

and in energy—and even a United States Congressman.

So happy birthday, Ms. Lancaster.

In saluting her, I salute all of those teachers every day who are preparing the next generation of American leaders.

SAVE AMERICAN WORKERS ACT

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the subject of my Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, the President proposes a 25 percent increase in the minimum wage. ObamaCare, however, is resulting in as much as a 25 percent decrease in the pay of millions of hourly workers. Because of the 30 hours is full time provision, too many Americans are not able to work the hours they need to support their families. By passing my bill, the Save American Workers Act, we can create an America that works simply by restoring the traditional 40-hour workweek.

I am joined this evening in this Special Order by my colleagues, Representatives KELLY of Pennsylvania and BARR of Kentucky, but so many people have helped bring this important issue to the attention of the American people at large, to rank and file Americans, who during this down economy are looking for as many hours as they can get and for as much take-home pay as they might receive.

Let me just kick this evening off by explaining in some level of detail what this 30-hour provision is because, frankly, for the uninitiated, it is a bit foreign for most of us to consider full-time employment to be a 30-hour workweek, but that is the case under the Affordable Care Act. In fact, the Affordable Care Act mandates employers provide ObamaCare-sanctioned health insurance to all of their employees should they employ 50 or more individuals who work 30 or more hours per week.

We have all heard from employers about the adverse consequences—unintended, I expect—created by this 30 hours is full time provision. The unintended consequence is chiefly that so many employers, especially those who are squeezed by tight profit margins or those who just wouldn't be financially viable entities, are moving their employees down below this 30-hour threshold. They are reducing the number of hours that their hourly employ-

ees can work so that they don't have to provide ObamaCare-sanctioned health insurance.

The employer mandate has been delayed by the administration twice, so it is clear that this is ill-considered policy. While the White House says the delays are to help employers, it should be even more apparent to those of us who visit with our constituents on an almost daily basis that it is the low- and middle-income worker who is being most adversely impacted by this employer mandate.

The real result of the 30-hour bill—let me be clear—is fewer jobs, reduced hours, reduced wages, less take-home pay for things like food and shelter and clothing for Americans who need it most. I can cite plenty of examples in my district in which this is having a very serious impact at this early stage of ObamaCare's implementation. I live in Bloomington, Indiana.

Indiana University is feeling the pinch of this and is reducing some hours of some of their hourly employees, from custodians to cafeteria workers and others, because they cannot remain a financially viable entity, as taxpayers expect it to be, should it have to comply with this employer mandate as it is currently constructed.

Ivy Tech Community College is also feeling the pinch. In fact, 4,500 of their adjunct professors are losing hours. This is resulting in reduced course offerings for many students, but more importantly for those adjunct professors, they need the wages, they need the hours. Should Ivy Tech decide to continue on with business as usual, they would be eating all sorts of compliance costs to try and measure the hours of their hourly employees and ensure that they are complying with the law. They have done the math. They have figured out that this 30 hours is full time provision amounts to a \$12 million unfunded mandate, courtesy of Uncle Sam.

I have heard from 39 public school corporations in Indiana about the adverse consequences of this 30 hours is full time provision. In fact, they are suing the Federal Government, along with the State of Indiana, because of this provision, which they say will have catastrophic financial consequences on their operations, on their balance sheets.

From a practical perspective, the majority of employers who voluntarily provide coverage to their employees do so for their full-time employees, and they do so because they want to attract the absolute best talent they can within the labor market. This system has succeeded in providing coverage for nearly 160 million Americans. It is working. In fact, this is the largest source of health coverage in America, but the 30-hour rule radically disrupts this success and this model. Many people will lose their coverage, especially your lower-skilled workers, often your entry-level opportunities where younger workers get valuable work experi-

ence and start to work their way up the economic ladder. We need to protect the wages of Americans who depend on them the most. That is what this bipartisan effort, the Save American Workers Act, is all about.

I am proud to be joined in this effort by Representative BARR, who has shown some leadership on this issue, and by Representative KELLY, who was out front very early with respect to this issue. I look forward to engaging in some dialogue this evening and in turning over the mike to them to get their State level perspectives, but I think it is worth noting, because I do want to recognize them, the fair-minded Members among us who look for opportunities to work across the aisle.

Representative LIPINSKI, a Democrat from Illinois, has shown a lot of leadership in the U.S. House of Representatives with respect to this issue. There are a handful of other Democrat Members who have signed on to the Save American Workers Act. It is my fervent hope, not for my interest but for the interests of my constituents and for those like them around the country, that other Democrats will join the vast majority of Republican Members of Congress in supporting this bill.

