



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 117th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 168

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, MARCH 31, 2022

No. 57

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
March 31, 2022.

I hereby appoint the Honorable TONY CÁRDENAS to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Byrd, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agreed to the following resolution:

S. RES. 565

Whereas Donald Edwin Young was born on June 9, 1933, to James Young and Nora (Bucy) Young in Meridian, California;

Whereas Don Young earned an associate degree from Yuba Junior College and a bachelor's degree in teaching from Chico State University;

Whereas Don Young began what would be decades of service to the United States when he served in the Army as part of the 41st Tank Battalion from 1955 to 1957;

Whereas Don Young moved to Alaska in 1959 and found his true home in the village of Fort Yukon, which is located 7 miles above the Arctic Circle;

Whereas Don Young met and married the first love of his life, Lula "Lu" Young, in Fort Yukon;

Whereas Don Young and Lu had 2 wonderful daughters, Dawn and Joni, and later 14 grandchildren;

Whereas Don Young taught fifth grade at a school run by the Bureau of Indian Affairs during the winter and worked in construction, mining, fishing, and trapping, and as a tugboat captain in the warmer months;

Whereas Don Young was elected mayor of Fort Yukon in 1964 and served in that role until 1967;

Whereas Don Young was elected to and served in the Alaska House of Representatives from 1967 to 1970 and the Alaska State Senate from 1970 to 1973;

Whereas Don Young was elected to the House of Representatives in 1973 in a special election and served 24 additional and consecutive terms;

Whereas Representative Young served as Chairman of the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives from 1995 to 2001, and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives from 2001 to 2007;

Whereas Representative Young was a champion for Alaska Native peoples, including as Chairman of the Subcommittee on Indian, Insular and Alaska Native Affairs of the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives;

Whereas Representative Young fiercely defended Alaska and Alaskans as the sole Representative for the largest State in the United States and devoted himself to fulfilling the immense promise of his home State;

Whereas Representative Young was a leader in strengthening the role of Alaska in providing for the national defense of the United States through his support for the Coast Guard, the Alaskan Command, and the ballistic missile defense and his steadfast commitment to the leadership of the United States in the Arctic;

Whereas Representative Young sponsored at least 85 bills that were enacted into Federal law and sponsored and co-sponsored many more measures that were part of broader legislation;

Whereas legislative achievements by Representative Young span the policy spectrum, from authorizing the construction of the Trans-Alaska Pipeline System to important amendments and the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1601 et seq.);

Whereas Representative Young authored and advocated for generational laws, including the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 5301 et seq.) in 1975, the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (Public Law 94-265; 90 Stat. 331) in 1976, the National Wildlife Refuge System Improvement Act of 1997 (Public Law 105-57; 111 Stat. 1252) in 1997, SAFETEA-LU (Public Law 109-59; 119 Stat. 1144) in 2005, Multinational Species Conservation Funds Reauthorization Act of 2007 (Public Law 110-132; 121 Stat. 1360) in 2007, and the

Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (Public Law 117-58; 135 Stat. 429) in 2021;

Whereas Representative Young formed strong relationships and friendships with members on both sides of the aisle and proudly worked with 10 different presidents;

Whereas Representative Young married his second love, Anne Garland Walton, in 2015, in the United States Capitol;

Whereas, on December 5, 2017, Representative Young became the 45th Dean of the House of Representatives, reflecting his status as its most senior member;

Whereas Representative Young was the longest-serving Republican in the history of Congress; and

Whereas Representative Young ultimately served the 49th State with dedication and distinction for 49 years and 13 days, which is more than ¾ of the period in which Alaska has been a State: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) mourns the death of Don Young, congressman for all Alaska and the 45th Dean of the House of Representatives;

(2) honors Representative Young for his lifetime of service to Alaska and the United States, his spirited bipartisanship, and his enduring respect for and devotion to the House of Representatives;

(3) respectfully requests that the Secretary of the Senate—

(A) communicate this resolution to the House of Representatives; and

(B) transmit an enrolled copy of this resolution to the family of the Honorable Don Young; and

(4) at the time that the Senate adjourns or recesses today, the Senate stands adjourned as a further mark of respect to the memory of the Honorable Don Young.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed bills of the following titles in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 442. An act to amend title 40, United States Code, to require the Administrator of General Services to procure the most life-cycle cost effective and energy efficient lighting products and to issue guidance on the efficiency, effectiveness, and economy of those products, and for other purposes.

S. 3969. An act to amend the Help America Vote Act of 2002 to explicitly authorize distribution of grant funds to the voting accessibility protection and advocacy system of the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana

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

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



Printed on recycled paper.

H4009

Islands and the system serving the American Indian consortium, and the other purposes.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 10, 2022, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

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

REMEMBERING CONGRESSMAN DON YOUNG

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

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize one of my political mentors, the dean of the House, Representative Don Young.

I met Don on one of my first days as a Member of the House of Representatives. I walked into this Chamber and took a seat. Minutes later, some old guy starts digging his knuckles into my back. I couldn't believe that was happening. I had no idea what this guy was doing.

You can imagine my confusion as I frustratingly found myself another chair, but you can also be assured that I never sat in that seat again. It wasn't until afterward that I learned that I had sat in his seat. I never made that mistake again.

Knowing him, he has probably already picked out a seat in Heaven, and I pity the fool who tries to sit there.

Don Young is and was a dear friend. At work, he was my mentor, someone whose stalwart belief system and passion for public service inspired me every single day.

Don truly loved the great men and women of Alaska. That was obvious from his fearless advocacy for the Last Frontier up here in Washington and even more obvious on our annual fishing trip, where I got to see firsthand the State he loved so dearly.

I was able to go with him on three separate occasions on that trip. Every one was a great experience. I will miss those annual fishing trips, not just for the sport of it, but for the comradery I felt with the amazing public servants who joined together to learn from one another.

Luckily for Alaska residents and the Young family, Don was a better man and legislator than he was a fisherman.

My prayers and support go out to his wife, Anne, his children, and everyone who was privileged to know this great friend, father, and public servant.

It was an honor to gather and pay tribute to him yesterday. He made every second count and worked hard to

leave this country better than he found it. He was the oldest Member of Congress, and I never let him forget that. I still feel like his time on Earth here was cut short.

Don, your presence, your knowledge, and your leadership will be sorely missed, but they will never be forgotten.

REMEMBERING MABEL JOSEPHINE "JO" MASON

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember the life of a woman dedicated to the service of her community, Jo Mason. Throughout her years, Jo remained involved in her community in as many aspects as she could.

After graduating from Glynn Academy, Jo was active in The American Legion Auxiliary for 78 years, where she held several positions in the local, district, and State levels.

The Saint Simons native enjoyed making the lap throws that The American Legion Auxiliary gave out to veterans and their spouses in the local nursing homes in Brunswick. Jo also volunteered at the fire department, helping to man radio station 2 and serving as treasurer for many years.

She was involved with the Golden Isles Emerald Society, Elks Lodge, Golden Isles Retired Firefighters Association, Veterans Council of Golden Isles, and the Coastal Republican Women's Club. She set an example for all of us to follow.

Her memory will be cherished by the many lives that she impacted, including her husband, Bill, who she met on a blind date in December 1965 while he was serving in the Marine Corps.

I am praying for her friends, her family, and her community during this very sad time.

RECOGNIZING THE LIFE OF DR. GROVER BELL

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the life of a man dedicated to his community and to the people he served, Dr. Grover Bell of Savannah, Georgia.

Dr. Bell was born in Sardis, Georgia, in 1928 and went to Georgia Teachers College, where he met his beloved wife, Lourdine.

After determining that his calling was to join the ministry, Dr. Bell attended Emory School of Divinity, where he learned to be a shepherd of men.

Throughout his career, he served almost 30 churches of the South Georgia United Methodist Conference, including my home church of Wesley Monumental.

He was loved as a minister by those he served and truly embodied what it means to put others before oneself.

Dr. Bell was also known for his gardening and for his southern, homestyle cooking, two of his passions. His love for daylilies and fried chicken were rivaled only by his love for God and his family.

Leaving behind his wife, four children, eight grandchildren, six great-grandchildren, and countless others to whom he ministered, Dr. Bell has left a

lasting impact on the community that he loved so dearly.

His family and friends remain in my thoughts and prayers after this tremendous loss.

REPEAL THE PINK TAX

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER) for 5 minutes.

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, on the very last day of Women's History Month, I want to draw attention to the fact that there is an insidious form of gender discrimination that goes on in this country from cradle to grave. It is called the pink tax.

It costs more to be a woman. We have seen it happen over and over again, where retailers find it okay to jack up the prices for the same products just because they are being marketed to women.

A New York City Consumer Affairs study compared 800 products and found that they were 13 percent more for those that were virtually identical but provided for women. As I am going to show you today, we see the cost as much as 60 percent more for the same products being focused on women, but basically the same products.

We need to think no further than looking at haircuts, where a woman can't get a haircut for \$26 like former Governor Scott Walker, who mocked one of our colleagues about the cost of her particular haircut.

Let's talk about retail sales. I had my office go online and do some online shopping. On Amazon, you can get this four-pack of Dove deodorant for women for \$19.39, but the male version of this particular product is only \$13.58 for a four-pack. That is a 60 percent cost differential, a 60 percent tax on women.

Here is a pack of probiotics from CVS for a woman. It costs \$32.79. For a man, it costs \$22.79. That is a 68 percent increase and a tax on women for the same product.

Then, we can move on to diapers. Believe it or not, diapers for girls cost more than diapers for boys. In fact, \$37.79 for boys and \$33.99 for girls.

Finally, my favorite is the teddy bears. If you go online and buy a pink teddy bear, you are going to pay a tax. It is \$14.99. A blue teddy bear is only \$12.30.

This is stupid. This is crazy. This is discrimination. It is time for us to deal with it, and there is a way to deal with it.

I have introduced the Pink Tax Repeal Act, which I am hopeful will be heard in the Energy and Commerce Committee. I am hopeful that, once and for all, we can do something about the fact that women pay more for the same goods and the same services.

In California, we have a law that I had passed many years ago that focused on services. The Assembly Office of Research found that women pay \$1,300 more per year for services. It shouldn't be based on gender; it should

be based on the amount of time it takes, whether it is a haircut or dry cleaning a shirt. We have seen over and over again that we pay more for the same service as well.

Colleagues, I hope that on this very last day of Women's History Month, we remember this for the rest of the year, that women pay more for the same goods and services, and that should be against the law.

PROTECT WOMEN'S SPORTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) for 5 minutes.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, the strides women have made across all corners of the sports world deserve to be celebrated, not torn to pieces by the far left's radical ideological agenda.

This year officially marks the 50th anniversary of title IX, a law from 1972 that mandates equal opportunities for women in education.

While this anniversary deserves to be recognized, the threat of President Biden's flawed interpretation of this legislation looms larger than ever before. This administration's radical reinterpretation of title IX to include sexual orientation and gender identity has pushed women to the sidelines.

President Biden's decision to allow biological male athletes who identify as transgender to compete in women's sports is an affront to the progress that women have made since 1972.

Title IX was a revolution for women's sports. Since its passage, title IX has spurred women's participation in sports by a considerable margin. Instead of rightfully celebrating these achievements, the left is willing to sacrifice them for the sake of its radical political agenda.

Mr. Speaker, we should not be tolerating the left's assault on women. We must ensure that the safety and needs of young girls and women are made a top priority. Erasing sex and gender means, ultimately, erasing women, especially when it comes to sports.

Girls and women at the top of their sport lose a fair chance to compete when a biological male enters the field. How is this any different than keeping women off the field altogether?

We can't let women's sports become collateral damage to the far left's campaign against the traditional, science-based understanding of sex and gender. Allowing women and girls to suffer for the sake of being politically correct is the textbook definition of cowardice.

I am proud of the progress our Nation has made in the past 50 years to uplift and affirm the rights of women. The prospect of those advances being lost today is gut-wrenching. If we allow these fantasies of the radical left to become mainstream, 50 years of progress will be buried completely.

HUMANITARIAN CRISIS IN UKRAINE

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak from both the heart and the Constitution.

The privilege of citizenship in the United States gives Americans the freedom to exert and to speak about what is in the depths of their heart while holding the Constitution that indicates: "We the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect Union, establish justice"—the Constitution goes on to describe a myriad of justice issues in the Bill of Rights.

In addition to that, we have exhibits, symbols of freedom. I begin first with the Statue of Liberty standing tall in the New York Harbor. What you can see is the throng of humanity, fleeing Ukrainians, who now will probably amount to 6 million internally displaced persons and refugees in totality.

□ 1015

Amongst these individuals are separated families from their husbands, brothers, and cousins and others who are on the fight.

But it is important to describe why we are here: one man, Putin. One man. One man has established this level of intense brutality and violence, insensitivity, rage, and attack.

Mr. Putin's attack is on the babies of Ukraine. I will not give him any credence or respect that he is at war. He is in the midst of destruction and vile actions and attacked a hospital with pregnant women. He separated pregnant women from their babies who were born dead or mothers who gave birth and died and the baby died shortly thereafter.

The new revelation is that babies and women and children have been stolen by Russian soldiers and carted off to Russian territory. That is the vileness of this ludicrous Putin war.

Then we come to find out—which is in the public domain—that he may not be getting the right information, but let us not use that as an excuse.

It didn't matter what revelations he would get. He is a violent actor living in a dream world of reimagining the Soviet Union.

And so it is crucial for those of us who believe in peace that our administration determines the validity of any peace discussions because we would want to be part of ensuring that they are viable.

But, at the same time, to the dismay of many of us, the weapons should be given, the drones should be given, the war has to stop, and there is no end in sight.

And so the murderous attack, the destruction of cities, such as the ocean-based city, that have been destroyed, brought to their knees, individuals lost lives under the pile of rubble, and particularly, the theater where 300 died where children were written on the outside.

Mr. Speaker, we must prepare now for refugees. And may I suggest that we must prepare for refugees coming from South and Central America that will include Haitians and Africans.

We are prepared to take in 125,000. Only 7,000 have been utilized. As some would say, including my late friend and colleague, Elijah Cummings, America is better than this. We know how to do this, and we must find the way to do it.

Standing at podiums and banging on the desk about we don't want these people, then you must not want those who are fleeing the bloody, violent actions of this horrific person.

I believe we should stand united as Americans, to capture the words: "We the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect Union, establish justice". . . I want us to stand with the Ukrainian people, that nation.

Mr. Speaker, I thank MARCY KAPTUR for leading the Ukrainian Caucus and all of the Members, Republicans and Democrats.

But as I conclude, let me quickly say in 1 minute one issue that we should not forget in establishing justice: We must have oversight over the United States Supreme Court, and the texts of a spouse, as well, must be addressed, and we will address it.

COVENANT SCHOOL BOYS AND GIRLS CHAMPIONSHIP BASKETBALL TEAMS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from West Virginia (Mrs. MILLER) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MILLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate both the boys and girls high school basketball teams from the Covenant School in Huntington, West Virginia.

The boys high school basketball team took home the national championship in their division and finished their season with an 11-game winning streak.

The girls high school basketball team came in second place in their division nationally.

Athletics play a huge role in ensuring that our next generation is well-rounded, able to work as a team, and are equipped to tackle challenges ahead.

I applaud the Covenant School for instilling these very important values in our student athletes.

