

Holt	McGovern	Sánchez, Linda
Honda	Meehan	T.
Hoyer	Meeks	Sarbanes
Hudson	Miller (FL)	Schakowsky
Huelskamp	Miller, George	Schiff
Huizenga (MI)	Moore	Schock
Israel	Mulvaney	Sewell (AL)
Jackson Lee	Murphy (FL)	Shea-Porter
Jeffries	Murphy (PA)	Sires
Jenkins	Neal	Slaughter
Johnson (OH)	Negrete McLeod	Smith (MO)
Jones	Nolan	Stivers
Jordan	Palazzo	Stockman
Joyce	Pallone	Stutzman
Keating	Pastor (AZ)	Terry
Kilmer	Paulsen	Thompson (CA)
Kind	Payne	Thompson (MS)
Kinzinger (IL)	Pearce	Thompson (PA)
Kirkpatrick	Peters (CA)	Tiberi
Lance	Peterson	Tipton
Lee (CA)	Pittenger	Turner
Levin	Pitts	Upton
Lewis	Poe (TX)	Valadao
LoBiondo	Price (GA)	Vargas
Lowe	Rahall	Veasey
Lummis	Reed	Velázquez
Maffei	Reichert	Visclosky
Maloney,	Renacci	Walberg
Carolyn	Rigell	Weber (TX)
Maloney, Sean	Ros-Lehtinen	Wittman
Marchant	Rush	Woodall
Matheson	Ryan (OH)	Yoder
McDermott	Salmon	Young (AK)

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 2575

*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 2014”.

**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.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) each will control 90 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 2575.

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

There was no objection.

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

Today, I rise in support of restoring Americans’ work hours so they can see bigger paychecks and more opportunities.

ObamaCare places an unprecedented government regulation on workers, changing the definition of “full-time work” from 40 hours per week to 30 hours. As a direct result, Americans across the country are having their hours cut at work, and they are seeing smaller paychecks. At a time when the costs of groceries, gas, and health care keep increasing, lower paychecks are simply unacceptable.

The bill we have before us today, the Save American Workers Act, would re-

peal ObamaCare’s 30-hour workweek definition of “full-time employment” and would restore the traditional definition of a 40-hour workweek. Today, we are voting to restore hours and wages and to give businesses and their workers some relief from the burdens of ObamaCare. This is a critical step in creating an America that works.

I hear about the effects of ObamaCare from workers and employers across mid-Michigan. Recently, Central Michigan University was forced to cut back student employees’ hours. As one student said:

Students use that money to pay for finances and school, and I think it’s going to become increasingly harder for them to pay for school when we can only work 25 hours.

A faculty member at a community college in my district wrote to me recently, and said:

I hold two part-time positions . . . Today, I was informed I cannot continue to do both jobs because of ObamaCare laws. Beginning in August, I will no longer be advising and will lose approximately one-third of my income. Last year, I bought a house, a house I now fear I will no longer be able to afford.

By forcing employers to shift workers from full time to part time, the 30-hour rule is destroying hardworking Americans’ abilities to earn more during these tough economic times. At a time when the President is calling on Congress to increase wages, it is his health care law that is forcing Americans to see smaller paychecks. ObamaCare is putting full-time work and the potential to earn more wages out of the reach of millions of Americans. Those who are hit the hardest are low-income Americans who are already struggling in these tough economic times. According to a Hoover Institution study, 2.6 million Americans making under \$30,000 a year are most at risk of having their hours and wages cut as a result of the 30-hour rule. Of that, over 60 percent are women, and 90 percent do not have a college degree.

The administration has made exceptions and has implemented delays for big businesses and political allies. Why not American workers and job creators?

The nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office confirmed the bill we are considering today will reduce ObamaCare’s unacceptable burden on job creators and will increase wages for American workers. According to the Congressional Budget Office, the Save American Workers Act will increase cash wages for American workers by \$75 billion, repeal \$63.4 billion in ObamaCare tax increases, and reduce the number of employers subject to penalties related to ObamaCare.

I applaud Congressman TODD YOUNG, a distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee, for his work on this legislation.

It is time to vote in support of Americans who are facing higher bills and smaller paychecks. I urge my colleagues to join me in a “yes” vote.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG) to control.

ANSWERED “PRESENT”—2

Gohmert Owens

NOT VOTING—10

Capuano	Grijalva	Peters (MI)
Clark (MA)	Lynch	Webster (FL)
Conyers	Miller, Gary	
Garamendi	Perlmutter	

□ 1402

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 154, I was unavoidably detained and unable to cast my vote. Had I been present, I would have voted “yes.”

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 3717

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed as a cosponsor from H.R. 3717, the Helping Families in Mental Health Crisis Act of 2013.

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

There was no objection.

SAVE AMERICAN WORKERS ACT OF 2014

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 530, I call up the bill (H.R. 2575) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the 30-hour threshold for classification as a full-time employee for purposes of the employer mandate in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and replace it with 40 hours, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 530, the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Ways and Means, printed in the bill, is adopted. The bill, as amended, is considered read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. YODER). Without objection, the gentleman from Indiana will control the time.

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as the Senate continues to push for a 25 percent increase in the Federal minimum wage, they continue to ignore that millions of hourly workers face as much as a 25 percent pay cut as a result of ObamaCare. Because of the 30 hours is full time provision buried in the employer mandate, many employees face the prospect of being limited in their work hours. When they are not allowed to work more than 29 hours, they simply aren't able to generate the income they need to support themselves and their families.

It is worth noting that an employee who sees his hours cut from 39 to 29 is losing 10 hours a week, which, over the course of a month, is an entire week's worth of wages. The employees we are talking about are the people who most depend on getting every hour and every bit of wages that they can. We are talking about custodians, cafeteria workers, and substitute teachers at your child's school. We are talking about the waitresses and busboys at your favorite restaurant, about the cashier who rings you out at the grocery store, and about the guys on the assembly line who help make your car. In my district, we are also talking about adjunct professors at places like Ivy Tech Community College and Indiana University.

These are all Americans who want to work, but they are dealing with the unintended consequences—and I do believe they are unintended—of this health care law, ObamaCare. Some of these provisions are limiting their hours and pay, and this needs to be fixed. So I introduced the Save American Workers Act because I want to help these hardworking Hoosiers and other Americans who are just trying to make ends meet. By simply repealing this provision and restoring the traditional 40-hour workweek, we can help make an America that works.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this bill. I commend my colleagues on the other side who have already signed on as cosponsors.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

My colleagues on the Republican side in the House are so blinded by their ideology that they will not or cannot see reality or hear other voices. So here is the reality:

7-plus million people have enrolled in private plans through the ACA marketplaces. The ACA is working; millions have new coverage under Medicaid; up to 129 million Americans with pre-existing health conditions, including 17 million children, no longer have to worry about being denied coverage or

about being charged higher premiums due to their health status; 3.1 million young adults have gained health coverage because they can now, up to age 26, stay on their parents' health plans. That is the reality of ACA.

There is more. There is also the reality of what this legislation would do, and I want to emphasize this because I don't think it has been accurately stated to date.

It would force 1 million people out of employer-based health insurance. According to the CBO, 1 million people would be forced out of employer-based health insurance. It would increase the number of uninsured by about a half a million people, also according to the CBO. So they are bringing this up at the same time that 7 million people have enrolled in private plans through the marketplace and when millions now have coverage under Medicaid. They essentially want to go in reverse in terms of health coverage, and they don't face up to this.

I think it has also been misdescribed. This bill would add \$74 billion to the deficit, according to the CBO, when there is no offset.

□ 1415

That is \$74 billion, and you are coming forth here, the day after we receive the latest information about ACA and all that has happened beneficially and now coming and saying knock people off of employer-based insurance and add \$74 billion to the deficit.

If any of those figures are wrong, I would like someone to stand up and say so.

Also, there has been much discussion about the impact in terms of part-time employment. I want to read what the CBO said definitively in February. In CBO's judgment:

There is no compelling evidence that part-time employment has increased as a result of the ACA.

So as we heard in testimony, a community college came forth and said they had reduced the hours of teachers in order to avoid paying health insurance. Somebody in the education came forth and said that is their policy.

I suggest, instead of foregoing their responsibility as employers, they ought to go into the marketplace and see what they can do to bring more coverage for the people who are working hard.

Essentially, what you are doing here today is saying to many, many people who are working hard and who need insurance that this bill will knock you off your employer-based insurance and increase the number of uninsured by half a million, while increasing the deficit by \$74 billion. Ideology is indeed blind when this kind of a proposition is put forth.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, it is worth noting this bill would decrease by \$63 billion the

amount of taxes on our employers during the worst economy, some will say, since the Great Depression. It will cause our wage earners around the country to realize an additional \$75 billion in wage income.

I take the fiscal condition of this country very seriously. I find it very hard to believe, though, that anyone—a Member of this body—would desire to pass a national health care law that is paid for on the backs of our hourly workers, those who can least afford to absorb lower wages, fewer hours, and perhaps losing their job altogether.

I think that is essentially the argument I hear from the other side when I hear the \$75 billion figure put forward.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BUCHANAN), a distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I want to thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, there is no issue today that is more important in this body than growing the economy and creating jobs.

The Wall Street Journal noted that there are fewer jobs today than since the recession began back in 2007.

The gentleman from Michigan mentioned we need to go in the marketplace. I have been in the marketplace for 30 years, as someone who created a lot of jobs, and I can tell you this health care mandate that has employees looking at 30 hours or less a week unless they get health care is a big issue. The 30-hour requirement is forcing businesses to reduce working hours and cut wages.