With that, I would just invite the dialogue of Mr. BARR, my good colleague in his first term—but he seems far more experienced than that—to speak to the Save American Workers Act.

Mr. BARR. I thank my friend, the gentleman from Indiana, Congressman YOUNG, for his leadership on this very important issue.

Mr. Speaker, it is an important issue because ObamaCare is hurting American families. It is hurting American employers. It is hurting American workers who are struggling to make ends meet, to put food on the table. This is a bad economy. We continue to suffer from a bad economy despite 5 years having passed after the financial crisis.

The project of ObamaCare—the project of the Affordable Care Act—is really the project of the entire Obama Presidency. It is a project to determine whether or not Big Government can solve big problems. It is a project to determine whether or not the Federal Government can micromanage one-sixth of the American economy. It is a project to determine whether or not it is a good idea to allow the government to take away choices from the American people—from American workers and from American small business owners.

Wages in this country have gone down over \$2,300 in the last several years. The labor participation rate in this country—the percentage of working-aged people actually in the workforce—is the lowest it has been in 35 years, and 75 percent of the American people are living paycheck to paycheck. This is not a sign and these statistics are not indicators of a healthy economy. This is a very unhealthy economy.

Why? Why haven't we seen a robust economic recovery in which American families, American businesses, American entrepreneurs, and American workers can achieve the potential that they deserve, can achieve the opportunities, can reach out and take advantage of the American Dream—why is that objective so illusive for so many Americans today?

Unfortunately, we all know people who are currently looking for employment and who are unable to care for their families as they would like. On top of insurance cancelation notices, higher premiums, broken promises, a malfunctioning Web site, and reduced health care choices, Americans are now seeing as a result of ObamaCare that the law is forcing job creators to cut employees' hours just so that they can comply with the law, just so that they can prevent any kind of sanctions or penalties that they would incur as a result of running afoul of the provisions of the law. Thanks to ObamaCare, millions of these already struggling Americans are having an even harder time finding work, caring for their families, putting food on their tables because, again, ObamaCare is putting full-time work and decent wages out of reach.

Mr. Speaker, we are moving from a full-time work economy to a part-time work economy, and it is largely because of ObamaCare. I speak with small business owners across central and eastern Kentucky all the time, and what they tell me is very consistent: they want to put people back to work; they want to invest and grow their businesses; they want to be able to provide good, quality health care to their employees and to their workers, who are the backbone of the American Dream, who are the backbone of their entrepreneurial success. ObamaCare is holding them back. Employers in my district and all over America consistently cite ObamaCare as one of the top reasons for planned layoffs and their reluctance to hire more workers.

Think about that.

Why on Earth in a down economy—in the worst economy—and with the worst labor participation rate in 35 years would lawmakers in Washington want to punish American businesses—American entrepreneurs, American job creators—for hiring more people? Yet that is exactly what this flawed law does.

□ 1945

This law entangles small businesses in a web of rules and regulations, making it expensive and nearly impossible to invest in new workers.

In particular, ObamaCare's 30-hour rule, which defines full-time work as averaging only 30 hours per week, is resulting in fewer jobs, reduced hours, and less opportunities for so many Americans.

This 30-hour rule forces employers who have been providing coverage—in some cases, for decades—which is good, quality health care, to fundamentally alter their benefit plans, to drop cov-

erage altogether, or shift more of their workforce to part time by cutting workers' hours below 30 a week because they can't afford to offer the health insurance mandated by ObamaCare.

The Wall Street Journal had an editorial and called these the 49ers and the 29ers—49ers because these are businesses that will not hire more than 49 employees because ObamaCare will punish the employer if they hire more than 49 employees, 29ers because employers will not and cannot hire people for more than 29 hours a week.

So these are the 29ers. These are people who are struggling to take care of their families. This is hurting people.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Reclaiming my time, I sometimes like to distill the narrative down to some numbers.

You just mentioned the movement down to 29 hours a week. Let's consider the Kentuckian or the Hoosier who is currently working 39 hours a week, and because of this provision, their employer is unable, under the current economic conditions, to offer them ObamaCare-sanctioned health insurance.

They are incentivized to move that hardworking hourly work down to 29 hours. That is a loss of 10 hours per week. Over the course of a month, that worker is losing an entire work week.

How is an hourly worker that has to pay for food and shelter and clothing and other basic expenditures supposed to take care of their family?

It is imminently unfair, and someone needs to stand up for our low- and middle-income workers. I think that is the essence of what this is all about.