West Virginia is so proud of the Covenant School's basketball teams.

GREAT LAKES AUTHORITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with considerable anticipation as Great Lakes Members introduce legislation to create the Great Lakes Authority.

The Great Lakes Authority is an instrumentality that will unlock our freshwater, industrial heartland's full potential for the century ahead.

The Midwest communities our Members represent are home to people who make, build, and grow that which makes, builds, and grows America.

For decades, however, our region has borne the brunt of job losses associated with disastrous trade policies, underinvestment, and deindustrialization.

Since the passage of NAFTA in 1993, China's entrance into the World Trade Organization in 2001, and CAFTA's passage in 2005, over 91,000 factories have closed across our country.

Nearly 5 million good-paying jobs have been lost, and our region has been very hard hit and is clawing its way back.

But our workers and their families in Ohio, Minnesota, Wisconsin, Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Pennsylvania, and New York, in the Great Lakes watershed have suffered enormously as middle class jobs evaporated.

The tragedy does not end there. Local governments have been left to scramble as declining revenues led to the collapse of their budgets and the accrual of crushing bonded indebtedness.

The size and scope of these accumulated economic challenges are too much for any one city or county or, indeed, State to overcome alone. Places like Toledo, Ohio, Lorain, Detroit, Buffalo, Flint, Rochester, all the towns along the old Erie Canal struggle to recover from the outsourcing of manufacturing jobs to penny-wage countries.

Chicago, Cleveland, and Erie, Pennsylvania, alone are limited in their ability to halt climate change and reverse its increasing effects on their shorelines and neighborhoods.

The Great Lakes region needs a boost through accelerated investments and strategic and coordinated support to get back on track.

Last year, President Biden and congressional Democrats accomplished what many had tried but failed to do, and that is pass an historic investment in jobs and infrastructure. That is step one.

This support will help empower our communities to begin planning the necessary steps to rebuilding roads and bridges, improve ports, rail lines and airports, modernize energy and water infrastructure, and protect all of our lakes, the freshwater kingdom on this continent.

But to maximize the impact and turbocharge revitalization, our region really needs a strategic plan to coordinate these resources along, importantly, with private investment to reboot our future.

The Great Lakes region is the only major economic region in our country that lacks a Federal entity dedicated to supporting its long-term coordinated economic development and conserving its natural environment.

The West's water is served by the Bureau of Reclamation, or if you look at the Delta Regional Authority, it helps 10 million people in the Delta Region. And more than 400 counties from Mis-

issippi to West Virginia are served by the Appalachian Regional Commission.

The Great Lakes deserves no less. The Great Lakes Authority Act is long overdue and will create an instrumentality to serve the Great Lakes fresh watershed which will become even more important in the decades to come with each passing day.

The Great Lakes Authority will be a Federal/State instrumentality like the others to spur job creation and world-class worker education, training, and adjustment in communities left behind.

It will foster innovation to build forward the struggling core U.S. manufacturing and industrial base. And it will promote new advances in renewable energy technologies like solar, wind and hydrogen while conserving and stewarding our precious environmental assets.

It will allow us an efficient multimodal transportation shared network with our closest neighbor, Canada, that connects people and goods with where they need to go. Indeed, Canada is our largest trading partner.

For America to compete in this century, we simply need a Great Lakes Authority, and I urge my colleagues to join us in this important effort. Please help us help the Great Lakes region.

AMERICAN BUDGET CRISIS

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

Mr. EMMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address a crisis eroding the budgets of hard-working Americans.

Earlier this month, the price of unleaded gasoline rose to the highest level on record, and President Biden's anti-energy policies are directly responsible.

On the campaign trail, Joe Biden promised to end fossil fuels. Since assuming office, President Biden has worked to make good on that promise, imposing 81 individual anti-energy policies.

Coincidentally, the price of gasoline has risen 81 percent since the beginning of his presidency.

Analysts estimate that President Biden's anti-energy agenda will cost American families an additional \$2,000 per year in gasoline costs alone. This is staggering for the 64 percent of Americans who live paycheck to paycheck, thanks to rising costs.

President Biden claims he can't do much right now to reduce gas prices. This simply is not true. President Biden can end the Federal freeze on new oil and gas projects, fast track LNG export permits, expedite approval of all pipeline and energy development, and stop the regulatory barrage on U.S. energy development.

There is so much that can and should be done right now, and this crusade against American energy dominance must end.

RECOGNIZING THE SHERBURNE COUNTY SHERIFF'S OFFICE

Mr. EMMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the extraordinary achievement of the Sherburne County Sheriff's Office.

Sheriff Joel Brott, his deputies, and the Sherburne County Jail and clinic staff have earned the prestigious Triple Crown accreditation from the National Sheriffs' Association.

As one of only 50 sheriffs' offices in the country to earn the Triple Crown accreditation, this is a major achievement.

In fact, this accreditation is so rare that, according to the National Sheriffs' Association, fewer than 100 sheriffs' offices have qualified since its establishment in 1993.

The Triple Crown requires simultaneous accreditation by four law enforcement organizations. Achieving one of them is a feat, but gaining all four at once is truly remarkable.

Congratulations, Sheriff Brott. We applaud you and your entire staff for your exceptional work and commitment to excellence in law enforcement.

OWEN LIPINSKI HOCKEY TOURNAMENT

Mr. EMMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a young hockey player in my district who embodies the spirit of our great sport.

For Minnesotans, hockey is a way of life. Like many young people in our State, Owen Lipinski grew up with a love for the game.

Sadly, when Owen was just 2 years old, he was diagnosed with Marfan syndrome, a connective tissue disorder that makes it difficult for him to play.

One rough hit could cause Owen to lose his eyesight or possibly even threaten his life.

However, this didn't stop him from playing. Owen participated in Minnesota Special Hockey and enjoyed it, but he still wanted more.

Recently, Owen organized a tournament with six teams composed of friends from his neighborhood. He organized the entire event on a pond in his back yard, complete with a public address system and a small concession stand.

As a fellow Minnesotan who loves the game, Owen is an inspiration. I am inspired by Owen and his great work. Congratulations on the tournament, Owen, and I hope you continue to inspire us for years to come.

□ 1030

HONORING REBECCA BOOKER

Mr. EMMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the outstanding accomplishments of one of my constituents, Ms. Rebecca Booker.

Rebecca has served the Blaine community as a certified fire and life safety educator for the last 20 years. Recently, Rebecca was honored with the 2022 Dr. Anne W. Phillips Award for Leadership in Fire Safety Education by the Congressional Fire Services Institute and the International Fire Service Training Association.

Among her many contributions to fire safety education, Rebecca helped develop the nationally recognized Home Safety Survey, a voluntary home inspection program that looks for potential fire, injury, and crime hazards while offering solutions. Rebecca has completed nearly 4,000 of these surveys herself and trained many colleagues across the country to perform these surveys in their communities.

Ms. Booker also helped establish New America Academy in Minnesota, an organization that provides fire safety education for culturally diverse and immigrant communities.

Rebecca, congratulations on earning this prestigious award and thank you for all you do to increase fire safety education in Minnesota's Sixth Congressional District.

RECOGNIZING ABBY HONOLD

Mr. EMMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Abby Honold, one of the strongest Minnesotans I have ever met and a leader in the fight against sexual assault.

Sexual assault is a life-shattering event, the trauma of which lasts a lifetime but can be compounded in the immediate aftermath by improper care. When Abby, then a student at the University of Minnesota, reported her assault to police in 2014, she worked with a healthcare professional proficient in trauma-informed care to recall important details about her assault to law enforcement and bring the perpetrator to justice.

Survivors like Abby deserve justice, and I was pleased to see that the Abby Honold Act got signed into law earlier this month.

CELEBRATING THE HISTORIC NOMINATION OF KETANJI BROWN JACKSON

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. ROSS) for 5 minutes.

Ms. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with great admiration for the strength and grace that Judge Ketanji Brown Jackson has demonstrated throughout her nomination process for the United States Supreme Court.

Last week, people from all over the world watched as she embarked on a journey that only five other women in history have taken. For too long, our judicial system and our government have not reflected the great talent and diversity of our Nation.

Like so many young women, especially our mothers and grandmothers, I had very few female examples to emulate at the beginning of my legal career. When I was at a pivotal age in high school, trying to decide exactly what path to take and what was even possible to achieve, I got to watch the nomination process for Justice Sandra Day O'Connor.

She was the first woman ever nominated to our Nation's highest Court, and I was deeply moved by her poise

and intelligence under questioning from the much older male Senators. Her confirmation solidified in me a passion for the law and a belief that I could accomplish anything I set my mind to.

I then went on to become a student of the Constitution myself, attending law school, practicing constitutional law, arguing in court, and fighting for justice as an attorney, a State legislator, and now as a proud member of the Judiciary Committee in the United States House of Representatives.

The world has completely transformed since I watched that confirmation hearing in 1981, yet, since that time, only four other women have joined our Nation's highest Court. Each of these Justices brought a unique perspective and inspired young women across the country.

Because of the small number of women who have been appointed, every time a woman is up for the bench, it is necessarily historic. I am ready for it to be less historic.

Although 51 percent of our population is female, of the 115 Justices in American history, 110 of them have been men. And none of them, not one, has been an African-American woman. Mr. Speaker, that needs to change at a faster rate.

Justice Ginsburg was once asked when there will be enough women on the Court. She responded, "When there are nine."

If confirmed, Judge Ketanji Brown Jackson will be the next, and the first African-American woman. I would like to say "when confirmed." Her nomination marks a momentous step forward in the long struggle for a judicial system that truly represents every American and delivers justice, fairness, and equality for all.

I can relate to all the young women out there watching this nomination process, feeling inspired to follow in her footsteps. Don't be deterred or dismayed by the disrespect that she was shown by a handful of Senators. My message to the young women is: You can do this. No matter the challenges or the obstacles, you can achieve your dreams.

Judge Brown Jackson said last week that her nomination is truly a testament to the hope and the promise of this country. She continues to give us new hope, especially to young women lawyers, and her rise to the highest Court of the land holds out the promise of a brighter future for our country.

Mr. Speaker, Judge Brown Jackson is an exceptional, extremely qualified nominee, and I look forward to calling her Justice Brown Jackson.

TROUBLING RECORD OF KETANJI BROWN JACKSON

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

Mr. CLYDE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to highlight the troubling record

of President Biden's U.S. Supreme Court nominee, Ketanji Brown Jackson, commonly known as KBJ.

Throughout her legal career, Ketanji Brown Jackson has earned a disturbing record on crime. In advocating for and administering lighter sentences for sex offenders, particularly those preying on and sexually abusing innocent children, KBJ has set an unforgivable pattern that disqualifies her from our country's highest Court.

A prime example of this pattern can be found in the case of U.S. v. Hawkins, where the sentencing guidelines called for up to 10 years in prison for a man, an adult convicted of possessing multiple images of child sex torture. Ketanji Brown Jackson sentenced this predator to just 3 months in jail. Unconscionable.

Mr. Hawkins recently told The Washington Post, "I wasn't very happy that she gave me 3 months, although after reflection when I was in jail, I was hearing from other people who said it was their first time arrested and they got 5 years, 6 years." And he got 3 months.

As crime rates soar in our cities across the country, adding soft-on-crime Justices, especially a Justice who basically ignores the crime of possessing and promoting images of severe child sexual assault, adding a Justice like that to the bench sends an alarming message to communities fearing for their safety.

Additionally, during her confirmation hearing last week, KBJ refused to define what a woman is, excusing her absurdity by claiming she isn't a biologist.

From women's sports to woke corporations like Disney, liberals are pushing an evil agenda that is erasing women and undermining women's accomplishments. As conservatives like myself fight this woke extremism, there will surely be cases considered in the future at the Supreme Court that require Justices to understand and accept the differences between men and women.

If KBJ can't define a woman, how is she to adjudicate Title IX cases? This is a legitimate question that no Democrat wants to answer. This, too, is disqualifying.

While I do not serve in the body that decides this monumental confirmation, I do have a responsibility to tell the American people the truth. And the truth is, a vote to confirm Ketanji Brown Jackson is a vote for lenient sentences for child sexual torture, a vote for the left's woke war on canceling the achievements of real women, and a vote for the liberals' dangerous agenda.

Americans, including Georgians, don't want a Justice on the bench who supports any of this radical garbage. Georgians are watching Senators WARNOCK and OSSOFF. Will they vote for a Supreme Court nominee that is soft on crime, on one of the most heinous crimes of all, child sex torture, or

will they stand up for all of Georgia's family values, protect our children, and be tough on crime by voting "no" on this Supreme Court nominee?

For the sake of our great Nation, the Senate must save the Supreme Court from a lifetime of votes siding with demented pedophiles by voting "no" on Ketanji Brown Jackson's confirmation.

NO VACCINE MANDATES

Mr. CLYDE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to join me in ensuring the Federal Government never again abuses its power by ordering employees to receive a vaccine or lose their job.

The COVID-19 pandemic has proven powerful elites will stop at nothing to quench their thirst for power, including President Biden, who issued through OSHA a rule that forced businesses with 100 or more employees to require the COVID-19 vaccine.

Forcing workers out of a job if they refuse to take a jab is a wholly unconstitutional power grab that violates Americans' freedoms, exacerbates labor shortages, and intensifies the supply chain crisis.

Congress occasionally gives our government agencies certain broad authorities, and when those powers are abused, it is our responsibility to claw them back and safeguard the rights of American citizens.

While the U.S. Supreme Court blocked President Biden's OSHA rule, Congress has the authority and the responsibility to prevent any future attempts by the executive branch to subject the American people to unlawful mandates. This is why I proudly introduced H.R. 7281, the Reversing Every Vaccine Emergency Requirement and Stopping Employee OSHA Mandates Act.

My bill, whose short title, is REVERSE OSHA Mandates Act, amends the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 to repeal the Secretary's authority to issue emergency temporary standards and is a commonsense and crucial step toward preventing future government overreach by OSHA and defeating their hand in medical tyranny.

It is incumbent upon Congress to prohibit this dangerous abuse of power from further tarnishing our Nation's history and subverting American workers' rights, which is why I urge all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this legislation that reins in OSHA and protects the freedoms of American workers.

PHIL JENKINS' REMARKABLE ACHIEVEMENTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Virginia (Ms. SPANBERGER) for 5 minutes.

Ms. SPANBERGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the remarkable contributions of Phil Jenkins, who recently finished serving as managing and executive editor at the Free Lance-Star in Fredericksburg, Virginia.

Phil gave his time, his energy, and his dedication to the Free Lance-Star for 24 years.

"Equally wise and unflappable," that is how his colleagues describe him. "A trusted leader, gifted editor, and generous mentor."

When he arrived at the paper in 1998, Phil made sure the paper stayed at the top of its game. As the years went on, his determination guided the paper through difficult stretches and through thousands of local news developments.

He oversaw critical investigations, including those related to the D.C. sniper trial. He managed major transitions, such as shifting from an afternoon to morning production cycle and moving the paper's offices to downtown Fredericksburg.

Under Phil's leadership the Free Lance-Star was nine times judged as Virginia's best midsize daily between 2011 and 2020, winning first place for its writing, design, and photography.

In Fredericksburg, Phil supervised dozens of people, including writers, photographers, designers, editors, web producers, and clerical staff. Those who worked with him over the years said that "few knew a more journalistically savvy, more evenhanded or more calming influence in the newsroom."