I had a gentleman in my congressional district last week that has three restaurants and 291 employees. He has mentioned to me numerous times that he is going to have to cut quite a few employees from 40 hours to 29 hours.

He has even suggested that, in many cases, to reduce his health care costs, he is going to have to push some people down even more hours, so he can bring down his health care costs.

The fact is that health care costs in my district are as much as \$1,500 to \$2,000 an employee, so it is a big issue.

Another employer in our area—one of our larger employers—is going to be moving hundreds of employees from 40 hours to 29 hours a week, so it is a very big issue in my congressional district in Sarasota.

With that, I would ask my colleagues for quick passage. We need to move this bill quickly.

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

The evidence is clear that more people would have their hours reduced if this bill passed than might be true under the present ACA.

I said what the CBO has said in terms of reduced hours of work. Once again, you are just not facing the reality. Changing this to 40 hours will hurt all around.

I now yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CASTRO).

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Thank you, Ranking Member LEVIN, for yielding.

We speak a lot in this body about the freedoms that we as Americans have been endowed with by our forefathers and that are enshrined in the Constitution, whether it is the freedom of speech, the freedom of religion, or our Second Amendment freedoms.

I think we all understand and know—unfortunately, too many Americans know firsthand—that when you are sick and lying in a hospital bed or at home and have a child that you can't afford to take to the doctor, those freedoms mean very little.

For someone who couldn't get health insurance, whose life is spiraling downward, who can't afford to make their car or mortgage payment, how much are those freedoms worth when their life is spiraling downward because they can't afford health care anymore?

The fact is one of the greatest things that the Affordable Care Act has done is allowed more Americans to be able to enjoy the freedoms that all of us here in Congress fight so hard to protect for the American people.

A few of the troubling things about this bill is that up to a million people would lose their health care coverage if this piece of legislation was enacted. As Congressman LEVIN mentioned, it would cost \$74 billion to the American people, adding to our debt and deficit.

What is also interesting is that just about every bill that is now allowed to pass through the House of Representatives requires a pay-for. In other words, the Republican majority does not allow a piece of legislation to be passed unless it is paid for by cutting something else.

What is different about this piece of legislation is that there is no question that it would cost \$74 billion, and yet there is absolutely no pay-for in this bill.

I would also note, as was mentioned, that this would cost American business some money. Well, a few things; first, many, many American businesses don't define the workweek as 40 hours. They define it as 32 hours or, sometimes, lower. Sometimes, it is 30.

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

Mr. LEVIN. I yield the gentleman an additional 2 minutes.

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. So this is inconsistent even with how millions of American businesses define full-time employment, and I would also point out this: we know that, as our economy has started to rebound from the worst recession that we have had since the Great Depression, many American businesses are doing well.

Wall Street is hitting all-time highs, and the stock market has soared. That is a good thing for America. We certainly don't begrudge any company or business that, but small businesses are already exempted from the ACA requirements, so this is about more sizable companies.

In an economy where business is doing well, why should we say to all of

these workers—people who are going to work every day, who have incredible work ethic, who are powering our economy—that they don't deserve health insurance?

I was in San Antonio—and I know it happened in many cities—and we had long lines on Monday to enroll in the Affordable Care Act. People's faces lit up because, for the first time in many of their lives, they were going to be able to afford health care coverage. Many of them had their kids with them. There were teenagers and senior citizens there.

This is a milestone in people's lives, and this bill would take that away from a million people.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I know my good colleague spoke with a great deal of sincerity and earnestness when he talked about pay-fors.

It is worth noting, once again, that the attempt to pay for this Affordable Care Act—ObamaCare, as it is popularly known—on the backs of our hourly workers strikes me as unconscionable and something that none of us ought to be contemplating, which is why this is a bipartisan effort.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY), the distinguished majority whip.

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2575, the Save American Workers Act.

Mr. Speaker, working on an hourly wage is tough. I know this. I worked every single job in a deli I started 25 years ago. Working an hourly wage is an opportunity to start, to work hard, to impress, and to be able to move up; but in today's world, it is a little different.

Today, because of ObamaCare, you don't have the opportunity to work the extra hours. You don't have the opportunity to expand.

Mr. Speaker, I listened to another colleague on this floor who said small businesses up to 50 employees were exempt, so now, our law is saying: you have to stay small, you can't grow, you can't have that American Dream to be something bigger.

Mr. Speaker, this affects business, but it also affects the public sector as well. In every single district across this country, this is having a great deal of effect.

In my own hometown in Kern County, the board of supervisors no longer allows seasonal workers, such as seasonal firefighters, because they can't go beyond the time allowed.

My community college in my district no longer has that extra job for the students. The students packed the boardroom and wanted to know why we could no longer do this. They pointed to one bill, ObamaCare.

Those are the stories you hear, the stories you know about, but numbers don't lie.

So what have the numbers shown since this law has gone into effect?

Last December, the Department of Labor showed low wage workers clocked the shortest workweek on record, only 27.4 hours a week. That is lower than during the recession.

Today, we have an opportunity to change that. Today, we have an opportunity to unshackle this, so an individual can work more hours. An individual that maybe owns a business can give other people opportunities; and, yes, the barrier will not be there to make sure you are only small, but you can have the American Dream. You can grow.

Mr. Speaker, I ask all to join us and make it a bipartisan bill, when individuals have cosponsored this bill, to move America forward.

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

It is too bad that we don't have a position called fact-checker on the floor. We could yield to the fact-checker every time something is misstated. If there were such a position here today, that person would be immensely busy.

For example, I think it is correct that student workers are exempted from the count, so to come here and talk about students, I think, misstates the facts.

The same is true of the story about the ACA would hurt workers, when the truth of the matter is this shift from 30 to 40 would indeed have a major impact in terms of people.

□ 1430

Let me read to you from the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, dated October 12, 2013:

Moreover, raising the law's threshold for full-time work from 30 hours a week to 40 hours would make a shift toward part-time employment much more likely, not less so. That's because only a small share of workers today, less than 8 percent, work 34 hours a week and, thus, are more at risk of having their hours cut below health reform's threshold.

In comparison, 43 percent of employees work 40 hours a week, and another several percent 41 to 44 hours a week. Thus, raising the threshold to 40 hours would place more than five times as many workers at risk of having their hours reduced.

That is the reality. And to come here and to say that what would happen if we don't pass this bill is that more people would have their hours reduced than if we pass the bill, that simply is not correct.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CANTOR), the House majority leader.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Indiana for his leadership in bringing this bill forward, the Save American Workers Act. It is today that I rise in support of the Save American Workers Act.

Mr. Speaker, every working American deserves a fair shot at climbing the economic ladder of success, and every wage earner deserves a chance to

live the American Dream. However, over the past few months, we have watched the President's health care law wreak havoc on working families and squeeze the middle class, who are already struggling to make ends meet.

As we all know, millions of people have seen their premiums and deductibles go up under the President's health care law, while others have been forced off the very plans they were promised they could keep. But that is not the full picture. Because of the 30-hour workweek provision in ObamaCare, wage earners could see their hours reduced, resulting in a 25 percent cut to their pay.

Now, let me just take a moment to explain exactly who might see their paychecks shrink. According to a study by the Hoover Institution, there are 2.6 million Americans especially at risk of having their wages cut. Of those 2.6 million, 59 percent are younger workers between the ages of 18 and 34, many of whom may be trying to save for college or for their first home; 63 percent are women, many of them single moms trying to support their children. The median household income for families most at risk from harm under this ObamaCare regulation is just over \$29,000. That is the median household income most at risk.

The bottom line is this: the workers most affected by these cuts are those who earn the least. For someone who currently earns \$10 an hour and works 40 hours a week, being cut to 29 hours means a loss of \$110 each and every week. Three out of four Americans are already claiming they are working paycheck to paycheck. A 25 percent cut to their income would have a devastating effect. This is not how America should work.

While this rule will impact Americans in all different industries, those who are most likely to be affected work in retail, restaurants, manufacturing, and even America's education sector.

In my hometown of Richmond, many school districts have begun to limit part-time workers to less than 30 hours a week to avoid added costs imposed by the advent of this health care law and would thus strain their budgets.

A substitute teacher named Amy, from Chesterfield County, Virginia, was asked by the Richmond Times-Dispatch about the burdens of this rule under ObamaCare, and she said: "The people that it is going to affect are the people that need or want to work every single day."

So why is the government punishing those who are looking to earn an honest wage?

This administration believes that they can hide the reality of the wage cuts with an increase in the minimum wage. But that proposal, which the nonpartisan experts say will result in 500,000 lost jobs, is not the answer. The answer is restore the 40-hour workweek and let people work.

We have known for a long time that the President's health care law was

broken, but now it is beginning to break the backs of American workers. Our constituents don't deserve this broken law or more broken promises. They deserve a fair shot at success without the government standing in the way.

Today, we have an opportunity to unclench this middle class squeeze and restore the 40-hour workweek so that wage earners don't have to worry about smaller paychecks. So let's stand together, in a bipartisan fashion, and take a big step towards creating an America that works again—and works again for everyone.

I would like to thank Chairman CAMP, Representative YOUNG, and the rest of the Ways and Means Committee for their hard work on this issue, and I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support working families by passing this legislation.

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

I knew the majority would come here and talk about the middle class. They are trying to escape from their failure to help take action to provide jobs for middle class Americans.