Mr. BARR. Absolutely. I totally agree. You are absolutely right. I would commend the gentleman for being one of those leaders in our country who is standing up for the working people of this country.

I would just note the president of the Teamsters Union, James Hoffa, has said that this rule will "destroy the foundation of the 40-hour work week that is the backbone of the American middle class."

In short, ObamaCare is hurting the very people that it was intended to help. I don't think this is a partisan issue. There are well-meaning people on both sides of the aisle who want to help working families make it a little easier and get by a little easier and put food on the table and earn a living wage, but this law is punishing people for working hard. Hard work is what made this country great.

Why would we disincentivize hard work? Yet that is exactly what ObamaCare does.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. If I could interject because I think you hit on a key point. This isn't ideological. This ought not be partisan at all. In fact, we have a number of Democratic cosponsors. I am gratified by their intellectual honesty, their courage, their support. They are doing the right thing here. They are looking out for their constituents.

We have all been asked to come here and get something done while people are feeling pain. This was certainly an unintended consequence, is my reading. I don't want to impugn the motives of those who hurriedly passed this Affordable Care Act. I don't think they intended this.

So we repeal the provision. We replace it with something that makes sense and restores wages for workers that need it most.

Mr. BARR. Absolutely. This is commonsense reform.

Again, I commend Congressman YOUNG and other colleagues who have sponsored the Save American Workers Act. This is a simple piece of legislation. It would simply repeal the 30-hour definition of full-time employment in the Affordable Care Act, in ObamaCare, and restore the traditional 40-hour definition.

It makes perfect sense. It would help employees who are seeking the hours that they need to take care of themselves and their families. It would lower the burden and the regulatory costs on employers.

It would allow American businesses to be more productive. It will allow American workers to be more productive. It will get to the heart of why our economy is not where it should be today.

I really appreciate the gentleman's leadership on this issue.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Thank you for not just your support, but your vocal support, engagement, leadership, and education of your colleagues and others who are important stakeholders with respect to this issue. Thank you so much for being with us here this evening.

I would like to pivot off of your discussion of this down economy. We are at a 35-year low in labor force participation. None of us is happy with the rate of job creation or business creation.

One of my constituents was sharing with me recently they saw a stat indicating that business creation and entrepreneurship are at a 15-year low. Clearly, we are experiencing the hardest of times.

The way to grow an economy, based on my economic background, is not to reduce the hours of workers and impose new compliance costs on our employers. Instead, we need to be removing obstacles to realizing the sorts of income that people need and opportunities to work your way up that economic ladder. Unfortunately, this goes in the opposite direction.

I am pleased today to be joined by my good colleague, MIKE KELLY of Pennsylvania, who partnered with me in helping to draft this legislation. He has proven himself to be a fine leader in the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman. It is really a pleasure to be with you tonight.

Representative YOUNG's piece of legislation, H.R. 2575, is really something

that I think that perhaps if more of us who serve in this body were actually people who experienced what it was like to be in the private sector, more of us would understand.

I was very fortunate to have a family business, and I can tell you, from an employer standpoint, that one of the greatest thrills you have in your life is to sit across the desk from somebody who has come in and applied for a job and to be able to say to them: you're hired, we need you on board, we need you to be part of our team to make the business successful.

You can see in their eyes, at that moment, that they look at this opportunity as: my goodness, now I can put a roof over the head of my family, I can put food on the table, and I can put clothes on their back, and I can plan for a future.

Now, why in the world would we all of a sudden say: You know what? We are going to change that dynamic because it is no longer going to be a 40-hour week; we are going to dial it back to 30 hours a week.

You say to yourself: How did anybody come up with those numbers? Why would they come up with those numbers, and what is the benefit of those numbers?

The answer is that it helps make the Affordable Care Act work. It doesn't help America work. It helps a piece of flawed legislation work. It is about the dynamics of the math.

It is not about the dynamics of allowing men and women to go to work and be able to go home at night and say: I went to work today for you, I went to work to make your life better.

You look at some of the numbers, Mr. YOUNG. The 30-hour rule puts 2.6 million workers with a median income of under \$30,000 at risk for losing jobs or hours. Eighty-nine percent of these workers impacted by the rule do not have a college degree. 63 percent of these folks are women, and over half have a high school diploma or less.

When I look back at my district, District Three in Pennsylvania, they are hardworking good American people. I have no idea how they are registered. I have no idea how they vote. I have no idea what they think about at night and what they pray for at night before they lay their head on the pillow.

