routing of.

Again, as one of the very first bills that bypasses committee, that nobody can amend here on the floor, we are asked to encourage employers to cut their employees from 40 hours to 39 hours, so they can eliminate their benefits and force taxpayers to pay for it to the tune of \$53 billion over 10 years.

We are being asked to approve a phantom pipeline that nobody wants to pay for and nobody knows where it is going to go. What a way to start a Congress. Let's do better. Let's defeat this rule.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER).

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, this rule and the underlying bill should pass. If the underlying bill doesn't pass or gets vetoed, the Canadians will sell their product someplace else. That is what the choice is.

The Canadians want to sell their product to us and to use this pipeline to connect the product with the refineries along the gulf coast. If they can't do that because the pipeline isn't built because of political arguments—not economic arguments—then what will happen is the Canadians will build their own pipeline across the mountains to a port in Canada on the Pacific Ocean.

Where will that oil go? That oil will go straight to China, so that they can use that oil to compete against us, to undersell us, and to take American jobs away.

The XL pipeline is a job-creator both for American workers in building the pipeline, as well as American workers who will be utilizing the oil that comes through the pipeline. We should not listen to what we hear on the other side of the aisle, which will end up being a huge job-outsourcing bill to China. We have done enough of that in the past. We shouldn't do any more of that in the future.

I urge the passage of the rule and passage of the bill.

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), my distinguished colleague on the Rules Committee.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, it appears that the more things change, the more they stay the same. The Republican majority talks a good game. They talk about an open process, but when push comes to shove, they fall back on the same old tired, closed, heavy-handed, undemocratic business as usual.

If you believe their speeches, you would think they believe in regular order. You would think that they believe that all Members, Republicans and Democrats, deserve to be heard and that a fair and substantive process will be the practice of this body. But actions speak louder than words, Madam Speaker, and if the American people judge us by our actions, as they should, the House is off to a very, very bad start.

Just look at the rule before us today. On two incredibly important and controversial issues, the Keystone pipeline and making major changes to the Affordable Care Act, the Republican majority has decided to shut the House down, to say to every single member of this House, "Take it or leave it."

Do you believe that the Keystone pipeline won't actually do much to move the United States toward energy dependence or might harm our environment? Too bad, your amendment won't be made in order.

Do you believe that the 54th vote to undermine the Affordable Care Act is a waste of time? Too bad, the Republican leadership doesn't want to hear about it.

Are you a duly-elected Member of the House of Representatives with an interesting and substantive idea about how to change the underlying legislation? Too bad, according to the Republican leadership, your voice doesn't matter.

It is no wonder that an almost unprecedented number of Republican Members voted against the current leadership. They are fed up, and I don't blame them. That is where we are in the House of Representatives.

What about the Senate? According to Jennifer Rubin of The Washington Post, a Republican spokesman for Majority Leader MITCH MCCONNELL said:

Restoring the Senate to a place where legislation is debated and voted on, rather than simply using it as a campaign studio, is a priority for Senator McConnell.

Frankly, Madam Speaker, given MITCH MCCONNELL's past record, I will believe it when I see it, but at least he is saying something constructive. Unfortunately, here in the House, we have the same old-same old: a completely closed process that denies all Members the opportunity to be heard.

If this week is any indication, it is clear that the Republican leadership will keep using the House of Representatives as a campaign studio. They will continue to bring legislation to the floor that the President will veto, with no chance of amendments.

What a waste of time, what a squandered opportunity—but I have got an idea. This is a radical idea. Let's restore the House of Representatives to a place where substantive issues are debated and considered and voted on. My friends on the other side of the aisle like to talk about democracy. Let's restore a little bit of democracy in the House of Representatives.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to reject the temptation to close this process down. I urge them to vote "no" on rules like this one that are closed for no good reason.

Let me just say to my Republican colleagues: this is a lousy way to start the new Congress.

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

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY) who, by the

way, had an idea to try to improve one of these bills, and his idea is not even allowed to be discussed or debated or voted on here on the floor of the House.

Mr. COURTNEY. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule and both underlying bills, particularly the misnamed Save American Workers Act.

I would like to just cite very quickly from the Congressional Research Service, which is one of the gems of quality, neutral, nonpartisan analysis for this body, which took a look at this bill and said very clearly:

Changing the cutoff from 30 hours per week to 40 hours per week would not eliminate the incentive for employers to shift more workers to part-time status and could actually provide a greater incentive for firms not to offer health insurance to their employees.

In theory, changing the definition of a full-time worker to 40 hours a week would shift, not eliminate, the incentive for employers to reduce workers' hours. Additionally, more employers could be inclined to shift more workers to "part-time" status under a 40-hour definition because the disruption to their workforce is smaller from 40 to 39 hours per week than 40 to 29 hours per week.

I will submit this report for the RECORD.

CHANGE THE DEFINITION OF "FULL-TIME" TO 40 HOURS PER WEEK

Multiple bills introduced in the 113th Congress propose changing ACA's definition of "full-time" from 30 hours per week to 40 hours per week. Proponents of this revision argue that the current, 30-hour per-week definition is unusually low compared with "traditional standards" of a full-time worker in many industries, thus increasing employer's calculations and compliance costs. In addition, proponents of the revision argue that the 30-hour definition encourages employers to reduce the number of hours allotted to each worker (thereby reducing their pay) in order to reduce the number of "full-time" workers and reduce their compliance costs with ACA (or the size of their employer penalty, because the penalty is only based on full-time workers). Note, as discussed below, that the incentive for firms paying the penalty could be eliminated by imposing the penalty to apply to FTEs.

As shown in Table 3, 2012 Census data indicates that the majority (67.8%) of workers usually work 40 hours or more per week. The average work week for people who typically work "full time" is 42.5 hours per week—more than the 30-hour definition of an "FTE" in ACA. However, the data in Table 3 does not provide much behavioral insight into the responses of firms to ACA, as they were collected prior to the initial measurement period for ACA's employer penalty that began in January 2013.

TABLE 3. PERSONS AT WORK, BY AVERAGE HOURS WORKED PER WEEK, 2012

Hours of work	Distribution of workers across all industries
1 to 14	5.0%
15 to 29	12.5%
30 to 34	7.6%
35 to 39	7.1%
40	42.8%
41+	25.0%
Average Hours, Total at Work	38.5 hours
Average Hours, Persons Who Usually Work "Full Time"	42.5 hours

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2012 Current Population Survey, "Household Data—Annual Averages—19. Persons at work in agricultural and non-agricultural industries by hours of work," <http://www.bls.gov/cps/cpsaat19.htm>.

^a The Census Bureau defines a "full-time worker" as someone working 35 hours or more per week.

Several employer surveys indicate that most respondents are not reducing their employees' hours in response to ACA's definition of a full-time worker. According to a 2013 survey conducted by the International Foundation of Employee Benefits Plans, a non-profit foundation, 16% of the 966 employers surveyed said they have adjusted or plan to adjust hours so that fewer employees qualify for full-time. According to a 2012 survey of 1,203 employers conducted by Mercer, a global business consulting firm, 68% of survey respondents indicated that they will begin offering health coverage to all employees working 30 or more hours per week. Other surveys with fewer respondents support these findings.

In addition to surveys (which could or could not be representative of the firms that could be affected by the employer penalty), some researchers have conducted empirical analysis of broad, public-use data. A 2013 study conducted by the U.C. Berkeley Labor Center estimated that approximately 2.3 million workers in firms with 100 or more employees (representing 3.1% of all workers) were most vulnerable to a reduction in their payroll hours from above 30 hours per week to below 30 hours per week. These workers were mostly concentrated in the restaurant industry. In contrast, a 2013 study conducted by Helen Jorgensen and Dean Baker of the Center for Economic and Policy Research (CEPR) found that less than 1% of all workers in 2013 fall just below ACA's full-time threshold (26–29 hours per week). Jorgensen and Baker's study uses more recent data and is probably a more reliable study to forecast future conditions. Unlike the U.C. Berkeley Labor Center's study, Jorgensen and Baker's study likely captured any initial employers' responses to shifting workers below the 30 hour per week cutoff because, according to ACA, the baseline measurement period for measuring a firm's FTE employees begins in 2013. Also, Jorgensen and Baker's study better captures more recent improvements in the labor market; there are likely to be more "underemployed" workers (working under 40 hours) in the older data because the macroeconomy was in an earlier stage of recovery.

Changing the cutoff from 30 hours per week to 40 hours per week would not eliminate the incentive for employers to shift more workers to part-time status, and could actually provide a greater incentive for firms not to offer health insurance to their employees. In theory, changing the definition of a full-time worker to 40 hours per week would shift, not eliminate, the incentive for employers to reduce workers' hours. Additionally, more employers could be inclined to shift more workers to "part-time" status (in terms of the ACA) under a 40-hour definition, because the disruption to their workforce is smaller from 40 to 39 hours than 40 to 29 hours. If the incentive to retain their workers on full-time status is diminished, then fewer firms could be compelled by the employer penalty to offer health care coverage relative to current law. As shown in Table 3, more workers are also clustered around the 40-hour per-week threshold than the 30-hour threshold.

Mr. COURTNEY. Madam Speaker, I had an amendment, which is being shut off today, which I think actually really addresses the problem. Under the structure of the employer mandate that came out of the Senate, when an employer goes from 49 to 50 employees, the employer is taxed for 20 employees. Again, that is a cliff. There is just no denying that fact.

When the House passed the Affordable Care Act, we had a smooth, gradual, incremental increase based on payroll which, again, did not create a cliff.

My amendment would simply say that the exempt number of employees before the tax kicked in would be raised from 30 to 49, so that when an additional employee was hired above the 50 threshold, there would be a tax, there still would be an incentive, but there would not be a cliff.

Unbelievably, the committee just totally refused to allow this amendment to be considered. It was a strike-everything substitute amendment because the underlying bill does not accomplish the ends that its sponsors claim—and the CRS has verified that—but in fact, the Small Business Majority, which represents a large contingent of small employers across the country, endorsed my amendment.

Madam Speaker, sadly, under this rule—which, again, just completely shuts off any ability for Members to do their job, represent their district, come up with ideas that are well-founded in independent analysis—we are not going to have that opportunity.

I will submit a copy of the amendment which is not going to be discussed and the statement of support from the Small Business Majority in the RECORD.

AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE TO H.R.

OFFERED BY MR. COURTNEY OF CONNECTICUT

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Eliminate the Small Employer Tax Cliff Act”.

SEC. 2. INCREASE IN REDUCTION IN DETERMINING APPLICATION OF EMPLOYER SIZE TO ASSESSABLE PENALTIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Clause (i) of section 4980H(c)(2)(D) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking “30” and inserting “49”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) 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.

Amend the title so as to read: “A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the reduction in determining the application of employer size to assessable penalties under the employer mandate.”.

[From Small Business Majority]

STATEMENT OF SUPPORT FOR THE ELIMINATE THE SMALL EMPLOYER TAX CLIFF ACT

(Statement from John Arensmeyer, Founder & CEO of Small Business Majority)

Small Business Majority supports Congressman Courtney’s amendment to increase the cliff of the employer penalty in the Affordable Care Act from 30 to 49 employees because it will provide small business owners with more flexibility and can relieve some of the burden on those few who have more than 50 employees but do not provide health insurance.

Ninety-six percent of businesses in this country have fewer than 50 employees. For larger businesses with more than 50 employees, 96% already offer insurance. Only the 4% of larger employers that do not offer health insurance are impacted by the penalty.

However, the Congressman’s amendment will mean fewer small business owners with

more than 50 employees will have to pay a penalty if they do not offer insurance.

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

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I thank the gentleman from California and the gentleman from Texas.

Madam Speaker, I wonder: Does anyone know who Lisa Gray is? Or the many Lisa Grays across America? Lisa Gray is a woman who, as a small business owner, admitted that if it had not been for the Affordable Care Act, she would not have been able to get the chemo treatment for her leukemia.

Just think of the workers who are now getting affordable care access. Now, with this legislation, they will be cut to 39 or 38 or 32 hours, so as not to have the employee-mandated and responsible way of treating their health insurance.

This bill that is on the floor today will give us a \$53 billion deficit. It will result in 1 million people losing their employee-sponsored coverage like Lisa Gray or families that I saw coming for enrollment in Texas.

It will increase the number of people obtaining coverage through Medicaid, CHIP, and the health insurance marketplace between 500,000 and 1 million and increase the number of uninsured by upwards of 500,000.

Do we realize what we have gained through the Affordable Care Act? According to the Kaiser Family Foundation, the average annual premium for employer-sponsored family health insurance rose just 3 percent. That is far different from 7.9 percent before the Affordable Care Act. Where is all this noise that our insurance premiums are going up?

I will tell you what will be going up: it will cause an additional 6.5 million workers to find that their employers have cut their hours, and it will result in \$19.6 billion in additional costs to the Federal health care program.

Are we talking about deficit? I am talking about lives, Madam Speaker, and I am talking about the ability to save lives. This legislation is not interested in doing so.

What about my State of Texas? We have not opted in to the expanded Medicaid. Twenty-three States—what will that do to individuals below 100 percent of the Federal poverty line if they had any ability to access the marketplace? They won’t have the ability to access the marketplace because they will be in those who are cut down.

Let me just say that we have the ability to realize and do better. Let me stop people from saying there is no Federal law that requires employers, Madam Speaker, to cover employees. You won’t face penalties.

You can do better. I believe this bill does not answer our concerns. I don’t want Lisa Gray to lose her insurance.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 30, the so-called “Save American Work-

ers Act of 2014,” which is the latest attempt by the House Republican majority to impede the implementation of the Affordable Care Act and deny Americans the security that comes from having access to affordable, high-quality health care.

At the start of the new Congress the American people expect the “People’s House” to take up matters of central concern to their lives: jobs, affordable education; and initiatives to close the income gap.

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

The majority is bringing before the House of Representatives a bill that was brought before the last Congress, and the Obama Administration said that it would be vetoed.

The majority has attempted over 50 times to end the Affordable Care Act with no hope of accomplishing their goal. Today’s vote is no different from past attempts to take away Americans’ right to affordable health care insurance.

Further, should the Republican majority in the Senate decide to take up this bill—they do not have the 60 votes to bring H.R. 30 before the Senate for a final vote.

If they could get H.R. 30 out of the Senate the President would veto the bill and neither the House nor the Senate has the two-thirds majority necessary to overcome a veto.

This is a waste of limited legislative days for 2015, and a poor start to the 114th Congress.

The Congressional Budget Office estimates that H.R. 30, the Save American Workers Act would: Increase the federal deficit by \$53 billion over the next decade; Result in one million people losing sponsoring coverage; Increase the number of people obtaining coverage through Medicaid, CHIP, and the Health Insurance Marketplaces by between 500,000 and one million people; and Increase the number of uninsured by up to 500,000.

Since 2013, over 10 million Americans now have health insurance because they took advantage of the Affordable Care Act.

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.

Premiums for employer-sponsored insurance grew in 2014 at the lowest rate on record back to 1999, tied with 2010. According to the Kaiser Family Foundation data, the average annual premium for employer-sponsored family health insurance coverage rose just 3.0 percent (1.2 percent adjusted for inflation) to \$16,834 in 2014, far below the 7.9 percent (5.6 percent adjusted for inflation) rate seen from 2000–2010.

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

This nation because of the Affordable Care Act has 7.3 million people signed up for Marketplace plans, paid their premiums, and accessed quality, affordable coverage.

An additionally, 8 million individuals enrolled in Medicaid and CHIP since the beginning

2015 Open Enrollment—that's an increase of nearly 14 percent compared to average monthly signups before this year's enrollment period began.

Millions of young adults have gotten covered on their parent's plan, because the law says they can now do so until they turn 26.

An article in the *New England Journal of Medicine* found that 10.3 million uninsured Americans have gotten since the start of Open Enrollment.

In just one year (since the start of Open Enrollment), we've reduced the number of uninsured adults by 26 percent.

Americans have more choices. During Open Enrollment 21314, consumers could choose from an average of 47 plans. Contrast that to before the Affordable Care Act when many consumers had few, if any, real choices.

Today, we're able to announce that in 2015 there is a 25 percent increase in the total number of insurers selling health insurance plans in the Marketplace in 44 states.

Seventy-six million Americans with private health insurance can finally get preventive services such as vaccines, cancer screenings, and yearly wellness visits without cost sharing, because the law says your insurance company must provide you with these services with no copay or other out-of-pocket expense.

This includes nearly 30 million women and over 18 million children. Millions of families have real financial security because insurance companies can no longer deny them coverage because of a pre-existing condition or because they reach an annual or lifetime limit in coverage. Insurance companies must include things like prescription drugs and hospital stays in their coverage. And being a woman is no longer a pre-existing condition.

H.R. 30 proposes to amend the Internal Revenue Code by redefining a full time employee for purposes of providing health insurance to only those workers who work a 40-hour workweek.

The bill would redefine "full-time employee," for purposes of determining which employees an employer must provide health insurance coverage to only those hourly wageworkers who work 40 hours a week. The Affordable Care Act for the purpose of employers providing health care to workers defined a full time employee as any worker who works 30 hours a week or more.

Few hourly workers in low-wage jobs work a 40-hour work week. These employees often rely on government assistance, which amounts to a hidden tax break to employers. Low wageworkers often rely upon public housing assistance, SNAP, WIC or Medicaid to make ends meet.

In the 115th Congress wants to help Americans with access to affordable health care insurance they would address the issue of states that are not participating in the Medicaid expansion in states like the state of Texas where millions of uninsured low wage workers do not have access to health care insurance.

Health insurance should not be used as a status symbol, but a basic right for people who live in the world's most prosperous nation. I know that many predicted that the Affordable Care Act would cause havoc on the nation's health care system, but it is not the ACA that is causing havoc—it is a small vocal minority within the majority party that is causing headaches and heartaches to doctors and their patients.

I ask that my Colleagues vote against the rule for H.R. 30.