They also, by the way, so far haven't helped out to provide the continuation of the unemployment insurance for hundreds of thousands of people, so many in the middle class, who have lost their jobs.

Look, I quoted from CBO, and I guess I will have to quote again. This is in February. "In CBO's judgment, there is no compelling evidence that part-time employment has increased as a result of the ACA."

I will quote again from this study of the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, and it is headed this way: "Health reform not causing significant shift to part-time work, but raising threshold to 40 hours a week would make a sizable shift likely."

I quoted why they say that because the number of people who are working 40 hours or thereabouts, that number is so much larger than those who are working 30 hours or thereabouts; and so any employer who wanted, essentially, to shift the burden from them to others, they are more likely to do it under this bill than under the present circumstance. That is the reason why it has been said by CBO that it would force 1 million people out of employer-based health insurance, and it would add \$74 billion to the deficit since it is not offset.

You haven't refuted a single one of those statements. If they are not true, I would like you to say so. I would like you to say CBO is wrong, and also wrong when they say it would increase the number of uninsured by half a million people.

Those are three CBO statements. They stand here to refute the myths that are being brought here in defense of this bill.

So you raise the middle class banner. At the same time, you essentially, with this bill, would take away health insur-

ance from many, many, many, many, many middle class citizens. That is what you would be doing here.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would remind Members to address their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PAULSEN), a distinguished member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. PAULSEN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, it has been said before, the more we learn about the President's health care law, the more the facts show it is hurting more people than it is helping. The latest development now is the law's 30-hour rule is forcing some companies to scale back hours with more part-time jobs and less full-time jobs, so that those employees that have good full-time jobs are now having to go to part-time jobs.

Mr. Speaker, I met with a small business owner. He owns seven different restaurants. And I know that a lot of folks think that people in the restaurant industry, they only employ part-time workers, but 41 percent of his workers he employs full-time. But because of the new law, where now 30 hours is the standard being considered full-time work, he is being forced to lower the work hours for those employees, nearly all of them, to 29 hours or less. That absolutely makes no sense. These reduced hours are now going to force a 25 percent reduction in pay for those workers. Many will now have to go out and find a second part-time job just to make up for the hours that they lost.

Another small business owner I talked to from Minnesota, he was imploring me when he contacted me: please, Congress needs to correct the 30-hour rule so that it reflects his workforce's needs and his employees' desire to have more flexible hours. He said, if it's not addressed by Congress soon, there will be disruptions in the workforce, and the flexible work options for his employees could disappear altogether.

The 30-hour work rule is negatively impacting restaurateurs, manufacturers, and even our schools, as was mentioned earlier, Mr. Speaker. We should be removing these barriers to work. We should not punish employees who want to work more, and we should be helping American workers.

So let's pass this legislation. It will restore some common sense and a common understanding in America that full-time work is 40 hours. It will pass with bipartisan support.

I commend the gentleman for his leadership on this issue for getting Americans back to work.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would like to also indicate the fact that I, too, have read the Congressional Budget Office's estimate of this legislation. They indicate that \$75 billion in wages will be lost as a result of the Affordable Care Act if something like the Save American Workers Act isn't implemented.

So, effectively, I hear some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle making the case that we ought to be funding the Affordable Care Act essentially on the backs of these hourly workers, and I don't think that is a position anyone wants to find themselves in.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SALMON).

Mr. SALMON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, it is interesting, as we throw all these numbers around, I guess they mean a lot on the floor debate, but to the real people that are suffering, they don't really mean anything.

There is an old adage that says there are lies, damn lies, and statistics. We are throwing numbers around here like they matter, but the fact is there are real people's lives that are being hurt, being destroyed.

In fact, I read an article just a few months ago that the community college where I met my wife is actually notifying 1,300 employees, 700 of them that were adjunct professors, that their hours are going to be reduced, and they are being reduced because of this law. They are being hurt.

I guess we can quote them a statistic to tell them: go on your merry way. I know you can't pay for your mortgage. I know you can't make your car payment. You can't pay for your child's college education, but we got this great statistic that we just got out of Congress that ought to make you feel better about your life.

The fact is we ought to be more concerned about individuals than we are throwing numbers around.

I understand CBO also said that total implementation of ObamaCare would cost \$2.1 trillion. The fact is we can use statistics to say just about whatever we want them to say, but real people's lives are being hurt; and we have a responsibility here in this body to do everything that we can to try to raise the lifestyle in this country, not degrade it.

People are losing their jobs. My son lost his insurance because of ObamaCare. He was one of that small percentage—again, a statistic—that we were quoted, but the fact is he lost his insurance. Now he just told us that he is having his third child. The first two children were delivered by a doctor that they know and trust, but because of ObamaCare, their doctor is not covered under their new policy. To add insult to injury, when he went on the exchange to sign up, after he was told that his policy was no longer covered because of ObamaCare, his premiums went up from \$450 a month to \$850 a month. That is hardly helping people.

I think that it is safe to note, this law was passed without one Republican, and it is time that we stopped our high horse of statistics and actually care about people.

□ 1445

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

Mr. Speaker, if you care about people you should be for the ACA. Seven million people have been enrolled in private plans through the ACA marketplaces, 7 million-plus. And millions—we will get the figures—now have coverage under Medicaid. That is lots of millions of people, and you come forth with an individual case?

In many cases, I don't know your instance, these cases have turned out to be incorrect. They have been put in political ads, and they have been refuted.

I now want to read the Statement of Administration Policy from the President:

The administration strongly opposes House passage of H.R. 2575, the Save American Workers Act—it should be the so-called Save American Workers Act—because it would significantly increase the deficit and reduce the number of Americans with employer-based health insurance. Rather than attempting once again to repeal the Affordable Care Act, which the House has tried to do over 50 times, it is time for the Congress to stop fighting old political battles and join the President in an agenda focused on providing greater economic opportunity and security for middle class families and all those working to get into the middle class.

This legislation would weaken the provision of the Affordable Care Act that keeps employers from dropping health insurance coverage and shifting the cost to taxpayers. According to the Congressional Budget Office, it would increase the budget deficit by \$73.7 billion over the 2015 to 2024 period. Moreover, the proposed change would reduce the number of people receiving employer-based coverage by about 1 million, while increasing the number of uninsured.

The Affordable Care Act gives people greater control over their own health care. Since October 1, over 7 million have signed up for insurance in the health insurance marketplaces. Because of the Affordable Care Act, Americans who have previously been denied coverage due to a preexisting condition now have access to coverage. Additionally, the law helps millions of Americans stay on their parents' plan until age 26 and provides access to free preventive care like cancer screenings that catch illness early on.

While the administration welcomes ideas to improve the law, H.R. 2575 would undermine it by shifting costs to taxpayers and causing employers either to drop or to not expand health insurance coverage.

“If the President”—and this is underlined—“were presented with H.R. 2575 he would veto it.”

With that very effective, I think so convincing statement—I hope all listen to it—I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I cannot believe what I just heard. I heard that individual cases ought not be cited, that that is somehow off limits.

Mr. Speaker, one of my colleagues just cited the example of his son, lost his insurance despite the promises of

this bill during campaign season. He lost his doctor. He saw his insurance premiums and copays go up. These are real lives we are talking about. These are real hours and real wages that we are trying to remedy. This is a real 40-hour workweek that people depend upon.

Then to cite the Statement of Administration Policy as somehow being more authoritative than these personal examples I find, frankly, a bit off-putting.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KLINE), the chairman of the Education and the Workforce Committee.

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

It was pointed out by the chairman in the House Education and the Workforce Committee, as the name suggests, the committee has broad jurisdiction over policies affecting our Nation's classrooms and workplaces. It goes without saying that both face difficult challenges today.

Budget constraints continue to plague States, school districts, and institutions of higher education, straining their ability to effectively serve students. Workers and job creators are still struggling in a persistently anemic economy, making it difficult for many Americans to pay the bills and provide for their families.

Unfortunately, the health care law is making things worse. Thanks to the President's government-run scheme, full-time jobs are being destroyed, not created. Health care costs are going up, not down; and millions of individuals are losing the health care plan they like—an example of which we just heard earlier—instead of keeping it as promised.

This reality isn't limited to private businesses. It is a reality unfolding in schools, colleges, and universities across the country. Recent headlines confirm in stark detail how the President's health care law is hurting our education system.

From The Washington Free Beacon: “Alabama schools face shortage of substitute teachers due to ObamaCare.”

From The Weekly Standard: “Hours cut for 200 North Carolina teachers due to ObamaCare.”

And just in case my friends from the other side of the aisle would accuse me of selecting only conservative publications, from The New York Times: “Public sector capping part-time hours to skirt health care law.”

Aside from press reports, we have also heard firsthand accounts of how ObamaCare is making it harder for school leaders to meet the needs of students. In December, the committee asked the public to share personal stories about the effects of the health care law on local classrooms and campuses.

Helieanna, from Saint Anthony, Minnesota, described her dream to teach at the school she once attended as a student. While that dream may have come

true, she wrote that her financial situation is less stable than it was before the health care law.

Kate, from Hemet, California, informed the committee that her community college would have to restrict workers' hours, noting this impacts our ability to properly serve students.

Secretary Sebelius once dismissed concerns about jobs lost and hours cut under ObamaCare as "speculation." Yet for Helianna, Kate, and countless others, the health care law is wreaking havoc on their families, their livelihood, and their schools. It is time to do something about it.