I do know who they are, basically, because they are all of the same ilk. They are the same people. The blood that courses through their veins is pretty much the same. They believe in America. They believe in paying their fair share. They believe in lifting the load and helping out.

Barb Wilson works for the Arc in Mercer County, Pennsylvania. This is a phenomenal organization that assists people with developmental disabilities. Barb is a part-time employee who used to work 30 to 35 hours a week.

Her employer recently informed her and her coworkers that all part-time employees will be having their hours cut to around just 20 hours a week be-

cause of the Affordable Care Act's employer mandate.

Barb tells me that she was shocked when she heard this news. Because of her hours being cut, she says she will no longer be able to afford the cost of living.

I have more people in my district that come to me and talk to me. One of the things—and I think you found the same thing in Indiana, and I am sure Mr. BARR has in Kentucky—I have people that say: You can use my story, but you can't use my name.

Now, that is a very chilling effect to think that, in this country, the United States of America, people are afraid to be identified with their story because they are afraid of a retribution from the government. That is just totally unacceptable.

One of those people is in the fast food business. How about this?

In 2012, 92 of its 993 employees worked more than 30 hours a week. Think about that. All of these 92 employees have had their hours cut to less than 30 hours.

On top of that, more than 30 employees have had access to their health insurance plans ended. Even though their plans made sense for them, they did not meet ObamaCare's standards, and so the company could not afford to keep them.

This doesn't make any sense. At a time when we want to get America to work, when we want to increase jobs, why would we make it harder for those people to accomplish those goals? It just doesn't make sense.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. It makes absolutely no sense. For example, I have a school corporation in Washington County, Indiana, which I recently visited. I was visiting their superintendent and members of their school board.

I don't know their politics, but I certainly know that they care about children. They care about all the employees who work for them. They were absolutely distraught.

They said: Congressman, I don't know what we're going to do with respect to this 30 hours is full time provision. When we think about our substitute teachers, we are actually contemplating having to reduce the number of hours in the middle of classes because we don't have a large enough pool of substitute teachers available to draw on.

We can literally have somebody substituting for half of a class. In order to fall under the 30 hours is full time provision in the Affordable Care Act, these folks are having to leave early.

The students are unattended. They are not being educated. Parents are certainly upset. It is imposing undue costs upon the school corporation in order to track the hours of their employees.

This is the sort of Rube Goldberg sort of contraption that only could be conceived of in Washington, D.C.

I cannot make sense of why anyone would oppose trying to change this pro-

vision, as we have done in this bill. Some have speculated that it is a matter of saving face. You pass a big bill; you pass it quickly.

It perhaps was most ill-advised in any sort of fundamental change to the bill. Any sort of repeal of a major provision within the bill and a replacement with something that works better undermines the credibility not only of the bill itself, but of those who supported it originally.

I would like to think better of my colleagues than that. I think there has to be something else at work here, but I don't know how to explain to that superintendent and those concerned school board members in Washington County, Indiana, why others won't sign on to this.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I agree with you. In my district, Butler Area School District has had to implement procedures to keep all of its part-time employees working less than 30 hours. This hurts education.

In New Castle, Lawrence County, their local government has reduced all of it employees to just 28 hours.

So we talk about these things. You and I just got here 3 years ago. You look at a government that is supposed to be a citizen government—a government that works for the people and does things in the people's best interest—and then you look at this piece of legislation and say: My goodness, how did we come up with this?

The answer is always: There are unintended consequences.

I understand that there are unintended consequences, but they are not always painful consequences. If we are going to do anything here, we better start responding when we hurt the people we represent.

We also better understand that these unintended consequences are also fixable. They are not unfixable. Why wouldn't we fix it if you know it is hurting someone, if you know it is taking away opportunity?

I talked about being in the private sector. When we bring people on board, it is mutually beneficial. It is to share in success.

□ 2000

I can tell you that the gap right now has widened between those who own businesses and run them and those associates who work there. We have put them at odds with each other because now it becomes: well, you know what? The people that employ you really don't care enough about you. And you say: my goodness. No, no, that is not true. That is not true.

I can tell you from the position that I have been in from a business that my dad started in 1953 after being a parts-picker in a Chevrolet warehouse and coming back after the war and starting a little Chevrolet dealership and watching it grow into something where we have 110 people that every 2 weeks get a check, I know that when they are successful, the business is successful;

and when the business is successful, the community is successful, because we all participate at every level.

Now, why would you destroy a model that is so perfect? Why would you destroy something that is so fundamentally strong? Why would you take apart the American Dream in order to have a flawed piece of legislation meet the metrics that this is looking for? It just doesn't make sense.