[From The Ledger.com, Jan. 8, 2015]

STORIES BEHIND THE LEGISLATION: WOMAN—
OBAMA'S HEALTH COVERAGE SAVED ME
(By Noam N. Levey)

ALEXANDRIA, VA.—Like many working Americans, Lisa Gray thought she had good health insurance.

That was until she was diagnosed with leukemia in mid-2013, and the self-employed businesswoman made a startling discovery: Her health plan didn't cover the chemotherapy she needed. "I thought I was going to die," Gray, 62, said recently, recalling her desperate scramble to get lifesaving drugs.

Through a mix of temporary measures, doctors and patient advocates managed to keep Gray stable for a few months.

But it was a new health plan through the Affordable Care Act that Gray credits with saving her life. The plan, which started Jan. 1, 2014, gave her access to the recommended chemotherapy. Her cancer went into remission in the fall.

It's been one year since the federal law began guaranteeing coverage to most Americans for the first time, even if they are sick.

Some consumers pay more for insurance. Some pay less. Doctors, hospitals and businesses are laboring to keep up with new requirements. And across the country, "Obamacare" remains a polarizing political issue.

For many Americans like Gray—who were stuck in plans that didn't cover vital services or who couldn't get insurance because of a pre-existing medical condition—the law has had a personal, even life-changing impact.

"A couple years earlier, I think I would have been done," Gray said.

Even the law's supporters concede more must be done to control health care costs and ensure access to care.

But the insurance guarantee—which includes billions of dollars in aid to low- and middle-income Americans—has extended coverage to about 10 million people who previously had no insurance, surveys indicate.

That cut the nation's uninsured rate more than 20 percent last year, the largest drop in half a century.

The law also changed coverage for millions more people who were in plans like Gray's that capped or excluded benefits.

Gray thought little of these potential changes when President Barack Obama signed the health law in the spring of 2010. She'd had health insurance for decades.

With a monthly \$1,095 premium, the Kaiser Permanente plan that she had gotten through her husband's employer wasn't cheap.

But it was her only option. As a breast cancer survivor, Gray probably wouldn't have been able to find a new plan.

On the morning of May 20, 2013, Gray skidded off the road driving to her vacation condominium on Maryland's Eastern Shore. Aside from a few bruises, she was unhurt.

But she had a bigger surprise at the emergency room. A routine blood test showed an unusually high white blood cell count.

Gray had chronic myeloid leukemia, a relatively uncommon form of cancer that starts in the bone marrow and leads to the production of abnormal blood cells.

The disease is now considered highly treatable. Gray's oncologist at Kaiser prescribed the standard oral chemotherapy, a medication known as Gleevec.

Gray called her pharmacy to pick up the prescription.

There was a pause on the line. The pharmacist asked Gray whether she knew the drug would cost \$6,809 per month.

"I freaked out," she recalled. "Why would they even make this drug if people can't afford it?"

Neither Gray nor her doctor realized her Kaiser plan covered only \$1,500 worth of prescription drugs a year, a provision spelled out in small type in Appendix B of her 80-page plan brochure.

Gray's family explored going to Canada, where pharmaceuticals are often less expensive. They finally found a clinical trial closer to home at the University of Maryland, Baltimore, where researchers were testing an alternative to Gleevec called ponatinib.

Gray's cancer quickly responded. The relief was only temporary, however. The next month, Gray had to stop the ponatinib. Without access to either drug, she was again scrambling.

Bristol-Myers Squibb, which provides cancer patients with a temporary insurance card for a 30-day supply of yet another cancer drug, seemed to offer hope. But the card wasn't accepted at the Kaiser pharmacy where Gray had to get her prescriptions.

American Cancer Society advocate Brandon Costantino persuaded a company sales representative to give Gray a month's supply anyway.

Even the promise of a new insurance plan under the Affordable Care Act seemed elusive at first. Gray, like others, battled through the problems that hobbled HealthCare.gov after it opened.

Finally, on Dec. 2, 2013, she selected a new Kaiser Permanente health plan for \$780 per month. That was \$315 less than her current plan. Most important, the plan covered Gleevec for a \$30-a-month co-pay.

Gray broke down in the pharmacy when she picked up her first prescription.

She admits she's "kind of a crier."

Nine months later, a bone marrow biopsy showed no further sign of leukemia.

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

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE. I thank the gentleman for yielding and for his leadership on the Rules Committee and on so many issues.

I rise today, Madam Speaker, in strong opposition to this rule and to H.R. 3, the Keystone XL Pipeline Act, and H.R. 30, the so-called Save American Workers Act of 2015.

Madam Speaker, both of these bills are damaging to the health of Americans, with one aimed at denying access to affordable health care and the other designed to strike a blow to our environment.

Madam Speaker, approval of Keystone XL would worsen climate change by expanding the extraction of the dirtiest oil on the planet. Emissions from extracting the dirty tar sands oil that would flow through the Keystone XL pipeline would be equal to the tailpipe emissions from 5.7 million cars. That is not the air that we want to breathe.

We must reject this assault on our environment, especially at a time when so many communities across our country are experiencing the impacts of climate change through severe weather, coastal storms, and crippling droughts.

Let me turn quickly to H.R. 30, the so-called "Save Health Care for Working Families Act."

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

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, I yield the gentlewoman an additional 15 seconds.

Ms. LEE. Sadly, this bill is nothing more than the latest Republican attack on the Affordable Care Act and would result in an estimated 1 million people losing access to their health care coverage. This is unacceptable.

We should be in the business of providing hardworking Americans access to affordable health care, not taking it away.

I strongly urge a “no” vote on this rule and these damaging bills.

□ 1300

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER), the chairwoman of the House Administration Committee.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. I certainly thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the combined rule, but specifically I want to talk in favor of the Keystone XL Pipeline Act, which will finally approve this very, very long overdue project. The act that we are going to be passing will certainly show this House's intent to pass it, and I do believe that now the Senate will pass the Keystone Pipeline project as well.

There are just so many reasons—so many reasons—to vote in favor of this bill:

First of all, tens of thousands of good-paying jobs, American jobs, at zero cost to the American taxpayers.

Greater American access to safe and reliable North American energy resources, because certainly getting more energy from our close friends, our neighbors, our closest ally, the Canadians, makes perfect sense.

Reduced energy costs for American families. How important is that?

Enhanced American energy security. And in today's modern world, more than ever, energy independence and energy security equals national security.

So no wonder, Madam Speaker, that this project is supported by so many groups from all across the spectrum: labor organizations, so many labor organizations are supportive of this because of the jobs that it will bring; so many business organizations because of what it is going to do to help turbocharge our economy; and certainly the vast majority of American people, in poll after poll after poll, have demonstrated that they want this project to happen. They are totally cognizant, very aware of what this project means, again, to reducing our reliance that we have currently on fossil fuel from foreign sources, some countries that are not particularly favorable to American values and our way of life, and the American people are very, very supportive of this project.

I say now, Madam Speaker, that it is time to turn away from the extreme

environmentalists and work toward the priorities of the American people. The time to act is now.

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Madam Speaker, today the House is scheduled to consider H.R. 30, which is really more properly called the “Sabotage American Workers Act,” a bill to provide a major change in ACA's requirement that larger employers offer health coverage to employees who work 30 or more hours a week or face a penalty, raising the threshold to 40 hours instead.

The GOP claims the 30-hour threshold is a destructive barrier to more hours for workers. However, in reality, this GOP bill would lead to fewer hours and more part-time workers, the exact opposite of what the Republican rhetoric about restoring the 40-hour workweek implies.

The nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office and the Urban Institute have found no compelling evidence that part-time employment has increased as a result of ObamaCare. H.R. 30 would lead to more part-time work, since large employers could avoid providing health care coverage by reducing employees' work schedules by even just an hour.

Even conservative analysts agree. Yuval Levin recently wrote in the *National Review* that changing the definition to 40 hours “would likely put far, far more people at risk of having their hours cut” and “would make for a worse effect on workers.”

Unfortunately, Congressional Republicans remain unmoved by the facts, choosing instead to launch yet another attack on working families.

According to the CBO, this bill would increase the Federal deficit by \$53 billion over the next decade. So I would urge all of my colleagues to vote “no” on this rule and then “no” on H.R. 30.

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

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN).

(Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise today to express my opposition both to the rule and also to the underlying legislation, Save American Workers Act of 2015.

To paraphrase President Reagan: There you go again. This bill is another effort to undermine the Affordable Care Act, and, even worse, this significantly makes the problem worse. Raising the threshold for full-time employees from 30 hours a week to 40 hours a week would result in lost work hours for 6.5 million people. This essentially guts the employer responsibility requirement at the direct expense of the hardworking employees and of the taxpayers who end up subsidizing these employees' health care coverage.

According to the Congressional Budget Office and the Joint Committee on Taxation, the misnamed Save American Workers Act will cause 1 million people to lose their employer-based health insurance coverage, increase the number of uninsured Americans by 500,000, and add \$74 billion to the deficit over the next 10 years.

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

Mr. POLIS. I yield the gentleman an additional 15 seconds.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. It will make shifts toward part-time employment more likely rather than less.

Starting the 114th Congress with the 54th attempt to undermine or repeal the Affordable Care Act is disappointing, and the American people deserve better.

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CASTRO).

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Thank you, Congressman POLIS.

Mr. Speaker, Democrats have said all along that we understand that when you have a bill that is this wide in scope, whether it is hundreds of pages or thousands of pages, regardless of the subject matter, whether it is health care or education or banking or anything else, that it is likely not going to be perfect, that we are always willing to come back and look at making reasonable changes and tweaking it to make it better, and that we would be willing to work with Republicans to do it. We demonstrated that a few days ago when Congressman DAVIS received overwhelming support from both Republicans and Democrats to make sure that employers don't have to count folks who are receiving coverage through the VA or through some other VA-related health care coverage.

This, however, is unreasonable. This action, this bill, would mean that a million Americans would lose health care coverage—a million Americans. We are expecting, because the ACA has been so successful, that 9 million Americans will enroll by the end of this enrollment period.

Now, at the beginning, Republicans were saying that this would be the biggest job killer there was, that the economy would suffer, that businesses would be cutting employees.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. YODER). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. POLIS. I yield the gentleman an additional 15 seconds.

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Those predictions have turned out to be completely misguided and false.

This country is going through an incredible economic expansion, almost 5 percent. The unemployment rate is below 6 percent. And so, as we go through this debate, I hope that we will keep those considerations in mind.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois

(Mr. SHIMKUS), a fellow member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my friend.

This is a debate that we shouldn't even have to have had since this should have been approved 6 years ago. If you understand how Keystone was supposed to happen, all it took was the President and, really, his Cabinet, Secretary of State, to approve the cross-border passage 6 years ago. But because of politics and the President making a decision—we thought this was going to be done 6 years ago, hence, the legislative body getting involved.

And what has happened over the past 6 years? Fifteen hearings, four mark-ups. This is our 10th vote, and it is time to move on.

Moving liquid crude by pipeline is the safest way to move product—the safest. In the Energy and Commerce Committee, people have no understanding how many pipelines we have in this country—thousands of miles and multiple cross-border. The only reason this got involved in a political debate is the whole debate on climate change and fossil fuel. That is the debate.

Now, you put more bulk crude product on the world market, that lowers the prices for all Americans. Why are we seeing low gasoline prices today? It is because there is a glut of crude oil on the entire world market. Moving Keystone XL allows even more bulk crude oil to get on the world market. Most of that would be refined in our country.

Major refiners have done billions of dollars of investments—next to my district in Ohio, up in Chicagoland—to be prepared to refine this type of crude oil, so this is, unfortunately, a problem that we need to move and fix.

I appreciate the rule, and I look forward to debating the bill.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes and 15 seconds to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY).

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I would just say to my friend from Illinois that, yes, this is politicized all right, and now we have got Congress in the business of permitting. And if we are going to go down that route, I have a 7-Eleven in my home county that can't get a permit. Maybe I will bring it to Congress.

This is not the way to solve environmental problems, and this oil is for export from Port Arthur, Texas. It is not designed to help domestic supply in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, my friends on the other side of the aisle have now tried more than 54 times to repeal the Affordable Care Act in some fashion. Today they are at it once again, offering the so-called, Orwellian-named Save American Workers Act.

I am still trying to figure out what they are trying to save the American workers from. Good health care? Doctors? Nurses? Free preventative check-ups? The denial of insurance based on a preexisting condition?

Exactly what are you trying to save them from?

Despite the repeated distortions and assaults, the Affordable Care Act is working. In the most recent open enrollment, more than 6.5 million people have registered for or renewed their health insurance coverage through the marketplace exchange, and open enrollment will continue through February 15 of this year.

Just this week, new data show the uninsured rate has sunk to 12.9 percent, a 4-point drop in the past year, and one of the lowest in decades. Many of these are our constituents who, without the Affordable Care Act, would not have health insurance. They are realizing the benefits of a patient-centered insurance model in which their coverage cannot be rescinded or denied because of a preexisting condition and does not put them at risk of bankruptcy in the event of an emergency.

But my friends on the other side will not be deterred in their zeal to repeal, at any cost, no matter who it hurts, even if it means abandoning their own professed principles.

The Congressional Budget Office says this bill would increase the Federal deficit by at least \$53.2 billion over the next 10 years. I thought my colleagues wanted to reduce the deficit, which is exactly what the Affordable Care Act does do, to the tune of \$109 billion over the same period.

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

Mr. POLIS. I yield the gentleman an additional 15 seconds.

Mr. CONNOLLY. But rather than save workers, as its title would suggest, this bill will actually sabotage them. Again, CBO says 1 million people who currently have insurance will lose it under the Republican plan today, half of whom will have to go to Medicaid, and the other half will just be left on the street.

Mr. Speaker, American workers need the Affordable Care Act. I urge my colleagues to oppose the rule and the underlying H.R. 30.

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BEYER) for his very first speech here on the floor of the House of Representatives.

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in opposition to the rule.

With my brother, I have owned and managed a small business for 40 years, and I know well that the most important asset of any business is its workers.

H.R. 30 creates perverse incentives to cut employee hours and to eliminate the health care benefits entitled to full-time workers. It would allow employers like me to easily cut back full-time employees from the usual 40 hours to 39 hours, just so we don't have to offer health care coverage. Work 12 minutes fewer a day and have no health insurance coverage.

This bill is a wolf in sheep's clothing. It doesn't save American workers. It does just the opposite.

Forty-four percent of all American workers will be at risk of losing their health care benefits, and at least a half a million will be forced onto public welfare rolls.

□ 1315

According to the CBO, we hear it will increase the budget deficit by \$53.2 billion over the next 10 years. You don't have to have a background in business to know that doesn't make good business sense.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the rule. This is not a job-creating bill—it is a job-destroying bill—and that is not why we are here.

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

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

So here we are, Mr. Speaker. We have two bills that didn't go through any committee and that no Member of this body, Democrat or Republican, had a chance to amend. They went to the Rules Committee. No Members are allowed to amend them on the floor of the House, and they have to vote for them.

One of those bills is for a phantom pipeline. We don't even know if anybody wants to build it, and we don't know where it is going to go. We don't even know whether this right of eminent domain might be given to a private company over this so that a company can condemn private property of a private landowner's and take it away. Those are some of the things that are being fought out in court and in law in States like Nebraska. Without even knowing where it is going to go or if anybody wants to pay for it or build it, somehow we are engaged with a permitting process. Let's go ahead and approve a 7-Eleven in GERRY CONNOLLY's district. I would like a hotel at the corner of 29th and Arapahoe in my district, if we can do that, too.

What are we doing—seizing all control here in Washington and taking it away from States and local governments and individual landowners, who normally have a say in these matters?

Of course, there is the other bill that we have here. Again, it didn't go through committee. Nobody could amend it. It is a bill that increases the deficit by \$52 billion by forcing Americans to take taxpayer subsidies for their health care rather than buying it themselves with their employee's share and their employer's share. It is a bill that encourages companies to cut their employees from 40 hours a week to 39 hours a week. It is a bill that will lead hundreds of thousands or millions of Americans to lose their health care and have to take taxpayer subsidies through the exchange to be able to even have any kind of health care.

Look, instead of rehashing proposals that we voted on I don't even know how many times—in fact, we voted on

this phantom pipeline when it was a little less phantom. I think there were actually people who wanted to build it when oil was \$110 a barrel. Guess what? The costs of the pipeline have gone up by about 30 percent, and as far as we can tell, there has been no evidence presented, either in the Rules Committee or here on the floor, that anybody wants to build it. By the way, that is what congressional hearings are about in normal regular order, where there would be somebody to testify: "Well, yes, we can build it at \$70 a barrel. No, we can't build it at \$70 a barrel." We don't even have that information. I have seen an independent report that said that the tar sands are not profitable at anything less than \$65 a barrel. We are at \$52 a barrel now.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WEBER).

Mr. WEBER of Texas. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the rule and of the two underlying bills, one of which is H.R. 3, the Keystone XL Pipeline Act, which comes into my district.

I thank Congressman CRAMER for introducing legislation approving this project and for the leadership in making it a priority at the beginning of this Congress.

It has been 2,302 days since the first permit application was filed for Keystone XL. Now, folks, that is before the Apple iPad was released 6 years ago. The State Department's exhaustive study of this project has led many to conclude that the Keystone XL is the most studied pipeline in history. It looks like the only job this has produced has been for those who are studying it. The Department has concluded that this pipeline will be safe and environmentally sound. Despite this favorable review, the administration has failed to make a decision on a project that will strengthen our relationship with an important ally and create American jobs—40,000, to use their number.

In addition to Canadian oil, this pipeline will also transport American oil from North Dakota and Montana. This will make our roads and communities safer as fewer trucks and fewer railcars will be needed to transport oil to energy-hungry communities all across our great country. The Keystone pipeline is supported by over 70 percent of the American people, and there is no further reason for any kind of delay for this project.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 3.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 35 seconds to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this bill.

By cutting full-time workers from 40 hours per week to 39, an employer could escape having to pay for health care. This bill would put millions of

workers at risk of losing both wages and health care. It is wrong for our country, wrong for public health, and it is wrong for the middle class. It leaves the American people worse off, with smaller paychecks and with bigger insurance bills. I urge my colleagues to vote against this bill.