When asked to describe Phil's tenure at the paper, a former colleague said that Phil showed "unparalleled leadership" as well as "an uncanny ability to measure and satiate the community's hunger for the news that makes it unique."

Today, Phil's staff and the entire greater Fredericksburg region and the Free Lance-Star readership will greatly miss Phil's hand at the helm of the Free Lance-Star.

One former Free Lance-Star editor said, "Working with such a gifted journalist and wonderful person as Phil Jenkins was one of the highest honors of my life. There is no way to adequately thank him for the contributions he has made to the paper and to the community."

Phil's service to the Fredericksburg area and Virginia overall speaks to the enduring importance of local news, including print journalism. Local news keeps us informed about the day-to-day events in our communities. It allows us to share the triumphs of our neighbors. It holds those in power to account, and it brings to light the challenges we face together, as a community, as a Commonwealth, and as a country.

As another former colleague said, "Nobody gave more to the cause of community journalism than Phil Jenkins."

Today, on the floor of the U.S. House of Representatives, I would like to thank Phil Jenkins for his service to the people of Virginia. We thank him for his devotion to his colleagues, his commitment to accuracy, and his love of a good story founded on the truth.

□ 1045

RECOGNIZING BILL SHUGARTS

Ms. SPANBERGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Seventh Dis-

trict constituent and U.S. Army veteran Bill Shugarts.

Bill is a Vietnam veteran who served with the 23rd Infantry Division. In Vietnam, Bill planned and ran convoys, and one day, while doing command and control above the Hiep Duc Valley, Bill was in a helicopter crash. Thankfully, he suffered only minimal injuries.

Bill was honorably discharged in 1971 with various commendations and medals, including a Bronze Star with two oak leaf clusters. He began a successful corporate career spanning three different Fortune 500 companies.

But never forgetting his experiences in Vietnam or with his soldiers, Bill has devoted himself to his fellow veterans and our Nation's allies who have stood by our servicemembers.

In service to the community and local veterans, Bill founded the Northern Virginia Military Ministry Outreach, and he cofounded the Fawn Lake Veterans Group. He is a docent at the U.S. Army Museum, and he is a lay leader of the Methodist Wilderness Community Church's military ministry.

In my earliest days in office, and well before the final exit of American forces from Afghanistan, Bill was working to bring attention to the urgent needs of the SIV program. As a founding member of No One Left Behind, Bill focused on increasing the number of visas available, speeding up processing, and bringing refuge to those in danger. Bill worked closely with my office as we strived to make progress, get questions answered, and ultimately get SIVs home to America, their new home.

Now, through their church, Bill and his wife, Margene, continue their tireless work to help Afghan evacuees resettle and build community in their new home in Virginia.

Bill represents the best of Virginia, a Commonwealth made stronger through our ability to keep our promises to our veterans, our military families, and our allies. As the U.S. Representative for Virginia's Seventh District, I thank Bill Shugarts for his advocacy, his compassion, and his deep and abiding sense of service to our country and our Commonwealth.

HONORING DONNA DOSS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TONY GONZALES) for 5 minutes.

Mr. TONY GONZALES of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the passage of the Donna Doss Memorial Act.

In February 2019, Border Patrol agent Donna Doss was struck and killed by a vehicle while assisting a State trooper. Donna served more than 15 years in Border Patrol and held several leadership roles within the agency.

Donna was survived by her husband, two sons, parents, brother, and sister.

The House voted yesterday to officially rename the Rocksprings Border

Patrol Station the Donna M. Doss Border Patrol Station. This effort has been underway in Congress since 2020, and I am glad to see it has finally gotten over the finish line.

Our men and women in green put their lives on the line every single day to protect our country, and Americans everywhere are grateful.

CONGRATULATING GREGG POPOVICH

Mr. TONY GONZALES of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Gregg Popovich, head coach of the San Antonio Spurs, on becoming the winningest head coach in the history of the National Basketball Association.

On March 11, 2020, Pop earned his record-setting 1,336th win as head coach of the San Antonio Spurs when he defeated the Utah Jazz 104–102.

Pop has led the Spurs for over 26 seasons. Pop has won five NBA championships and was named head coach of the year three separate times.

I am honored to introduce my House resolution to congratulate Coach Popovich.

HONORING VETERANS BY EXPANDING CARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ) for 5 minutes.

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to thank every single veteran in New Mexico and nationwide for their service and sacrifices to our country.

But we cannot only thank our veterans for their service. We must honor their service by providing veterans the services they have earned.

In 2018, President Trump's VA began a process under the Asset Infrastructure Review Act to develop a list of recommendations to modernize and realign VA medical facilities.

Two weeks ago, the VA released its recommendations to the Infrastructure Review Commission and proposed the closure of four community-based outpatient clinics in rural areas of my district, closing the Gallup, Las Vegas, Raton, and Espanola clinics.

Combined, these four clinics serve thousands of veterans in predominantly Hispanic and Native American communities. Hispanics and Native Americans serve our country at higher rates. We are incredibly patriotic.

The VA wrongly assumes that these patriotic veterans can receive care from other community providers. They fail to understand that, in our rural areas, there aren't enough healthcare providers. The VA clearly doesn't seem to understand rural America.

The VA's own report listed veterans' statements that they have serious issues driving long distances for care and can't receive critical care and quality care in many areas due to limited community providers. While these were listed in the report, the VA may have listened, but I don't think they heard. But I do hear. I hear my vet-

erans and their stories. I hear their needs.

I heard Harry. Harry is a 75-year-old Cold War veteran who is also a cancer survivor. He is a survivor today because his clinic doctor, Dr. Gomez, ensured Harry received a biopsy, and he received it quickly. It caught his cancer and saved his life. The clinic doctor knew Harry. He knew his history and could respond quickly to Harry's concerns. Harry told me: "It was my pleasure serving this country, but the thing is that they need to take care of us."

Chris, another veteran I spoke to, told me: "Congress is quick to send us to war, but when it comes to healthcare, the government is severely lacking."

Shirley cried as she told me she believes she is alive today because she could drive herself to the clinic where she was immediately triaged, stabilized, and sent to a hospital for the chest pains she was experiencing. Her heart still beats today because of that clinic.

It breaks my heart that after all that these brave veterans have done for us, we are abandoning them just because they live in rural America.

I know how my communities struggle to receive care and the toll it takes on their loved ones to take a full day off work to drive them 6 hours just to draw labs or to have an annual checkup when it could be done in 25 minutes or less in town closer to where they live. Some veterans would be forced to drive those 6 hours round trip for care at the VA hospital in Albuquerque, which is itself overwhelmed, where veterans wait months for appointments.

Do you know what? The VA never spoke to the local Espanola VA clinic. I did. The Espanola clinic doctor told me that other local clinics are not specialized to the unique needs of veterans and don't understand the mental toll that military service has had on our veterans. He asked: "Don't veterans deserve more?"

Veterans do deserve more.

I have traveled to rural parts of my district to meet with veterans and hear what they need. The veterans I spoke to were upset, and rightly so. I am upset, too. They gave years of their lives in service to our country.

It is our Nation's solemn obligation to provide veterans the healthcare, education, housing, and honorable services they have earned, regardless of where they live.

This is about respect. This is about service. This is about saving lives.

I will not stop until we convince the VA and, when it gets to him, President Biden to reject these recommendations.

Instead of closing clinics, we should be expanding care and services to our veterans, meeting their needs wherever they happen to live—in cities, suburbs, or beautiful rural America and rural New Mexico.

That is how we truly thank our veterans.

CONGRATULATING U.S. MEN'S NATIONAL SOCCER TEAM

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

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the United States men's national soccer team on qualifying for the 2022 World Cup this November in Qatar.

Last night, the U.S. men's national soccer team completed their qualifying campaign in Costa Rica. It was a fitting ending to the team's qualifying run, filled with ups and downs and exciting matches, including big wins over Mexico, Panama, Jamaica, and Costa Rica.

After missing out on the 2018 World Cup, the United States team is headed back to the World Cup for the first time in 8 years.

From day one of the 2022 qualifying campaign, Coach Gregg Berhalter and the team set out on one mission and one goal, and that was to qualify. Bolstered by a golden generation of young and exciting talent, including players such as Christian Pulisic, Gio Reyna, Weston McKennie, Tyler Adams, Tim Weah, and many others, the U.S. put together a strong qualifying performance, including an undefeated record against the Mexican national team this past year, which is the first time that has been done in decades.

I am proud that Illinois is home to the United States Soccer Federation, which supports our men's and women's programs at all levels.

I know I join with many in Congress and across the country in congratulating the U.S. men's national soccer team. This qualification is a well-deserved result that is a testament to the hard work put in by all of U.S. soccer and the men's team.

The team has made their country proud, and I look forward to cheering them on at the World Cup in November.

A NEW DAY FOR TRANSIT IN NEW YORK CITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. ESPAILLAT) for 5 minutes.

Mr. ESPAILLAT. Mr. Speaker, I have the privilege of representing two historic and iconic districts in the 13th Congressional District.

Harlem is the center, the mecca, of the African-American diaspora. It is the center of culture, of music, of literature for the Black community with the Apollo, the Schomburg, and other great historical institutions.

The other neighborhood that I represent, Mr. Speaker, is East Harlem, El Barrio, which is the launching pad for the Latino experience in New York City. It was the home, the cradle, for the Puerto Rican community that opened its doors to Dominicans, Ecuadorians, Colombians, Central and South Americans.

They really are two historic districts within the 13th Congressional District. Today, we mark a new day for those two communities with regard to transit access.

This week, President Biden announced and submitted to Congress a strong and visionary budget. It included \$4.5 billion for the Capital Investment Grant program, which includes \$400 million for the construction of the second phase of the Second Avenue subway extension.

The first phase was completed not too long ago, several years ago, and it went from 96th Street south to 72nd Street, touching some of the most affluent ZIP Codes in the country.

This phase, the second phase, will go north to 125th Street. Some people have categorized it and called it Uptown Grand Central. It would connect East Harlem, El Barrio, and Harlem at 125th Street to the rest of the world.

These stops will connect a transportation desert where over 75 percent of its residents use public transportation to the Lexington Avenue line, which is the most overcrowded subway line in the city, if not the country.

East Harlem, as I said earlier, is currently a transportation desert, and this second phase will change the lives of over 100,000 New Yorkers who will use it on a daily basis.

This phase will extend train services to 96th Street and 125th Street, a 2-mile stretch, and benefit thousands upon thousands of New Yorkers. But it would also connect to Metro-North, a total of 124 stations in seven different counties in upstate New York, suburban New York, as well as Connecticut. As such, it will also connect folks to LaGuardia Airport via bus and future water transportation in the Hudson River and Harlem River.

This is truly a regional project that will connect Harlem and East Harlem, El Barrio, to the rest of the world.

I am happy and proud that President Biden included \$400 million for the second phase of the Second Avenue subway.

The first phase saw 160,000 people benefit on a regular basis, \$842 million in wages, and \$2.87 billion in economic activity in that region.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to see this new initiative.

I thank President Biden for bringing the second phase of the Second Avenue Subway to the 13th Congressional District.

□ 1100

SOUTHERN BORDER

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

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States takes an oath, promising to faithfully execute the office that he holds. That is a promise to uphold and defend the laws of this country and to protect our Na-

tion's citizens. But President Biden seems determined to violate that oath when it comes to enforcing our immigration and asylum laws.

There is an undeniable crisis at our southern border, and it is a direct result of President Biden's halting of the construction of the border wall, ending the remain-in-Mexico policy and re-implementing catch and release.

Now, instead of taking steps to rectify the situation that he has created, President Biden is preparing to pour fuel on the fire by lifting Title 42. Title 42 is essential to ensuring the immediate expulsion of illegal aliens. And officials within the President's own Department of Homeland Security are sounding the alarm. Officials have said that if this policy is revoked, it would cause a massive run on the border, even worse than we are seeing right now, resulting in upwards of 18,000 illegal crossings a day. That is 6.5 million illegal immigrants crossing every year.

State and local governments, especially school districts across the country, are being overwhelmed. Customs and Border Protection can barely keep up as it is, let alone with that kind of surge. President Biden is failing the American people and his neglect at the border is having catastrophic consequences.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

SOCIAL SECURITY AND THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

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

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about Social Security and its importance to the American people.

Mr. Speaker, everybody is alarmed by the fact that we have been dealing with a global pandemic. That global pandemic, commonly referred to as COVID, has taken close to a million lives in the United States of America. Over 700,000 of those lives are individuals over the age of 65.

The COVID pandemic has also turned the economy upside down and has led to a period of inflation. And during that period, the group that is impacted the most as well as seniors in America. It is people that are on fixed incomes that need our help directly.

There are more than 10,000 baby boomers a day who become eligible for Social Security. And for about 40 percent of senior beneficiaries, Social Security provides the majority of their income. And for one in six Americans, it provides more than 90 percent of their income. And yet, shamefully, the United States Congress has not taken action on this in more than 50 years.

Today, and every day, you can hear Members come to the floor and talk about their concern for our constitu-

ents; most notably, the elderly and even more poignantly, the veterans. More veterans rely on Social Security disability than they do on the VA. And yet, Congress has not addressed this issue in more than 50 years. The last time Congress addressed this issue, milk was 72 cents a gallon. Everybody knows that those prices have become so high today that it causes seniors to have to put food back on the grocery shelves because they can't afford it. This is especially true for people of color.

Mr. Speaker, I commend our former leader, John Lewis, who pointed out and said that Social Security is the next Civil Rights Movement because of the discrimination that is taking place within Social Security. And because also, people have come to rely on it because it is a guarantee.

We don't have to go back to 1929 and the great crash. We only have to go back as far as 2008 and 2009 to look at what happened in that recession and find out that people's 401(k) became a 101(k). And yet, during that same time period, Social Security never missed a payment—not a pension payment, not a spousal payment, not a dependent coverage payment, and not a disability payment.

This is not something the President can do by executive order, nor is it anything that the Supreme Court is going to adjudicate. This is the responsibility of the United States Congress, and help is on the way. People are going to have an opportunity to vote on Social Security 2100, bringing Social Security into this century and then also rectifying the discrimination that has taken place.

Recent polls show this: That 64 percent of Black adults say securing Social Security should be the top priority for the President and Congress to address this year. Martin Luther King had a better way of saying it. He called it the "fierce urgency of now."

In the midst of this pandemic, remember this, my colleagues on both sides of the aisle: These are your brothers and sisters. These are your parents. These are your aunts and uncles. These are your co-workers. These are people you worship with.

Over 5 million Americans get below-poverty level checks from Social Security. Why? Because Congress hasn't taken on its responsibility and stepped up to the plate and done what is expected of them.

I commend JIM CLYBURN, our leader here, who has come out strongly in favor of making sure that we address this inequality.

RECOGNIZING ODESSA AND MIDLAND CHAMBERS OF COMMERCE

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

Mr. PFLUGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Odessa and Midland Chambers of Commerce during

their fly-in to Washington, D.C., this week. It was incredible to host nearly 70 business and community leaders, elected officials, students, teachers, and staff from all throughout the Permian Basin, including the University of Texas of the Permian Basin, engaging with lawmakers, advocating for their community and advocating for energy independence. Thank you to the Odessa Chamber president, Renee Earls, the Midland Chamber president, Bobby Burns, and all the fantastic staff, leaders, and volunteers who helped make this fly-in successful.