By restoring the traditional standard of full-time work, the Save American Workers Act will help restore workers' hours and allow them to earn the wages they deserve. Just as important, the legislation will provide relief for schools grappling with a flawed health care law.

Congress should not stand by while teachers have their hours cut and students receive diminished access to educational opportunities, all because of bad policies out of Washington.

Certainly I urge my colleagues to provide relief for our Nation's workplaces and classrooms by supporting the Save American Workers Act. I would point out, as my colleague did, that taking the administration's Statement of Administrative Policy as definitive here defies, frankly, all logic.

There is no one in America who would be surprised that the President doesn't want changes to his law, unless he unilaterally makes those changes, because after all, Mr. Speaker, if you like your health care plan, you can keep your health care plan—unless you can't. If you like your doctor, Mr. Speaker, you can keep your doctor—except when you can't.

Before I yield back my time, I would like to thank the Ways and Means Committee for their excellent work on this legislation, and I would like to take a moment to recognize my friend and colleague, DAVE CAMP, who announced earlier this week his plan to retire. During more than 20 years of service, Chairman CAMP has been a distinguished Member, a dedicated reformer, and tireless champion of working families. We are going to miss him. I wish him all the best.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the balance of our time today be managed by the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL), a member of the committee.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RANGEL. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LYNCH).

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York for yielding.

I rise today in opposition to this bill, the so-called Save American Workers Act, and to speak in support of work-

ing men and women of this great country. I am here today and every day, not only as a Member of Congress, but as someone who knows what it is like to work for a living.

As someone who for 18 years as an ironworker strapped on a pair of work boots during boom times and down economies, I know what it is like to stand in an unemployment line when my local shipyard closed and when our auto plant shut down.

Mr. Speaker, I am part of the American workforce. Like many of my colleagues, I represent hundreds of thousands of hard-working people who struggle every day to make ends meet. That is why I am deeply offended that the Republican leadership of this House, the people's House, has the temerity to refer to any of their efforts in the context of saving the American worker.

Now, the simple fact is that during my time in Congress the actions of my colleagues, especially the Republican leadership, have spoken loudly to the contrary. It is impossible in the time allowed to me to cover all the anti-worker efforts that the Republican majority has undertaken since I have been in Congress. They have continually tried to roll back prevailing wage laws and workers' rights and protections that have been in place since the 1930s. They tried to cripple the National Labor Relations Board, put in place in 1935 to protect American workers.

Their attacks on the Federal workforce are ceaseless, freezing pay and cutting benefits, and demoralizing our hard-working men and women in government. The Republican leadership has opposed equal pay for women; they have opposed raising the minimum wage; they have opposed employee non-discrimination legislation. In fact, they won't even bring some of those bills for a vote.

As we struggle to recover from the worst economic downturn since the Great Depression, the Republican leadership has refused to extend emergency unemployment benefits to the long-term unemployed, many of whom use that money just to put food on the table while they search for work.

Now the Republican majority has the audacity to put forward a bill they call the Save American Workers Act. We have got to save the American worker from you. That is who we need to be saving them from.

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

Mr. RANGEL. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, and I thank the Speaker for his indulgence.

The bill before us today is more of the same. According to the Congressional Budget Office, the bill will add \$74 billion to the Federal deficit, force 1 million more people to lose employer-covered health care, and leave 500,000 completely uninsured.

According to a study released by the University of California Berkley, this

bill will cause 6.5 million workers to lose more hours. This bill, like so many others offered by my colleagues from across the aisle, is not crafted to save the American worker. It is crafted to increase the profits of large employers while workers continue to struggle.

Perhaps this bill should be named the "Save American CEO Act." It is the height of hypocrisy, that after all their efforts to harm the American worker my colleagues should have the audacity to even offer a bill entitled "Save American Workers Act."

We all know and realize that we need to save the American worker from the Republican leadership. That is what we need to do. So I urge my colleagues to continue to oppose these efforts to destroy the middle class and sabotage the American worker and the American family.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. ROE), a member of the Education and Workforce Committee.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, this bill would repeal ObamaCare's mandate on employers to provide insurance to all employees working at least 30 hours per week and would instead restore the traditional 40-hour standard. Everywhere I go, I hear concerns about the lack of jobs and the need for job creation. Tennessee's unemployment rate is still near 7 percent. We need to be doing everything possible to encourage employers to not only create jobs, but to maintain current jobs.

That is why the 30-hour standard makes no sense. Employers are already struggling to make their budgets work in the stagnant Obama economy. We all know how the employers are forced to respond: by cutting hours or hiring fewer workers. There is concrete evidence this is already happening, not just in the private sector. In my own hometown, Johnson, Tennessee, where I was mayor before I came here, the city school system been forced to keep approximately 200 employees, including substitute teachers, below the 129 hours a month.

□ 1500

This hurts the families that count on that income and the schoolchildren that benefit from the efforts of these adults.

President Obama's case for defending this flawed law is built on a false premise: that there is no other way to help individuals who cannot afford health insurance or who have been affected by a catastrophic illness or disease.

Mr. Speaker, I have spent my entire adult life as a physician taking care of people from all walks of life. I want every American to have access to an affordable health care plan, and I have worked since I arrived in Congress to develop patient-centered solutions to help people afford health care, like H.R. 3121, the American Health Care Reform Act.

There are ways to reach this goal without creating massive new bureaucracies, spending \$2 trillion, weakening the doctor-patient relationship, or increasing premiums for millions of hardworking Americans, but the President won't even engage in a conversation. So, in the meantime, we must do everything we can to protect the American people from this law. That is why I encourage my colleagues to support this bill.

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

I think, Mr. Speaker, this is about the 52nd time that the Republican majority has attempted to either repeal or derail the Affordable Care Act. I don't know why they do it so often since constitutionally it is abundantly clear that they don't have the votes to pass it in the Senate, and clearly, if it ever reached the President's desk, it would be vetoed, and there are not enough votes to override the veto. So, clearly, this madness continues even after more than enough people have enrolled, far beyond those that were expected by some of the Republicans. And this struggle, this madness, goes on as though Democrats are the only people that are going to become sick and need health care.

So I don't know where we go from here. I assume that comes the next election, once again, the voters will speak out. And for those people that have had kids on their insurance policy, we will hear from them; for those who have had preconditions and couldn't get health insurance, we will hear from them; for those that thought that getting preventive health care was a luxury, we should hear from them; but, more importantly, the people who just could not afford insurance. I cannot conceive how these people are all Democrats, in that the Republicans have no people that are vulnerable to illnesses and the severe expenses that are involved.

But, clearly, it has been my opinion that if this bill doesn't work, if it fails, and if some of these tactics had been successful, that the Democrats would be embarrassed by its failure. But I also thought—and it makes a lot of sense to me—that if, indeed, the American people started to understand the complexities of the bill and thought they were in need of health insurance, as close to 10 million people feel, then the Republicans would have to defend their negative position as to why they fight so hard to deny people health insurance.

So I understand from Mr. LYNCH that the bill is named after workers. So that brings me to include a letter for the RECORD from the AFL/CIO. Clearly, this is not a management outfit but really supports the workers, and they, of course, are opposed to this bill that is drafted to go nowhere.

In addition to that, I include for the RECORD, Mr. Speaker, a letter from the AFSCME into the RECORD, which represents county and municipal employ-

ees, and they strongly oppose the legislation that the Republican majority has brought to the floor.

Lastly, I include for the RECORD a letter from the National Education Association that opposes this legislation.

Before I reserve the balance of my time, I would like to join in with the majority that has complimented the work of Chairman DAVID CAMP. His announcement surprised most of us, but I don't think in his challenge that he has really proven his chairmanship to be all that we expected from him and then some. I regret the Republicans have passed over his opportunity to reform the tax law, but, then again, the chairman's tax reform law made too much sense for anybody to think that it would be picked up by the Republican majority. But it was a bill that would be great for discussion; it was hard hitting; it provided a lot of savings; and it reduced the rates.

So I don't know why before he leaves that we couldn't have this taken up, but it is my understanding that the gift that was given to him by his majority was just to allow him to present his draft. I think that is unfortunate because, if ever there was a time we need to reform the tax laws, it would be now. So I congratulate Chairman CAMP for his attempt to introduce this to the House, and I regret that the Republican majority has, out of hand, rejected it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR  
AND CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS,

*Washington, DC, January 28, 2014.*

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the AFL-CIO, I am writing to express our strong opposition to the Save American Workers Act (H.R. 2575) sponsored by Congressman Todd Young and the Forty Hours is Full Time Act (H.R. 2988) introduced by Representative Dan Lipinski.

Both of these bills would weaken the employer responsibility requirements of the Affordable Care Act (ACA) by increasing to 40 hours per week the threshold at which employers are required to either offer coverage or pay a penalty. Contrary to the intent of this legislation, economic data show that raising the threshold would cause more employers to reduce the hours of their workers, and it would result in millions of working families losing employment-based insurance coverage.

As the Ways and Means Committee examines these issues in a hearing this week, and as discussions continue, the House should instead seek to strengthen the employer responsibility requirements of the ACA by lowering the hours threshold, requiring employers to provide coverage for workers who work 20 hours a week or more, and by applying a pro rata shared responsibility penalty if workers with fewer than 20 hours are not offered coverage. This is the only way to protect groups of workers—such as low-wage employees, school staff, and adjunct professors—that will lose wages under the existing incentive to reduce hours.