Mr. POLIS. We are prepared to close if the gentleman from Texas is prepared to close.

Mr. BURGESS. I have no additional speakers.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Colorado has 15 seconds remaining.

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

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the rule and on the underlying bills—no committee hearings, no committee markup, no amendments on the floor of the House, a phantom pipeline, job-destroying, deficit-busting.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time I have remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has 15½ minutes remaining.

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

It has been an interesting afternoon, and we have heard a lot of discussion. The first week of a new Congress is a little bit different from other times. None of our committees have been constituted. Yet, in this Congress—in this historic Congress—we have been left an enormous amount of work by the previous Congress, not because the House wouldn't do its work. Republicans and Democrats showed up and passed bills and sent them over to the Senate, and there they languished. Well over 300 bills are stacked up on the former majority leader's desk. I stress the word "former" in that statement, and I believe that is why he is the former majority leader.

Now it is a new day and a new Congress. No, the committees have not yet been constituted, but there is an enormous amount of work—there is an enormous body of work—that has already been accomplished by the House of Representatives that now needs to move forward on behalf of the American people, on behalf of our economy, on behalf of our jobs, on behalf of heating our homes. Look, I am old enough to remember when the Democrats assumed power in 2007, in the 110th Congress. It was kind of an unusual time for me because I had been in the majority previously, and I didn't know what it was like to be in the minority, but let me just take everyone back for a moment.

The rules package that the Democrats passed in the 110th Congress—their first year of the majority—provided for the consideration of five measures. I never quite understood that because the Democrats ran on "six for '06." Nevertheless, five measures were included in their rules pack-

age. They went directly to the floor with these bills, with no committee consideration, not even the consideration of a hearing in the House Rules Committee, which they controlled at the time. So it is a little disingenuous to say, "Oh, we are rushing things. Oh, we have not had adequate consideration." You heard the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS) describe the number of hearings and markups that have been done on just the Keystone pipeline.

In the time I have been sitting here I have heard discussions that there is nothing in the Affordable Care Act that actually cuts a worker's hours, but a plain reading of the legislation—of section 1513, page 158, paragraph four, for those who are keeping score at home—reads:

A full-time employee, section A, in general: The term "full-time employee" means, with respect to any month, an employee who is employed at least 30 hours of service per week.

That seems pretty straightforward.

What has happened as a result of that very plain language even before the Department of Labor issued its rules, which were even more restrictive, is employers made the decision of: Do you know what? We are not going to employ anyone over 29 hours because we don't want to run the risk of invoking this employer mandate.

Now, it is true enough that the administration did delay the mandate. Yes, we are criticized for passing things that are restrictive on the Affordable Care Act. The administration has done so so many times—30, 35—I don't even remember how many. One of the things they delayed was the employer mandate. In fact, later on, in this very section, section 1513, it states:

On the effective date of the employer mandate, the amendments made by this section shall apply to months beginning after December 31, 2013.

That is in the past.

It is important to bring this up. It is not part of our discussion today on the rules, but it is for employers—for small businesses—in this country to recognize, with the delay of the employer mandate—actually, it started last week, January 1 of 2015—no taxes for calendar year 2015 will be paid until next year. So the fines under the Affordable Care Act will, in fact, not start until next year, but the reporting requirements started 7 days ago. Big companies understand this. Big companies get this. Big companies have got lots of lawyers on retainer who are working on this every day. It is the small employers with 50 employees back home in our districts who need to understand that they have to be keeping these records today so that they will be able to go back and verify the statements on their tax bills next year.

Mr. SHIMKUS said it very well. On the Keystone pipeline, there have been 15 hearings in the House and Senate, four markups, 10 votes—10 votes on the Keystone pipeline. Tell me we haven't studied this situation.

We heard discussion from the other side that this was a phantom pipeline, that no one is even interested in building it anymore, and that the price of gas is so low that no one would be interested in building the Keystone pipeline. In fact, the president and CEO of TransCanada, in a statement yesterday, said that Keystone XL is a project that was needed when oil prices were less than \$40 a barrel.

That was in 2008 that it was less than \$40 a barrel. It is a project that was needed when oil prices were less than \$40 a barrel. It was needed when prices were over \$100 a barrel, and it is certainly needed when prices are \$50 a barrel, as they are today.

He went on to say that the review process for the Keystone XL has been anything but a well-established process. For decades, the normal process to review and make a decision on an infrastructure project like Keystone would take 2 years. He went on to say that we are well over the 6-year mark in reviewing the final phase of Keystone with, seemingly, no end in sight. The bar continues to move again and again.

What business can function like that, Mr. Speaker?

TransCanada has patiently and diligently worked since 2008 to comply with every twist and turn in this unparalleled process. We have done this to ensure that the Keystone XL is built and operated safely. The State Department has concluded this to be the case time and time again, and it can be done.

Mr. Speaker, I would just submit that that does not sound like a CEO who is not willing to invest his money. We are not even talking about government money here. We are talking about private money. This private investment, indeed, is going forward. I would just submit again, from Cushing, Oklahoma, to Port Arthur, Texas, the pipeline is actually in the ground and exists today—far from a phantom pipeline.

Mr. Speaker, today's rule provides for the consideration of important bills pertaining to health care and energy—the two very centers of excellence within the Energy and Commerce Committee.

I applaud Mr. YOUNG and Mr. CRAMER for their thoughtful pieces of legislation. I applaud them for working across the aisle to offer bills that both Republicans and Democrats have publicly supported. Over two-dozen Democrats voted for the 40-hour workweek the last time it came to the floor. I urge my colleagues to support both the rule and the underlying bills.

For that reason, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 240, nays 180, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 11]

YEAS—240

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

NAYS—180

Adams	Gabbard	Nadler
Aguilar	Napolitano	Napolitano
Ashford	Graham	Neal
Bass	Grayson	Nolan
Beatty	Green, Al	Norcross
Becerra	Green, Gene	Pallone
Bera	Grijalva	Pascarell
Beyer	Gutiérrez	Payne
Bishop (GA)	Hahn	Pelosi
Blumenauer	Hastings	Perlmutter
Bonamici	Heck (WA)	Peters
Boyle (PA)	Higgins	Peterson
Brady (PA)	Himes	Pingree
Brown (FL)	Hinojosa	Pocan
Brownley (CA)	Honda	Polis
Bustos	Hoyer	Price (NC)
Butterfield	Huffman	Quigley
Capps	Israel	Rangel
Capuano	Jackson Lee	Rice (NY)
Cárdenas	Jeffries	Richmond
Carney	Johnson (GA)	Roybal-Allard
Carson (IN)	Johnson, E. B.	Ruiz
Cartwright	Kaptur	Ruppersberger
Castor (FL)	Keating	Ryan (OH)
Castro (TX)	Kelly (IL)	Sánchez, Linda
Chu (CA)	Kennedy	T.
Cicilline	Kildee	Sanchez, Loretta
Clark (MA)	Kilmer	Schiff
Clarke (NY)	Kind	Schrader
Clay	Kirkpatrick	Scott (VA)
Cleaver	Kuster	Scott, David
Clyburn	Langevin	Serrano
Cohen	Larsen (WA)	Sewell (AL)
Connolly	Larson (CT)	Sherman
Conyers	Lawrence	Sinema
Cooper	Lee	Sires
Courtney	Levin	Slaughter
Crowley	Lewis	Smith (WA)
Cuellar	Lieu (CA)	Speier
Cummings	Lipinski	Swalwell (CA)
Davis (CA)	Loeb	Takai
Davis, Danny	Loeb	Takano
DeFazio	Lowgren	Thompson (CA)
DeGette	Lowenthal	Thompson (MS)
Delaney	Lowey	Titus
DeLauro	Lujan Grisham	Tonko
DelBene	(NM)	Torres
DeSaulnier	Luján, Ben Ray	Tsongas
Deutch	(NM)	Van Hollen
Dingell	Lynch	Vargas
Doggett	Maloney,	Veasey
Doyle (PA)	Carolyn	Vela
Edwards	Maloney, Sean	Velázquez
Ellison	Matsui	Viscosky
Engel	McCollum	Walz
Eshoo	McDermott	Wasserman
Esty	McGovern	Schultz
Farr	McNerney	Watson Coleman
Fattah	Meeks	Welch
Foster	Meng	Wilson (FL)
Frankel (FL)	Moore	Yarmuth
Fudge	Moulton	
	Murphy (FL)	

NOT VOTING—9

□ 1353

Mr. NORCROSS changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, earlier today, I was unavoidably detained during the vote on the Motion on Ordering the Previous Question on the Rule providing for consideration of H.R. 30, the Save American Workers Act of 2015 and H.R. 3, the Keystone XL Pipeline Act. Had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

(By unanimous consent, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ was allowed to speak out of order.)

MOMENT OF SILENCE ON TUCSON SHOOTINGS'

4-YEAR ANNIVERSARY

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise to lead my colleagues on both sides of the aisle in a moment of silence to honor the victims of the

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

NOES—181

Adams	Capuano
Aguilar	Cardenas
Ashford	Carney
Bass	Carson (IN)
Beatty	Cartwright
Becerra	Castor (FL)
Bera	Castro (TX)
Beyer	Chu (CA)
Bishop (GA)	Cicilline
Blumenauer	Clark (MA)
Bonamici	Clarke (NY)
Boyle (PA)	Clay
Brady (PA)	Cleaver
Brown (FL)	Clyburn
Brownley (CA)	Cohen
	Connolly
	Conyers
	Cooper

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

Engel	Levin
Eshoo	Lewis
Esty	Lieu (CA)
Farr	Lipinski
Fattah	Loeb
Foster	Loeb
Frankel (FL)	Loftis
Fudge	Lowenthal
Gabbard	Lowey
Garamendi	Lujan Grisham
Graham	(NM)
Grayson	Lujan, Ben Ray
Green, Al	(NM)
Green, Gene	Lynch
Grijalva	Maloney,
Gutierrez	Carolyn
Hahn	Maloney, Sean
Hastings	Matsui
Heck (WA)	McCollum
Higgins	McDermott
Himes	McGovern
Hinojosa	McNerney
Honda	Meeks
Hoyer	Meng
Huffman	Moore
Israel	Moulton
Jackson Lee	Murphy (FL)
Jeffries	Nadler
Johnson (GA)	Napolitano
Johnson, E. B.	Neal
Kaptur	Nolan
Keating	Norcross
Kelly (IL)	Pallone
Kennedy	Pascarella
Kildee	Payne
Kilmer	Pelosi
Kind	Perlmutter
Kirkpatrick	Peters
Kuster	Pingree
Langevin	Pocan
Larsen (WA)	Polis
Larson (CT)	Price (NC)
Lawrence	Quigley
Lee	Rangel
	Rice (NY)

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 at 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. PASCARELL), another active member of our committee.

Mr. PASCARELL. 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 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 Commerce (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 the 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 Harper
 Rigell Simpson Webster (FL)
 Roby Sinema Wenstrup
 Roe (TN) Smith (MO) Westerman
 Rogers (AL) Smith (NE) Westmoreland
 Rogers (KY) Smith (NJ) Williams
 Rohrabacher Smith (TX) Wilson (SC)
 Rokita Stefanik Wittman
 Rooney (FL) Stewart Womack
 Ros-Lehtinen Stivers Woodall
 Roskam Stutzman Yoder
 Ross Thompson (PA) Yoho
 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
 Billirakis Comstock Fleischmann
 Bishop (MI) Conaway Fleming
 Bishop (UT) Cook Flores
 Black Costa Forbes
 Blackburn Costello (PA) Fortenberry
 Blum Cramer Foxx
 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) McCarthy Rothfus
 Graves (MO) McCaul Rouzer
 Griffith McHenry Royce
 Grothman McKinley Russell
 Guinta McMorris Ryan (WI)
 Guthrie Rodgers Salmon
 Hanna McSally Sanford
 Hardy Meadows Scalise
 Meehan Schrock Schick
 Messer Schradler Schweikert
 Mica Scott, Austin
 Miller (FL) Sensenbrenner
 Miller (MI) Sessions
 Moolenaar Shimkus
 Mooney (WV) Shuster
 Mullin Simpson
 Mulvaney Sinema
 Murphy (FL) Smith (MO)
 Murphy (PA) Smith (NE)
 Neugebauer Smith (NJ)
 Newhouse Smith (TX)
 Noem Stefanik
 Nugent Stewart
 Nunes Stivers
 Olson Stutzman
 Palazzo Thompson (PA)
 Palmer Thornberry
 Paulsen Tiberi
 Pearce Tipton
 Perry Trott
 Peters Turner
 Peterson Upton
 Pittenger Valadao
 Pitts Wagner
 Poe (TX) Walberg
 Poliquin Walden
 Pompeo Walker
 Posey Walorski
 Price (GA) Walters, Mimi
 Ratcliffe Reed
 Reichert Webster (FL)
 Renacci Wenstrup
 Ribble Westerman
 Rice (SC) Westmoreland
 Rigell Williams
 Roby Wilson (SC)
 Roe (TN) Wittman
 Rogers (AL) Womack
 Rogers (KY) Woodall
 Rohrabacher Yoder
 Rokita Yoho
 Rooney (FL) Young (IA)
 Ros-Lehtinen Young (IN)
 Roskam Zeldin
 Ross Zinke

NOES—172

Adams DeFazio Johnson, E. B.
 Aguilar DeGette Kaptur
 Bass DeLauro Keating
 Beatty DelBene Kelly (IL)
 Becerra DeSaunier 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)
 Brownlee (CA) Eshoo Larson (CT)
 Bustos Esty Lawrence
 Butterfield Farr Lee
 Capps Fattah Levin
 Capuano Poster Lewis
 Cárdenas Frankel (FL) Lieu (CA)
 Carney Fudge Loebsock
 Carson (IN) Gabbard Lofgren
 Cartwright Garamendi Lowenthal
 Castor (FL) Grayson Lowey
 Castro (TX) Green, Al Lujan Grisham
 Chu (CA) Green, Gene (NM)
 Cicilline Grijalva Luján, 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 Sánchez, Linda Titus
 Norcross T. Tonko
 Pallone Sanchez, Loretta Torres
 Pascrell Sarbanes Tsongas
 Payne Schakowsky Van Hollen
 Pelosi Schiff Vargas
 Perlmutter Scott (VA) Veasey
 Pingree Scott, David Vela
 Pocan Serrano Velázquez
 Polis Sewell (AL) Vislosky
 Price (NC) Sherman Walz
 Quigley Sires Wasserman
 Rangel Slaughter Schultz
 Rice (NY) Smith (WA) Watson Coleman
 Richmond Speier Welch
 Roybal-Allard Swalwell (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

its first piece of legislation yesterday to prioritize employment opportunities for veterans and reservists. This is particularly important to me as I proudly represent Fort Bragg and over 100,000 veterans, servicemembers, and their spouses.

Recently, I held a military roundtable in Fayetteville, North Carolina. As you can imagine, the number one concern for military spouses and veterans was unemployment.

Unfortunately, ObamaCare's employer mandate has made employment opportunities for veterans scarcer than ever before. However, the Hire More Heroes Act is a step in the right direction in improving veterans' transition into the civilian workforce.

This commonsense legislation is to be held up and applauded. I am proud to have been an original cosponsor, and I look forward to do more for our veterans every day.

CUBA

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, due to President Obama's latest actions designed to seek closer ties to rogue regimes and terrorist groups across the world, these entities now have the blueprint on how to obtain concessions from the United States: hold innocent American citizens hostage and demand the release of convicted terrorists or spies in return.

The Castro regime has always and will always continue to perpetrate the most heinous of human rights violations in order to remain in control over the millions of Cubans yearning for freedom. What does that say about us as a Nation when we are willing to cave to the demands of these thugs and terrorists and abandon our ideals and our policies?

We must uphold the American values of freedom, democracy, respect for human rights and the rule of law, and stand in solidarity with all people who crave these fundamental rights.

REMEMBERING THE VICTIMS IN PARIS, FRANCE

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

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I know at some point the House will take more official and formal notice of what happened in Paris as we awakened early yesterday morning. It was such a tragic terrorist act not only upon freedom of the press, but upon freedom of expression and life in a civil society.

In this Chamber, there are two paintings, as you know, Mr. Speaker. One is of our patriarch, George Washington, and the other is of the Marquis de Lafayette. After 9/11, the French newspaper *Le Monde* said, "We are all Americans." Last night, we heard, "Je

suis Charlie." People all over the world were saying, "I am Charlie," referencing Charlie Hebdo, the publication that was assaulted.

I am certain the Speaker is putting together a formal moment of silence, but I didn't want the day to go by without acknowledging the tragedy that befell our friends in France. They were with us to help the founding of our country, hence the Marquis de Lafayette painting in this Chamber, along with our own patriarch, George Washington.

My thoughts and prayers and those of our Members are with the families of those who lost their lives in this terrible terrorist act and also with the people of France as they mourn their loss.

CONGRESSIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY

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

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call for increased accountability in Congress. The American public has signaled time and time again that it is frustrated with the dysfunction in Washington.

For far too long, Congress has failed to fund the government on schedule and has fallen into a cycle of crisis management with shortsighted, temporary budget measures. To fix this, I have introduced a bill and a resolution that can help prove to the American people that Congress is here to do its duty.

First, the No Budget, No Pay Act would prohibit Members of the House or Senate from receiving a paycheck if their respective Chamber fails to pass a budget by April 15. H. Res. 17, the Stay on Schedule resolution, prohibits the House from adjourning for an August recess unless we have passed all of our appropriations bills by July 31.

These are commonsense initiatives that will restore regular budget order and provide certainty to our communities. I ask my colleagues to join me in fixing the dysfunction in Congress by cosponsoring the No Budget, No Pay Act and the Stay on Schedule resolution.

PENNSYLVANIA FARM SHOW

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the 99th annual Pennsylvania Farm Show in Harrisburg, Pennsylvania.