TITLE 42 RESCISSION

Mr. PFLUGER. Mr. Speaker, the Biden administration's handling of the border crisis is not humane. It is heart-breaking.

Yesterday, the White House confirmed their intention to rescind Title 42, one of the only policies in place that is helping quell the border crisis.

This decision will have disastrous consequences on the already several million illegal immigrants who have flooded into this country. Human trafficking and smuggling across our border have reached historic highs, and our border States are paying the price. In fact, every State is a border State.

Texas is suffering from record-high levels of fentanyl and drugs pouring across the border, increased crime, high-speed chases, and more.

DHS already lacks the capacity to process, retain, and apprehend illegal immigrants along the border. Rescinding Title 42 will only double down on the amount of people that are illegally crossing the border, making it that much more difficult for those in the Border Patrol and Customs, and other agencies, who are trying to do their job to keep this country safe.

The small communities along the border are already overwhelmed and they cannot withstand a surge of hundreds of thousands of illegal migrants reportedly waiting on the other side of the border to get in once Title 42 is rescinded.

Migrants will pour into this country in a flood as our communities experience the catastrophic results. Patrol facilities and local communities will once again be forced to absorb at least double the current number. Title 42 is the only policy that is helping.

The administration has abandoned Texas, has abandoned other border States, and has abandoned its duty to secure our country. Making any changes to this policy will have disastrous consequences.

And get this straight, I remind everyone in this House that we still have a mask mandate on board aircrafts in this country to keep us safe from COVID. Yet, we are rescinding Title 42, also in place because of the pandemic. Think about that.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to stand with us and to help come up with a reasonable solution. Title 42 rescission is not that solution. President Biden must not rescind Title 42.

RECOGNIZING ELIZABETH ANN MAFFORD

Mr. PFLUGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a staple in the Odessa, Texas, community, Ms. Elizabeth Ann Mafford, also known as "Ms. Ann".

Ms. Ann recently celebrated her 10th work anniversary at Chick-fil-A in Odessa, Texas. And while this was a special occasion in and of itself, it comes on the heels of Ms. Ann also celebrating her 90th birthday.

Ms. Ann is a constant in Odessa, Texas, bringing joy and light to everyone she encounters. From working the drive-through and the front counter and just greeting customers on the way in, she continuously spreads light throughout the entire community.

In a testament to Ms. Ann's life, her celebration of her 10th anniversary on the job was recognized community-wide. Folks posted online in recognition of Ms. Ann's kindness and love, and I would like to personally thank her for living the American Dream, for showing everyone throughout this country that even at 90 years young that she can still work and be a productive member of our community, bringing so much light and joy throughout Odessa, the Permian Basin, and Texas.

Ms. Ann, thank you for what you do for our community and the joy you spread.

OIL AND GAS REBATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PORTER) for 5 minutes.

Ms. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, Orange County families are feeling the squeeze of higher gas prices. As a single working mom, I share their concern when I fill up my minivan. We can provide relief by holding oil companies accountable.

These corporations are making record profits, the highest they have been in over 7 years, even as Americans are struggling. And as the price of crude oil falls, oil and gas companies have refused to pass on savings to customers. Especially as Big Oil engages in profiteering, they should not get our taxpayer dollars to line their pockets. Each year, the industry receives roughly \$650 billion in direct and indirect subsidies, financed by taxpayers.

This week, I am leading an effort to bring legislation to the House floor that ends these giveaways to a profitable industry and instead puts these dollars toward helping families make ends meet.

Last week, I introduced the End Oil and Gas Tax Subsidies Act, which would eliminate nearly a dozen longstanding egregious tax breaks to the oil and gas industry. Healthy capitalism requires a level-playing field. For far too long, Big Oil has manipulated the market in its favor by lobbying Congress for sweetheart deals. Then, they raise prices while simultaneously rewarding their executives with huge bonuses.

Their record profits are proof that they can do without market-distorting government subsidies.

Eliminating these tax breaks would provide approximately \$60 billion in help to families feeling the squeeze. If my colleagues have the political courage to stand up to Big Oil, we can quickly relieve the pain that Americans feel at the pump. I am ready.

□ 1115

CRACKING DOWN ON PORCH PIRATES

Ms. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, porch pirates steal packages and make our communities less safe. Over 1 in 3 Americans, myself included, have been a victim of this theft, which costs us billions of dollars each year.

I joined Democrats and Republicans to introduce the Porch Pirates Act, which will crack down on this crime. This bipartisan bill expands Federal protections for mail and parcels to cover deliveries from private carriers.

Porch pirates are committing crimes of opportunity, and online shopping—especially during the pandemic—has dramatically increased these opportunities. I recently met with the Irvine police chief who described to me how sophisticated these bad actors have become.

Our Porch Pirates Act modernizes Federal law and helps keep families safe.

SOCIAL SECURITY IS A PROMISE

Ms. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, Social Security is a promise. It is a promise that we make to older adults and disabled Americans, people who count on our support.

One of Social Security's most important features—one not found in traditional pensions—is that benefits automatically adjust for inflation each year. The current level of adjustment isn't working. As corporate profiteers drive inflation to new highs, people on Social Security are not even treading water, they are sinking.

Democrats have a solution. The Social Security 2100 Act fixes the inflation adjustment. It would put more money in the pocket of older Americans and people with disabilities so they can afford higher healthcare costs and other expenses.

It would also eliminate waiting periods for people with disabilities, reducing disabled poverty. More than 200 Members of Congress support this bill, and I am proud to be among them. By passing the Social Security 2100 Act, we honor our promise to older Americans and disabled Americans.

AMERICA'S ENERGY INDEPENDENCE

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

Mr. MEUSER. Mr. Speaker, when the Biden administration learned Iran was just weeks away from enriching enough uranium for a weapon, this administration's response was to rush to a deal to

slow but not stop Iran's nuclear ambitions. This is so.

Mr. Speaker, the fact is, no deal will include concrete guarantees that Iran will not develop nuclear weapons. Yet, in pursuit of a deal, the Biden administration is offering concessions that will enrich our adversaries, endanger our allies, and cost America dearly.

The whole new deal now hinges on delisting the Islamic Revolutionary Guard—yes, that terrorist organization—even as the IRGC supported attacks against U.S. troops recently in the UAE.

Mr. Speaker, sanctions relief will give Iran access to over \$100 billion in frozen assets. That is over \$100 billion in frozen assets to the center of terrorism in the world. Nuclear trade, in addition, with Russia and China will only strengthen this unholy alliance.

What can our allies expect from an Iran enriched from energy sales and free from sanctions? Even worse, President Biden is seeking to buy oil from Iran instead of ramping up U.S. production. This disastrous decision, irrational decision, will fill their coffers even more.

We have wrecked our U.S. national and economic security, Mr. Speaker, by forfeiting our energy over the last 15 months and our independence. We are now subject to the fluctuations from the randomness of the geopolitical events rather than relying upon American workers and American energy.

We have cost our Nation thousands of jobs and empowered our enemies. We are seeing this firsthand with the leverage we have ceded to Russia because this administration seeks to decimate U.S. energy production.

The Department of Energy is taking trips and seeking oil purchases from Venezuela. Mr. Speaker, I have not seen Department of Energy representatives in Pennsylvania to see how the great reserves in the Marcellus Shale can support our country's energy needs.

Is the Biden administration choosing Venezuela over Pennsylvania? Are they choosing Tehran over Texas? And as my good friend, Representative AUGUST PFLUGER, branded not too long ago: Are they choosing Moscow over Midland?

This is the product of disastrous domestic policies weakening our hand in diplomacy and the Biden administration rushing to negotiate from a position of weakness. It is why our allies are urging us to walk away and keep sanctions in place on Iran.

This deal was misguided 7 years ago. It is downright dangerous today. We need Democrats and Republicans in this House to stand up for America and against this erroneous, misguided, senseless Iran nuke deal.

HONORING MAJOR NHIA LONG VANG

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

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I want to begin by taking a moment to remember one of my constituents who lived an extraordinary life, Major Nhia Long Vang, who recently passed away.

Major Vang was a longtime leader in the Fresno Hmong community and bravely served alongside American soldiers in Laos during the Vietnam war. This conflict also is known as the secret war in Laos. Major Vang was recruited at the age of 19 by the Central Intelligence Agency to serve in the Special Guerilla Unit, otherwise known as the SGU, during the secret war to help the U.S. fight against the North Vietnamese Communist Army and the Pathet Lao Communist troops.

In the late 1960s and early 1970s, Major Vang led intelligence missions on the Ho Chi Minh Trail to gather surveillance on the Communist forces. He also oversaw missions that rescued American pilots during the Vietnam war when their planes were shot down.

By 1980, Major Vang's family received asylum to come to the United States, where he would settle in Fresno in 1983. Once in the United States, Major Vang worked tirelessly to support the families of soldiers whom the secret war in Laos impacted.

Major Vang was a leader and advisor to organizations like the Lao Veterans of America and the Special Guerilla Units Veterans and Families. Major Vang was also instrumental and a partner in helping my efforts to secure burial rights in national cemeteries and other benefits for Special Guerilla Unit veterans who fought alongside with American soldiers.

It has been an honor in my career to get to know a hero like Major Vang and work with him as an advocate for the SGU veterans and get them the recognition they so deserve.

WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I want to turn now to recognize Women's History Month. While it is the end of March now, we so honor always the contributions that women make in our country and in our valley. Across the world they make a difference every day, as we know.

I would like to take this opportunity to recognize just some of the so many talented and incredible women that I interact with and I get a chance to work with:

Dora Westerlund is president and CEO of the Fresno Area Hispanic Foundation. Dora has changed the lives of more than 15,000 Hispanic and non-Hispanic-owned businesses to become economically self-sufficient and add to the vibrancy of our economy in the San Joaquin Valley.

Sara Bosse serves as the public health director for Madera County. During this pandemic she has been incredibly responsive and led the county's response to combat COVID-19 by expanding testing, vaccinations, and managing the outbreaks in Madera County.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to recognize Gammeloh Mohammed of Merced who

founded the Merced County Freedom Coalition, which fosters collaboration between law enforcement, government agencies, and other community partners in the fight against human trafficking. As co-chair of the Victims Rights Caucus, I know her efforts are very important. She has provided essential resources to support survivors and victims of crime.

AMERICA'S SUPPLY CHAIN ISSUES

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I now want to turn to an important issue that is affecting our economy, and that is the supply chain issue. Congress can take effective action by cracking down on foreign-owned shipping companies that have monopolized the industry and that are creating inflationary pressures.

My bill, the Ocean Shipping Antitrust Enforcement Act, subjects foreign-owned ocean shipping carriers to American antitrust law, as they should be. This builds on provisions in the Ocean Shipping Reform Act that Representative GARAMENDI and I and others are supporting that has already passed the House.

Together, these pieces of legislation protect American exporters from unfair trade practices like container rate increases, sudden change in shipping schedules, unreasonable fees by shipping companies, and ships leaving ports with empty containers after they have offloaded their goods here in America.

Agricultural producers in California are suffering. A University of California study found that in the fall of 2021, an empty container leaving California ports hit almost 80 percent, pre-pandemic it was about 30 percent. This is an unfair trade practice.

President Biden said in this very Chamber during the State of the Union—on the topic of ocean shipping reform—that capitalism without competition is exploitation. It is. We must answer the President's call to get this meaningful ocean shipping reform legislation to his desk.

GOD BLESS UKRAINE

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, let me close by saying, God bless the people of Ukraine and the suffering during this horrific war taken on by the pariah Putin, who is a war criminal and must be punished for it. God bless them.

TRIBUTE TO DON YOUNG

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN) for 5 minutes.

Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to give tribute to Congressman Don Young.

For almost 50 years, Congressman Don Young proudly represented all Alaska. The dean of the House, as he was affectionately known, was the ninth-longest tenured Member of Congress. His passing last week leaves a huge void for his constituents, for this body, and certainly for so many of us who had the honor of personally knowing Don. For me, personally, I thought

he was a mentor for many of the issues that we shared together.

Our paths first crossed when I was 20 years old and I was elected among a group of fellow young Republicans to meet Congressman Young when he visited the island to discuss its future political status. It was in that moment when I was able to witness firsthand his loyalty to the causes he deeply cared about, including Puerto Rico's quest for statehood.

Little did I know at that time that I would have the fortune and honor to serve alongside him in the U.S. House of Representatives, and to sit on the two committees he ever served on and chaired, the Natural Resources and the Transportation and Infrastructure Committees.

Congressman Don Young had a unique perspective when it came to Puerto Rico's fight for statehood and full equality as American citizens. He could relate because he moved to Alaska shortly after it was admitted into the Union as the 49th State.

As Alaska's sole Representative in the House, he understood better than anyone else the inequities under the territorial status and the opportunities that statehood brings. He knew what kind of fight we would be in for, and he was with us every step of the way.

He understood the difficulties of representing a non-contiguous district here in this body, and because of this, Puerto Rico found in him an immediate ally. He frequently visited the island and even served as an election observer in one of our most recent referendums, demonstrating once again his longstanding commitment to ensuring the island's 3.2 million American citizens had their voice heard.

When former Speaker Paul Ryan was giving a tribute to Congressman Don Young when he became the dean of the House, he said: You always knew where he stood, but more importantly, you always knew where you stood with him. And that is because he made no secret of his politics or his opinion.

He was a staunch supporter of utilizing domestic energy and mineral production and infrastructure development to spur economic growth. He also fiercely defended Alaska Natives' rights and worked tirelessly to ensure they were enabled to improve their lives and economic status. He was a loyal friend to organized labor and to his fellow veterans.

Congressman Don Young was a legislative force of nature. He was the primary sponsor of 123 bills that were enacted into law, including legislation for the Trans-Alaska Pipeline in his first year in Congress. More often than not, he crossed the aisle on bills such as the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act, women's rights, such as the Lily Ledbetter Fair Pay Act of 2009, and the Magnuson-Stevens Act, otherwise known as the Young-Studds bill, which revolutionized Federal fisheries management and preserved the commercial fishing industry in Alaska and across the country.

Mr. Speaker, Congressman Don Young's legacy will live on in every Alaskan, every Member who has served with him, and every staffer who has been fortunate to learn from him.

His passing leaves a big void. He touched our lives deeply in so many ways, and this House will never be the same without Don.

I pray for his wife, Anne; Congressman Young's two daughters; and his grandchildren.

Godspeed, Don Young, and gracias.

□ 1130

WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH

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

Mr. CARTER of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, March is Women's History Month, and I can't let this month pass without highlighting two barrier-breaking public servants.

So many women have contributed greatly to Louisiana, but today, I want to take a few moments to celebrate two: Councilwoman Dorothy Mae Taylor and Congresswoman Lindy Claiborne Boggs.

A New Orleans teacher and activist, Dorothy led a fight for equality within the segregated school systems while serving as a PTA president. Under her leadership, the city's Black and White schools finally achieved equal funding.

While I didn't know it at the time, my educational experience as a boy growing up in New Orleans in the sixties and seventies would improve thanks to the work of Mrs. Taylor. During the civil rights movement, she successfully fought to desegregate New Orleans recreational facilities and register African-American voters.

She was a woman of many firsts: the first woman of color to be elected to the Louisiana House of Representatives; the first African-American woman to hold the head of a State department; and the first Black woman and one of the first two women to serve on the New Orleans City Council, in 1986.

