

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

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

COMMUNICATION FROM THE
CLERK OF THE HOUSE

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

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

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

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

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

With best wishes, I am
Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

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

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

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 19

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

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

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 30) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the 30-hour threshold for classification as a full-time employee for purposes of the employer mandate in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and replace it with 40 hours. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means; and (2) one motion to recommit.

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

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

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

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

□ 1230

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

claim that they are interested in any fixes at all.

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

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

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

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

I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

□ 1245

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

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

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

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

I yield to the gentleman.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I will submit this report for the RECORD.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

OFFERED BY MR. COURTNEY OF CONNECTICUT

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

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

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

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

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply to months beginning after December 31, 2013.

SEC. 3. BUDGETARY EFFECTS.

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

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

[From Small Business Majority]

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Gray called her pharmacy to pick up the prescription.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

□ 1300

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Exactly what are you trying to save them from?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

□ 1315

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. WEBER of Texas. I thank the gentleman.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. BURGESS. I have no additional speakers.

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

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

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

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

That seems pretty straightforward.

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

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

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

That is in the past.

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

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

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

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

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

What business can function like that, Mr. Speaker?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

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

[Roll No. 11]

YEAS—240

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

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

NOT VOTING—9

□ 1353

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

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

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

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

MOMENT OF SILENCE ON TUCSON SHOOTINGS'

4-YEAR ANNIVERSARY

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The question is on the resolution.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER. This will be a 5-minute vote.

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

[Roll No. 12]

AYES—244

Abraham	Amash	Barletta
Aderholt	Amodei	Barr
Allen	Babin	Barton

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

NOES—181

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

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

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

NOT VOTING—4

Duckworth	Gosar
Gallego	O'Rourke

□ 1410

So the resolution was agreed to. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SAVE AMERICAN WORKERS ACT OF 2015

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 19, I call up the bill (H.R. 30) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the 30-hour threshold for classification as a full-time employee for purposes of the employer mandate in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and replace it with 40 hours, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 30

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

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

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

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

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