Unfortunately, the ACA's employer responsibility requirements do not adequately sanction employers that drop coverage or decline to offer affordable, comprehensive coverage. The \$2,000 penalty for not offering coverage to a full-time employee pales in comparison to the average annual cost of single

coverage, which was \$5,884 in 2013. The ACA's extension of Medicaid eligibility to the uninsured will tempt low road employers to move lower-income employees into the program, since the law has no penalty to discourage employers from shifting the responsibility for covering these workers. In the construction industry, where the vast majority of firms have fewer than 50 employees, there is no penalty for companies that fail to provide coverage, creating a competitive disadvantage for employers that do provide coverage. A true "employer mandate" would address these issues and other weaknesses in the employer requirements.

The bills introduced by Representatives Young and Lipinski would take the ACA in the opposite direction, compounding the problem they seek to solve. A December 2013 analysis by the UC Berkeley Center for Labor Research and Education found that the approach employed by this legislation—moving the threshold for coverage from 30 hours to 40 hours—would result in reduced work hours for three times as many workers (6.5 million) compared to the number vulnerable to a reduction of hours at the current threshold (2.3 million).

The researchers also found that the approach would "effectively eliminate" the employer shared responsibility requirement, because employers could cut workers to 39 hours or less with relatively little cost. Pointing to the Congressional Budget Office estimate that one million workers will lose job-based coverage as a result of the Administration's one-year delay in implementing the current employer responsibility rules, the researchers warned that making the "employer requirement effectively non-binding on a permanent basis" would cause many more workers to lose employment-based coverage. The responsibility for covering this group would shift from employers to the federal government, incurring substantial new costs. Instead, the authors recommend that the incentive to reduce hours created by the 30-hour cliff could be addressed by applying the employer requirement to part-time workers and by pro rating the penalty for these workers.

The AFL-CIO endorses this kind of approach. We seek a full penalty for employers that fail to provide affordable, comprehensive coverage to workers averaging 20 hours a week or more. A pro-rated penalty should apply if adequate coverage is not provided to employees working less than 20 hours. This policy would eliminate the cliff imposed by the current 30-hour threshold, rather than simply shifting it higher and creating a new incentive for employers to reduce hours.

We look forward to working with you to strengthen the employer responsibility rules of the ACA, by extending coverage requirements to part-time workers and bolstering requirements related to the affordability and comprehensiveness of coverage. Achieving the coverage goals of the Affordable Care Act will depend upon maintaining employer responsibility for providing coverage to working families.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM SAMUEL,  
*Director,*  
*Government Affairs Department.*

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF STATE,  
COUNTY AND MUNICIPAL EMPLOYEES, AFL-CIO,

*Washington, DC, February 3, 2014.*

HOUSE WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE,  
*House of Representatives,*  
*Washington, DC.*

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the 1.6 million members of the American, Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees, I am writing to express our strong opposition to the Save American Workers Act

(H.R. 2575), sponsored by Rep. Todd Young and the Forty Hours is Full Time Act (H.R. 2988), sponsored by Rep. Dan Lipinski.

Both of these bills would weaken employer responsibility requirements of the Affordable Care Act (ACA) by increasing to 40 hours per week, the threshold at which employers are required to either offer coverage or pay a penalty. Based on research described in testimony to the Committee last week, three times as many workers would be at risk of a reduction in hours if one of these bills became law. Rather than resolve any problems that may exist, these bills would make them worse.

Financing our health care system must be a shared responsibility. While our health care system is based on employer-provided coverage, some employers are shirking their responsibility. Instead of making it easier for employers to do so, the ACA should be strengthened to ask more from employers. We urge the Committee to approve legislation that would require employers to provide coverage for those working 20 hours or more, or pay a penalty. A pro-rated penalty should apply for workers who put in fewer than 20 hours per week.

Today, we urge you to oppose legislation to raise the hour's threshold to 40.

Sincerely,

CHARLES M. LOVELESS.

NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION,

Washington, DC, February 4, 2014.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the 3 million members of the National Education Association, and the students they serve, we urge you to vote NO on the Save American Workers Act of 2013 (H.R. 2575), scheduled to be voted on in committee today. We oppose the bill because we believe it would create a disincentive for employers to provide health care coverage, negatively impacting employer sponsored health insurance and harming families, children and educators who need coverage.

We believe that the Affordable Care Act's shared responsibility for employers, sometimes referred to as the employer penalty, supports the overall goal of expanding quality, affordable coverage to all Americans.

We are concerned that this bill's changes to the ACA's definition of what constitutes full-time employment from "on average at least 30 hours of service per week" monthly to an average of 40 hours per week monthly would adversely affect overall employer-sponsored health coverage. It also may lead to higher costs to the federal government as workers are passed off to exchanges and potentially become eligible for premium tax credits and cost-sharing reductions.

Additionally, if employer-based coverage is reduced, an even greater number of low-income individuals and their families in the 25 states that have refused to expand Medicaid will be unable to afford buying health benefits. In those states, childless adults whose incomes fall below 100 percent of the federal poverty line will not only be denied access to Medicaid coverage, but they will be ineligible for premium tax credits and cost-sharing reductions through a health insurance marketplace (exchange). Moving the full-time definition from 30 hours to 40 hours, as this bill does, would only expand the number of people hurt by this coverage gap.

We believe the bill misses the mark by substituting "40 hours" for "30 hours" because it would do nothing to stop employers' misuse of the ACA's employer penalty provisions as a justification for cutting employees' hours. Experience with this portion of the ACA shows that one of the biggest implementation challenges in the education sector consists of making sure that employers and other health plan sponsors fully understand

the law's provisions related to shared responsibility for employers. For years, we have engaged with the Department of the Treasury and Internal Revenue Service to ensure that regulations on shared responsibility for employers work consistently well in the education sector, and believe regulators have taken important steps to correct this.

The changes contemplated in H.R. 2575, however, would simply shift the hours-related context in which these common errors take place:

Mistakenly believing that the only way to avoid employer penalties is to cut employees' hours to under 30 a week or to under six hours a day;

Misunderstanding how and when to use proposed regulations related to an optional hours-counting method called the look-back measurement method;

Overestimating the potential cost of complying with the law's provisions on shared responsibility for employers; and

Failing to incorporate into decision-making the statutory and regulatory provisions that ensure that this part of the ACA establishes possible penalties on large employers rather than an "employer mandate."

These and other ACA-implementation errors can lead to exaggerated responses that hurt students, workers, and families alike. Unfortunately, H.R. 2575 would just shift the hours-related focal point for such errors.

Employers who take the time to understand the law and regulations as they currently stand can develop common sense, constructive, and consensual approaches to properly implementing the law.

Again, we urge you to vote NO on H.R. 2575. We would welcome the opportunity to work with the committee on this issue.

Sincerely,

MARY KUSLER,

Director of Government Relations.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I would like to acknowledge that to get a bill this far in the legislative process requires the work of a lot of people: my own staff within my office, the committee staff, and my fellow colleagues who are willing to provide a consultative role, constructive advice, and a very strong leadership role.

So, with that, I am very happy to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan, TIM WALBERG, who helped us introduce this bill. He is a member of the Education and the Workforce Committee.

Mr. WALBERG. I thank the gentleman. I thank you for your leadership.

Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to stand here in support of this legislation—good legislation—that will help people in my district in Michigan, a hard-hit State because of economic problems and, I think, bad, bad efforts and policies from an administration that didn't understand that workers who are encouraged to work to their fullest extent produce an economy.

It is hard to take seriously the objections of the Democrat side of the aisle here when they talk about the middle class, they talk about employees and their efforts to help them, a party who enshrines the minimum wage and unemployment insurance as the golden grail of what grows an economy. I find that absurd.

It is a party who has decimated the middle class in the last 6 years with

policies including what we are discussing today. Moving from 40 hours to 30 hours as full-time worker requirements? I don't get it.

We also understand it is the same party that told us, if you like your insurance, you can keep it—no. If you like your doctor, you can keep it—no. If you like your hospital, you can keep it—no. And now we hear their objection that basically says, if you like your job, you can keep it—no.

Back in September, before this ill-advised law took place, Janet from Jackson, Michigan, called my office in tears, a 56-year-old mother of three, single parent, who had just been told that morning by her job provider in home health care—a very valuable field of service—that she no longer would be working 36 hours, which was her normal working hour opportunity, and was being moved back to 28 because of what? The Affordable Care Act requirements. And so she said to my office staff, in tears:

How am I now going to make it when I was making it on 36 hours at that job, supplementing that with a waitress job on the weekend, and I was paying my mortgage and my insurance, and now I am going to be asked to pay for all that on 28 hours? I am 56 years old. Where am I going to get another job?

That is what is being produced by this. We want to give Janet the opportunity to have her 36 hours back. We want to give Jim, Jerry, and Joan, and all the rest of the people, the opportunity to have the fullest hours they can possibly have in an America that grows the middle class and gives opportunity for success.

Mr. RANGEL. I just don't know what part of the Constitution the gentleman doesn't understand, but the truth of the matter is that this law passed the House of Representatives, passed the Senate, was signed into law, and verified by the United States Supreme Court, and still we hear people yelling at the darkness that we should repeal it.

Now, there are ways to do these things, but one thing is abundantly clear: the way we have been going about this, the 52 parliamentary opportunities that the House has had, this doesn't work. And so if you tried something 51 times, it would seem to me, unless somebody is putting something in the water on the other side of the aisle, that we will try something else like try to repair it, try to fix it, try in a bipartisan way to see where we agree that changes could be made to make it easier for employers and employees. But this barking at the Moon, to me, is just a waste of taxpayers' money and time.