In a town that you and I have discussed many times is devoid of common sense, we need to take a look at it, because if our real concern is the next election and not the direction that we are going in, then we are here for the wrong purposes.

So I want to thank the gentleman. I have got to tell you, we talked long and we talked at great length about the effects this was having.

H.R. 2575 corrects a flawed idea. It just makes sense what you are doing, sir. And I would just tell you that, for all of those thousands and thousands and millions of workers who have been hurt by this law, our ability to fix it, which is what some of our colleagues say—I know you don't like it; I know you don't agree with it, but help us fix it—we need to fix it, not so much for a political agenda but for the people we represent.

I thank you for what you are doing. I think that this piece of legislation is timely and is needed, and your dedication to the American worker and to the American families is to be heralded.

Thank you so much.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Thank you for your leadership on this important issue.

This is not a political issue. There is an old saying that good policy is good politics. Those who are driven primarily by political considerations—and I think there are, frankly, few that are primarily driven by those—they need to be on the right side of history. They need to be adopting a more optimal policy with respect to how we treat our low- and middle-income workers, so I would invite their support.

Please understand, even in this sometimes shrill, divided Congress, even in this sometimes divided Nation, there are still things we can agree upon. There are commonsensical solutions that we can adopt. There are problems that we can solve.

Repealing the first ever definition of “full time” in full law at 30 hours and moving it up to 40 hours, the traditional full-time workweek standard, just makes common sense. It is going to restore wages for millions of workers. \$75 billion in foregone wages will be realized if we pass the Save American Workers Act.

Now, there has been quite a bit of talk about wages in this town and beyond in recent weeks, the minimum wage, in particular. I didn't come here to talk specifically about the minimum wage, but let me just illustrate the impact of this 40-hour provision. Let's consider the worker who works at the

Federal minimum wage, which few actually do, but \$7.25 an hour. So many States have a higher minimum wage. So many people get multiple jobs and, you know, gosh, my heart goes out to them. I appreciate their work ethic. But as a proportion of our economy, most people are not working at the \$7.25 rate.

But let's suppose someone is and they work 40 hours a week. That is \$290 in take-home pay per week. Now, if we were to raise the minimum wage as the President suggests to \$10.20 but this person got dropped down to 29 hours a week, guess what they would be making? Roughly \$290 a week. The same thing.

So, for those who see this as a sort of an issue that is somehow partisan but care deeply about the issue of the minimum wage, which I think can create distortions in the economy and kill jobs and so forth—that is a separate debate that I suspect we will have—but those who care deeply about this ought to be on board with this 40 hours is full time legislation, the Save American Workers Act, so I would invite their bipartisan support.

I note that we have just about every Republican who has signed on to this bill. We have a handful of courageous Democrats, and I commend their participation. I think we have some others with us this evening who are supportive of this legislation, prepared to speak to their constituents' experiences and their thoughts about the adverse consequences of a 30-hour definition of “full time” in the United States of America.

I am joined by my colleague from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD), who is a very thoughtful and articulate member of the Budget Committee and cares deeply about his State. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LANKFORD. I thank the gentleman from Indiana.

It is my privilege to get a chance to be able to speak out for the constituents that I represent who are asking the same questions a lot of Americans are asking: Why did you just drop my hours?

People that have jobs, go to work every day, trying to pay for their family, barely eking by, working hourly, suddenly got their hours dropped, and they are asking all of us: Why did this happen?

Well, the difficult thing is we are trying to explain to people it happened because more people were needed onto the exchanges, and so the administration needed additional people to get onto this health care coverage. So it isn't actually something to help people; it is something to help the administration and their formula, which makes them even madder.

They don't want to be a pawn in some game. They want to take care of their family. They want to be able to do what they can do in their job and to take care of their kids and play soccer with them on weekends and be able to

spend time, but things have changed dramatically for them now.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. So would it be accurate to say that, in part, it is our lower-income to middle-income workers, through reduced hours, who are paying for the Affordable Care Act, which is wildly unpopular nationally?

Mr. LANKFORD. It is. And it is wildly unpopular larger in that group as well. Every section of Americans, when you go and get a chance to visit with them, they will tell you the same thing: my premiums went up; my deduction went up; I lost access to a doctor; I had to change to a different hospital; I lost some of my choices.

And this whole belief that suddenly now we have 7 million new people that got there, millions of those individuals that are now in the exchanges used to be on health care that they liked. They were kicked off of it January 1, and now they are forced into a new system, and the President is somehow celebrating.