Pennsylvania hosts the largest indoor agriculture exposition in the Nation with nearly 6,000 animals, 10,000 competitive exhibits, and 300 commercial exhibits. The Farm Show showcases Pennsylvania agriculture, an industry exceeding \$7.5 billion in annual cash receipts. Pennsylvania has 62,000

farm families, stewards of more than 7.7 million acres of farmland.

The Pennsylvania Farm Show features the full spectrum of Pennsylvania-preferred food and products. It is only possible through the hard work of staff of the Pennsylvania Farm Show Complex, the Pennsylvania Department of Agriculture, and hundreds of volunteers.

Special thanks to Pennsylvania Secretary of Agriculture George Greig and one of my favorite Pennsylvania agriculture ambassadors, Mike Firestine, for their leadership.

I encourage all Pennsylvanians to attend the 99th Pennsylvania Farm Show and to celebrate Pennsylvania's affordable, high-quality, and safe food.

COMMEMORATING THE 200TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BATTLE OF NEW ORLEANS

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

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate and celebrate the 200th anniversary of the Battle of New Orleans. A lot of celebrations are going on about this important, decisive victory that helped America expand West and establish the Port of New Orleans, but there has also been such a great collaboration with the British Government.

In fact, the British Government has been working with the National Park Service and the Battle of New Orleans Commission to not only commemorate this occasion, but also to remember those who died on both the American and British sides.

They are working together again to forge that great relationship that we have always had. In fact, this was the last time that the United States and Great Britain were on the opposite sides of a war.

While we appreciate that great relationship we have with Great Britain, we are also celebrating that important moment in the history of the United States: the 200th anniversary of the Battle of New Orleans.

□ 1630

HONORING THE WORK OF LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS

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

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, I simply rise to honor the dedication and commitment of the men and women who protect us all as members of the law enforcement community.

Every day police officers throughout the country wear the uniform with pride and understand the tremendous responsibility that comes with it, putting the safety of others before the safety of themselves.

Unfortunately, over the last few months, we have been reminded of the

danger that police officers face every day in keeping our neighborhoods safe. The recent tragic murder of two police officers in New York serves as a stark reminder that officers put their lives on the line to protect our communities.

In the coming weeks, I will be re-introducing legislation to make sure that the families of those officers who gave the ultimate sacrifice receive the benefits that they are promised without being subject to the burdens of Federal taxes.

Mr. Speaker, all of us should be honoring the work that all of our police officers and law enforcement do, the sacrifices that they make every day to keep us safe.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER TO PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BLUM). The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to clause 11 of rule X, clause 11 of rule I, and the order of the House of January 6, 2015, of the following Member of the House to the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence:

Mr. SCHIFF, California

THE TRANS-PACIFIC PARTNERSHIP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. POCAN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Speaker, I am here on behalf of the Congressional Progressive Caucus in our Special Order hour where we want to share with the American public our concerns about a trade deal that we think will be coming through Congress in the first few months or first half of this session.

The Trans-Pacific Partnership is the biggest and the baddest of the trade deals that we have seen come before this country. It represents a dozen countries. From Chile to Japan, almost 800 million people are represented by countries that would be included within the Trans-Pacific Partnership, and it represents 40 percent of the world's economy.

Yet the trade agreement has been drafted largely in secret. No one from the public has seen it. Quite honestly, Members of Congress haven't seen it. But about 600 people in this country are involved with the drafting of this trade deal. It has great ramifications that go beyond trade, the 29 chapters that make up the Trans-Pacific Partnership.

We anticipate there also could be a move from leadership to introduce legislation to Fast Track the trade deal. What that means to Fast Track it is to really take away the public's ability, through their elected Members of Congress, to have a say, to be able to debate and to amend the trade deal.

We anticipate that could be one of the first votes that would come to us

this Congress about trade. We at the Progressive Caucus want to share with the public the various concerns that we may have about this very, very large, all-encompassing trade deal that could affect American jobs, could affect food safety, could affect environmental concerns, could affect things like buy American laws, currency policy, and many, many more issues.

I am joined by a number of Members of Congress today who would like to take part in this, and I would like to, at this time, yield to my colleague from the great State of New York, who has put a number of efforts towards this in working very strongly to make sure the public knows what is in the Trans-Pacific Partnership.

I would like to yield to Mr. PAUL TONKO from New York.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative POCAN. It is great to join him in this hour of discussion about the Fast Track method that has been associated with trade negotiations and with fair trade/free trade concepts alike.

I represent a district in upstate New York, the 20th Congressional District, which is primarily the confluence of the Hudson and Mohawk River Valleys, and it was there that we became the donor area to the Erie Canal that gave birth to westward movement for this Nation and sparked an industrial revolution. It was there that we saw the development of a necklace of communities, dubbed mill towns, that then rose as the epicenters of invention and innovation that saw manufacturing booming as we went forward as a nation.

Many an immigrant called that their new home, that region their new home, and they tethered their American Dream to the prosperity that was continuing to grow in the region. I think back to the manufacturing sector and all that it meant to my ancestors, all it meant to me and the opportunities that came into my life, and it was that empowerment that came through the availability of work, the dignity of work, the opportunity to earn a paycheck that really made a difference.

I think of those same towns today having really lost millions of jobs across America. We are reflective of all those towns that became those manufacturing centers, that enabled people again to engage in meaningful employment and to be able to have those dreams, those American Dreams fully, fully strengthened by the opportunity for work.

When I see the reduction of standards, of environmental standards, where we are willing to have our children exploited by the ugly sins of the past with concerns for child labor laws that might erode, when we think about some of the inequities that are brought to bear with the denial of collective bargaining, all of these items have snuck into trade negotiations. There is an importance for Congress to be able to provide the oversight and the assess-

ment of these various negotiations, where we can look at these trade deals and suggest amendments or have sound debate.

We not only have a right as Members of Congress, I think the public that we represent has a need for Congress to review these documents and to suggest improvements. So I look forward to this hour of discussion where you and I and our several colleagues will join together in speaking to the wisdom, or lack thereof, of some of the processes that have followed this entire trade discussion.

We are talking about a trade deficit now that has ballooned beyond belief, to record proportions, and where we are putting our economy and that American Dream at risk and where we are denying meaningful employment to those whom we represent here in Washington.

I thank you for leading us in this hour of discussion, and I know that the information that we will exchange will be very critical and important to people who will be airing into this discussion and allowing them to trade those, exchange those ideas with their given elected representatives.

With that, I thank you for leading us in this important discussion.

Mr. POCAN. Thank you, Representative TONKO. As you mentioned, one of the concerns we have, not only in your region but in my district, is the loss of jobs that we have had because of some of these past trade deals that haven't quite gone as promised.

It has been estimated we have lost 4 million U.S. jobs due to just three trade deals, and three-quarters of those jobs lost were in the manufacturing sector.

I had mentioned earlier today at a press conference in Rock County, Wisconsin, a county that I share with Representative PAUL RYAN, we used to have Parker Pen, made good American-made quality pens. A thousand jobs at one time were in that community working at Parker Pen. In early 2010, the final jobs had moved to Mexico. That is just one example of the number of jobs that we lost just in south central Wisconsin, much less Flint, Michigan, and Los Angeles, California, and other parts of the country. So we appreciate your efforts and your comments.

I would like to also yield to another colleague of mine from the great State of California, someone who has been a strong member of our Progressive Caucus. I would like to yield to Representative JANICE HAHN of the great State of California.

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Speaker, I am rising in solidarity today with millions of American working families who are deeply concerned about the impact that harmful trade deals have on our Nation. I am proud to join with my colleagues in the Progressive Caucus in explaining why we oppose this so-called Fast Track authority for international trade deals.

Let me be clear. I am very much pro-trade. Trade is essential to the economy of my district, and I am proud to represent the Port of Los Angeles, the largest container port in the country. Trade is essential to our economy in my district, but it is essential to the economy of the whole State of California—and of course, dare I say, the whole Nation—the many wonderful and diverse exports we do promote in our State: films, creative content made in Hollywood, the fruits and vegetables grown in Central Valley, the wines from Sonoma and Napa, the innovative products developed in our Silicon Valley, or the goods that are manufactured in California factories.

Trade is essential to our entire U.S. economy. Trade creates and sustains American jobs, not only at our ports in this country, but throughout the entire supply chain. Trade helps American businesses reach new markets, grow, prosper.

Trade helps American consumers gain access to many products that we value, and trade is not an exclusive Democratic issue or Republican issue. Everyone who wants our Nation to prosper understands the importance and value of engaging in trade and being globally competitive and connected.

That is why I am proud that as a progressive Democrat I was able to join with a conservative Republican, TED POE, and we have worked together to cochair our Congressional PORTS Caucus. We now have about 90 Members of Congress, Republicans and Democrats, coming together over the issue of investing in and sustaining and making competitive our Nation's seaports. We might disagree on other policy issues, but we have a common understanding of the economic benefits of trade, especially trade passing through our ports. So I want to say it again, and I hope it is clear that I strongly support trade.

However, I am opposed to trade deals with other countries that have harmful consequences on our American workers and deals that give unfair advantages to those who exploit workers and destroy the environment. That is why I oppose Fast Track.

I believe with all my heart that Congress has a constitutional duty to oversee trade agreements, but Fast Track takes away our authority to regulate trade and to be involved in these negotiations. Under Fast Track, we would only be able to vote for or against a deal that has been negotiated without us, and we would not even have the opportunity to amend it. That sounds like a recipe for a raw deal, not a good deal.

I am honored to hold public office and to have earned the support and the trust of those who depend on me to stand up for them and what is best for them. I take my responsibility very seriously to represent them and act in their interests, as I think every Member of Congress does, and I think our constituents are counting on us to

make trade deals that are fair and beneficial.

I think Fast Track undercuts our authority and our ability to provide this oversight. I hope that we can support trade and have good trade agreements, but I hope we can all oppose the idea of Fast Tracking these trade deals.

Mr. POCAN. Thank you, Representative HAHN. I think you said it very eloquently. We are all for trade. I don't think there is a Member in this body who doesn't want to see trade happen, but we want fair trade. We don't want the so-called free trade that makes it harder for American workers, that depresses our wages and ultimately includes a whole lot of other things that affect everything from food safety to environmental concerns to our ability to have something as basic as buy American laws and buy local laws. So thank you for your comments.

I would also like to yield to a gentleman, a colleague, and a friend from the State of Michigan, someone who represents the Flint and Saginaw area. I would like to yield to Representative DAN KILDEE from the great State of Michigan.

Mr. KILDEE. First of all, thank you to my colleague, Mr. POCAN, for his leadership on this and for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, this is a really important subject for the American people. It is a really important subject for the people that I represent in Flint, Michigan, in Saginaw, Michigan, Bay City.

You mentioned Flint. It is my hometown. I was born and raised there. September 16, 1908, General Motors was incorporated in Flint, Michigan, and it was a company that brought together carriage-makers and wheel-makers, and they put the world on wheels.

About 30 years later, the workers in that city at General Motors organized and got the first UAW contract. Between the auto industry itself and the organized workers who were able to then claim their fair share of the tremendous wealth generated by their productive capacity, we built the American middle class. We built an amazing society that gives opportunity, gave opportunity, I think, to just about anybody who felt they could work hard and would put in the time and get a fair wage and get decent benefits and be able to go to work with some dignity.

□ 1645

We built something that was truly amazing.

It was not that long ago, because of globalization and because of trade deals like the one that is being considered right now, that the Federal Government, rightfully, and this President, rightfully, stood up for the American auto industry and put it back on its feet. They gave the American auto-worker—the American worker—the chance to reclaim that dignity that so many people fought for even decades ago.

What I worry about is that everything that those people worked and

fought for could go away. In fact, even the great work that this President did to rescue the American auto industry could all be for naught if we continue down this path of pursuing trade policy that puts corporate and stockholder and offshore interests, really, in front of the interests of the American people and the American worker.

My hometown has seen this play itself out. I remember—I was in local government—when the North American Free Trade Agreement was adopted. We keep hearing that the agreement that is being contemplated right now is a vastly different sort of agreement, but we don't see that. What we do hear and see is the very same language and the very same rhetoric and the very same explanations or excuses about the need to grant Fast Track authority to negotiate this agreement and bring it back to Congress for a "yes" or "no" vote. The same arguments that are being made now were being made then, and the people whom I represent truly believed that they were sold a bill of goods.

At one point in time, in my hometown of Flint, Michigan, we had 79,000 autoworkers. This was a city that was never more than 200,000 in population, so this is a city that really grew up around American manufacturing. It was direct GM employees, but it was suppliers and a whole community built around this incredible productive capacity that started over a century ago; but in just a few short years, we have gone from that 79,000 number to about 10,000 autoworkers in my hometown.

When I think about trade and these trade deals, it is not a question of sort of the big geopolitical tensions that we are trying to address. It is not even a matter of this kind of esoteric argument about the philosophy of trade policy. It is about Flint and Saginaw and Bay City, Michigan, families who have worked hard their whole lives and who stand to lose everything because we are continuing to pursue trade policy that thinks about the short-term profits of multinational corporations and not about strengthening the long-term integrity of the American middle class. This is a dangerous path that we are on.

What is particularly concerning to me is that, when I go home, as I do—as you all do—we get questions about this.

The questions are: "We keep hearing that this trade agreement will have a high standard, a high set of standards, and that it will not be like past agreements." Even some here in Washington have said that we are fighting old battles and that this is a new day. Yet, when I have to answer to my constituents' questions like: "Will these agreements have environmental protections and enforcement mechanisms for those environmental standards unlike some previous agreements?" I have to say, "I don't really know because we don't have access to the documents. We don't have access to the process. We haven't been asked to weigh in."

“Will the agreements have labor standards that guarantee that American workers won’t have to compete with nations that outlaw labor unions?” for example.

“I don’t know because we have not seen that language.”

We are being asked to accept on faith that, somehow, miraculously, this trade agreement is going to look dramatically different than others, even of those that have been fairly recently passed.

Finally, I am asked, “Will there be protections to keep other nations from manipulating their currency?” No matter what else is in any of these trade agreements, if currency can be manipulated to a point so that the price of one nation’s exports makes it impossible for us to compete with them, all is lost.

From what we hear, there will be no currency provisions or at least, if there are any at all, they certainly won’t be strong enough to have any influence whatsoever on the ability of these nations to undermine the American economy by dumping goods, by manipulating currency in a fashion that makes it impossible for us to compete.

This is the wrong track for this country. It is something for which Congress needs to stand up and assert its constitutional role in defending. I stand with my colleagues, and I know many, many others who simply are not going to sit idly by no matter who the President is—a Democrat, a Republican, or otherwise—and allow the prerogatives of Congress, which means the prerogatives of the people who sent us here, to be overlooked. It would be a dangerous path for us to take, and I am very grateful to my friend Mr. POCAN for his leadership and for the leadership of many others here on this issue.

I am glad to stand with you in fighting this battle.

Mr. POCAN. Again, thank you so much, Representative KILDEE.

When you mentioned the auto industry, I have to admit that I grew up in Kenosha, Wisconsin. American Motors was the company that ran the town. Almost everyone had a family member or a neighbor who worked at American Motors. Now, granted, we made Pacers and Gremlins, so there were some mistakes along the way. American Motors eventually went away to Renault, and it went away to Chrysler. It went away to nothing as well as the people who had the strong family-supporting wages from that auto industry. Now the companies that have replaced the auto industry are, quite honestly, jelly bean manufacturers and companies like that. It does not pay the same wage. It doesn’t support the family in the same way.

Just as we were promised with the Korean free trade agreement, especially around autos, in that 70,000 jobs would be created, instead, 60,000 jobs were lost. That is exactly why we have to be involved now while it matters, not after it has been negotiated. We don’t have a debate, and we don’t have

a chance to amend it. So thank you for all of your work on this on behalf of the people of Michigan.

I would also like to yield to another colleague of mine, someone who has been a stalwart in the Progressive Caucus, someone I respected long before I ever had the chance to come to Congress. I would like to yield to my great colleague, Representative BARBARA LEE, from the great State of California.

Ms. LEE. Thank you very much.

Let me thank you, Congressman POCAN, for yielding but also for your tireless leadership on behalf of the American people and for leading not only this Progressive Caucus special hour but each and every one of them for so many years. You have been our voice. I think the American people are hearing from us through you, so I just want to thank you again for really beating the drum across America, allowing the American people to know what the real deal is here in Washington, D.C.

Let me also thank all of my colleagues in the Congressional Progressive Caucus for rising tonight to talk about why we are strongly opposed to Fast Track for the Trans-Pacific Partnership.

Mr. Speaker, when it comes to trade deals and American jobs, Congress should never be a rubber stamp. As the Representative from California’s 13th Congressional District, I have the honor and the privilege of representing the Port of Oakland—one of our Nation’s busiest seaports—and also the airport. I support trade because it is critical to the economy of my district and our Nation. Trade is good when it is fair, when it is open, when it is transparent, and when it creates good-paying jobs here in America. Trade is bad, however, when it ships American jobs overseas so that the 1 percent can reap even greater profits. For this reason, I join the vast majority of Americans—Americans from both parties—in opposing Fast Track for the TPP. Bad trade hurts all American workers—American families, American businesses, and also, especially, those individuals and businesses in communities of color.

Of the 2.7 million jobs lost because of the U.S.-China trade deal, a disproportionately high percentage—35 percent, mind you—came from communities of color. That is outrageous. Now, after these individuals lost their jobs, their situations got even worse. When they found a new job, it was, on average, for a 30 percent lower wage. The loss of these jobs and wages totals more than \$10 billion in lost economic growth for these communities, not one time, but each and every year. Enacting another bad trade deal will continue to prevent communities of color from building wealth and moving into the middle class. In addition to the negative impact on communities of color, Fast Track for TPP will not provide an opportunity to add critical labor and environmental protections that are crit-

ical to respecting human rights and preserving our planet.