How many speakers do we have, and how much time do we have remaining, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HULTGREN). The gentleman from New York has 62 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Indiana has 64 minutes remaining.

Mr. RANGEL. How many speakers does the gentleman have? I only have two speakers.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. We have six speakers on this side.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I would like to include in the RECORD a letter of support for the Save American Workers Act, the bipartisan bill, by the National Restaurant Association.

Mr. Speaker, I also now yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON), a member of the Education and the Workforce Committee.

NATIONAL RESTAURANT ASSOCIATION,  
Washington, DC, April 1, 2014.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the National Restaurant Association, the leading trade association representing the restaurant and foodservice industry, I write to urge you to vote YES in favor of H.R. 2575, the "Save American Workers Act," when it is considered on the House floor this week. The National Restaurant Association may consider any votes on, or related to, such legislation in our annual "How They Voted" legislative scorecard.

H.R. 2575 would reinstate the historic definition of full-time as working 40 hours per week. The law's definition of full-time set at 30 hours could have lasting impacts on the labor market, far beyond the Affordable Care Act, with the unintended consequence of potentially limiting hours for workers who do not intend to rely on their employer for their insurance needs.

One reason so many Americans are drawn to restaurant and foodservice industry jobs is the flexibility to build a work schedule or change hours to suit their personal needs. Generally, most restaurant operators have classified positions as salaried and hourly, not full- or part-time. Previously, hourly workers were able to take on extra shifts as available and as they chose to work. However, under this law, there is now a bright line as to who is considered full-time and who is considered part-time. As a result, the flexibility so many enjoy and seek out in working for the industry may become harder to find.

In its analysis of the legislation, the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) acknowledged employers' commitment to offering coverage to employees and projects that only a small percentage of employers would either reassign or reduce hours of employees who work more than 40 hours per week. More than 156 million people would continue to be covered by employer-sponsored plans, underscoring the CBO's conclusion that "most of the affected employers would continue to offer coverage because most employers construct compensation packages to attract the best available workers at the lowest possible cost."

Aligning the law's definition of full-time employee status with current levels used by restaurant and foodservice operators would help avoid any unnecessary disruptions to employees' wages and hours, and would provide significant relief to employers. The National Restaurant Association supports H.R. 2575 and encourages you to vote YES when it is considered on the House floor.

Sincerely,

SCOTT DEFIFE,  
Executive Vice President,  
Policy and Government Affairs.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Thank you, Congressman YOUNG, for yielding.

As an original cosponsor, I am very grateful for Chairman JOHN KLINE and Congressman TODD YOUNG for their thoughtful leadership on this very important issue with the Save American Workers Act.

ObamaCare is the saddest example of Big Government failure. The American people have lost their health care plans, access to their most trusted doctors, and been forced to pay significant premium increases for poorer coverage and higher deductibles.

On top of all of these broken promises, it is tragic for American families that the President's signature health care law will also destroy jobs. Every day, real constituents living in South Carolina's Second Congressional District reach out to me expressing frustration with this broken law. Jennifer, a true small business owner from Lexington, writes:

Keep trying to repeal ObamaCare at all costs. The employer mandate will cause my business to move full-time employees to part-time.

Dozens of actual people express these same sentiments and plead with Congress to provide relief. The National Federation of Independent Business, NFIB, was correct that ObamaCare will destroy 1.6 million jobs.

ObamaCare's 30-hour workweek rule is lowering wages for a significant portion of hardworking Americans, the very ones the President claims to champion.

On behalf of the millions of Americans who are receiving smaller paychecks and having to work multiple jobs, I urge my colleagues to support this bill and provide greater economic security and opportunity for those who need it the most.

Mr. RANGEL. At this time, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN), the former chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee that played such an important role in bringing this historic legislation to the floor and to the law.

□ 1515

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, this is an historic week for the economic security of the American people. After the unprecedented surge in enrollment, the Affordable Care Act has led to the largest expansion of health insurance coverage in half a century.

More than 7.1 million Americans have signed up for private coverage through the marketplaces. More than 3 million young adults are covered through their parents' plans, and millions more Americans are now covered through Medicaid or through private insurance purchased directly from an insurer.

According to an analysis by the Los Angeles Times, more than 9.5 million Americans who previously lacked health insurance now have coverage because of the Affordable Care Act.

These millions of Americans now have the peace of mind and economic security that comes with quality, af-

fordable health insurance, and every American knows that they will never be discriminated against because of a preexisting condition. These are historic achievements.

However, despite these reforms to our health system, the Affordable Care Act does not change the fact that the vast majority of Americans who have health insurance get it through their employer. In fact, the law strengthens the employer-sponsored insurance system.

It encourages larger employers to do the responsible thing and offer their employees affordable coverage. It ensures that workers get quality coverage and do not face harsh annual limits on their coverage.

The bill before us today, however, weakens the employer-sponsored insurance system and hurts American workers. The Congressional Budget Office has indicated that the bill would cause 1 million Americans to lose their employer coverage.

CBO found that the bill will cause half a million Americans to become uninsured, and CBO found that the bill will cost taxpayers nearly \$75 billion.

Republicans claim that all these costs are worthwhile because their legislation will keep workers from having their hours cut, but the fact is this bill is a solution in search of a problem.

CBO said it plainly:

There is no compelling evidence that part-time employment has increased as a result of the ACA.

Since the Affordable Care Act became law, we have added more than 8.6 million private sector jobs. After years of increasing part-time labor, the number of part-time workers today is actually lower than it was before the ACA was enacted. The flimsy justification for this bill just does not stand up to scrutiny.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the end of the ACA's first open enrollment period can be an opportunity for the Congress to change its approach to this law. More than 7 million Americans have signed up for coverage through health insurance marketplaces.

Tens of millions more will sign up in the months and years to come. Rather than pushing divisive legislation, let's come together to acknowledge the fact that millions of Americans getting covered is a great step forward for this Nation.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I submit for the RECORD a letter of support from the International Franchise Association for this bill, and I now yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUCSHON), a member of the Education and Workforce Committee.

INTERNATIONAL  
FRANCHISE ASSOCIATION,

Washington, DC, February 3, 2013.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the International Franchise Association, I write today to urge you to support H.R. 2575, the Save American Workers Act, sponsored by Rep. Todd Young (R-IN). This legislation will change the definition of a full-time employee in the Affordable Care Act (ACA) to 40

hours, the definition that employers have traditionally used to manage their workforce, and will help small businesses better adjust to the ACA's employer mandate.

For decades, employers have used the 40-hour work week as a standard for workforce management. The ACA's provision requiring employers to provide coverage to full-time employees, and defining full-time as 30-hours, will cause many employers to simply manage their part-time employees to fewer hours. Data from a recent Public Opinion Strategies survey commissioned by the IFA and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce shows that 31 percent of franchises and 12 percent of non-franchised businesses have already reduced worker hours to lower costs, a full year before the employer mandate is set to take effect. Not only has the employer mandate discouraged job creation and business expansion, it has also damaged existing jobs by including a misguided statutory requirement that discarded more than a half-century of established labor policy.

The employer mandate will hurt American workers in many ways, but one of the most devastating effects of the mandate is that fewer workers will be offered health insurance, and employees will be less able to afford their own coverage when working fewer hours. Allowing employers to manage their workers to the traditional 40-hour work week will give employees more flexibility and eliminate the need to revamp longstanding employer personnel policies.

IFA urges you to support the Save American Workers Act. This is a common-sense effort to a problem we know is only going to get worse. The passing of this bill would provide much-needed relief and flexibility for employers and employees by avoiding the worst effects of the employer mandate.

While this measure will not make the Affordable Care Act completely workable for the 825,000 franchise locations nationwide or the 9 million workers they employ, it will help both employers and workers better absorb the impact of the employer mandate.

Sincerely,

STEPHEN J. CALDEIRA,  
President & Chief Executive Officer,  
International Franchise Association.

Mr. BUCSHON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of this legislation. Let's focus on schools in my district. Greencastle School Corporation was forced to cut the hours of 54 employees from full time to part time.

The Terre Haute School Corporation was forced to cut the hours of hundreds of employees. Many of them are bus drivers who are no longer allowed to provide transportation for afterschool activities.

Washington Greene County School Corporation was forced to cut the hours of 150 employees from 40 to 29 hours.

Eastern Greene County School Corporation announced that all of their employees who aren't receiving health insurance will have their hours cut to 28 hours a week.

Dubois County School was forced to reduce the hours for instructional assistants, cafeteria employees, and custodial staff.

Mr. Speaker, the vast majority of these employees already receive health insurance either through their spouse or other sources, and many of them have worked for their school corporation for many years.

School corporations don't have the luxury of raising taxes to pay for these

provisions of the Affordable Care Act. They are not a major business that can raise their prices.

School corporations simply can't afford the Affordable Care Act. These Hoosiers work every day with students, and because of this provision in the Affordable Care Act, our students will suffer.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support this legislation and urge my colleagues to vote in favor of it.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), our distinguished minority whip. Maybe after he expresses what makes common sense, our Republican friends may change their minds, and so I yield for the hard work he has done in this area, and good luck.

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I might say that the chairman in exile of the Ways and Means Committee and his confidence in my ability to change minds is wonderful, but probably overstated. I regret that, but I will try anyway.

The previous speaker said that people will be forced to reduce hours. Now, they will only be forced to reduce hours from 40 to 39, as opposed to 30 to 29. In other words, if you work 39 hours a week, you won't have to be covered.