I was astounded by the sense of, at the very last minute, all these people filed and they got excited about it. There are around 43 million people that are uninsured in the United States. Seven million of them have actually capitulated to the administration's forced enrollment into this program or face a fine. That would be something akin to, during tax day coming up just 15 days from now, the administration standing up and celebrating that 25 percent of Americans actually filed their taxes on time because they would face a fine if they don't. Well, no one would actually celebrate that, but this administration is celebrating 25 percent of the people actually following through on it.

There are real lives and real people that are attached to this. Let me tell you about one of them. Her name is Cindy. And like some of the other individuals that were here visiting before, Mr. KELLY from Pennsylvania, didn't want her name put out publicly on it because, in this day and age, people are becoming more and more afraid of their government and what their government is going to do to them rather than for them.

So Cindy works at a job at a restaurant. She works more than 40 hours a week, and then finds out, after the transition happens, January 1, they are dropping her hours back to 26 hours a week. Twenty-six hours a week is really hard. Her job plus 30 hours was really difficult for her to make ends meet. She can't make it at 26 hours. So now this individual has to go out and try to find a different job to add up to two different jobs.

Let me talk to you about a dad that his son just graduated from high school. He didn't make great grades in high school, but he is a good, hard worker. So he is engaged in a job, and he is out looking for a job. Doesn't have a college degree, just a working guy. He cannot find a job for more than 28½ hours, so he is looking for two jobs

to try to get that, to try to build up to enough money to be able to do it.

So suddenly, this sense of we are going to help provide for people by forcing people to get to this providing health care, what is actually happening is people are just dropping the hours. It is the same thing everyone said before.

And the President's statement today that there is no good reason to go back to a time before ObamaCare, I would have to tell you, Cindy would disagree with that; this other gentleman would disagree with that. A lot of people would look back and say: I would much rather go back to working one job than be forced to work two jobs and still not have health care coverage.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. You mentioned a very compelling story, incidentally, and I think all of us hear these stories, Republican, Democrat, Independent. It matters not. I suspect we all hear them around our district. You mentioned the President's Statement of Administration Policy which came out today, April Fools' Day. I had to wonder whether it might have been an April Fools' joke. It, in part, reads: 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 Congress to stop fighting old political battles and join the President in an agenda focused on providing greater economic opportunity. And then it goes on and on.

Listen, this is not a repeal of the Affordable Care Act. This is a repeal of a provision that we recognize that a bipartisan group of United States Congressmen and many Senators recognize is flawed. So, I mean, it is an absolute red herring.

I cannot understand why the administration won't engage with us in a fair-minded, statesmanlike way to mitigate the pain so many Americans are feeling.

Mr. LANKFORD. I would have to tell you honestly, I would like nothing better for my citizens that I represent to not have to live under this law. I would absolutely vote again, as I have multiple times, to repeal this entire law.

But I also have a responsibility to do whatever I can to protect the people of my district from the harmful effects of this law, and this law has many harmful effects. One of them is it is forcing those that struggle the most in our economy to make two ends meet to have to go out and get multiple jobs, and it has made it even harder for them, in transportation, in timing, in time with their family. They are losing all of those things. It has been taken away from them based on a preference of an administration, not something that is actually economic responsibility of the President.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. I would like to associate myself with those remarks pertaining to preferring to start over in an open, deliberative fashion. My belief would be that, if we started over with respect to health care reform, we could actually control costs, increase

access, continue to incentivize innovation, and do all the other things that were purportedly the rationale behind this law.

We want to broaden coverage to those who don't have coverage, but the Affordable Care Act, so-called, does not even accomplish that. And so the administration, at least according to the Statement of Administration Policy put out today, welcomes ideas to improve the law. Well, this is an idea to improve the health care circumstances of so many Americans. We need to repeal this 30-hour provision within the law, so that is what the Save American Workers Act does.

Now, I noted that this created some perverse incentives, this 30-hour threshold. I heard a story from a constituent who will remain unnamed for obvious reasons, but they indicated they own some fast-food restaurants, and they are actually contemplating employing some of their workers at one fast-food restaurant under the 30-hour threshold and then making an arrangement with a nearby restaurant, whether they own it or someone else owns it, of a different name to finish out their workweek. So basically, to use a colloquial example, you take off the Subway shirt or the McDonald's shirt and then put on a Burger King shirt.

These are the sorts of perverse incentives created by ill-considered provisions in a very hastily passed and, frankly, partisan law.

Mr. BARR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BARR. I thank the gentleman.