That is why my colleagues and I are here, saying “no” to Fast Track for the Trans-Pacific Partnership. Trade negotiations should not be conducted in back rooms. The American people and Members of Congress deserve to know what is in these deals. That is why, again, Congress is so important. Otherwise, people have no say. They have no voice on trade policies that really affect their economic livelihoods—their ability to put food on the table and their ability to aspire into the middle class. Fast Track for the Trans-Pacific Partnership does not help the American people. It only allows special interests and corporations to craft trade deals that are bad for the American people.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to turn the lights on the TPP. If the United States is going to pursue a trade deal in the Pacific, Congress needs to fully debate it so we are certain that it creates jobs and all the protections that we all are standing for and know about and want right here in America.

Over the last 20 years, the U.S. has lost nearly 3.5 million jobs due to NAFTA and the United States-China trade deal. Many of these jobs were lost in California and in communities of color. Let’s not make the same mistake again. Let’s stand together in opposing Fast Track because it will sacrifice American jobs and environmental protections in the name of international corporate profits. Let’s take Fast Track off of the table, and let’s start talking about creating good-paying American jobs for American families.

Thank you, once again, for your tremendous leadership.

Mr. POCAN. Thank you, Representative LEE.

I look forward to working with you on our Progressive alternative also for the budget, when, I think, we will showcase many of those initiatives that we would much rather see the country do to help create good-paying jobs and get more people back to work. So thank you for all of your efforts.

At this point, I would like to yield to a colleague of mine from the great State of Ohio, who has seen much of this firsthand and who, today, has very eloquently explained her experiences of being around when NAFTA had passed. Let me yield to Representative MARCY KAPTUR from the great State of Ohio.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the very able gentleman from Wisconsin, Congressman POCAN, for organizing all of us this evening and for his indefatigable efforts to tell the truth about what is happening to the workers of our country and those around the world.

I rise with you tonight because America—our wonderful country—has a huge “good jobs” deficit because we have a gigantic free trade deficit. Our trade policies export more U.S. jobs than U.S. products. More and more foreign imports come across our shores

than we send goods out, and the gap grows wider every decade at extraordinary proportion. Never before in American history have so many good jobs been outsourced off our shores. America's workers have had income shortages—every family knows it—because America has had this jobs hemorrhage due to the flawed, Fast Tracked free trade agreements that have been ramrodded through this Congress.

Since 1975, when Wall Street's free trade regimen began to lock down, America has amassed a \$9.5 trillion trade deficit with the world. If you count up every year, numbers don't lie, and this has translated into a gigantic, unprecedented jobs loss of over 47.5 million lost American jobs—good jobs from coast to coast, living-wage jobs, jobs that have evaporated from our communities, jobs that have been shipped out. We know the places as we just look at the tags on any products—Mexico, China, Vietnam, Korea, Bangladesh, Honduras, Guatemala, Turkey, El Salvador—to dozens of Third World nations—frankly, most very undemocratic—where workers are treated like a bonded class. Workers everywhere—here, too—are being treated like expendable parts. Yes, American jobs are being shipped out to penny-wage sweatshops behind the Iron Curtain of anonymous towns in distant countries most Americans will never visit.

□ 1700

Anonymity, worker exploitation, and hidden squalor are fundamental to free trade. And so are the stories of Americans who struggle to earn a living, who lose their jobs and are forgotten, are forgotten in their plight.

In our country, the impact on the average American family has been a loss of real income of \$7,000 a year. Imagine that. The public knows it.

The people who elected me to Congress—and I thank them—have allowed me to be a voice, to put the ugly puzzle of outsourcing together. And I have made it my mission to travel the world to find the companies that fled our shores. And I have traveled to find them.

I have lots of photos, and I have lots of interviews. And I have had time to talk to unemployed Americans too—far too many—and the exploited workers of developing nations and to visit the plants that have been displaced from this country and built elsewhere.

The titans who run these global transnational corporations, their operatives, and the Wall Street giants that finance them couldn't care less about workers anywhere or the communities in which they live. And, frankly, these new bosses of global production don't care about democracy or the rule of law either. They pay whatever they want, and they can pay off as they see fit.

I have seen workers making Maytag washing machines in Monterrey, Mexico. Those used to be made in Newton,

Iowa. These Mexican workers don't earn enough to buy the very washing machines they make. And with the jobs lost from Newton, the poverty rate in Newton has dramatically increased in the town that Fred Maytag proudly helped build. However—I don't know if you have noticed—the quality of those machines has gone down too. Who can be proud of what is happening?

I have visited the homes where those workers from Monterrey live and other maquiladora factory zones and have seen firsthand their impoverished living standards.

I have stood at a surreal location in Mexico following NAFTA's passage called Michigan-Ohio Avenues and witnessed the jobs outsourced from our country from a windshield wiper factory that used to be located in New York.

I have met women in the garment industry from Honduras and El Salvador who earn 10 cents for every T-shirt they produce in those sweat shops down there, barricaded off behind barbed wire and outsourced from places like the Carolinas. The women are being paid 10 cents an hour for every T-shirt that then comes in here and is sold for \$20 each at stores and shopping centers around the country. Meanwhile, the booming garment and textile industry of the Carolinas, like the furniture industry too, has all but disappeared, and the tens of thousands of jobs that went with them. I visited those massive shuttered factories, and they reminded me of the auto plants that existed in my industrial region.

I have tracked furniture jobs to Vietnam and have seen child laborers perched with their bare feet on the edge of large wooden bowls that they sand and spray with lacquer paint, wearing no face masks, with no air filters, breathing in the fumes and chemicals certain to damage their fragile lungs and bodies.

Let me just say in closing, as an Ohio Representative, we have lost over 5 million manufacturing jobs alone in northern Ohio since the passage of NAFTA, which I fought with every ounce of being that I had here in 1993. We lost that fight. A 12-votes switch here would have made the difference. And as I speak here today, another global company, Hugo Boss, a German-owned company, is shutting down a factory in Brooklyn, Ohio, where workers had their pay cut 17 percent 2 years ago to save that company. You can walk into any Hugo Boss outlet, and you can see men's suits selling for \$1,200 apiece. What a tragedy. What a tragedy for our country. What a tragedy for workers globally.

I will say to my wonderful colleague from Wisconsin (Mr. POCAN), thank you so much for doing this.

In terms of China—and others will cover this more completely—just in the past year, 2013, the latest complete year of data, our country assumed \$319 billion of trade deficit with the nation of China just in that year, just in that

year with that one country. Because of that deficit, we have lost an additional 1,595,000 more American jobs, just with this one country in 1 year.

The answer to balanced global growth is to pay workers a living wage and to respect their work, not exploit it. The answer to balanced growth is to stop the outsourcing of U.S. jobs and to pry open the closed markets of the world, starting with Japan, China, and Korea. And the answer to balanced growth and fair trade is to stop the hemorrhage of more jobs from this country by defeating any more deals like NAFTA and all of its offspring, and the Fast Tracking of more jobs that they are trying to do in the Trans-Pacific Partnership.

It is time for America to stand up and for this Congress to stand up with the American workers and communities.

Again, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me this evening.

Mr. POCAN. Thank you, Representative KAPTUR, for all that you have done. You have been an articulate spokesperson on behalf of jobs and the effects of these bad trade deals on jobs. And I have to say, I am really glad you brought up the textile industry, because when we talk about the need to work together in this Congress, this is an issue where Democrats and Republicans can absolutely unite.

About 12 years ago, I was on a delegation of the American Council of Young Political Leaders. And one of the people on the delegation was a very conservative judge from the State of Mississippi. She and I and the group had met with some sweatshop workers in Indonesia to talk about all the mills that have left, especially in the southern part of the United States, and those jobs are pretty much gone forever.

I have been in business for 27 years, since I had hair. I have had a small business. And in that role, we screen-print on T-shirts. And I have watched over the years all of the mills that made T-shirts in the United States pretty much leave. It is pretty hard to find clothes still made in the USA. It is even harder to find them union-made in the USA. And this is something that unites people of different political ideologies because we see those jobs leaving. It doesn't matter. It is not a Democratic job or a Republican job. These bad trade deals too often just cost us jobs.

I appreciate you bringing that up, and thank you again for all that you do.

Next I would like to yield to someone who has been an extraordinary leader in this area. She has helped to coordinate Members of Congress like no one else, not just on this issue but on many other issues. She is an absolutely tireless advocate for the American public and for making sure that Congress has the proper role when it comes to trade agreements. She is someone whom I am extremely honored to have as a colleague and a friend. I would like to

yield to the great Representative ROSA DELAURO from the State of Connecticut.

Ms. DELAURO. Thank you so much to the gentleman from Wisconsin. Again, it is reciprocal. It is just such an honor to serve with you. We are simpatico in the views that we hold with regard to this and so many others. I am honored to be able to serve with you and to be tied together on this critically important issue.

Earlier today, my colleagues who are on the floor here tonight and others who have spoken, we were all at a press conference. And I think we can say with one voice that it was one of the broadest advocacy coalitions that we have seen come together. It certainly is true for me in my 24 years in the House. The advocacy groups and Members of Congress came together to oppose Fast Track. It included faith groups, human rights groups, labor unions, environmental groups, and consumer protection groups. And the purpose, as I said, was to oppose the policy known as Fast Track for trade deals.

Under this Fast Track umbrella, if you will, what happens? Members of Congress are denied the opportunity to debate and vote in detail on the text of these deals. We cannot have a serious debate, nor can we amend the process.

Negotiations are going on right now between the United States and 11 other countries. If these negotiations are successful, it will create the largest trade deal in history, something called the Trans-Pacific Partnership. Yet the details of this trade agreement remain a secret from the American people, from the Representatives of the American people in this body. The contours of the deal are being sketched out in secret, as I have said, by a Who's Who of Wall Street firms, big pharmaceutical companies, energy companies, and other corporate interests.

They want to ram the agreement through the Congress, again, without amendment and with little opportunity for debate. To me, that is the very opposite of what we have been sent here to do.

I have always opposed Fast Track, no matter who was in the Oval Office. I will oppose it again. We cannot, and we must not, really just sign away our constitutional duties. We need to retain the ability to scrutinize trade deals page by page, line by line, word by word. We should do that for all legislation, let alone legislation with such far-reaching implications for American workers.

Some of us remember the debate on this floor or going back home during the debate on health care when our constituents and our colleagues on the other side of the aisle would say to us, have you read the bill? Have you read the bill? How can you vote on a bill that you have not read?

The TPP is 1,000 pages, 1,000 pages. We want to read the bill. That is what we are asking for.

Make no mistake: bad trade deals can have grave consequences for our people.

And it used to be that the working-class families became middle class by finding work that paid enough to save a little, buy a home in a safe neighborhood, send their kids to college, and leave the next generation better off. But today, the good jobs that used to lift people into the middle class have been shipped overseas to places where labor is cheap. Many of them have gone to countries that get ahead by abusing labor rights, polluting the environment, risking public health, or manipulating their currency.

A recent GAO report tells us of unpunished violence against trade unionists in Colombia, of union suppression in Guatemala, of abuses against foreign workers in Oman. These are all countries that we have trade deals with, agreements under which they promised—they promised—to improve their records. We haven't held them accountable on these promises.

I am not against free trade. I am in favor of fair trade on a level playing field. Hardworking Americans will win 9 times out of 10, but the competition must be fair.

A recent Gallup Poll showed that in 2014, the issues Americans most often identified as the biggest problem facing our country was "poor government leadership." Today, 80 percent of Americans disapprove of the job that this institution is doing. Why? Because far too often, we are seen as working not for all Americans but for a privileged few: tax breaks for millionaires, benefit cuts for the poorest; unprecedented paydays for those at the top, dwindling paychecks for everyone else. The big economic problem today is that jobs that people have do not pay enough to them so that they can live on it. Fast Tracking this trade agreement will exacerbate that problem.

NAFTA-style trade deals are in the same category. For a narrow band of wealthy individuals and big corporations with the means to invest their money beyond our borders, they do wonders. For the rest of us, they spell disaster. They send our jobs overseas. They erode our ability to protect our workers, consumers, and the environment. Worst of all, they threaten to saw the legs off the ladder of opportunity that leads to the middle class.

Fast Tracking these deals would be yet another insult to American workers, yet another sign of how little their political leaders really care about them.

□ 1715

Instead of our abdicating our constitutional responsibility, let's send a clear message: enough is enough. No more offshoring. No more NAFTA-style trade deals, no more Fast Track. Let us focus on helping American workers, not throwing their jobs away.

I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin for all of his efforts, and it is a

privilege to work with you on this issue.

Mr. POCAN. Again, thank you so much, Representative DELAURO, for all your leadership. You are helping to coordinate all of our voices in this battle, and we really appreciate that and all your efforts. Thank you so much.

When you brought up the public opinion of Congress, there is no question. If you were actually to explain this process to anyone, regardless of their political ideology, that for the last 2 years, about 600 people in this country from America's biggest corporations and Wall Street's biggest banks have been involved in trying to craft this legislation that we haven't seen and the American public hasn't seen and we are going to be asked to vote on something that would take away our ability, sight unseen, to vote to limit our ability to debate and to amend any kind of a trade agreement—that is exactly what is wrong with Washington. That is why people, I think, get so disgusted with Washington.

We need to stand up, Democrats and Republicans together, to make sure that we have our ability to have our voices heard, which is the public's voices through Members of Congress. So your efforts on Fast Track, on TPP, food safety, and so many areas, thank you so much. Again, I appreciate it.

Another one of our leaders of our caucus is here who has been an articulate fighter on so many progressive issues.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from the State of Maryland, Representative DONNA EDWARDS, my great colleague.

Ms. EDWARDS. I want to thank Mr. POCAN for yielding and for his leadership for calling us together this evening to talk about what trade means to American paychecks.

Thank you again because I was sitting in my office, and I was listening to my colleagues speak so eloquently about the need for Congress, for individual Members of Congress representing—those of us representing 725,000 Americans, to have a voice in a process that is so important to American paychecks.

As I sat there, I thought I owed it to my constituents in the Fourth Congressional District of Maryland to come to this floor to stand on their side for their paychecks, so I thank you for that.

As I listened to some of my colleagues, one of the things that I heard Ms. KAPTUR say was to talk about the job loss in the manufacturing sector, in the clothing textile sector in the Carolinas. I represent a district in Maryland, but my family is from North Carolina.

A lot of my family members had those good-paying jobs in the mills. They were making the sheets, pillowcases, T-shirts, and hats, and they all lost their jobs. All of those jobs went someplace else, but they didn't stay in North Carolina. That was a tragedy. It

was a tragedy for my family, as it has been a tragedy for families all across this country.

I remember the NAFTA debate, and so many Members of Congress—I wasn't in Congress at the time, Mr. POCAN wasn't in Congress at the time—but we remember the debate. We remember that they told us: "Well, there would be other jobs that would be created, so don't worry about any jobs that would be lost." They said the jobs in the service sector would grow and they would stay.

Almost one of the first things to happen after NAFTA went into effect was all those call centers closed. Those were service-sector jobs, and they left, along with millions of manufacturing jobs.

In my home State of Maryland, we lost 70,000 jobs—and we are a small State—but we lost those just to NAFTA, so when people tell me now as a Member of Congress: "We want you to just Fast Track this trade deal, this Trans-Pacific Partnership deal, and just trust us that the process is going to work, just trust us that all you have to do is rubberstamp the trade deal"—I remember—and Mr. POCAN, you remember—and that is what requires us for our constituents to say no way, that we cannot just give Fast Track authority over, hand it over and, in effect, just say that whatever the deal is that has been negotiated, we will just take that deal for the American people.

Well, you and I know better. One of the things that has long concerned me is getting wind that our Trade Representative, on behalf of my constituents and your constituents, were negotiating away Buy American provisions, negotiating them away without our even having a voice in that conversation.

Let's look at those Buy American provisions. In 2012, 68 of our colleagues joined us in saying to President Obama, "Don't negotiate away the Buy American provision." Then just last year, 120 Members of Congress said, "Mr. President, don't negotiate away the Buy American provisions."

So I see that the wind is really beneath our sails because the American people understand that when you negotiate away Buy American, what you do is negotiate away the buying power and the jobs of American workers. You trade what is, in effect, billions of dollars of American taxpayer buying power for very little buying power coming from the other direction.

I am troubled that we have a Trade Representative that just wants to say, "Take the deal and run," and those of us who stand in the steps of American workers, we are in their place. We are representing them. We have their voice. We need to have their voice, and we have to have their back and say "no" to Fast Track and say "no" to the TPP and "no" to provisions that would trade away what we know the statistics are.

The U.S. procurement market is more than 10 times larger than all the

TPP procurement markets combined, and so that means that we would trade away preferential access for U.S. firms to \$556 billion in Federal Government procurement. For what? \$53 billion in return? We have to say "no" to this deal.

I want to thank Mr. POCAN for bringing us together. It is good that we are doing this from day one in the United States House of Representatives because what we are saying to American workers is: "Not only will we stand with you on the first day of the Congress and the next day of the Congress, but all the way to the end, to keep from trading away millions of your jobs."

Mr. POCAN. Thank you again so much, Representative EDWARDS. When you talked about the job loss in Maryland, we lost nearly 75,000 manufacturing job through the NAFTA-WTO period in the last 20 years.

When I was a legislator in the State of Wisconsin, it was a Buy American law that I got passed with a bipartisan vote in the Wisconsin Legislature. The fact that we are going to give up our sovereignty to have that law and some multinational corporation can sue any local unit of government so that they can contest those laws and we can lose that ability, I think the average person, if they knew that was something even being discussed, would be opposed to that, much less the other 28 chapters in addition to procurement that are included in this Trans-Pacific Partnership.

Thank you so much for all the work you have done on this and for making people aware of all the little hidden gems that if we don't have an ability to have a full and fair debate in this House, things that could happen in the biggest and the baddest of the trade deals yet we have seen in this country, so thank you so much.

Mr. Speaker, the Progressive Caucus is going to be doing everything we can in the coming months to fight this, to make sure that Congress has a say. We aren't against trade, we want fair trade, but the so-called free trade that is out there right now that is being drafted by corporate CEOs and Wall Street banks doesn't include the public and doesn't include Congress, and it needs to have every single person represented.

We are the voices of the American people. We need to be able to have a full debate in this body, and we need to be able to amend any deal that we don't like, the particular deals that have been decided by others, by corporate leaders in this country. The American public has to be included.