Councilwoman Taylor worked issues like criminal justice reform before they were popular. After a century of segregation, she was the first councilmember to move on a proposal to ban discrimination in Mardi Gras krewe membership, a move that paved the way for their eventual desegregation.

I was elected to the New Orleans City Council in 1994, the year that Councilwoman Taylor retired, but I am so grateful to have known her and to have had an opportunity to learn from her many pearls of wisdom.

Though she passed in the year 2000, she left a lasting mark on New Orleans, Louisiana, and our country.

Congresswoman Lindy Boggs lived a life of service and warmth, unafraid to break the glass ceiling while overcoming great personal loss.

Her husband, the Honorable Hale Boggs, served in Congress for decades

until his tragic death in a plane crash. Following his passing, Lindy Boggs replaced him as Congresswoman Boggs and became the first woman ever elected to Congress from the State of Louisiana.

It takes a lot of inner strength to do that, strength we also see today from our current colleague serving as a Member of Congress from Louisiana, Congresswoman JULIA LETLOW.

In this very Chamber, Congresswoman Boggs fought tirelessly for equal rights for women and minorities. She also fought to make the House of Representatives more welcoming to women, successfully advocating for a women's-only space in a governing body that was more than 96 percent male. That room still exists today and is appropriately named the Lindy Claiborne Boggs Congressional Women's Reading Room.

Throughout her life, Congresswoman Boggs famously opened her home, her kitchen, and her heart to the people of Louisiana and the community she loved so much.

She passed in 2013, but we all uplift the memory of Congresswoman Boggs and Councilwoman Dorothy Mae Taylor for advancing issues that they had committed their entire lives to protecting and advancing voting rights, fighting against discrimination, providing healthcare to underserved members of our community, and fighting for humanity for people everywhere.

In the spirit of the Honorable Lindy Boggs and the Honorable Dorothy Mae Taylor, we say thank you for your incredible service, and we will continue the drumbeat of these issues here in Congress.

ENERGY COSTS AFFECTING U.S. FARMERS

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, there has been a lot of talk about energy and energy costs in this country and, of course, in my home State of California, where you can easily find fuel over 6 bucks a gallon. Let me translate this conversation into what it means for farmers and what farmers mean for food supply.

Now, we know the United States farmer provides the best, the cleanest, the most efficient process, more grown per acre per unit than anywhere else in the world. So, it is amazing to me that, just a few days ago, President Biden announced that we are going to have food shortages in the world and even here. We are already seeing the empty shelves. We are already seeing the high prices—supply and demand for everything.

In the United States of America, food shortages make me ask: What are our priorities as a country and as a government here or in my home State, the government of California?

We are looking at energy costs. Everything requires energy when we have a product that goes from a field, from a mine, or from a manufacturer to your home, Mr. Speaker. The fuel costs to operate a tractor, a combine, the trucks that bring you fertilizer and that bring you seed, the trucks that take away the grown product to the processor, to the mill, and finally bringing it to your store shelf or even if you have it delivered to your house, Mr. Speaker. All those energy costs ripple through everything we do and have as citizens of this country.

What is being done about energy costs? Well, I just saw a blurb a minute ago that the President wants to tap into our energy reserve, the stored oil that we have someplace that always seems to be a political football around here to solve some problem when it is really supposed to be a reserve for very acute times of danger for our country. Now, they are using it as an economic flattener or what have you.

We have reserves in the ground in this country that we are not tapping, but our tone-deaf government here and our State of California won't do anything about that. Instead, let's export it from Venezuela, and let's export it from the Middle East. Maybe we will do something about Russia. We will see if that takes effect.

We are not doing anything to help our own people with the energy crisis and energy costs here. We are dancing around that collectively as a government in this administration. Why? What is their priority? When John Kerry says he hopes this thing Putin is doing in Ukraine doesn't stop our ability to reach our climate change goals, how tone-deaf are these people? Are you kidding me?

We are going to continue to enjoy even emptier shelves for our food, tires, and everything else because of high energy costs and a government in Washington and in Sacramento unwilling to do anything about it other than half measures or zero measures.

What does this do to our food supply, as we talked about? My colleagues in the State legislature proposed a sales tax holiday, a fuel tax holiday, which would knock about 51 cents off of a gallon of fuel. It is not the be-all or fix-all, but it can do something temporarily to help while we get our energy going again, supposedly. It would help. They turned that down. Instead, they proposed a tax increase on production of fuel in California. Unbelievable. Damn, who are you guys working for? Amazing.

In my home State, as we try to produce food, tens of millions of acre-feet of water and snow fall upon our State each year. We hear drought, drought, drought, record drought. Yes, it is lower than normal, but we are not capturing the water we can.

We could raise Shasta Dam, a Federal project, which Federal dollars were put toward. We could build Sites Reservoir in northern California and

add 1.5 million-acre feet of stored water.

But no. They are letting the water get away out through the delta for salinity and for fish populations that don't even exist. The delta smelt is gone.

The Klamath Basin up in the north, zero allocation for agriculture last year and this year. Statewide, we are looking at probably 70 percent of irrigated acres by the time it is all added up. They are going to be idle this year.

What does that mean to the American people? That is California's problem; you guys don't know what you are doing out there anyway. Well, tomato production is going to be down quite a bit, so that means less tomato sauce for New York, less olives and olive oil for New York.

This is what we are doing to our food production. Fertilizer costs are going to drive costs even more, and we will not be farming in California much longer.

PRESIDENT BIDEN'S BUDGET DISREGARDS FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY

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

Mr. ARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, President Biden's own words: Show me your budget, and I will show you your priorities.

President Biden's budget is not only a reflection of his priorities; it is a mirror into the soul of the Democrat Party. Biden's budget exposes Democrat leadership's complete disregard for fiscal responsibility, adding trillions of dollars in new spending and sending us hurtling toward an incalculable national debt of \$45 trillion by 2032.

The budget proposal includes a staggering \$2.5 trillion in tax hikes that would weaken our global competitiveness, stifle wage growth, and send prices skyrocketing even higher than the current 40-year high inflation. The result would be devastating for American investment, innovation, and jobs.

The deficit spending in Biden's proposal will leave our children steeped in debt and at risk of an economic crisis they cannot borrow their way out of. His budget doubles down on the radical socialist policies, including the Green New Deal and its extreme environmental policies and a whole-of-government assault on oil and gas, which is undermining our energy independence and making us weaker and more vulnerable, like our friends in Europe. It also includes tax hikes that will make America less competitive, raising taxes higher than Communist China, and hiring tens of thousands of new IRS agents to harass hardworking Americans.

This is his vision for a stronger and more prosperous America.

While the President's expansion of nondefense domestic spending is on

pace to double over the next several years, his budget effectively cuts spending for the Defense Department by 4 percent. If our adversaries weren't already emboldened by the disaster at the southern border, the debacle in Afghanistan, the weak negotiations with Iran, or the slow and feckless response to Russia's invasion of Ukraine, they certainly will be now.

The President's budget is not only a failure in the area of readiness; it is more advertisement of weakness in an increasingly dangerous world.

Lastly, the President's budget uses an outrageous budget gimmick to prevent his massive, multitrillion-dollar Build Back Better from affecting the budget score.

Mr. Speaker, if the American people did that—that off-balance, Enron-like accounting scheme—they would go to prison. This is not just intellectually dishonest; it is downright deceitful.

From the top-line numbers to tax hikes, from partisan policies to bureaucratic bloat, President Biden's budget highlights the Democratic Party's real priorities: the largest expansion and most radical reimagination of the Federal Government in the lives of its people.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 44 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. LIEU) at noon.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Margaret Grun Kibben, offered the following prayer:

Gracious God, take this day into Your keeping. Let no minute pass that we fail to realize that You have ordained its stewardship, guided our footsteps, and allowed our enjoyment of it.

For You only had to speak, and the heavens were created. You breathed Your words, and the stars were born. You assigned the sea its boundaries and locked the oceans in vast reservoirs.

Holy God, we marvel at Your handiwork and stand in awe of Your power. So may we realize that You are at work in us this day.

In reverence to You, may we display the beauty of Your creation in us. May we be true to the purposes for which You have placed us in this time, in this place.

From our mouths, may there come forth words that reflect both Your

truth and Your compassion. May our attitudes reveal the care and concern You have for all those You have made in your image.

Let our lives ever flow with the love You have shown us that all may come to rejoice in Your loving kindness.

In Your merciful name, we pray.
Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 11(a) of House Resolution 188, the Journal of the last day's proceedings is approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. LAMALFA led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

HONORING REPRESENTATIVE DONALD E. YOUNG

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

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor the legacy of my good friend and colleague, Congressman Don Young from Alaska, who sadly passed away the evening of March 18.

Don was an inspirational man who served the people of Alaska in the House of Representatives for nearly half a century and did so with a giant heart and tremendous passion.

Don cherished this institution. He was a strong proponent of bipartisanism and civility, and he consistently sought to find common ground. It is something I always admired about him.

There is something I want the country and the world to know: He was also a champion for the disability community, and I was proud to work closely with Don as co-chairs of the Bipartisan Disabilities Caucus.

Together, we worked across the aisle to break down barriers and provide opportunities for Americans with disabilities and to raise awareness of disability issues for our colleagues.

Don was a problem solver. He was a dedicated public servant. And, in many ways, he was larger than life. I was devastated to learn of his passing, and I am really going to miss him. He made a difference.

His wife, Anne, and his children, Dawn and Joni, are in my prayers, as well as his entire family.
Rest in peace.

AMERICA'S EXTREME ECONOMIC CRISIS

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

Mrs. MILLER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, a tree is known by its fruits. Every policy that Biden and the Democrats have created is demonstrably an America last policy.

They call it Build Back Better, but the truth is, their agenda is Americans last, build back broke policies.

Americans are facing an extreme economic crisis as a result of Democrat policies that President Biden and Speaker PELOSI have put into place.

Skyrocketing prices at the store and the pump are causing Americans pain in their pocketbook. Biden's outrageous budget is fuel on the inflation fire.

President Biden and the Democrats in the House are deliberately bankrupting Americans and taking away their economic opportunities. What are we leaving behind for our children and grandchildren?

Americans cannot afford the America last policies the Democrats have created that have made crisis upon crisis.

RELIANCE ON FOREIGN OIL

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

(Mr. HIGGINS of New York). Mr. Speaker, U.S. reliance on foreign oil threatens our national security, pollutes our environment, and unnecessarily burdens our families with high and fluctuating gas prices.

Americans want to make the leap to electric vehicles which are cleaner, quicker, and quieter. But the lack of supply and changing infrastructure is holding people back.

China ranks number 1 in the world, controlling 80 percent of the market of producing raw materials in lithium ion batteries, the United States ranks 15. If we don't move quickly, we will fall further behind.

I support efforts to invoke the Defense Production Act so President Biden can help domestic manufacturers expand the production and supply of critical materials and goods.

This is a bold and necessary move that will accelerate the availability of electric vehicles and put Americans back to work.

ENERGY COSTS AFFECT FARMERS

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, President Biden has been promising recently

empty shelves, food shortages in the United States of America.

American farmers are the most efficient and the best in the world at what they do, but they can't do it very well with these high energy costs.

Fertilizer takes energy to produce. It takes oil to produce. When you see the cost increasing 51 percent, this isn't just going to hit the farmers; it is going to hit all consumers.

Energy costs ripple through everything: planting, harvesting, delivering, everything. So what are we doing? What is our focus going to be?

In my home State of California, water is being taken away from agriculture. We need the Bureau of Reclamation and our own State water resources to be focused on producing food for people.

In Ukraine, those farmers are trying to plant amidst bombs from Putin and Russia. In our own country, in my own home State, the bombs are being dropped by the government on farmers, having their water taken away, having their energy costs go through the roof.

We have to focus on producing energy and food for Americans that is affordable instead of this direction that the Federal and my own State government are doing to the people and not for them.

HONORING THE LEGACY OF RETIRED MAJOR GENERAL NORBERT RAPPL

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

Mr. MORELLE. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to pay tribute to an American patriot and a prominent fixture in my community, retired Major General Norbert Rappl, who passed away earlier this month.

General Rappl was a courageous veteran who dedicated his life to serving our great Nation in the United States Army.

A Korean war veteran, he rose through the ranks, retiring as Commander of the 98th Training Division of the United States Army Reserves. We are deeply grateful for his service.

Upon returning home, General Rappl turned his dedication to his community, and my hometown of Irondequoit, becoming a charter member and past president of the Irondequoit Rotary Club chapter.

His never-ending devotion to serving others was his life's calling and is a key piece of his legacy that will never be forgotten. May he rest in peace.

VIETNAM VETERANS DAY

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, this past Tuesday was Vietnam Veterans Day. The day was a reminder that our freedom is not free.

We stand together to thank and honor Vietnam veterans and their families for their service and their sacrifice. Across the country, we paused and remembered the service and sacrifices made.

Tuesday, in Indiana County, in the Pennsylvania 15th Congressional District, the Historical and Genealogical Society hosted their second annual program featuring guest speakers, music from the era, and an historical display relating to the Vietnam Memorial in Washington, D.C., called "The Wall that Heals."

Vietnam Veterans Day and the programs are dedicated to honor the veterans who served Active Duty in the United States Armed Forces from November 1, 1955, to May 15, 1975, the time period in which the U.S. had soldiers deployed.

In addition to a pinning ceremony for Vietnam veterans in attendance, wreaths will be placed remembering Indiana County residents who were killed in the line of duty or named as missing in action during the war.

Mr. Speaker, events like the program in Indiana County are a great way for our younger generation to learn and our older generations to be remembered. It is important we always find time to thank and honor our veterans for their service to our great Nation.

To my friends who are Vietnam veterans, welcome home.

REMEMBERING UKRAINE

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

Ms. DEAN. Mr. Speaker, it has been 5 weeks since Vladimir Putin launched his assault on Ukraine and its people; a relentless churn of cruelty, of war crimes, crimes against humanity.

More than 4 million people have fled Ukraine, but tragically, not everyone has found refuge. More than 1,000 civilians have been murdered, and that number grows.

On Monday, there were more than 40 shellings by Russian troops in and around Kyiv, destroying homes, and in one case, killing a child in his own bed.

The children. There have been 145 children known dead, a likely horrifying undercount. Innocent children, unarmed civilians. The horror continues.

We must continue to support Ukraine and provide all necessary aid. We must not lose sight of the people.

Pennsylvania is home to more than 122,000 Ukrainians, the second most of any State, and my district is home to a dynamic Ukrainian-American community, many with family in Ukraine.

I think of them. I think of Ukraine every day. The world must stand united to end this series of war crimes.

"Glory to Ukraine." "Slava Ukraini."

"Glory to the heroes." "Slava heroyam."

HAPPY 100TH BIRTHDAY, MARINA METEVELIS

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

Mr. HERN. Mr. Speaker, a very special friend and constituent of mine turned 100 years old last week. Her name is Marina Metevelis, but back home, she is better known as Tulsa's "Rosie the Riveter."

Marina took the iconic red bandana for the first time and wrapped it around her head when she was 16 years old in 1941, when she reported to work on the B-17 Flying Fortress bombers in the aftermath of the attack on Pearl Harbor.

Marina joined the "Rosie the Riveter" sisterhood that day and stood shoulder to shoulder with an army of extraordinary women who became the most formidable munition and war supply manufacturers in modern history.