I would like to note a point that the President made in his State of the Union address and, really, why Congressman YOUNG's bill should be a point of agreement for all of us—for the President, for Members of the other side of the aisle, for those of us on this side of the aisle. Here is what the President said in his State of the Union address, speaking to the state of our economy: Inequality has grown, he said, income inequality. Upward mobility has stalled.

That is what the President of the United States said. I agree with the President. Upward mobility has stalled.

Why has it stalled?

Well, one of the reasons, Mr. Speaker, upward mobility has stalled in this country is because we are punishing hard work. ObamaCare is punishing people for working hard. That is what made this country great.

□ 2015

The Congressional Budget Office released a report a few weeks ago, and that report projects that ObamaCare will force 2.5 million Americans to leave the workforce in the next decade.

Think about that. There are Members of Congress who are defending a law that will shrink the American workforce by 2.5 million Americans.

And what is the administration's response? They say it is a good thing. They say it is a good thing that Americans are going to be forced to leave their jobs.

So this law does two things: it forces Americans to lose their jobs or leave the workforce, and it forces employers to reduce the number of hours for those who remain in the workforce. This is a prescription for continued economic stagnation.

Now, we have a solution before us. The solution is the legislation H.R. 2575, proposed by my friend from Indiana, TODD YOUNG, the Save American Workers Act. Not only is this proposal good for working Americans—because it would repeal the 30-hour workweek definition and replace it with a traditional 40-hour workweek definition for full-time work—but it would also, according to the Congressional Budget Office, it will create \$75 billion in higher cash wages for American workers.

Now, if that is what the nonpartisan CBO says—and we know that wages have been declining in this country; we know that working families are struggling to put food on the table because they are not making enough to make ends meet and to take care of their kids—why on Earth would we not vote in favor of legislation that will create \$75 billion in higher cash wages?

I just want to, once again, thank the gentleman from Indiana. I want to thank my friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, also for his leadership and the gentleman from Oklahoma who spoke earlier and eloquently shared a story of his constituent.

This is about American workers having the ability to achieve that upward mobility that the President spoke about in his State of the Union. I invite the President to join us. I invite my friends on the other side of the aisle to join us in helping the American workers achieve their potential, reinvigorate the work ethic in this country, allow people to work the way they want to without punishing small businesses and workers for achieving their potential.

At a time when Americans are struggling, we must do everything we can to invest in real solutions like the Save American Workers Act of 2014 that would grow the economy and get the country working again.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. I thank the gentleman.

I am going to close where I began. The President is proposing a 25 percent increase in the minimum wage, but ObamaCare is resulting in as much as a 25 percent decrease in the pay of millions of hourly workers. Because of the 30 hours is full time provision, too many Americans aren't able to work the number of hours they need, aren't able to get the take-home pay they need to support themselves and their families and to go after the dreams that they want to realize.

So by passing my bill, one which has bipartisan support and which has enjoyed great leadership by so many of

my colleagues, the Save American Workers Act, we can create an America that works simply by restoring the traditional 40-hour workweek.

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

COAST GUARD AND MARITIME TRANSPORTATION

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

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, thank you for the opportunity to talk about a couple of issues that are on the floor. I really want to spend this evening talking about an enormous opportunity that America has to further jobs in this Nation. It is a piece of legislation that passed off the House floor this afternoon, H.R. 4005, a piece of legislation that deals with the Coast Guard and the maritime industry.

But just a few words about the previous hour that was spent here talking about the 40-hour workweek. There is nothing in the Affordable Care Act that does away with the 40-hour workweek, not at all. The 40-hour workweek remains, and, in fact, Democrats are trying to strengthen the overtime provisions that are needed to be put into effect, when men and women across the United States work more than 40 hours and do not receive overtime, time-and-a-half pay. So that is another thing.

We just basically heard yet one more effort by our Republican colleagues to eviscerate and otherwise put aside the Affordable Care Act, which now has perhaps 12 to 15 million Americans with some sort of insurance. Perhaps it is a new health insurance policy that they previously did not have available to them or they are on Medicaid or they are on their parents' health insurance. Well over 12 million Americans now have insurance because of the Affordable Care Act.

They also have guaranteed coverage. No longer can an insurance company discriminate against them because they have a preexisting condition. No longer are newborn babies denied coverage because they are born with some sort of a medical problem. That is what used to occur in America before the Affordable Care Act.

Also, it is kind of ironic, if you will, that we just heard an hour of discussion on the 30-hour workweek, the 40-hour workweek. The 30 hours only talks about when an employer must provide insurance for their employees. It doesn't take away anybody's 40-hour workweek at all.