You won't have to have health care insurance, and somebody else will pay their bill, maybe Medicaid, depending upon how much they make. Maybe all of us will pay that extra thousand dollars in our premium so the uninsured can be funded; or maybe the other employers who do, in fact, believe it is good to offer their employees health insurance, even though they only work 39 hours a week, somebody else will pay the bill.

That is what has been happening with employers who don't provide health care insurance. Their competitors who do are in an unfair position.

Why did we choose 30 hours a week? We chose 30 hours a week, Mr. Speaker, because in surveying the private sector employment field, we found that 29 hours was perceived to be the litmus test for 29 hours or less being part time; so we picked 30 hours, which was more than the average in the private sector.

Now, we have a bill that is the 52nd vote to repeal the Affordable Care Act, this obsession with undermining the access to affordable, quality health care by the American people.

This bill changes the definition of full-time employee in a way that would make approximately 1 million Americans lose their employer-sponsored coverage.

Do we care? Do 1 million Americans make a difference to us? Do 1 million Americans not having the availability of the assurance that they and their families have health coverage, does that matter to us?

Or are they all part of the 47 percent who aren't going to vote for some of us

anyway—the proposition is—so why worry about them?

In addition, it would increase the number of uninsured by as many as half a million people, and it would increase the deficit by \$74 billion. A million people lose their employer-sponsored care, half a million people would continue to be uninsured, and \$74 billion is the loss in revenue.

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

Mr. RANGEL. I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, this is because the legislation provides an incentive for some employers to redefine work hours, so that more employees would be categorized as part-time.

In other words, you work in the United States of America 39 hours, and you are part-time.

Under this bill, more than five times as many workers would be put at risk of having their employers just slightly reduce their hours to avoid providing them with health insurance.

That would be a change that subverts the goals of the Affordable Care Act, and it is not going to help grow our economy either; but more importantly, it subverts the quality of life, the confidence, the assurance, if you will, of millions of Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the defeat of this legislation. I urge us to confirm the fact that we believe Americans in the richest country on the face of the Earth ought to have access to affordable, quality health care and that everybody would participate in that objective.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, it is clear that this bill, the Affordable Care Act that the President calls ObamaCare, clearly would not insure every American in the country.

Dropping somebody from 39 hours down to 29 hours is effectively a loss of 10 hours of work per week. Over the course of a month, that is the loss of an entire week's work of wages.

For the life of me, I can't understand why the very same individuals who embraced all of the three dozen or so administrative changes to this law without hesitation will not work together in a bipartisan fashion because this is a bipartisan bill to restore the hours and income of those who need it most during the worst economy since the Great Depression.

With that, I am proud to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LANCE), a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. LANCE. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman YOUNG for his superb management of this bill and for his expertise in this area.

I rise today in support of H.R. 2575, the Save American Workers Act, which would change the health care law's definition of full-time employee from 30 hours per week to the traditional 40 hours per week.

That is 8 hours a day, times 5 days in the workweek, 40 hours, the traditional

workweek, empowering hardworking middle class men and women to earn additional wages otherwise denied to them under the health care law.

Not long ago, I spoke to a constituent from Basking Ridge, New Jersey, the congressional district I have the honor of representing, whose son works at a grocery store.

This young man was told he could only work 29 hours a week. Despite the company wanting him to work more and pay him more, it could not permit employees to exceed the health care law's arbitrary definition of full-time status. This young man from Basking Ridge must work less and earn less because of the health care law.

Too many Americans are experiencing significantly reduced wages and hours worked because of the law. H.R. 2575 will protect existing jobs by removing some of the uncertainty facing employers and employees and help America's job creators put people back to work.

I urge passage of H.R. 2575.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from New York for his leadership and years of service and his understanding of this issue.

I heard his debate on the floor of the House, which would drive many of us as Members of Congress to come and join you because of the literalness and the straightforwardness of your argument.

Frankly, I think that is the challenge we have this afternoon, wondering how many Americans even understand what we are doing because it is a numbers game. I have heard the stories of my colleagues, and I am absolutely empathetic, and I am sympathetic.

All of us have young people working, single parents working, husband and wife working. Maybe there are two working in a grocery store.

I think the problem with this legislation is that we are giving a pass to businesses who, in actuality, we are providing them with an opportunity to provide enhanced benefits to their hardworking workers.

□ 1530

This is a threshold question. The Affordable Care Act defined a full-time job as 30 hours. So it means that if you have 50 employees that are at 30 hours or above, you provide them with health insurance. But let me remind you, it is the Affordable Care Act. That means that these individuals, if you don't provide them, you have the opportunity to get into a pool or you can find insurance that fits that level of 50 workers. This does not apply if you have one worker; it doesn't apply if you have two workers. It is a threshold.

So what my friends are telling me is that, if you can afford 50 workers, you are dead broke. Then you have to take that 50th worker and drive him or her into the ground and leave them crawling out of your business at 29½ or 28 simply because you don't want to do the right thing. That is why this bill is so baffling.

In the Rules Committee, I offered two amendments to try to make it better to indicate that commuting time would be included as part of your 40 hours, or that we should delay this bill until we fully appreciate and understand the overall impact of whether or not it, in fact, undermines hardworking Americans who are in hardworking businesses. We are just passing this bill and have no clue as to whether or not this is going to be something that undermines businesses that have 50 employees.

Now, this is the backdrop of what they are doing. I even offered the point, Mr. RANGEL, of why not a tax incentive so that these businesses with 50 employees can keep the 50 employees at 30 hours and get a benefit for providing them with health insurance; and when I say that, one that is pointed to the fact that you have 50 employees and you are willing to give insurance. As it is now, we know that the individual employees will get tax relief.

But 7 million people have enrolled, Mr. Speaker. The fact that we had a record-breaking access to the Affordable Care Act, or interest, this bill seems to be the complete wrong direction to go. It is wrongheaded. I would ask my colleagues to vote against the bill that destroys the working people of America and puts them on their knees to work less hours.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 2575, the so-called "Save American Workers Act of 2014."

This bill represents the 52nd time that House Republicans have tried to scuttle or impede the Affordable Care Act and deny Americans the security that comes from having access to affordable, high-quality health care.

Their record to date is 0–51.

The Affordable Care Act, which has been passed by both the House and Senate, signed by President, upheld by the Supreme Court, and ratified by the voters in the 2012 presidential election, is here to stay.

It is long past time that House Republicans abandon their quixotic quest to derail a law that is bringing so much peace of mind to millions of Americans and will reduce the deficit by \$1 trillion.

The Affordable Care Act is working. For example, in my State of Texas:

1. 5,198,000 individuals on private insurance have gained coverage for at least one free preventive health care service such as a mammogram, birth control, or an immunization in 2011 and 2012. In the first eleven months of 2013 alone, an additional 1,683,800 people with Medicare have received at least one preventive service at no out of pocket cost.

2. The up to 10,695,000 individuals with pre-existing conditions such as asthma, cancer, or diabetes—including up to 1,632,000 children—will no longer have to worry about

being denied coverage or charged higher prices because of their health status or history.

3. Approximately 5,189,000 Texans have gained expanded mental health and substance use disorder benefits and/or federal parity protections.

4. 4,889,000 uninsured Texans will have new health insurance options through Medicaid or private health plans in the Marketplace.

5. As a result of new policies that make sure premium dollars work for the consumer, not just the insurer, in the past year insurance companies have sent rebates averaging \$95 per family to approximately 726,200 consumers.

6. In the first ten months of 2013, 233,100 seniors and people with disabilities have saved on average \$866 on prescription medications as the health care law closes Medicare's so-called "donut hole."

7. 357,000 young adults have gained health insurance because they can now stay on their parents' health plans until age 26.

8. Individuals no longer have to worry about having their health benefits cut off after they reach a lifetime limit on benefits, and since in January, 7,536,000 Texans will no longer have had to worry about annual limits, either.

9. Health centers have received \$293,038,000 to provide primary care, establish new sites, and renovate existing centers to expand access to quality health care. Texas has approximately 400 health center sites, which served about 1,079,000 individuals in 2012.

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

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

I offered two amendments to H.R. 2575 that would prevent this travesty but regrettably neither was made in order by the Rules Committee.

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

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

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

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

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

Our Nation has taken a momentous step in creating a mindset that health insurance is a personal responsibility with the enactment of

the Affordable Care Act. The law did not automatically enroll all citizens into the program because it was specifically designed to be an opt-in process.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I submit for the record a letter of support for the Save American Workers Act from the National Grocers Association on behalf of their members and on behalf of their workers, and I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROTHFUS).

NATIONAL GROCERS ASSOCIATION,  
Arlington, VA, March 31, 2014.

Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,  
Speaker, Washington, DC.

Hon. ERIC CANTOR,  
Majority Leader, Washington, DC.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,  
Democratic Leader, Washington, DC.

Hon. STENY HOYER,  
Democratic Whip, Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER BOEHNER, LEADER PELOSI, LEADER CANTOR, AND REPRESENTATIVE HOYER: The National Grocers Association (NGA) supports H.R. 2575, the Save American

Workers Act (SAW), a bill introduced by Representative Todd Young (R-IN) and championed by Representative Dan Lipinski (D-IL). The bill has broad support in the House, with 210 bipartisan co-sponsors. NGA strongly encourages the House to pass the bill with bipartisan support during the vote scheduled for the week of March 31. We commend Majority Leader Cantor for bringing H.R. 2575 to the Floor for what will hopefully be an overwhelming vote in support of the bill.