They played an integral role in World War II, for which the entire world is grateful.

Marina still wears the red bandana to this day. She hasn't slowed down for one second, working to forge a better community for Tulsa and continuing her lifelong mission to support our veterans by raising funds for numerous veteran organizations.

Happy birthday, Marina. Thank you for your service to our Nation, and may God bless you.

□ 1215

PREPARING OUR COUNTRY FOR THE FUTURE

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

Ms. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, today the House will take a historic step toward restoring American manufacturing leadership by voting to go to conference on the COMPETES Act.

This bold bill makes much-needed investments in research, innovation, and manufacturing that will ensure America can outcompete any nation in the world now and for decades to come.

The package will accelerate domestic production of semiconductor chips, the key component of everything from cars and computers to communications and clean energy systems. It will strengthen the supply chain to make more goods in America. It will create jobs and support new skill-building apprenticeship programs, and it will support strong labor and environmental standards.

What's more, the bill and its provisions have received bipartisan support, both here in the House and over in the Senate. You heard that right, Congress is delivering investments that will prepare our country for the next generation of success.

CONGRATULATING APR SUPPLY COMPANY ON 100 YEARS IN BUSINESS

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

Mr. SMUCKER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate APR Supply Company on the occasion of their company's 100th year in business, which is a milestone that not many companies achieve.

APR Supply Company is a third-generation-owned-and-operated full-service distributor of plumbing, HVAC, and hydronic supplies, supporting countless companies through their 38 locations in my district and in other areas of Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Delaware.

In America, the entrepreneurial spirit it has led many to pursue founding a business. Over the years some may succeed, some may fail, but to celebrate 100 years is a milestone that few achieve, as I mentioned. This achievement signals that an organization is relentlessly pursuing their values and supporting their customers.

I recently enjoyed visiting one of their facilities with third-generation president and CEO Scott Weaver to learn about their innovative inventory management system and their operations.

Again, congratulations to the team at APR Supply and to Scott on celebrating 100 years in business. Best wishes on their continued success.

CAPPING THE PRICE OF INSULIN

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

Mrs. TRAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of something every single Member of this body should be able to get behind, capping the price of insulin at \$35 a month.

In my home State of Massachusetts, over half a million people rely on their lifesaving insulin prescription. But being forced to pay anywhere from \$100 to \$1,600 a month for it simply isn't doable for so many families.

Far too many diabetics are being forced to ration their doses, and some are even skipping them altogether because they can't afford the medicine they need.

Let's be clear about what that means. Hardworking folks are risking their lives each day because big pharmaceutical companies are putting profits first.

We have the ability to change that with the legislation before us today, Mr. Speaker. And shame on us if we stand by and do nothing while people we have the honor to represent die waiting for Congress to act.

I plead with my colleagues to join me in supporting this important legislation. Our constituents are depending on us.

COMMENDING BOYS AND GIRLS CLUBS

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

Mrs. CHERFILUS-McCORMICK. Mr. Speaker, today I want to recognize the Boys and Girls Clubs of Broward County and Palm Beach County for over 100 years of combined service to their communities.

Over the past half a century, both clubs have grown and now serve more than 10,000 youth in 17 cities across Palm Beach County and over 12,500 youth at 12 locations across Broward County. Their work is critical for the success of the kids who need them most in our communities.

Each young person who walks through their doors can access programs that support their academic success, physical health, social-emotional well-being, and leadership development.

Most importantly, it is a safe place for kids to have fun, make lifelong friends, and to help build resiliency and the confidence that will serve them for the rest of their lives.

The Boys and Girls Clubs Movement challenges each and every one of us to fulfill our full potential. For more than 50 years, the Palm Beach County and Broward County clubs have done just that. I commend both organizations as they continue their essential work helping young people reach their full potential as productive, caring, and responsible citizens.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3617, MARIJUANA OPPORTUNITY REINVESTMENT AND EXPUNGEMENT ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 6833, AFFORDABLE INSULIN NOW ACT; AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1017 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1017

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 3617) to decriminalize and deschedule cannabis, to provide for reinvestment in certain persons adversely impacted by the War on Drugs, to provide for expungement of certain cannabis offenses, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary now printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 117-37, modified by the amendment printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without inter-

vening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary or their respective designees; (2) the further amendments described in section 2 of this resolution; and (3) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 2. After debate pursuant to the first section of this resolution, each further amendment printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules shall be considered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, may be withdrawn by the proponent at any time before the question is put thereon, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question. All points of order against the further amendments printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules are waived.

SEC. 3. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 6833) to amend title XXVII of the Public Health Service Act, the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, and the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to establish requirements with respect to cost-sharing for certain insulin products, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. An amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 117-38, modified by the amendment printed in part C of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided among and controlled by the respective chairs and ranking minority members of the Committees on Education and Labor, Energy and Commerce, and Ways and Means, or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 4. House Resolution 188, agreed to March 8, 2021 (as most recently amended by House Resolution 900, agreed to February 2, 2022), is amended by striking “April 1, 2022” each place it appears and inserting (in each instance) “April 29, 2022”.

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

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mrs. FISCHBACH), 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. PERLMUTTER. Mr. 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 Colorado?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, the Rules Committee met and reported a rule, House Resolution 1017, providing for consideration of two bills. The rule provides for consideration of H.R. 3617, the MORE Act, under a structured rule. The rule self-executes a manager's amendment from Chairman NADLER, provides 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, makes three amendments in order, and provides one motion to recommit.

The rule also provides for consideration of H.R. 6833, the Affordable Insulin Now Act, under a closed rule. The rule self-executes a manager's amendment from Chairwoman DELAURO, provides 1 hour of debate equally divided among and controlled by the chairs and ranking minority members of the Committees on Education and Labor, Energy and Commerce, and Ways and Means, and provides one motion to recommit.

Finally, the rule extends recess instructions, suspension authority, and same-day authority through April 29, 2022.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased we are here today to provide for consideration of Chairman NADLER's MORE Act, which would end decades of failed and unjust marijuana policy.

Today, 18 States, two territories, and the District of Columbia have laws legalizing and regulating commercial cannabis, and a total of 37 States, three territories, and the District of Columbia have laws allowing cannabis for medical purposes. An additional 11 States have low-THC medical cannabis laws.

This means a total of 47 States, four territories, and the District of Columbia have laws allowing some use of cannabis; 97.7 percent of the U.S. population live in these States and territories. It is clear Prohibition is over.

Today we have an opportunity to chart a new path forward on Federal cannabis policy that actually makes sense. The MORE Act is about justice, safety, equity, and States' rights. The bill would decriminalize cannabis at the Federal level by removing the substance from the Controlled Substances Act, but the bill does not force a State to legalize any form of cannabis. It is still up to the States to set their own policy.

The bill also contains provisions on resentencing and the expungement of criminal records. There is no reason why people should still be in prison for low-level, nonviolent cannabis convictions, or have their future predetermined by a cannabis conviction. The war on drugs has torn many families and communities apart and has had a disproportionate impact on people of color. The MORE Act would allow communities to start the healing process.

By removing cannabis from the Controlled Substances Act, the bill also addresses the cannabis banking problem that I have been working on for nearly

10 years in the form of the SAFE Banking Act. Under current law, banks and credit unions providing services to State-licensed cannabis businesses are subject to criminal prosecution and regulatory penalties under Federal law. Therefore, businesses which legally grow, market, or sell cannabis in States where it is legal are generally locked out of the banking system, making it difficult for them to maintain a checking account, access credit, accept credit and debit cards, meet payroll, or pay tax revenue.

This has created a significant public safety risk, as these businesses are forced to operate as cash-only businesses in an industry with billions and billions of dollars in transactions. These high-volume cash businesses are being targeted by violent criminals and putting our communities at risk.

I want to share a few examples of how bad the public safety issue has become.

In November 2021, over the course of one week in Oakland, California, more than 25 cannabis businesses had their stores vandalized and robbed and lost upwards of \$5 million.

A Colorado dispensary chain saw 15 burglaries during a 90-day period in mid-2021, with criminals driving vehicles into their buildings, cutting holes through rooftops and walls, and attacking the stores with pry bars and sledgehammers.

Washington State is averaging more than a robbery per day at dispensaries. In fact, recently in *The Seattle Times*, it was reported that there were three deaths related to robberies of dispensaries—the robber, a policeman, and owner of a store. This is just last week.

This is an untenable situation for these businesses, their employees, and their customers. If Congress fails to align Federal and State law, crimes targeting dispensaries will only get worse. The cannabis industry remains one of the fastest-growing industries and now supports more than 428,000 jobs, with nearly \$25 billion in State-legal cannabis sales per year. The time to pass the MORE Act and right the injustices in our community is now.

This rule also provides for consideration of H.R. 6833, the Affordable Insulin Now Act, to address skyrocketing insulin costs. Over 37 million Americans have been diagnosed with diabetes, and in Colorado there are over 300,000. The Affordable Insulin Now Act will require Medicare Part D and health insurance plans to cover insulin and cap out-of-pocket cost-sharing at \$35 per month.

Prescription drugs like insulin force Coloradans to make difficult financial decisions. In a 2020 report from the Colorado Attorney General, approximately 40 percent of all survey respondents reportedly using insulin are forced to ration their use of this lifesaving product at least once a year.

□ 1230

I am proud of the steps Colorado has taken to ensure individuals have great-

er access to insulin. In 2021, Colorado became the second State in the country to limit insulin prices by enacting an insulin affordability program.

No one should have to pay more than \$35 a month for insulin. The passage of this legislation will lower costs for insulin users and save money for hard-working Americans. I commend Representative ANGIE CRAIG and all of my colleagues for their work on this bill.

I urge all of my colleagues to support the rule and the underlying bills, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the Representative from Colorado for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Today, we are here to consider House Resolution 1017, a rule providing for consideration of H.R. 6833 and H.R. 3617. This rule makes in order no Republican amendments, completely ignoring the flaws of each underlying bill and the thoughtful concerns raised by my colleagues. Not only do my colleagues not want to debate these issues, but they also don't appear to even want to acknowledge them.

First, I want to address H.R. 6833, the Affordable Insulin Now Act, which would require health insurers to cover selected insulin products without applying any deductible or imposing any cost-sharing in excess of \$35.

This bill is just a partisan exercise that will only reshuffle the decks for how patients pay for insulin. It is not a serious attempt to address rising prices. The price controls in this legislation would be an expansive intervention into the free market and will most likely lead to an increase in premiums for everyone.

Let's not forget, one of the reasons drug prices are rising is because of Washington and the majority's runaway spending leading to the greatest deficits in American history. Instead of admitting that their wildly expensive spending bills have caused inflation, my colleagues claim that companies have suddenly decided now is the time to raise prices arbitrarily.

Congress cannot keep dumping money into the economy and then blaming American companies for the problems it creates. We need to be focusing on getting our debt under control and stop the war on American industry so that we can reduce prices not just on drugs but on everything.

Furthermore, addressing only insulin establishes a problematic precedent and fails to take into account the high prices associated with countless other necessary drugs, like those for cancer, heart disease, and a slew of other conditions.

A sincere attempt by Congress to solve this problem would be to focus on ways to reduce pricing through market-based forces. For example, Republicans on the Energy and Commerce Committee have offered several proposals which would improve price transparency so that Americans could

see the real cost of their drugs and make choices accordingly.

Instead of working with Republicans to advance these solutions, the majority has yet again elected a go-it-alone approach that has yet to achieve any results for the American people.

Next is H.R. 3617, the Marijuana Opportunity Reinvestment and Expungement Act, a broad bill that would remove pot from the list of scheduled substances under the Controlled Substances Act and eliminate criminal penalties for individuals who manufacture, distribute, or possess marijuana. This rule makes no Republican amendments in order, which is proof that the Democrats just want to push this bill as a messaging bill.

That said, there are several concerns with this bill. First, it fails to set any standards to prevent marijuana use by those most vulnerable to abuse: minors. In fact, back in September, when Mr. FITZGERALD offered an amendment to alter the definition of the term "minor" to align with other provisions of U.S. Code, the majority voted against it.

Without this amendment, crucial protections for our youth are left out of this bill. In committee, I even offered a motion to consider an amendment that would maintain existing penalties for selling pot to minors. It was defeated along party lines, a stunning position for Democrats to take.

But not only does this bill legalize pot; it creates a new government program to assist people in opening pot stores. Let me repeat that: This bill creates a government program to help people open pot stores.

This bill also ignores the issue of driving under the influence, even though driving under the influence of marijuana can have deadly consequences, something law enforcement officers across America have warned about.

Additionally, what happens if an illegal immigrant is arrested for driving under the influence of marijuana? This is not addressed.

Republicans on the committee sought to ensure that this bill would not impede the deportation of illegal immigrants who have been arrested for driving under the influence. That was also rejected along party lines.

There are so many issues our constituents are facing today. Yet, we are here, spending time considering legislation to legalize pot that is not only flawed, but it is also dangerous.

We could be working on lowering gas prices, tackling the snowballing Federal debt, or addressing the inflation affecting every American today. But instead, I guess the majority wants us to get as high as today's gas prices and spend tax dollars on pot stores.

Mr. Speaker, I oppose the rule and the underlying bill. I ask Members to do the same, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I remind my friend from Minnesota who was talking about party-line votes, we want to bring down the cost of prescription drugs, whether it is insulin or across the board, which we have done in the Build Back Better bill that is sitting in the Senate, and I can say I think virtually every single Republican voted against negotiating prescription drug prices.

If you want to talk about a free market, then you ought to be able to negotiate prescription drug prices so that Americans across the board get the best possible prices for their drugs.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. MORELLE), a prominent and distinguished member of the Rules Committee.

Mr. MORELLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished and, by his own admission, highly caffeinated gentleman from Colorado (Mr. PERLMUTTER), my Rules Committee colleague and great friend, for yielding me time.

I rise today in support of the rule and the underlying legislation. In particular, I would like to say a few words about the Affordable Insulin Now Act.

Over the past two decades, the costs of prescription diabetes drugs like insulin have artificially skyrocketed by more than tenfold.

A few years ago, I was proud to commission a report by the House Committee on Oversight and Reform to determine the extent of this price gouging and how it is affecting communities across the country, including my own in Rochester, New York, and the impact it is having on patients, especially older adults, and our uninsured population. The results of that review were staggering.

In communities across the country, out-of-pocket costs have risen by 400 percent for the Medicare program and beneficiaries over the last decade. The average price for a standard unit of insulin in the United States was more than 10 times the average price in a sampling of 32 other countries.

These excessively inflated prices have real consequences on how patients manage this chronic disease. I have talked with many patients and families in my own district that have had to ration their dose or stop taking this life-saving and life-sustaining medication altogether.

For the richest and most powerful nation in the world to allow this to continue is nothing less than shameful.

In passing this bill, we are taking the first step of many to rein in these inflated costs and protecting patients to ensure the best possible health outcomes.

I am so proud to deliver for my constituents back home, and I look forward to voting for this rule and getting one step closer toward seeing the bill passed into law.

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

Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amend-

ment to the rule to provide for consideration of Congresswoman MCMORRIS RODGERS and Congressman WESTERMAN's American Energy Independence from Russia Act.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include the text of my amendment in the RECORD, along with extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Mr. Speaker, while the majority is continuing to prioritize things like legalizing marijuana, constituents in my district continue to send me photos of their energy bills and the prices they are paying at the gas pumps.