Before I ever came to this Congress, the last 27 years, I have run a small business, a small specialty printing business. One of the things we do is we source American-made and union-made products for people.

I watched, over that 27 years, companies leave this country over and over and over, whether it be the mills that

I mentioned from the South that made T-shirts to things as simple as pens. Companies like Parker Pen used to have up to 1,000 jobs in Rock County, Wisconsin, that now have all gone out of this country. Those are the types of jobs that we have seen leave over and over.

When you go back into these communities, they have not replaced the same quality paying jobs. That is part of why we have got a problem. While the economy has been coming back, unfortunately, many people are being left behind, and they are not having the same family-supporting wages that they need out there.

The Trans-Pacific Partnership is 29 chapters, but only five of those chapters actually relate to trade. So much of what we have talked about has been about the job impacts and your income impacts of a trade deal, but this also covers environmental law, currency law, intellectual property law, food safety, and the ability for procurement, as we just talked about on Buy American laws, and on and on and on.

This Congress, I think, can work together, Democrats and Republicans, who have a concern about giving carte blanche authority to simply the U.S. Trade Representative and the White House and leaving the people out, leaving the Congress out of that conversation.

We are going to continue to fight this, to talk about this and to make sure that people understand what Fast Track is and what it isn't and to make sure that those myths that may be out there about how to help create jobs may not be true, and there is a lot more ramifications that are out there.

Mr. Speaker, we thank you so much for this time this evening. We appreciate the ability to talk about this on the floor of Congress.

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

ISSUES OF CONCERN TO THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BISHOP of Michigan). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate it very much. Like my colleague before me, I am grateful for the opportunity to be here on the floor to speak about issues that are of concern to the American people.

My colleague from California (Mr. LAMALFA) is joining me for a short period of time, and I would like to give him the opportunity to speak for a few minutes. I believe that he has some important things to say, and I would like him to share those.

I now yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA).

Mr. LAMALFA. I appreciate it. Thank you to my colleague from North

Carolina. You are very gracious in yielding to me, and it has been a pleasure to work with you.

Mr. Speaker, I thank those assembled here tonight. I just want to talk a little bit about some of the issues we have going on in the West, in northern California.

First of all, the excitement we have of coming in—it is a new Congress, it is a new direction for our country, I think. We have a stronger majority in the House of Representatives, of the Republican House. As well, it is a different majority over in the Senate. A lot of people aren't too concerned with what party it is or what partisan issues are; they want to see results. That is what I am looking for as well.

Many bills were sent out of the House last session and languished on a desk over on the Senate side, and I think we will now see action on those common-sense measures that are going to help jobs in America, help our economy rebound, and help people get out from under the grip of government power and government regulation that is just killing their hopes and killing their ideals.

We are looking for that in this new session, and we expect we will be held accountable to make that happen. It is not going to be a miracle. We are not going to get all the results we hoped for, but at least there are going to be things on the RECORD now that have gone through this House and have gone to the Senate that will be showing the American people what our agenda is and what it has been about.

Bringing it back home to California, I represent the First District in the northeast portion of the State. It is a beautiful district. I am very proud to have been elected for a second time to represent the First District. It is an area that has a lot of great resources that benefit our whole State, even our whole country.

To be able to have my family here with me in Washington attending the festivities, the honor of being sworn in and getting started, getting a fast start, going to work here in this new 114th has just been a real delight.

What we need to be happening in California is a better and wiser use of our resources. You may have seen, at the end of the last session, we were working towards better management of our water supply. Now, we have a deluge of rain once in a while, even when we are suffering drought for the last few years in California.

The water seems to all come at once. If it isn't being saved in snowpack, it will come quickly via rain through our streams, and that is an opportunity for us that we should be retaining that behind the dam, so that we have as well the water that gets down the Feather River and the Sacramento River and can be transferred and put somewhere to be used later.

We have the ability to have the water allocated as needed for fish, for habitat, but there is excess water that

needs to be stored. I don't know why that isn't the automatic protocol, but Congress—a bill I cosponsored with many of my other colleagues put forward reminding the Bureau of Reclamation and others that they need to retain this extra water.

It isn't needed for fish, and it isn't needed for the normal runs, so we will have more stored later.

□ 1730

That is what we will continue to work for. But I still go back to the vision that people before us had that have given us Shasta Dam, Lake Oroville, and the whole State water project and the Central Valley project that we have in our State that we have benefited from for so many years, that everybody benefits from, whether you are an environmentalist, a farmer, a person who lives in a city, or if you just have a tap in the country. If you are not on a well, you are probably benefiting from these projects because we had the vision in the past to build them and we didn't have nearly the roadblocks.

Now, of course, we have great environmental concerns and environmental awareness to do things better than we did in the 1850s or the 1880s or what have you. We know how to do these things. But it doesn't mean that, because of a handful of people who don't want to see things happen, we stop the progress for all the rest of us.

So that is what we will be pushing for in this new Congress, to build more water storage. We can do that in northern California. Sites Reservoir, and there are other projects that can be enhanced to retain more water, and there are smarter ways to keep the water that we do have to make the water go further because it is necessary. The way California is suffering from droughts, agricultural land is going to be the first thing to go. Any time an emergency can be declared to switch whatever water does get to agriculture to meet other needs around the State, we have to take care of people first and we have to take care of cities, but when we see so much being run out through the Golden Gate that could be saved or for questionable tactics on fish that really haven't been proven for that kind of habitat, then we are missing the mark.

So we will be working very hard to add to our water storage and to be smarter with the water we have available to us because we can't count on a record rainfall this year. We are very thankful and we have been blessed with good rainfall in November and the early part of December, but it has tailed off lately. We will need record rainfall the rest of the season up through the spring to have the kind of water we need to get through a good crop year. In the meantime, we should be doing everything possible in government to enhance, to retain, to be smarter with the water we have.

When we hear ideas of removing dams in the north part of the State,

part of my district, that produce hydroelectric power because of dubious studies that might benefit fish, we are hurting our region of the State. We are hurting our grid by taking enough renewable electricity off the grid that would somehow need to be replaced with other green power to manage 70,000 homes in the State because of dubious lack of science. We need to battle through this and have smarter use of our resources.

Another thing that we are very rich in in our part of the State is timber. Each summer we see the crisis of non-management of our timber and what that looks like. It is in the air. It is in our brown skies. We get to breathe that. The people within those communities are wondering why their mills are shut down and why their storefronts are boarded up and why they don't have jobs and why they have things like domestic violence increasing because people don't have work in those communities sometimes because their industry has been taken away from them.

I sit on the Natural Resources Committee to get after both of these and other issues—our water, our timber use, and other resources—that are so necessary to the rural part of the State, the rural West that has been languishing for many years, ever since the Endangered Species Act was passed in 1973, for good reason at the time, to save the bald eagle. We have bald eagles in our rice fields where I live at home. But we have gone so far beyond that rural America is suffering from this type of regulation that it isn't even proven to help recover a single species. Indeed, somewhere around 1 percent, at best, of species have been recovered after 40-plus years of the Endangered Species Act. That is pretty deplorable for what the cost has been to the people, to the jobs, and for the communities and their values.

But I am still optimistic that America is turning the corner and seeing things a little bit differently and that the job needs to come back home. And the jobs at home need to be revived once again. As a grower of grain myself, we look at our alternatives. Do we want to be in a situation where in the past we were dependent on oil from people who don't like us much? Do we want to be in a position to have our grain crops, the breadbasket of our Nation, do we want to become more dependent on that from people who maybe aren't always a reliable ally overseas? Wheat from Russia and rice from China, do we want to rely on that, or do we want to do the best we can?

My fellow farmers across the country and in my area, they are good stewards of the land. Many have been there for many, many generations. Some of the ranchers I know, their families have been farming and ranching for 160 years in northern California, my own family 80-plus years. We know how to take care of the land. We know what needs to be done. It is sustainable, to

use that buzz word that goes around a lot these days. If it wasn't sustainable, the land wouldn't still produce.

So this is the type of thing we are fighting for. If we don't have a breadbasket in this country, what will America rely on to keep us fed? With the unrest we have in the world, ultimately, if we can't fuel our own Armies if it becomes necessary, what kind of position will we be in to defend ourselves or our allies, like in Europe, like in Israel, like in Japan, or others we have great relations and great trade with? We are in great peril right now if we keep our head in the sand on these issues. We need to look at the resources we have.

As I look at the young people in the audience tonight, one of the first things that I am reminded of is that we are running an \$18 trillion national debt. We have lived for the future in the present on someone else's money. And so every dollar we have, every dollar that comes in, we have to be good stewards of, much better than in the past. So every dollar has to go for the type of infrastructure that will improve our transportation system, our water system, our flood control system, and keep our communities safe, and not on frivolous things.

I am reminded in California, instead of this water infrastructure that we so desperately need, we have had several years of drought to remind us, they are still pursuing a high-speed rail system in California. As a former State legislator, we were right in the middle of that as it was coming to a head. What will the rail cost? Voters were told then \$33 billion to go from San Francisco to Los Angeles at 220 miles per hour. It isn't even close to being that project anymore, and the price has tripled, at least. It has gone from \$33 billion to at least \$98 billion by the admission of the rail authority in a hearing we had in the State legislature back then. They are still chasing this dream. Now they have tried to downsize it to be a \$68 billion project. To this day, right now, they have still only identified \$13 billion—\$10 billion from the State bond and \$3 billion from the Federal Government via the Stimulus Act of 2009. So \$13 billion of a needed and downsized \$68 billion project. They are \$55 billion short, and they still think today they are going to go find that money. From the private sector, they are staying away in droves.

There is no way that it is going to be built anywhere near on time, anywhere near on any kind of budget, or that the riders they would have will ever be able to afford to ride it. Why don't we take a fraction of that money, of the \$13 billion or the \$68 billion, or whatever number it is, and put it towards the water storage we need?

We could build two really nice dams with \$68 billion, especially with private sector money that wants to come in and be a partner on this. Let's get it done, because this is the infrastructure

that will help our State and help the people and help bring jobs back to rural California and rural America.

I am looking for help from my other colleagues from other States, especially other Western States that have water infrastructure needs they are looking at themselves. Let's work together on this. That is what made us great back in the day.

We have had these huge projects that have made so much hydroelectric power. We like green power. We like renewable power. When it rains behind a dam, you have renewable power and it is reliable. And it is low cost, much more so than windmills and solar panels that require government assistance to put them in and keep them going. Let's do the right thing here and allow these things to happen, all that private sector to happen.

I am optimistic in this Congress that we can make that case and put it in front of the American people. I ask the President to join with us and help on that, whether it is that or the further development of energy that we need in this country to stay ahead of the curve. We are seeing prices coming down, amazingly. Hydraulic fracturing has played a big part in us seeing the price of fuel in some areas—not in California, but other States going below \$2 a gallon. In California, we are still taxing ourselves and thinking up cap-and-trade measures to drive the cost up so we will be our own island of high costs. But the other 49 States, God bless you, you have it pretty good.

The vision that we have had to do these things is what we need desperately going forward in 2015 because when we are productive, like what we can produce in northern California with agriculture, with timber, with our mine resources, all of the other things that come from the land, that sets the table for everything else across our district and across our State and across the whole country. That puts us back to work again.

We have trillions of dollars offshore that would love to be repatriated back to this country if we had any kind of constant as to what the tax burden would be for those dollars, for those businesses and investment that needs to be here, any kind of consistency for what our regulatory burden would be so they could predict. If they are to put 30-year loans and 30-year infrastructure in place, will they be able to do business 5 years from now? We would be bringing American jobs back if we could repatriate that money back here. So let's get it done.

We don't come here in Congress—at least I haven't—because it is nice to wear a suit and tie. We come here to get results. To be results oriented, we need to use real facts, real figures, real budgets, real numbers to get to the core of what we are supposed to be doing as to what the Founders had set for our government. The government is doing a lot more things it has no business doing and it can't do well. Let's

make sure that we are doing and we have the economy, we have the engineering to generate so we have a functioning school system, it has the funding it needs at fair and proper levels; for our law enforcement, so they are not left wanting for the equipment and backup they need; and for the folks deployed overseas defending our borders as well as helping our allies. We shouldn't leave them wanting while they are deployed; and certainly with the mess that the VA system is, when they come back home, the promises made to them are broken and the shame that we should all feel when our veterans, so many are left homeless or simply begging to have their claims processed.

I am confident in this new Congress that the House and the Senate can work together and put these ideas forward. We can put them out in front of the American people, have the accountability, have the oversight that our job demands. We will get there.

So whether it is now or 2 years from now, I challenge the President to look at these things from a commonsense way of thinking. Think about America first. That is what we will be doing in this House and over in the Senate.

So from northern California to the rest of the country, help us all to be productive and to live the lives we choose to give our kids a chance to live at home, to find jobs and opportunities in their own communities—farming, ranching, mining, whatever it is, or related industries in those small towns that so many are boarded up now. Let them have that chance to live at home, not have to go someplace else, go to a big city somewhere, a different State, or even overseas to try to find good employment so they would have the dream they see fit and the one that their parents would like to pass along to them.

My colleague from North Carolina, I appreciate the time tonight and the opportunity to talk about my district and the things we need to do there, as well as what we need to do for our country. I bid you a good evening, and thank you.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague, Mr. LAMALFA from California. I have heard him often speak on the floor. I have invited him several times to speak and do 1-minute speeches because I am the person in charge of getting people to the floor. I am very grateful to have had the opportunity to hear him speak in a little longer time because I found out how much we agree on issues.

□ 1745

I am particularly keen about the water issue that he spent some time talking about. I grew up in a house with no electricity and no running water. I grew up carrying water. Water has always been a precious, precious commodity to me.

We are the most fortunate people in the world in the United States that we

have the greatest resources available to us. Many times I think we don't appreciate the scarcity of some of those resources or the need to husband those resources in a way that protects them not only for ourselves but for future generations.

I have always felt that people who are farmers are among the most eloquent speakers for our environment. As Mr. LAMALFA said—and I completely agree with him and said it many times myself—farmers are the best stewards of our land. They believe in sustainability. They believed in sustainability long before sustainability became a catchword in the community because if they didn't keep the land sustainable, then they wouldn't have the land in order for their own livelihood.

I am a person who also grew up farming, sometimes on a very small scale. My husband and I still have a garden every year. We certainly understand the importance of taking care of all of our resources, but particularly our natural resources. I think so often Republicans don't get the credit that they deserve for being good stewards and for looking after our land and all of our resources.

I also am very keen on the fact that we have a diversity of people serving in Congress. Again, I think it is very important that we have people from all walks of life serving in here because it is the diversity of experiences that are so important to us in terms of having the different points of view as we consider legislation, so that there are people who grew up in cities who have no idea what it is like to farm, have no idea where food comes from exactly, and it is important for us to get the different points of view. We need farmers, we need educators, we do need some lawyers, but we need people who have had all kinds of experiences. We need people who have driven trains, train engineers. But every kind of diversity that is at all possible here. I think it is very important, though, that we have particularly a large share of farmers. Our numbers of farmers have gone down over the years, obviously, as we have left the farm and as farmers have become so incredibly productive in this country. They provide so much more than they have in the past. So I really appreciate the eloquence of my colleague from California in presenting the issues that he has presented.

I want to talk a little bit about some of the other things that he talked about. He talked about our need for jobs and for, again, maintaining what we can in this country, improving the economy. I want to talk about the three focuses that we in the majority have in this session of Congress, the three initiatives that we are going to be working on: energy, jobs and the economy, and regulatory reform.

This week already we have already passed two bills that we think will help us with the creation of jobs and the economy. On our first day here on

Tuesday, it got very little attention, but we passed a bill, the Jobs for Heroes Act. The idea for it came from a constituent of one of our colleagues from Illinois. The constituent said: Look, I was a veteran, couldn't get a job because the employer was concerned about going over the 50 limit, or hitting the limit of 50, which then his company would be subject to ObamaCare, and companies are avoiding being subject to ObamaCare.

So we passed a bill introduced by Congressman RODNEY DAVIS that said veterans don't have to be included in the 50 persons in a business requirement and then be forced to go into ObamaCare; that if they are covered by TRICARE then they don't have to do that. That is a positive bill to help create jobs.

Today, we passed another bill that we think will help with employment in this country. As many people know, ObamaCare has told employers if people are working 30 hours or more then you have to cover them with ObamaCare. So we changed the definition of full-time employment from 30 hours to restore the traditional 40-hour workweek. As I have said in other comments that I have made, from adjunct professors to hourly workers, I have heard from constituents all across North Carolina's Fifth District who have one thing in common: their work hours are being reduced. ObamaCare has placed an undue burden on employers and their employees by undermining the traditional 40-hour workweek, which has long been the standard for full-time work.

This legislation will help protect the estimated 2.6 million Americans at risk for lost hours and wages at work under this destructive rule. The employer mandate in ObamaCare defines a full-time employee as someone who works an average of at least 30 hours a week. But H.R. 30, the Save American Workers Act, which passed the House today by a vote of 252-172, changes that definition, and that is a good thing for American workers.

As I said, we have three big initiatives: energy, jobs and the economy, and regulatory reform. So the American people are going to see us passing bills all this year and next year focused on these three issues, in addition to the other things that we work on. We work on a plethora of subjects here.

But I introduced a bill on the first day which will help us deal with regulatory reform. It is a bill I am proud to say has passed the House before with bipartisan support. I am very proud to say that when I introduced the bill on Tuesday, it had bipartisan original co-sponsors. I am very pleased that Congresswoman LORETTA SANCHEZ, from Mr. LAMALFA's State of California, joined me in introducing legislation to shed light on how Federal policies impact the budgets of State and local governments and private sector employers.

The bill is called the Unfunded Mandates Information and Transparency

Act—H.R. 50—and it would fix loopholes within the bipartisan regulatory reform act, known as UMRA, which passed in 1995. I introduced this legislation in the past four Congresses, and it has successfully passed the House with bipartisan support on three separate occasions.