H.R. 2575 addresses one of the most problematic provisions of the Affordable Care Act (ACA) by amending the definition of a full-time employee, which the ACA currently defines as those averaging 30 hours a week. Left unchanged, this provision will have far reaching consequences on the independent supermarket industry. Simply put, 30 hours is not full-time and requiring employers to meet this new definition is one of the most significant challenges of the law, jeopardizing coverage for our true full-time workforce. The SAW Act seeks to amend this problematic provision by defining a full-time employee as those averaging 40 hours a week and treating full-time equivalents as full-time employees for the purposes of determining whether an employer is an applicable large employer. This is a win-win for both American employers and our nation's workforce.

Independent grocers face complex challenges in implementing the law all while operating on a profit margin of around 1 percent. They are committed to their workers, and 92% of independent grocers already provide health benefits to full-time employees. It is important that Congress work in a bipartisan manner to provide employers with important reforms such as the SAW Act before irreversible changes to the US job market occur. Maintaining the full-time level many employers use today is something both sides of the debate can agree would be better for job preservation and employee coverage. Reforms such as the SAW Act are vital to our businesses and to our goal of providing quality benefits and available hours to our employees. Independent retailers and wholesalers have a significant economic impact across nearly every community in America. Our industry is accountable for close to 1 percent of the nation's overall economy and is responsible for generating over \$131 billion in sales, 944,000 jobs, \$30 billion in wages, and \$27 billion in tax revenue. We are proud that the communities we serve are also the neighborhoods we live in.

Thank you for your support of this important issue. NGA looks forward to continuing to work with Congress to address this issue before the employer mandate is implemented in 2015. This is a critical issue for NGA and our member companies, and we will be key voting this vote and including it on our 2014 Legislative Scorecard. We remain appreciative of the reforms Congress has already made to amend the ACA to make the law workable for both employers and the American workforce.

Sincerely,

PETER J. LARKIN,  
President and CEO.

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, workers in western Pennsylvania and across the Nation are seeing their hours cut and wages reduced due to the employer mandate in President Obama's health care law. This mandate hurts our friends and neighbors who are working to provide for their families.

Last July, a mom working in the food service industry in Beaver County, Pennsylvania, told me about how her

hours had been cut nearly in half because of the employer mandate. Sadly, her story is not unique or an isolated incident.

Brian in Allegheny County, Pennsylvania, called the office to let me know that his daughter would have her hours cut at a bridal shop. She is yet another victim of this 30-hour workweek rule.

According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, the median hourly wage for someone working in sales in Pennsylvania was \$12.18 in 2013. Losing 10 hours a week will cost that worker almost \$6,000 annually.

Many small business owners want to add jobs and increase wages but cannot afford to because of the employer mandate. As Brandon from Ellwood City said: "Small companies like ours try to do the right thing for us. They probably won't be hiring someone who can really use a job."

Washington should be working to grow the economy and add jobs, not making it harder for employees to earn more and get ahead or for employers to hire more people. The Save American Workers Act will restore the traditional 40-hour workweek and help those who want the opportunity to work more hours and see their wages rise.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to stand in solidarity with these workers and support this legislation.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK).

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I congratulate Mr. YOUNG on his outstanding leadership in managing this bill, which is going to remove one of the most misguided and confusing provisions of the President's Affordable Care Act.

Everyone outside Washington knows that full time means 40 hours. Only Federal bureaucrats would try to redefine a commonly understood fact that is critical to millions of workers and employers nationwide.

The redefinition of full time to 30 hours under the health care law is not only confusing to hardworking Americans, it is confusing to the very government who changed the definition in the first place. Just last week, Mr. Speaker, news reports showed that on different forms of the Federal agencies and in different offices, full-time work was being described as 40 hours by some agencies, 30 hours by other departments, and 35 hours by still others.

By moving the goalposts on what is actually constituting full-time employment, this administration fundamentally changed the workplace for hourly workers, increasing the risk of lost hours and smaller paychecks for real people, for real workers, for real Americans who are losers under this law called ObamaCare.

The bipartisan Save American Workers Act, of which I am proud to cosponsor, is going to restore that 40-hour

workweek. I am proud to cosponsor it and urge my colleagues to support its passage.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I submit for the RECORD letters of support for the Save American Workers Act from The Associated General Contractors of America on behalf of their workers and their members, and also a letter by the National Franchise Association on behalf of their members and workers, and I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana (Mr. STUTZMAN), my colleague.

THE ASSOCIATED GENERAL  
CONTRACTORS OF AMERICA,  
Arlington, VA, February 3, 2014.

Re Support H.R. 2575, the Save American Workers Act of 2013

Hon. DAVE CAMP,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN CAMP: On behalf of the Associated General Contractors of America (AGC), I am writing in support of H.R. 2575, the Save American Workers Act of 2013. This act 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 the one-year delay of the reporting and enforcement provisions of the ACA, the law continues to add layers of administrative burdens for employers, while other regulations are yet to be issued. 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. 2575 and provide some relief for construction employers across the country.

Sincerely,

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

NATIONAL FRANCHISE ASSOCIATION, INC.,  
Kennesaw, GA, February 3, 2014.

Hon. DAVE CAMP,  
House Committee on Ways and Means.

DEAR CHAIRMAN CAMP: On behalf of thousands of BURGER KING® franchisees across the country, we would like to express our strong support for H.R. 2575, the Save American Workers Act of 2013, scheduled for mark-up in the Ways and Means Committee tomorrow.

The National Franchise Association (NFA) represents independent BURGER KING® restaurant entrepreneurs in the United States who operate more than 5,300 franchised restaurants and employ almost 200,000 individuals across the nation. The NFA works side by side with member franchisee regional organizations, system suppliers, business partners and Burger King Corporation to promote economic growth and prosperity.

The NFA strongly supports the Save American Workers Act, which amends "full-time" employment as defined in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act ("ACA") to working forty hours per week. The current 30-hour definition neither reflects current workplace standards nor the desire for flexible hours for both employers and employees in the Quick Service Restaurant (QSR) industry. By defining "full-time" as working 30 hours per week, our members may be forced to reduce hours, limit the number of full-time positions available and enforce rigid scheduling standards for their employees.

On behalf of thousands of small business owners, the NFA thanks you and the Ways and Means Committee for the opportunity to share our views. We look forward to working with you and the other members of this Committee to help small business owners create more jobs and grow their businesses.

Sincerely,

PETER J. COTTER,  
Chair, NFA Govern-  
ment Relations Com-  
mittee.

MISTY CHALLY,  
VP, Legislative Af-  
fairs.

Mr. STUTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman YOUNG for his hard work.

ObamaCare is waging a war on work. ObamaCare's 30-hour rule gives employers an awful choice: cut hours or pay new taxes.

Fort Wayne Community Schools, our State's largest school district, announced last year that they would cut 610 part-time workers after estimating a \$10 million cost of compliance with ObamaCare.

My constituent, Todd Hollman, the Vice President of Pizza Hut and KFC of Fort Wayne, writes this:

Due to ACA, our company has been forced to reduce the number of part-time employees or face even greater penalties than we already will. Even by reducing the number of newly defined full-time employees, we will still incur nearly a \$1 million penalty in 2015.

While the Obama administration has delayed the employer mandate, businesses are still bracing themselves for ObamaCare's inevitable impact. Hoosiers don't need a part-time economy. We deserve a full-throttled recovery. It is time to repeal ObamaCare's 30-hour definition of full employment.

I thank my friend and colleague, Mr. YOUNG, for his leadership on this issue, and I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2575. It is the right thing to do.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of H.R. 2575 is postponed.

#### AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CASTRO) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and in-

clude extraneous material on the subject of my Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Today, we are here to talk about the Affordable Care Act, and especially the big week that we have had in this country in making sure that millions of Americans will now enjoy access to quality, affordable health care.

Last week, we had a chance to talk about this and had other Members from all over the country who represent wonderful districts come forward and talk about how the Affordable Care Act has been very beneficial to their constituents. Part of the discussion last week and in the previous months, really since October, has been about whether Americans would accept the Affordable Care Act and how many people would enroll and how many States would expand Medicaid.

The numbers are very clear that, despite all of the advertisements and the millions of dollars that has been spent on television promoting misinformation about the Affordable Care Act, demonizing this as socialism and other bad things, that despite all of that, the American people have clearly rejected that narrative, that they believe the Affordable Care Act and what it is doing for this country are good things and that in the wealthiest nation on Earth, as we are, that people should be able to afford health care, that they should not be denied because of pre-existing conditions, that students should be able to stay on their parents' plans after college, and that Medicaid for low-income Americans should be made more readily available.

Let's look at some of those numbers. We know, for example, that 7.1 million people ended up signing up for the Affordable Care Act in the exchanges. Now, that is on top of the 3 million students who can now stay on their parents' plans because of this act. That is on top of all of the States that expanded Medicaid to make sure that folks who don't make a lot of money, the vast majority of these people working hard day in and day out, that they are going to be covered, too.

There are still about 19 States, including my home State of Texas, that have chosen not to expand Medicaid. That has been such an incredible blow to the people of my State. For example, we have the highest percentage of people in the Nation that have no health care coverage.

On Monday, I was back home in San Antonio and there was a large enrollment fair, as there was in many cities throughout the country on Monday. It was probably about 6, 7, and this fair was going to close at 8. So I went over to see how it was going and to say hello to folks. There was a long line of people waiting. Families were there, two and three and four and five family members. People brought their young kids to enroll them in insurance.