Since President Biden took office, gasoline prices are up by more than 50 percent, natural gas is up more than 25 percent, and diesel fuel is up more than 47 percent. These price increases are on top of crippling, record-high inflation that is a tax on the American people of every stripe, class, and creed.

When adjusted for these factors, wages and salaries are below prepandemic levels. My constituents are pleading with Congress to focus on this issue and are being ignored by the out-of-touch majority.

Mr. Speaker, to speak further on the previous question, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. HERN).

Mr. HERN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose the previous question so that we can immediately consider H.R. 6858.

This administration has sent desperate requests for oil from oppressive regimes like Iran and Venezuela. It is past time the Biden administration start making those frantic calls to Oklahoma instead of OPEC or even my friends in Texas instead of Tehran. Until that happens, gas prices will continue to soar, and hardworking Americans will suffer.

While Putin continues to wage war on Ukraine, exposing our dependence on Russian energy, Biden continues to wage war on our domestic oil and gas industry that provides sustainable, reliable energy to the American people.

This week, Biden doubled down his attack by releasing a budget that includes an astonishing \$45 billion in tax hikes on American energy producers.

Seventy percent of goods in America are moved by trucks. An increase in gas prices will continue to be passed down on the food and products that all Americans buy. Let me be clear: Biden's energy policy is hurting all Americans and not just at the pump.

Whether you like it or not, traditional energy powers our country. Oil and gas are essential to power our homes and, yes, provide the energy to power electric vehicles.

Biden's war on energy poses a threat to all of us. It is imperative that the Federal Government stop villainizing the industry that powers our world.

Global energy markets are complicated, but one thing is certain: If policymakers continue to impose barriers on domestic energy production, prices will continue to rise. Therefore, we need to instill confidence in the industry that plays such a crucial role in our economy by restoring stability and consistency with policies that prioritize American energy production.

Investors and business leaders make their decisions based not only on the policies debated and voted on in D.C. but also on the rhetoric from public officials. What happens in this Chamber impacts businesses, but also what we go out and say on cable TV.

Trust me, I was a business leader for 35 years. Today's political climate will directly influence future investment decisions, especially in heavily regulated industries like energy.

The Biden administration has been sending mixed messages. My colleagues on the other side of the aisle say they are concerned about the high prices reflected by the weak oil and gas supply, but their actions tell a different story. They aggressively push a plan to crush oil and gas production entirely.

Their video simply doesn't match their audio, which is why the American people have lost faith in Democratic leadership.

We must restore sanity and pursue energy dominance once again on the world stage.

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

Mr. Speaker, just a couple points in response.

One, we are trying to bring down the price of insulin—that is one of the bills here that we are talking about—from the outrageous amounts that are required for this lifesaving drug down to \$35. Yet, my Republican colleagues oppose reducing that.

They worry about inflation at the pump, which we all do, but it is Putin's price hike. We know where this came from, this increase, and the President is working to release millions of barrels of oil from our underground storage, and he wants to place a price on leases that aren't being used. We have 12 million acres that are under lease and are not being used. That will bring down the price at the pump. But we have to defeat Putin. It is his price hike.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5½ minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), the chairman of the Rules Committee.

□ 1245

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize someone who has made a truly exceptional contribution to this institution and to the work that goes on here, the amazing Peggy Fields.

Peggy has served in the Clerk's Office since 2008, first as assistant bill clerk and now as bill clerk, where she oversees an amazing team that works late

nights and long hours to literally keep the House of Representatives running.

I can spend hours talking about how incredible everyone in the Clerk's Office is:

How they have an incredible eye for detail and never drop the ball;

How they seamlessly process the hundreds of daily submissions into the hopper;

How they rose to the challenge of keeping this body running during a pandemic—implementing proxy voting and the e-hopper so our work could go on, even when it wasn't safe for all of us to be here;

And, of course, how much they believe in this institution and all that it represents.

But I only have a few minutes, so let me just say to everyone in the Clerk's Office that your work does not go unnoticed. It is recognized by so many of us here in the congressional community and beyond.

Mr. Speaker, Peggy Fields started her journey to Capitol Hill 33 years ago when she went to work for former Congressman "Bud" Cramer, who was then the district attorney of Madison County, Alabama.

Congressman Cramer told me that when he was sworn into Congress in January 1991, the first employee in his Washington office was Peggy Fields. Peggy helped run that office for 18 years, and unsurprisingly, she was beloved by everyone. In the Congressman's office, Peggy proudly represented her hometown of Huntsville, Alabama.

He told me that Peggy and her family are renowned in Huntsville, and that she is and always has been devoted to the people of Huntsville, as well as her friends and family back home.

In 2008, she joined the Office of the Clerk as an assistant bill clerk. And her dedication and exceptional work ethic earned her the promotion to bill clerk in July of 2021.

As if all this were not enough, Peggy will soon graduate from Wesley Theological Seminary with a doctorate of ministry degree in church leadership. And I want to congratulate her on that incredible achievement.

Peggy and her team have the daunting task of processing every single bill and cosponsor form for the House.

Mr. Speaker, as you know, the bill clerks work especially closely with the Parliamentarian's office, because the Parliamentarian is responsible for referring all bills on the day that they are introduced. And the bill clerks process those referrals on the same day as well.

Now, sometimes that means that the bill clerks and Parliamentarians share late nights together and they get to know each other quite well. I want to read a note sent over to me by the Parliamentarian's office about Peggy.

"Peggy is always such a welcoming presence to us, both on the floor and in

our offices. However, Peggy is so welcoming and kind that there is always a noticeable uptick in bill introduction whenever she is stationed on the floor. That is why we came to know her by the nickname 'The Bill Magnet,' we know that our workload increases whenever she is on the floor.

"However, always thinking of others, Peggy would make up for this increased bill count by singing a cappella renditions of popular songs in our office while we finished up our referrals. She is one of a kind, the consummate public servant, and truly irreplaceable to this institution."

Mr. Speaker, at a time when there are a lot of challenges and uncertainties in the world, here is someone who is doing everything she can to make everyone's day a little bit brighter and to give back to her community and to her country; someone who, through her dogged willpower, incredible knowledge, and decades of experience, tackles every challenge she faces with poise, talent, and a great sense of humor.

Even on her team's busiest days, during their longest hours, and on their latest nights, and during the historic and often unprecedented times that we are living through, Peggy is a beacon of light, bringing camaraderie and positivity to everything she does.

She has served this institution, and the people it represents, with integrity, with honor, and with skill for the past 33 years.

Mr. Speaker, Peggy Fields is an inspiration, and her career in public service has been nothing short of remarkable. She set out to make a difference, and what a difference she has made.

On behalf of all of my colleagues and staff on both sides of the aisle, past and present, and the countless people in whose lives Peggy has made an immeasurable difference, I would like to extend this institution's deepest and most sincere thanks to Peggy and wish her all the best as she begins this new chapter.

Thank you, Peggy.

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

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Mr. Speaker, I join the gentleman from Massachusetts and the entire body in congratulating Ms. Fields on her retirement and thank her for her service.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. JOYCE).

Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the previous question so that we can immediately consider H.R. 6858, the American Energy Independence from Russia Act.

As Congress debates legalizing marijuana, Americans in the real world are facing an energy crisis that we in Congress cannot afford to continue to ignore.

In my hometown of Altoona, Pennsylvania, the cost of gasoline is now \$4.28 a gallon; over 50 percent higher than it was just one year ago.

In rural communities, these skyrocketing prices are forcing families to make hard choices about what they can afford and what they cannot afford. Instead of working to support the needs of these Pennsylvanian families, President Biden and his administration have continued to work against American energy producers.

On day one of his Presidency, President Biden made good on a longtime liberal wish list item. He canceled the Keystone XL pipeline. Now, in his budget, President Biden has chosen to put solar panels ahead of natural gas. He has chosen to put windmills ahead of coal. He has chosen the Green New Deal ahead of Pennsylvanians.

Now, the President has decided to recklessly release oil from our strategic reserves without a concrete plan to refill them. This stopgap measure does not support our national security and it will do little to help lower the cost of fuel for American families.

It is time to invest in American energy. It is time to return to American energy dominance.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the previous question.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, we are here about reducing prices on insulin, something that so many Americans need. Yet, my colleagues want to talk about a bill that is not even before the House of Representatives today. We ought to be talking about reducing the price of prescription drugs, like insulin, for Americans who need it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. SCANLON), my friend, and another prominent member of the Committee on Rules.

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative PERLMUTTER for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of today's rule. The two bills in the rule provide for important, long overdue reforms that most Americans are in favor of. The MORE Act will reform our Federal drug laws to bring Federal laws in line with the majority of States which are now legally and responsibly regulating cannabis.

Mr. Speaker, 37 States, including the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, have successfully legalized medicinal cannabis, creating a thriving, safe, and legal market for cannabis, creating thousands of jobs and billions in new tax revenue. This is a rare win-win scenario for everyone—government, businesses, patients, and consumers.

However, the ongoing conflict between our State and Federal laws creates daily legal issues for businesses, banks, doctors, and consumers. The MORE Act will address these problems by removing cannabis from the Controlled Substances Act. This will allow veterans to use medicinal cannabis without losing their VA benefits.

It will allow legal businesses to access financial services. It will allow scientists and government agencies to research cannabis, and it will not prevent States from regulating or even criminalizing misuse of cannabis.

More importantly, the MORE Act includes a comprehensive package of criminal justice reforms to give a second chance to those whose lives have been upended by the excesses of the war on drugs.

Mr. Speaker, today's rule also includes the Affordable Insulin Now Act, which will cap insulin costs at \$35. This is a much-needed reform that will provide financial relief to the millions of Americans who rely on insulin to manage their diabetes. While I am glad that we are able to find compromise on capping insulin costs, Americans are demanding that we pass comprehensive legislation to lower prescription drug costs for all Americans. And we continue to invite our Republican colleagues to help us to do that.

Prescription drug prices are way too high. Insulin is ten times more expensive in the U.S. than in other countries. Across the board, Americans pay more for their drugs than people in other countries pay for the exact same drugs. There is no justification for this difference.

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

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman.

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, the prescription drug market is broken, and insulin is just one example of how bad the problem is. We urgently need prescription drug price reform so all Americans can afford the medications they need to manage their health.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to vote for today's rule and the underlying bills when they are considered on the floor.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Colorado (Mrs. BOEBERT).

Mrs. BOEBERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Minnesota for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question so that we can immediately consider the American Energy Independence from Russia Act.

Gas prices are at \$5 and even \$6 a gallon. The average household is now spending \$2,000 more a year because of increased gas costs on Biden's watch. Biden and the Democrats think that now is the time to add \$45 billion in new taxes on the oil and gas industry. Many Americans have been and are being regulated into poverty in an unnecessary sacrifice at the altar of climate change.

Instead of unleashing our domestic oil and gas industry, Biden is "simp" to radical environmentalists and not-in-my-backyard extremists, and literally begged OPEC to drill more oil instead of relying on the hardworking American roughneck.

On day one, he canceled the Keystone XL pipeline, killing 11,000 good-paying American energy jobs. But that didn't stop the big guy from approving the Nord Stream 2 pipeline and benefitting our enemies.

Because of Biden's fake ban on Russian oil and gas, that won't even go into effect for 22 more days and is littered with waivers to keep Russian energy flowing, the U.S. continues to import 100,000 barrels of Russian oil and send them roughly \$10 million each day. We folks are funding the Kremlin.

Why does Biden favor foreign energy over domestic energy? We know that American natural gas is 42 percent cleaner than Russian gas, so it is not for environmental reasons. But maybe there is another reason we don't know about. Perhaps there is 10 percent in this tucked away for the big guy.

How about this: Instead of funding both sides of the war and playing Biden and Pelosi's con games, we should restart construction of the Keystone XL pipeline, overturn Biden's energy leasing moratorium, and expedite permits for pipelines and natural gas exports.

We need the American Energy Independence from Russia Act and stop playing Biden's energy-from-anywhere-but-America game.

Mr. Speaker, America should not only have affordable energy for our own use, but we should be exporting it abroad. We can literally export strength and freedom to our allies.

In short, the solution is very simple. Drill, baby, drill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 90 seconds to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN).

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, and still I rise. In the richest country in the world, we cannot allow healthcare to become wealth care; available to those who can afford it.

Mr. Speaker, this is why I support H.R. 6833, the Affordable Insulin Now Act, because diabetes can kill, and insulin can save lives, if you can get it.

Some things bear repeating. Insulin saves lives if you can get it. Mr. Speaker, this bill will ensure that millions who need it will be able to get it. In the richest country in the world, Mr. Speaker, we cannot allow healthcare to be wealth care.

□ 1300

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUCSHON).

Mr. BUCSHON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the previous question so that we can immediately consider H.R. 6858, the American Energy Independence from Russia Act.

Just 1 year ago, our country was comfortably meeting our energy needs, and we were a net exporter of energy for the first time in 50 years. However, under the Biden administration, we have seen a continued assault on American energy that has killed jobs, increased our dependency on foreign energy sources, and most recently jeopardized our national security.

The administration continues to block new oil and gas lease sales from moving forward, all while placing undue regulatory burdens on American energy development. Just this week, President Biden proposed \$45 billion worth of tax increases on fossil fuels in his budget to further weaken America's ability to power our country.

These proposed tax increases are just another example of the administration doubling down on the anti-American-produced energy policies that have sent prices skyrocketing here at home. The administration's energy agenda has not only undermined our country's energy security, but has also forced our European allies to become even more dependent on Russia to meet their energy needs.

Instead of turning to America's own energy sector to meet our energy needs, this administration is asking countries like Iran and Venezuela to compensate for the ban on Russian imports and ignoring American energy producers. In doing so, they are prioritizing oil produced by dictators over American energy producers who support jobs and businesses here at home.

The administration must reverse course and stop depending on foreign dictators to ship oil to the United States.

Mr. Speaker, now is the time to flip the switch and reduce our dependence on foreign energy by unleashing American energy. I urge a "no" vote on the previous question.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, could I inquire how much time each side has remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Colorado has 10 minutes remaining and the gentlewoman from Minnesota has 13½ minutes remaining.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. TLAIB).

Ms. TLAIB. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Affordable Insulin Now Act and the underlying rule.

It is unconscionable that in the richest country the planet has ever seen, millions of Americans, our neighbors, are forced to choose between buying medicine and paying their gas bill. Americans pay more than 10 times the price of insulin compared to other similar countries; 10 times.

In fact, one in four of our neighbors who rely on insulin have rationed or skipped doses due to costs. I want folks to think about that. A quarter of the people prescribed insulin for their medical condition have risked their life to be able to afford another month's worth of insulin. This is shameful.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 6833 caps out-of-pocket costs for insulin at no more than \$35 per month in Medicare and commercial health insurance. This cap will be a lifesaver for millions of our neighbors who currently pay 10 times more the price of insulin compared to similar wealthy nations.

How can these companies sell the exact same drug here for 10 times the

price of other nations? Because corporate greed and price gouging are not just permitted in our country, but encouraged. The bill is not the complete fix, Mr. Speaker, and we must do more to help our uninsured. So many are hurt and getting sicker and even dying because of corporate greed and monopolies of Big Pharma.

This bill is the beginning in reining in corporate greed and putting people over profits. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. MOORE).