However, the ironic part is today, the Republicans announced the new Ryan budget, which seriously impacts every American's health care policy. The new Ryan budget repeals the Affordable Care Act and those guarantees of coverage that I spoke of just a moment

ago. The guarantee that a newborn child with a medical problem has insurance was wiped out by the proposal that was introduced by Mr. RYAN today. The guarantee that every woman is no longer discriminated against because she is a woman, a female, that guarantee was wiped out by the proposal that was put forward by Mr. RYAN today.

The guarantee that there are no more limits on coverage. Before the Affordable Care Act, if you came down with cancer and your insurance policy, as was common, had a total limit on the coverage, you would blow through that coverage and then bankruptcy was in your future. Oh, unless, of course, you didn't take the medical care. So these basic guarantees of health insurance availability were wiped out, or would be wiped out, by Mr. RYAN's budget that he proposed today.

Similarly, something that is really important for every senior is seriously affected by the Republican Ryan budget that was put forth today. It was 1965 that Medicare went into effect. Lyndon Johnson signed that bill. I actually have a photo of the speech that he gave here on the House floor, calling for the enactment of Medicare and Medicaid. It was 1963, '64 when that occurred.

The budget proposal that was put out by Mr. RYAN today would effectively end Medicare, as we know it. And if you are 55 years of age or younger, you would not have Medicare when you become 65. Instead, you would be given a voucher and told, go buy insurance in the health insurance market, which was so roundly criticized by our Republican colleagues today, and the improvements that have been made in that market by the Affordable Care Act.

So let's try to get this straight. First of all, a proposal put forward today by the Republican majority in this House would effectively end Medicare for every American who is 55 and younger and put those people into a health insurance market that has had all of its guarantees of coverage, all of the consumer protections, all of the consumer Bill of Rights in the Affordable Care Act repealed. So on the one hand you repeal all of those protections, and then on the other hand, you take every American 55 years and younger and force them into that dog fight with no protections in the private health insurance market. I don't think we want to go there. I don't think we want to go there.

What we want to do is to make sure that seniors have affordable Medicare insurance. But the proposal put forth today will deny those men and women that are currently in Medicare the opportunity to have the doughnut hole, the prescription drug doughnut hole, removed. Instead, the proposal put forth today would increase that doughnut hole, sending seniors back into the unaffordable prescription drug program that existed before the Affordable Care Act. So if you are a senior out there,

beware. Beware of the budget proposal that was put forth here in the House of Representatives today because there is serious harm to you in 2016, should that proposal ever become law.

We will fight that. We don't want Medicare to disappear, as we know it. We don't want a voucher program that forces seniors into the clutches of the private insurance companies without the protections that are presently in the Affordable Care program.

I didn't intend to talk about this today. But following on the previous hour from my colleagues who were talking so vehemently against the Affordable Care Act, I thought we ought to have a discussion about what is in the Affordable Care Act, all of the protections that are there for every, every American, whether they are 65 or older. And oh, by the way, if you are 65 now and you are on Medicare, you have an annual free medical checkup—high blood pressure, diabetes, all of those things that can affect you—an annual free checkup which has already shown that it keeps seniors healthy longer and has dramatically reduced the cost of Medicare this year and will continue to do so in the years ahead.

Now, what I really wanted to talk about was something really good and really positive that happened here on the floor of the House today, and that was the passage of H.R. 4005, the Coast Guard and Maritime legislation that reauthorizes the United States Coast Guard for 2 more years, expands their opportunities to protect our waterways, our lakes, and to protect America in the oceans that surround this great Nation. It also provides an opportunity for the mariners who want to enter that profession from the armed services, who may have been in the Navy, who have gained certain skills, so that they can get a license to be a mariner, to be a sailor, to be a ship's captain or an officer on one of our merchant marine ships. There is more that we can do with this piece of legislation, and I want to put it up here so that we can take a look at some of the opportunities that exist in this law. Here we go.

About 20 years ago, there were several hundred American-flagged ships and several tens of thousands of American sailors that were bringing American commerce, exports, and imports into our ports. So if we support the growth of jobs and the growth of trade, then we need to support the merchant marine and Coast Guard renewal act that passed the House today because it provides these opportunities.

This is not an LNG tanker. But the United States may very well be exporting liquefied natural gas. Rather than importing, we are likely to be exporting. Seven permits have been granted to the gas companies to export LNG, liquefied natural gas.

□ 2030

That is good, to a point. Export too much of this, and a strategic American