Every year, Washington imposes thousands of rules on local governments and small businesses. Hidden in those rules are costly mandates that stretch State and city budgets and make it harder for North Carolina businesses to hire. While Congress cannot create prosperity, we can work to ensure entrepreneurs and employers aren't crushed under costly regulations. This legislation will help restore transparency and hold Washington bureaucrats accountable for the true cost in dollars and in jobs that Federal dictates pose to the economy. Americans are better served when regulators are required to measure and consider the cost of rules they create.

The bill "increases transparency in the regulatory process and protects State and local governments from the burden of unfunded and often unnecessary mandates that waste time and money," is what my colleague LORETTA SANCHEZ said. H.R. 50 would increase transparency about the cost imposed by unfunded mandates and holds the Federal Government accountable for considering those costs before passing them on to local governments and small businesses. The legislation would make it easier for people to determine how much these regulations are going to cost and make sure that we are not imposing unnecessary rules and regulations on both State and local governments and the private sector. So I am very pleased that that bill has passed. It is going to be a part of the regulatory reform package that passes this House.

I encourage people watching this to contact your Member of Congress if you are aware of unnecessary rules and regulations that are out there that we could do something about. Obviously, we need rules and regulations. We want to make sure that we have safe food, that the airlines are flying correctly and safely, we want to make sure the railroads are operating safely, we want to make sure our cars are safe to drive in.

But as we all know, often bureaucrats in Washington, and sometimes at the State and local level, look for ways to create jobs for themselves, create a reason for their being, and pass along rules and regulations that are simply unnecessary for the health and safety of the people in this country.

So what we want to do is reduce those rules and regulations. That reduces cost, that helps with our emphasis on jobs and the economy. I believe that is going to be very important to us in getting our economy going again.

As I mentioned, we are going to be working hard on our third initiative: energy. We will be passing another

version of the Keystone XL pipeline. We will do that tomorrow. That bill will then go to the Senate. The Senate is already holding hearings on the bill, but the Senate does work a little bit slower than we do here in the House. We hope very much that the President will work with us in a bipartisan fashion and sign that bill.

We are all very happy about the cost of gasoline having gone down in our country in the past few months. It, of course, doubled under President Obama, and now it is coming back down. It is because in many cases we have been able in the private sector to create more energy supply, and that's been helping bring down the cost. We know that the economies in Europe and Asia have slowed down considerably so there is less demand. We are all very grateful for the price of gasoline going down. I am very grateful for it. Every Member of Congress is very grateful.

So what we hope is to help that cause even further by passing the Keystone XL pipeline and have more energy available in this country. We want to do everything we possibly can. Republicans have always believed in all of the above. As Mr. LAMALFA said, we want solar, wind, and all those other things, but they are primarily operating now because of giant government subsidies. What we would like to see is renewable and sustainable energy that doesn't require government subsidies, and we believe Keystone XL pipeline will help us along those lines.

□ 1800

I am looking forward very much to our passing that legislation, the Senate passing that legislation, and our being able to send that bill to the President for his signature. I am hoping that he will sign it.

I oftentimes get people quoting the Constitution to me and talking about what the Constitution says. Particularly, I hear from people a lot about the role of the House of Representatives. I want to talk a little bit about that in terms of our work in appropriations.

In particularly the last few weeks, many people have expressed genuine concerns to me about the appropriations bill that passed Congress in December. Unfortunately, many Washington-based special interest groups are confusing the matter of what happened in December with the omnibus bill that we passed with incomplete and sometimes, frankly, false messages aimed more at fundraising for themselves than uniting behind our shared goal of stopping President Obama's executive overreach on immigration.

One of the most misleading and commonly circulated suggestions is that the Constitution grants the House of Representatives alone the "power of the purse," or giving the House exclusive authority to withhold funding for targeted initiatives.

I am going to be reading a part of the Constitution in a moment that relates

to this, but I want to read another part of the Constitution that I think often gets misquoted to prove this example.

We often hear the quote from the First Amendment, "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion."

This comes oftentimes from groups who protest Ten Commandments being placed in public buildings or creches being placed on public land. They often quote that, but they usually forget to quote the second part of that sentence, which says "or prohibiting the free exercise thereof."

Congress has a dual responsibility there. It is the same when people, I believe, are attempting to quote the Constitution when it comes to their version of what they call the power of the purse.

As I said, they are, I believe, misconstruing a part of the Constitution. Specifically, it is article I, section 7, clause 1, of the Constitution which states, "All bills for raising revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives."

I believe many well-meaning people believe that that means the House of Representatives has total control over what happens with appropriations, but they have forgotten that there is another phrase there, and it is "but the Senate may propose or concur with amendments as on other bills."

While the House may pass an appropriations bill, it still has to go to the Senate for the Senate to pass. As we all learned in civics, the bill has to pass the House and pass the Senate in exactly the same form and be signed by the President in exactly the same form.

There is another clause that people are often thinking about also. Article I, section 9, clause 7 states, "No money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in consequence of appropriations made by law."

Those two are often talked about as power of the purse, meaning that is what people are talking about when they talk about power of the purse. As I said, all bills, including the appropriations bills that pass the House, must also pass the Senate and be signed by the President in the exact same form.

What happened, particularly last year, is the Democrat-controlled Senate could reject a House-passed bill. It could pass liberal amendments and return it to the House, forcing the House either to accept a worsened product or risk a Federal Government shutdown, which would still not stop the President's executive overreach.

What we did last December was pass a bill that would fund the rest of the government, except for the Department of Homeland Security, in a negotiation with the Senate because we needed to not shut down the government. Most of what was in that bill had already been passed by the House.

We passed seven appropriations bills and sent them to the Senate, but the

Senate had refused to act. We had also passed four more appropriations bills out of committee, but hadn't taken them up on the floor because they take so many hours to pass, and once the Senate made it clear they wouldn't take any of our appropriations bills, we thought we shouldn't waste additional time.

While H.R. 83 was not a perfect bill, we are all faced here with making decisions on what is presented to us rather than what we would like to be presented. We did have a lot of conservative victories in H.R. 83. It continued our track record of cutting wasteful discretionary spending by \$165 billion since FY 2010, but it is no small achievement that the Republican-led House has been able to implement overall spending cuts to save taxpayers more than \$2 trillion over the next 10 years since taking the majority 4 years ago. Certainly, we want to do more, but we shouldn't let the perfect be the enemy of the good.

We cut back spending to the Internal Revenue Service to pre-2008 funding levels. We blocked the Environmental Protection Agency from regulating farm ponds and ditches. There was no new funding for ObamaCare, and a host of pro-life and conservative, pro-gun policy "riders" were protected in that bill also.

House Republicans have worked extremely hard in the past 4 years to stop President Obama and the Senate Democrats from furthering the damage they did to this country when they and NANCY PELOSI were in control.

In fact, NANCY PELOSI and ELIZABETH WARREN both stridently opposed that legislation. However, unfortunately, when people focus on the perfect instead of the good, they don't give credit to us, and we were criticized by the liberal media and the conservative media.

Despite the short time we have had, the obstacles we faced, and the enormity of our task, House Republicans have still managed a number of conservative victories. Last summer, a bill I authored was passed. It streamlined the Federal workforce development system, including the elimination of 15 duplicative programs.

I would have liked to have eliminated more than that, but again, we take the victories that we can get. It is like being on a football team. You get the ball, and you look down field, and you think, "Gosh, I can't score a touchdown," so I just sit down because I can't score a touchdown.

No, that is not what the receiver does. The receiver says, "If I can make a few yards, if I can make a yard, I'm moving in the right direction." That is what Republicans have been doing for the past 4 years, moving us in the right direction.

Occasionally, we are going to score a touchdown, but if we are moving in the right direction totally, then we are going to win this game, and that is what we are doing. We wish we could

have done more, but we are going to have greater opportunities over the next 2 years with the Republican-led House and Senate.

This 114th Congress offers us new chances to pass legislation that will lead our country down a road of economic recovery. We are going to work to reduce the size and scope of the Federal Government, protect against executive overreach, reform Federal spending, and keep America strong.

This is America's Congress, and we are going to be addressing the American people's greatest priority in the 114th Congress. We are going to work hard to build a better future for American families. I believe we will accomplish that.

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

GETTING THE COUNTRY ON TRACK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I have great appreciation and affection for my friend from North Carolina, Dr. FOXX, and I appreciate her comments. Actually, I didn't realize at the time, but some of the things she said leads into some rather painful things to talk about this evening, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I have been greatly encouraged, first of all, over the last few days to find out that Americans are paying attention. They realize what is at risk. They realize there is a great deal at stake in this country, and now—maybe not more than ever, but as much as ever—we need to be about the business of getting this country on track.

I have mentioned before, Mr. Speaker, in recent years—maybe 3 years or so ago—my wife and I had gone to Togo, West Africa, which is by Nigeria, while Mercy Ships headquartered in my district were there. It is just an awesome charitable institution.

They bring a huge medical hospital ship into a dock in a Third World country, usually in Africa, and it is controlled by Christians, operated by Christians. They don't proselytize. They do the job of reaching out and ministering.

After the ship has been there, blind can see, and lame can walk. People who had massive tumors that were about to cut off their breathing are able to live. Women who had a child and developed a small hole in either the urinary tract or the colon when having a child that had been banned from families—sometimes, for 20 years, they were not allowed to be with the family. They were considered unclean.

They would have the fistula repaired and, after rather emotional ceremonies, for the first time, they would be reunited with family members. Sometimes, like I said, they hadn't seen them in 20 years. There were specific occasions like that.

□ 1815

And it is an amazing thing to watch. I was there for a week, really was blessed to help out with a number of different things.

But some of the West Africans wanted to meet with me before I left. They knew I was in Congress. Some of them were a little perplexed to see a Member of Congress. They were told he was a Member of Congress, but he is back there washing dishes in the kitchen.

But my late mother once said: I am not going to have you bunch of boys grow up and not be able to cook and wash dishes. So she made sure we could, and we can.

But we had the meeting with the West Africans there. They were Christians. And the oldest, senior citizen, hardworking man, after we had a really nice visit, he concluded, in essence, by saying: We were so thrilled when you elected your first Black President—his words—but since then, we have seen America getting weaker. It appears you are getting weaker and weaker. And the weaker it appears America gets, the more we suffer. Please, please, go back to Washington and tell your friends there stop getting weaker, because we know where we go when we die, but our only chance of having peace in this world is if America is strong.

I don't try to shove my religious beliefs on others, but it is part of who I am, just as it was with most of our Founding Fathers and those that went before us. But we were founded on Judeo-Christian beliefs. If you go look at one of the most important documents that established our independence—yes, the Declaration of Independence is critical. We are endowed by our Creator with certain inalienable rights.

But the Treaty of Paris, 1783, that was after the Revolutionary War, after the war had been won, but the Americans weren't sure that Britain wasn't going to come back. They had the most powerful navy, the most powerful army. What is to say they wouldn't come back?

So it was critical that a document be signed, and something put in that document that was so important, that would be such an oath that the leaders of Great Britain would not dare break that oath, that they truly would recognize the United States as being independent and free of Great Britain.

I didn't know until I got to Congress—I mean, I read history books. I read biographies. I love to learn more all the time. But I was struck when our pastor, David Dykes, his wife, Cindy, were up here and they wanted to go on a tour of the State Department. I had never been through a tour of the State Department.

I went with them and, lo and behold, there was an original copy of the Treaty of Paris, the actual treaty. We were told it was an original copy. And I was surprised at the huge, big, bold letters that started the document because that document, if that is not signed, we

are not free and independent, regardless of what the Declaration of Independence says. It means Britain is going to come in any time they get ready to. There had to be something so important put in that document so that when they signed it they wouldn't dare want to break it.

The words that started the Treaty of Paris, 1783, were: "In the name of the Most Holy and Undivided Trinity." That is a Christian belief. That was so important and held with such reverence that neither side would want to break an oath under the name of the Most Holy and Undivided Trinity.

Mr. Speaker, for those that don't know—I know you do—but that means the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. That is how the Treaty of Paris started that established not just our hopes and aspirations and principles as the Declaration of Independence did, this was the treaty that gave us the independence.

So, yes, we got back into a fight with Great Britain in 1812, the War of 1812. 1814, part of that war, this building was burned and, apparently, if it had not been for a massive thunderstorm or rainstorm that night, this would have gone the way—this actual wing didn't come into existence for about 40 years, 44 years or so, but the reason we didn't get a big ruin up here on what was once called Jenkins Hill was because the rainstorm put out the fire. The roof was badly damaged. And even though sandstone, marble granite doesn't burn, necessarily, in the presence of extreme heat you get cracks and it falls. We didn't get a big ruin because of the rainstorm.

Some thought maybe we ought to move the Capitol back to Philadelphia or New York, but others felt that what was here was preserved for a reason, so it was built back. It is part of our founding.

And what we have seen in the last 6 years as this noble effort by our President wanting to bring peace throughout the world by showing how nice we were, by showing that we meant them no harm, we would be glad to meet with them, to sit down, we will give them offices, we will give them things, we will let murderers go from prison, and those type things will show our enemies how really decent and good we are, and so they will want to be our friends and will not want to be at war with us—the only problem is that may work in some common core-type thing taught in school, but it is not in touch with reality because there is evil in this world, and that evil has been most recently manifested repeatedly in radical Islamic jihadist actions. And there is no way around it. The more the people in this administration refuse to rise up and call evil what it is, the more the evil rises up.

Last June, I was asked to go to Nigeria and meet with 23 of the mothers of daughters who were kidnapped by Boko Haram, a radical Islamic group. And I hope and pray more around this town,

especially down the end of Pennsylvania Avenue, will begin to develop the courage and understanding that we are not going to bring peace to Christians and Jews throughout the world, and we are not going to bring peace to moderate Muslims who want to stand up to radical Islamists, but they know they go to the top of the death chart. But we have got to have people in the executive branch understand this is evil, and it is done in the name of Islam, and it is radical, and it is what they believe is jihad.

Yes, it is their religion. It is not the religion of moderate Muslims, but to them it is their religion. It is their religion. It is their politics. It is their world view. And under their world view, you don't have freedom of expression. Ultimately, shari'a law will prevail, and either they must wipe you out and kill you as dogs, or some of the more moderate of the radicals will allow you to pay a tax, admit that you are subservient to the Islamists, and they may let you live in peace, unless they feel that they are being led by some religious fanatic to do otherwise.

Things around the world have gotten worse for Christians and Jews because we had an administration, as noble and idealistic as it wanted to be—as wonderful as it would be if you could just say, “We want to be at peace and we will turn the other cheek,” that is not for a government to do, even a Christian-based government, as this one started and was for most of this country's existence.

For Christians, there is an obligation to follow the beatitudes, the teachings of Christ. But, Mr. Speaker, some get confused and think that is the government's role, that if its people get killed, well, if we just say, “Oh, that was probably our fault; we deserved it,” then it will stop. It does not. It gets worse.

People need to begin to understand what is going on in this world. There is evil, and people are being killed and tortured and women and young girls raped and their lives stolen from them, Christians and Jews being persecuted in greater numbers than any time in the world's existence—not a greater percentage but greater numbers.

I met with many Nigerians who have been adversely affected by this radical Islamist—yes, radical Islamist—group, Boko Haram. And make no mistake, I am not advocating for sending troops into Nigeria. That would be a huge mistake, in my opinion. But we can help them. They need intelligence. We might use a drone and drop a bomb. That might help save many Christians from the horrors they are experiencing. We could work with the southern, with part of the Nigerian Government, at least, to help save those people.

I mentioned before, I asked—these were all Christians. I asked did they attack this girls' school, because I know they don't believe girls should be educated. And they said no, they don't believe girls should be educated, but they

attacked the school because they knew it was a Christian school.

And usually when they attack a school, if there are boys, they kill the boys, and then they take the girls and sell them into sex slavery. And in the case of these innocent children, these girls, they took them captive. They raped them repeatedly. They abused them severely. They demanded that they convert from Christianity to Islam.

But I asked the Christian pastor—and we were a couple of hours outside of town, where I had to go without the State Department or other people that would not have wanted me to put myself in that situation, but getting out to the remote location, secret location, where these survivors were. I said to the pastor: Where are the fathers? And he said: That is another part of the tragedy. They know that girls are being raped, sexually abused, abused in so many ways. They left their homes and they went into the bush because they are the fathers. They were supposed to protect their children, and they feel guilty, and they don't believe they deserve to be in a bed or a home while their daughters are being abused like they are.

□ 1830

That is a real human tragedy.

Then we hear not of just some violent action in Paris, France—it was a terrorist action, committed by radical Islamic jihadists who are being taught, so many of them, as tiny children growing up, to hate the West, to hate Western civilization, to hate America, that it is a good thing to kill innocent Americans, and that somehow, in their weird religious belief—in this evil—they benefit by killing and harming what are really innocent people.

This is a story from CNS News, on January 8, by Curtis Kalin:

In the wake of the terrorist attack on the offices of French satirist paper *Charlie Hebdo*, one Muslim cleric justified the murders under Islamic law.

Mr. Speaker, for those who don't understand, when they say they are justifying this under Islamic law, it means, to them, it is their religion. Yes, it is their religion:

USA Today published a column by avowed “radical Muslim cleric” Anjem Choudary. The piece, titled “People know the consequences,” asks why France would allow the paper to mock Islam, and further excuses the systematic murders as justified under Islamic law.

Then it quotes him:

“Muslims consider the honor of the Prophet Muhammad to be dearer to them than that of their parents or even themselves. To defend it is considered to be an obligation upon them. The strict punishment, if found guilty of this crime under sharia law, is capital punishment implementable by an Islamic State. This is because the Messenger Muhammad said, “Whoever insults a prophet, kill him.”

See, for those who don't understand, those are people who are saying, “This is our religion; it is our state; it is our

lives,” and until the people leading this administration understand that, it is going to get worse.

I do believe what is in the Bible: that to whom much is given, of them much will be required.

We have been put here in America in such a place and time that if we stand strong, we don't have to send American troops, who then end up being seen as occupiers, but we can help. We can give them intelligence, and we can give them the ability as we did in Africa. Within about 4 or 5 months, and with fewer than 500 American special ops people and intelligence, they defeated the Taliban by February of 2002. Then we became occupiers and added tens of thousands of troops and ended up, eventually, with over 100,000 in this administration. Occupiers don't do well in that part of the world. If we tried to be occupiers in Nigeria, we wouldn't do very well, but we can help with information and if we get weapons in the right hands.

I am not talking about sending weapons to the Free Syrian Army, which is working frequently with the Islamic State. I am talking about putting them in the hands of people who are our friends. Send them directly to those we can be sure are our friends in Nigeria. Send them to Erbil, where I was 2 or 3 weeks ago, in northern Iraq with the Kurds. They didn't throw down their weapons. They didn't hand them over to the Islamic State. They stood and fought. They are still standing and fighting. They helped clear an avenue to free some people who were trapped on a mountain while I was there.

My dear friend, DANA ROHRBACHER, set the trip up. He and I have traveled to so many places. My friend STEVE KING was there, and GREGORY MEEKS was there—a good man. We also were in Kabul in Afghanistan. There is hope there. We have got to be smart about the way that we help, but it does not help when we can't even recognize the enemy.

I warned about one of the Homeland Security advisers—top advisers—for a number of years. Finally, after all of this time—back, I believe it was, in August, he tweeted about the Islamic State's beheading and killing people. This adviser—top adviser—in the Obama administration tweeted out, Hey, the Islamic caliphate is inevitable, so just relax—words to that effect. Finally, that was enough. They let him resign and not renew his term again. Thank goodness.

I have been talking with people in Nigeria and emailing, and I have great hopes for the girls I have met with, these young girls, that they are going to come out of it. They are still traumatized. The families are still traumatized. The girls have not been released, and it doesn't appear that this administration has done anything to really help. As I was communicating with African friends in Nigeria, we got word of this story, this one from NBC News:

More than 2,000 people are unaccounted for after radical Islamist sect Boko Haram

torched more than 10 towns and villages in Nigeria, a local lawmaker told NBC News. Ahmed Zanna, a senator for Borno state, where the attack happened, said the militants razed the town of Baga as well as “10 to 20” other communities in the country’s rural northeast over the past 5 days. “These towns are just gone, burned down. The whole area is covered in bodies.”

Look, I know that there are people in this administration, including our President, who think you can win over evil by just being nice to it—offering to buy offices in Qatar, offering to release the evil forces—murderers—from captivity, and that such wonderful, gallant gestures will turn the tide. Individuals can, but governments are supposed to protect the people. It is causing this weakness to grow, which allows evil to grow around the world. There is a vacuum being filled as we have lost our leadership role around the world, and it is being filled with evil religious nastiness called “radical Islam.”

As this administration continues to act as if it is not a religion and as if we can win them over with kindness, more people die. Now they are saying maybe 2,000 Nigerians have died today. So I couldn’t help but reflect back to my senior citizen friend in Togo and his words, his imploring: “Stop getting weaker. When America gets weaker, we suffer.”

How much suffering is this administration going to allow before it wakes up to the reality of what radical Islam is?

Until such time, this Congress needs to stand up and say we are not going to keep supplying weapons to radical Islamists who are working with the Islamic State in Syria. We will help our friends, like the Kurds. We are not going to keep supplying weapons to people who may have them end up with the Taliban. We are going to help our friends like we did with the Northern Alliance in Afghanistan. It is time to wake up to the reality of evil that this radical Islam is because, until this administration does, it is going to get worse.

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

OMISSION FROM THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD OF WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 7, 2015 AT PAGE H87

I do hope that if this bill moves forward, we will continue our bipartisan efforts and work with the Senate to perfect this bill. Nevertheless, I understand the need to reauthorize this important program that can help minimize the number of Americans who are harmed or killed by windstorm disasters and reduce the costs associated with disaster recovery.

I support H.R. 23 and urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support the bill.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I have no other Members who wish to be heard on this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. O’ROURKE (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and the balance of the week on account of official business in district.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o’clock and 40 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, January 9, 2015, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker’s table and referred as follows:

6. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Medical Device Classification Procedures; Reclassification Petition: Content and Form; Technical Amendment [Docket No.: FDA-2013-N-1529] received January 5, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service’s final rule — Filing of Form 5472 [TD 9707] (RIN: 1545-BM08) received January 5, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN (for herself, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. SALMON, Mr. CHABOT, and Mr. POE of Texas):

H.R. 204. A bill to continue restrictions against and prohibit diplomatic recognition of the Government of North Korea, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BURGESS:

H.R. 205. A bill to prohibit the Secretary of Homeland Security from granting a work authorization to an alien found to have been unlawfully present in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLLINS of Georgia (for himself, Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mr. SALMON, and Mr. PERRY):

H.R. 206. A bill to prohibit the use of funds to carry out memoranda issued by the Secretary of Homeland Security and the President, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Homeland Security, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ:

H.R. 207. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to provide for improvements to

small business development centers; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ (for herself, Mr. NADLER, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. MENG, and Mr. CROWLEY):

H.R. 208. A bill to require the Administrator of the Small Business Administration to establish a program to make loans to certain businesses, homeowners, and renters affected by Superstorm Sandy; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. DOGGETT (for himself, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. MARINO):

H.R. 209. A bill to permanently allow an exclusion under the Supplemental Security Income program and the Medicaid program for compensation provided to individuals who participate in clinical trials for rare diseases or conditions; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MEADOWS (for himself, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. HANNA, Mr. JONES, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. ROSKAM, and Mr. TURNER):

H.R. 210. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt student workers for purposes of determining a higher education institution’s employer health care shared responsibility; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CALVERT:

H.R. 211. A bill to amend the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 to authorize assignment to States of Federal agency environmental review responsibilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. LATTA (for himself, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. QUIGLEY, and Ms. KAPTUR):

H.R. 212. A bill to amend the Safe Drinking Water Act to provide for the assessment and management of the risk of cyanotoxins in drinking water, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CHAFFETZ (for himself, Mr. LABRADOR, and Ms. LOFGREN):

H.R. 213. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to eliminate the per-country numerical limitation for employment-based immigrants, to increase the per-country numerical limitation for family-sponsored immigrants, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER (for himself, Mrs. CAPPAS, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. NADLER, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. LEE, and Mr. CONNOLLY):

H.R. 214. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify that tar sands are crude oil for purposes of the Federal excise tax on petroleum; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. BROWN of Florida:

H.R. 215. A bill to amend the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 to clarify the treatment of administrative expenses of the Department of Veterans Affairs during sequestration; to the Committee on the Budget.

By Ms. BROWN of Florida (for herself and Mr. MILLER of Florida):

H.R. 216. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to submit to Congress a Future-Years Veterans Program and a quadrennial veterans review, to establish in the Department of Veterans Affairs a Chief Strategy Officer, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. BLACK (for herself, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. JONES, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. COLE, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. HARPER, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. MICA, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. YOHO, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. CLAWSON of Florida, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. WALKER, Mr. BARR, Mr. FLORES, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. PITTS, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. POE of Texas, Mrs. ROBY, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. YODER, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. BOUTSTANY, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. BABIN, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. HARRIS, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mrs. NOEM, Ms. FOXX, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. OLSON, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. JOLLY, Mr. BUCSHON, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, and Mr. BROOKS of Alabama):

H.R. 217. A bill to amend title X of the Public Health Service Act to prohibit family planning grants from being awarded to any entity that performs abortions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. BROWN of Florida (for herself and Mr. WALZ):

H.R. 218. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase the maximum age for children eligible for medical care under the CHAMPVA program; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. COHEN:

H.R. 219. A bill to prohibit States from carrying out more than one Congressional redistricting after a decennial census and apportionment, to require States to conduct such redistricting through independent commissions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FORTENBERRY:

H.R. 220. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase the maximum age for children eligible for medical care under the CHAMPVA program; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HARRIS (for himself, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. STEWART, Mr. SALMON, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mr. RIBBLE, and Mr. HUELSKAMP):

H.R. 221. A bill to prevent a taxpayer bailout of health insurance issuers; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. HUFFMAN:

H.R. 222. A bill to prohibit the Export-Import Bank of the United States from pro-

viding financial support for certain high carbon intensity energy projects; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. JOYCE (for himself, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. NOLAN, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. REED, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. RENACCI, Ms. MOORE, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, and Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 223. A bill to authorize the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. KELLY of Illinois:

H.R. 224. A bill to require the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service to submit to Congress an annual report on the effects of gun violence on public health; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. KELLY of Illinois:

H.R. 225. A bill to amend the Consumer Product Safety Act to remove the exclusion of pistols, revolvers, and other firearms from the definition of consumer product in order to permit the issuance of safety standards for such articles by the Consumer Product Safety Commission; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. KELLY of Illinois:

H.R. 226. A bill to amend chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the sale or other disposition of a firearm to, and the possession, shipment, transportation, or receipt of a firearm by, certain classes of high-risk individuals; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING of Iowa (for himself, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. BARLETTA, and Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee):

H.R. 227. A bill to prohibit the use of funds for certain immigration-related policies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LOBIONDO (for himself and Mr. VISLOSKY):

H.R. 228. A bill to amend title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to extend the authorization of the Bulletproof Vest Partnership Grant Program through fiscal year 2018; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. MILLER of Michigan (for herself and Mr. MCCAUL):

H.R. 229. A bill to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to establish a biometric exit data system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. MURPHY of Florida (for himself, Mr. JOLLY, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. ROONEY of Florida, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. POSEY, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. CLAWSON of Florida, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, and Ms. GRAHAM):

H.R. 230. A bill to amend the Water Resources Development Act of 2000 to authorize the Central Everglades Planning Project, Florida; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. MURPHY of Florida (for himself and Mr. ROONEY of Florida):

H.R. 231. A bill to amend the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 to deauthorize the Ten Mile Creek Water Preserve Area Critical Restoration Project; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. PAULSEN (for himself, Mr. NEAL, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. DEFALZIO, Mr. MCHENRY, and Mr. MEEHAN):

H.R. 232. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a reduced rate of excise tax on beer produced domestically by certain qualifying producers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PERLMUTTER (for himself and Mr. STIVERS):

H.R. 233. A bill to allow reviews of certain families' incomes every 3 years for purposes of determining eligibility for certain Federal assisted housing programs; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. RUPPERSBERGER:

H.R. 234. A bill to provide for the sharing of certain cyber threat intelligence and cyber threat information between the intelligence community and cybersecurity entities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select), and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, Armed Services, and Homeland Security, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CALVERT:

H. Con. Res. 5. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress regarding outreach to families of members of the Armed Forces who have died in Iraq and Afghanistan, and in other conflicts; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HURD of Texas (for himself, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. SMITH of Texas, and Mr. CUELLAR):

H. Res. 23. A resolution congratulating the San Antonio Spurs for winning the 2014 National Basketball Association (NBA) League Championship; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN:

H.R. 204.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution
By Mr. BURGESS:

H.R. 205.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 4 of the Constitution of the United States: To Establish an uniform Rule of Naturalization.

By Mr. COLLINS of Georgia:

H.R. 206.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 4 of the Constitution, which states that Congress shall have power "to establish an uniform Rule of Naturalization, and uniform Laws on the subject of Bankruptcies throughout the United States."

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ:

H.R. 207.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3
The Congress shall have Power * * * To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ:

H.R. 208.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

The Congress shall have Power * * * To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. DOGGETT:

H.R. 209.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. MEADOWS:

H.R. 210.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1, which empowers Congress, in part, to “lay and collect Taxes” and “provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States . . .” The bill will exempt certain educational institutions from taxes imposed by public Law 111-148, as amended. Congress has the power to repeal such taxes and provide for the general welfare of those who have been and will be harmed by their imposition.

By Mr. CALVERT:

H.R. 211.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Constitutional authority of congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress).

By Mr. LATTA:

H.R. 212.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. CHAFFETZ:

H.R. 213.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clauses 4 and 18 to the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER:

H.R. 214.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Constitution of the United States provides clear authority for Congress to pass tax legislation. Article I of the Constitution, in detailing Congressional authority, provides that “Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes . . .” (Section 8, Clause 1). This legislation is introduced pursuant to that grant of authority.

By Ms. BROWN of Florida:

H.R. 215.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Pursuant to Article I, section 18—“The Congress shall have Power To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.”

By Ms. BROWN of Florida:

H.R. 216.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18—“The Congress shall have Power To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.”

By Mrs. BLACK:

H.R. 217.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution; whereby the Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

Furthermore, this bill makes specific changes to existing law, in accordance with the Fourteenth Amendment, Section 5, which states that “No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.”

By Ms. BROWN of Florida:

H.R. 218.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Pursuant to Article I, section 18—“The Congress shall have Power To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.”

By Mr. COHEN:

H.R. 219.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 4 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. FORTENBERRY:

H.R. 220.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H.R. 221.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. HUFFMAN:

H.R. 222.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1: The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Impost and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. JOYCE:

H.R. 223.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution: “To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.”

By Ms. KELLY of Illinois:

H.R. 224.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

US Const. Art. I, Sec. 8, Cl. 1 (“The Congress shall have the Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and General Welfare of the United States[.]”); US Const. Art. I, Sec. 8, Cl. 18 (“The Congress Shall have the Power . . . To

make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution for foregoing powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.”). The Surgeon General of the Public Health Service is operated using tax dollars, and serves the function of promoting and advancing the nation’s public health. Legislation requiring the office to submit an annual report on the impact of gun violence on the nation’s public health is a “necessary and proper” means of focusing the office’s attention, and ensuring all future public health legislation is well informed and effective.

By Ms. KELLY of Illinois:

H.R. 225.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

US Const. Art. I, Sec. 8, Cl. 3 (“The Congress has the Power . . . To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes[.]”). The sale, transfer, and manufacturing of firearms crosses state lines, and is therefore a component of interstate commerce—making firearm safety regulations a valid regulation of interstate commerce.

By Ms. KELLY of Illinois:

H.R. 226.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

US Const. Art. I, Sec. 8, Cl. 3 (“The Congress has the Power . . . To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes[.]”). The sale, transfer, and possession of firearms crosses state lines, and is therefore a component of interstate commerce—making regulations limiting who can sell, transfer, or possess a firearm a valid regulation of interstate commerce.

By Mr. KING of Iowa:

H.R. 227.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8 provides Congress the power to “establish a uniform rule of naturalization.”

By Mr. LOBIONDO:

H.R. 228.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mrs. MILLER of Michigan:

H.R. 229.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. MURPHY of Florida:

H.R. 230.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. MURPHY of Florida:

H.R. 231.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. PAULSEN:

H.R. 232.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. PERLMUTTER:

H.R. 233.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 1

By Mr. RUPPERSBERGER:

H.R. 234.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Commerce clause.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 3: Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. HILL, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. BABIN, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. BOST, Mr. DENT, Mr. BUCK, Mrs. ELLMERS, and Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia.

H.R. 24: Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. LATTA, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. EMMER, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. BRAT, Mr. SANFORD, and Mrs. LUMMIS.

H.R. 27: Mr. MESSER, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. BOST, and Mr. HUNTER.

H.R. 29: Mr. OLSON, Mrs. ELLMERS, and Mr. WEBER of Texas.

H.R. 30: Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Ms. MCSALLY, Mrs. LOVE, Mr. MICA, and Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 37: Mr. SESSIONS.

H.R. 44: Mr. NADLER.

H.R. 86: Mr. BISHOP of Utah.

H.R. 90: Mr. JONES.

H.R. 109: Mr. JOLLY, Mrs. BLACK, Ms. BORDALLO, and Mr. BOUSTANY.

H.R. 122: Mr. BUTTERFIELD.

H.R. 125: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 132: Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. JONES, Mr. AMASH, Mr. JOLLY, Mr. BABIN, Mr. SANFORD, Mr. HENSARLING and Mr. MOOLENAAR.

H.R. 154: Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. ESTY, Mr. COHEN, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. POLIS, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. JONES, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. BERA, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. TSONGAS, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. HAHN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. LEE, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. COSTA, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. SINEMA, and Mr. CUMMINGS.

H.R. 160: Ms. SPEIER and Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.
H.R. 161: Mr. REED, Mr. SESSIONS, and Mr. POLIQUIN.

H.R. 167: Mr. COLE, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. BENISHEK, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. PETERS, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. COSTA, Mr. TIPPON, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. COOK, Mr. NUNES, and Mr. WALDEN.

H.R. 173: Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN and Mr. SMITH of Texas.

H.R. 176: Mr. WESTERMAN.

H.R. 177: Mr. HUELSKAMP.

H.R. 178: Mr. WESTERMAN.

H.R. 187: Mrs. BLACK, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, Mr. COSTA, Mr. KILMER, and Mr. SCHRADER.

H.R. 189: Ms. BROWN of Florida.

H.R. 191: Mrs. ROBY, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. MICA, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. RATCLIFFE, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. POSEY, Mr. ZINKE, and Mr. BABIN.

H.R. 197: Ms. MATSUI, Mr. KEATING, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. LEVIN, Ms. BORDALLO, and Mr. GUTIÉRREZ.

H.R. 203: Mr. PETERS, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, and Mr. WELCH.

H.J. Res. 1: Mr. HOLDING, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. BLUM, Mr. MESSER, Mr. BARR, Mr. HICE of Georgia, and Mr. PITTENGER.

H.J. Res. 2: Mr. HOLDING, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. BLUM, Mr. MESSER, Mr. BARR, Mr. JOLLY, Mr. PITTENGER, and Mr. ROTHFUS.

H.J. Res. 7: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.

H. Res. 11: Mr. BYRNE.

H. Res. 12: Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. HIGGINS, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. COSTA, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. KEATING, Mr. COOK, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. TONKO, Mr. HINOJOSA, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Ms. TSONGAS, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. MOORE, Mr. HANNA, Mr. LANCE, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. SIREN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. WELCH, Mr. GIBSON, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. RUIZ, Ms. MENG, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. POCAN, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. LEE, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. ESTY, and Ms. KUSTER.