Mr. MOORE of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose the previous question so we can immediately consider H.R. 6858, the American Energy Independence from Russia Act.

I am a proud cosponsor of this bill that will strengthen our energy security, bolster our economy, and position ourselves to counter Russian aggression in Ukraine.

This morning, gas near my district office in Ogden, Utah, is \$4.30. For the average family driving the average vehicle in Utah, this means that each fill-up will cost over \$110. For Utah's hard-working agricultural industry, this means thousands of dollars more will be spent on fuel so they can feed the rest of America.

These skyrocketing prices are unacceptable. I share my constituents' outrage over how the Biden administration's policies have contributed to this painful situation. This is a self-imposed tax on all Americans. For those of us who come from energy producing States, we know we can do better.

It is past time we get back to what we were doing in 2019 when the United States was a net exporter of energy. It is better for our economy and our environment when we produce domestically. In Utah, we understand this because we do this.

Instead of allowing Americans to do their jobs, the Biden administration has shut down new oil and gas leasing. Instead of helping our communities grow, he has asked the oil cartels in the Middle East to pump more oil. Instead of investing in America, he has made us more dependent on energy imports from Russia and other foreign adversaries. We can do better.

Passing the America Energy Independence from Russia Act today will put us on a path toward energy independence. I encourage my colleagues to join me in rejecting the previous question so we can lower prices for all.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I support this bill's relief for Mary in Austin whose grandson, like so many others, will be able to get some relief. They are paying up to \$300 per month for insulin, and now they would pay \$35 per month.

But 5½ million Texans and 28 million Americans are uninsured. This bill of-

fers them no help whatsoever. In our upside-down healthcare system, those who have the least continually get asked to pay the most for essential pharmaceuticals. Sixty-eight percent of those without health insurance are forced to pay full monopoly prices for their essential insulin. They are being denied any relief today, despite the fact that I and 12 of my colleagues offered a simple amendment that could have provided that assistance.

Nor does this bill represent the slightest progress toward preventing prescription price gouging. It is so true, as many have said, that many Americans are paying 10 times the price for insulin as do consumers in other countries. This bill does not do anything, however, to lower it to nine times. Indeed, this bill does not lower the price of insulin by one penny, it just shifts the burden of paying for the insulin off the shoulders of insured insulin users, and shifts it on to the rest of us who are paying insurance premiums, and will pay higher premiums because of this, and \$11 billion more in costs to the taxpayers.

Mr. Speaker, I assume Big Pharma supports this bill because it is not facing any additional duty to lower its prices for this lifesaving product. Some day this Congress will break free of the shackles of Big Pharma, which fills these halls with more lobbyists than there are Members of Congress.

Some day we will provide genuine relief to all Americans burdened by soaring drug prices, but that day, sadly, is not today.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARRINGTON).

Mr. ARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose the previous question so that we can immediately consider H.R. 6858, the America Energy Independence from Russia Act. That would not only strengthen our security and independence, it would lower gas prices by approving the Keystone pipeline, removing restrictions on LNG exports, restarting production on Federal lands and waters, and overall encouraging more American energy development.

In the midst of skyrocketing inflation and surging prices at the pump, along with the geopolitical context where Europe is dependent on Russian oil and gas, you would think the Biden administration would abandon their whole-of-government approach to targeting American energy production. Since Biden took office, he has used every tool at his disposal to undermine the oil and gas industry and our energy independence along with it.

In addition to the onslaught of his unilateral attacks, his first Presidential budget was released and called for \$35 billion in punitive tax increases on the oil and gas industry. His administration has weaponized and abused their regulatory authority to attack the industry at every turn; SEC reports for permitting on the directives, and EPA radical regulations.

What is more astonishing is Biden's latest budget, which is \$4 trillion in taxes, and includes \$45 billion in taxes on oil and gas. These are the same provisions that his own party rejected and had to abandon their build back broke proposal.

Just like he has done with the regulatory regime, it appears our President is weaponizing the tax code to cancel an entire sector of our economy, one that is paramount to our prosperity and security. As events around the world constrain supply, he seems hell-bent to ensure that anyone but American energy producers, the most efficient, the cleanest producers in the world, are positioned to supply the United States and our people and our allies around the world.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I remind my friend, Mr. ARRINGTON, that there are 12 million acres of nonproducing Federal land with 9,000 unused but already approved permits for production.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to wish Mr. ARRINGTON a happy birthday.

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support H.R. 6833, and I acknowledge Ms. CRAIG and Mrs. MCBATH. I tell my friends on the other side of the aisle that we can walk and chew gum at the same time, but right now people are dying because they are apportioning or putting in proportion their insulin that they need—not taking the full amount, but doing it proportionately. That is a death sentence.

Let me indicate: Native Americans, 14.7 percent diabetic; Hispanic, 12.5 percent; Black Americans, 11.7 percent. Many of them are on Medicare and many of them are on Medicaid. We can do both. I do rise to support this legislation—\$35 in 2023, regardless of whether a beneficiary has reached the annual out-of-pocket spending; \$35 beginning in 2024.

It is well-known that those who had diabetes suffered more with COVID-19. This is an important step. In the 18th Congressional District uninsured residents paid 23 times more for the brand of insulin, and we must begin to work on that. I join with my colleagues in making that the next step. I rise for this.

Mr. Speaker, I also rise to support the new response to marijuana, and to insist that we pass the MORE Act that came out of my subcommittee on the Judiciary Committee.

Public support for legalization of marijuana has surged in the past two decades. A total of 47 States have reformed their laws. We must reform the banking aspect of it. We need to open the door to research, therapeutic treatment for veterans, better banking and tax laws, and we need to help fuel the economic growth within the industry.

We need to do this by sending dollars out to help our respective communities bring down the cost of crime, be able to

help those who are in business. We must do this and spend Federal resources to end criminalization, build the economic engine, and to ensure that we are in step with 47 of our States.

Thousands of men and women have suffered needlessly from the Federal criminalization of marijuana with mandatory minimums, particularly Black and Brown. All these persons incarcerated need to be able to be constructive, but they are in there on the false war on drugs.

Mr. Speaker, I support both the insulin bill and the MORE Act, and I ask my colleagues to support the underlying rule.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak in support of the Rule governing House consideration of H.R. 3617, the “Marijuana Opportunity Reinvestment and Expungement Act of 2021,” or the “MORE Act of 2021.”

The Rule that is being considered is carefully crafted and provides Members of the House an opportunity to address the existing conflict between federal and state laws regarding marijuana, or cannabis, and to provide reasonable solutions to resolve this conflict.

The bill is straightforward and responds to the need to leave the question of the legality of cannabis to the individual states while attempting to restore and reinvest in communities that have been ravaged by the War on Drugs.

Specifically, the bill decriminalizes cannabis on the federal level, provides a taxation structure for the sale of cannabis that will support a community reinvestment trust fund, and provides for expungement of convictions and arrests for federal cannabis offenses.

The Rule provides for debate and full consideration of the solutions and opportunities for cannabis reform offered by H.R. 3617 by the Congress.

The subject of the bill is public knowledge and well known by members of this body.

I have worked to provide sensible reforms to our criminal justice system.

Our outdated federal laws and policies unwisely require the expenditure of scarce law enforcement resources on cannabis offenses while conflicting with many states’ laws regarding cannabis.

Cannabis does not fit the definition of a Schedule One drug and federal law must be updated to reflect this reality—just as most states have already begun to do.

Thirty-seven states, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and Guam have adopted laws allowing medical use of cannabis.

Eighteen states, the District of Columbia, and the Northern Mariana Islands have adopted laws for legalizing cannabis for adult recreational use.

As public support for the legalization of marijuana has surged in the past two decades, a total of 47 States have reformed their laws in one form or another pertaining to cannabis, despite its federal criminalization.

We need to open the door to research, therapeutic treatment for veterans, better banking and tax laws, and we need to help fuel economic growth within the industry.

We need to do this without continuing to spend federal resources on criminalization and unjust incarceration for marijuana offenses.

Thousands of men and women have suffered needlessly from the federal criminaliza-

tion of marijuana, particularly in black and brown communities.

These individuals have borne the burden of collateral consequences that have damaged our society across generations—such as the denial of affordable housing, educational opportunities, employment, and the right to vote.

Meanwhile, the laws enacted for the purpose of perpetuating the “War on Drugs” have led America to imprison more people than any other country.

The Rule allows the House to address these historical wrongs by voting on H.R. 3617.

I thank the Committee on the Judiciary, on which I serve, for the work it has done to bring H.R. 3617 to the floor for a vote.

I encourage my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote in support of the Rule and the underlying bill H.R. 3617.

Mr. Speaker, I rise also to speak in strong support of the Rule governing House consideration of H.R. 6833, the Affordable Insulin Now Act.

The Rule that is being considered is well crafted and provides Members of the House an opportunity to address an urgent need of constituents who require life saving insulin.

The bill is simple and gets to the urgent need to limit cost-sharing for insulin under private health insurance and the Medicare prescription drug benefit.

Specifically, the bill caps cost-sharing under private health insurance for a month’s supply of selected insulin products at \$35 or 25 percent of a plan’s negotiated price (after any price concessions), whichever is less, beginning in 2023.

The bill caps cost-sharing under the Medicare prescription drug benefit for insulin products at: \$35 in 2023 regardless of whether a beneficiary has reached the annual out-of-pocket spending threshold, and \$35 beginning in 2024 for those who have not yet reached this threshold.

The Rule provides for debate and full consideration of the benefits offered by H.R. 6833 by the Congress.

The subject of the bill is public knowledge and well known by members of this body.

I have worked closely with the healthcare community that serve Houstonians to ensure that programs are receiving the appropriate level of federal support.

One of the most difficult challenges are the hurdles to healthcare created by lack of health insurance such as a lack of access to necessary medications due to the high costs of many prescription drugs.

Diabetes is a life-threatening disease that disproportionately affects communities of color.

Diabetes is associated with serious health problems, including heart disease and stroke, kidney failure, and blindness.

There are 15,000 Medicare beneficiaries in the Eighteenth Congressional District who have been diagnosed with diabetes.

These individuals are my constituents and I know that on average, each of them pays 4.8 times the cost of similar medication in Australia, 3.6 times the cost in the United Kingdom, and 2.6 times the cost in Canada.

Additionally, in the Eighteenth Congressional District, 26.7 percent of residents are uninsured.

For example, an uninsured resident of this congressional district pays 23 times more for this brand of insulin than their counterparts in

Australia, 15 times more than they would in the United Kingdom, and 13 times more than they would in Canada.

The consequences of these staggering costs are not benign.

Many patients often speak of having to make heart-wrenching decisions about what to buy with the commonly fixed incomes attendant to seniors.

Many medical professionals indicate that the high prices for prescription drugs are a function of a lack of competition, and authorizing Medicare to create a program to negotiate drug prices may be an estimable way to lower the cost of prescription drugs.

All told this reflects a disturbing trend: in our country, the cost of branded drugs tends to go up, whereas in other countries, the costs tend to go down.

Before insulin the prognosis for diabetics was bleak.

Over the past two decades, manufacturers have systematically and dramatically raised the prices of their insulin products by more than tenfold—often in lockstep.

In 2017, diabetes contributed to the death of 277,000 Americans—and was the primary death for 85,000 of those individuals.

That same year diagnosed diabetes cost the United States an estimated \$327 billion—including \$237 billion in direct medical costs and \$90 billion in productivity losses.

Diabetes drugs, including insulin and oral medications that regulate blood sugar levels, play a critical role in helping people with diabetes manage their condition and reduce the risk of diabetes-related health complications.

Although insulin is the most well-known diabetes medication, diabetes patients are often prescribed other oral drugs to use in place of or alongside insulin.

Many of these non-insulin products used to regulate blood sugar levels are brand drugs that lack generic alternatives.

In recent years, the high prices of diabetes drugs have placed a tremendous strain on diabetes patients as well as the federal government, which provides diabetes medications to more than 43 million Medicare beneficiaries.

Because Medicare lacks the authority to negotiate directly with drug manufacturers, Medicare beneficiaries pay significantly more for their drugs than patients abroad.

Patients who are uninsured or underinsured and must pay for their drugs out of pocket bear an even greater cost burden.

The Rule allows the House to address this urgent need by voting on H.R. 6833.

I thank the committees on Energy and Commerce, Ways and Means, and Education and Labor for the work they have done to bring H.R. 6833, the Affordable Insulin Now Act to the floor for a vote.

I encourage my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote in support of the Rule and the underlying bill H.R. 6833.

Thank you.

□ 1315

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Mr. Speaker, the American people should be asking—no, they should be demanding—that this body address energy independence. But the majority refuses to hear or even discuss the Republican solution that we have been talking about. Instead, we do have before us today a bill to legalize pot.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. TIFFANY).

Mr. TIFFANY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the MORE legislation both for what it does and what it does not do.

For starters, the bill authorizes the collection of detailed demographic information on marijuana-sector employees, including their race and ethnicity, for a massive, publicly accessible government database. This is another attempt by Democrats to promote their destructive identity politics agenda and lay the groundwork for a rigid quota system that picks winners and losers based on skin color.

The database will also put more sensitive personal data at risk and open the door to mischief by Federal bureaucrats who have repeatedly weaponized access to Americans' private information to promote a partisan political agenda. Hello IRS.

I am also disappointed that the majority refused to allow votes on two commonsense amendments I proposed. The first would have required child-resistant packaging and a Surgeon General's warning label detailing the dangers these products pose to pregnant women and their unborn babies. Investigative reports have revealed multiple instances of pot shop clerks recommending marijuana to expectant mothers as safe, despite well-documented risks. Few, if any, of these retail clerks have any medical training and should stick to dispensing pot, not prenatal advice.

The second would have banned the use of ingredients or flavor additives in marijuana-infused products such as fruit, chocolate, vanilla, or candy. For years, we have been told by many on the other side that such flavors appeal to children and should be banned from tobacco products. If this standard is good enough for JUUL and Puff Bar, shouldn't it also apply to Cheech and Chong?

Mr. Speaker, this legislation will make an already complicated situation worse. I ask for a "no" vote on the rule and a "no" vote on the bill.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I just remind my friend from Wisconsin that 47 States, every territory, and the District of Columbia now allow for some level of marijuana use, and this Congress is going to have to catch up to what the States are doing.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Ms. PELOSI).

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank him for his leadership in bringing this important legislation to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, in his outstanding State of the Union Address earlier this month, President Joe Biden presented Democrats' visionary agenda to build a better America with lower healthcare costs for American families, and with justice in all that we do.

House Democrats have long led the charge to lower the costs of prescrip-

tion drugs. So it is with great pride that the Democratic House today will advance one of the pillars of this vision: capping the cost of insulin at \$35 a month. In doing so, we take another important step in the fight to bring down drug prices across the board for every American family.

I thank the lead sponsors of this legislation who have been relentless, dissatisfied, and persistent in this fight: Congresswoman ANGIE CRAIG, Congressman DAN KILDEE, and Congresswoman LUCY MCBATH of Georgia.

I salute the chairs of the committees of jurisdiction for helping steer this vital legislation to the floor: Chairman FRANK PALLONE of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, Chairman RICHIE NEAL of the Committee on Ways and Means, and Chairman BOBBY SCOTT of the Committee on Education and Labor.

Everyone knows that the cost of insulin—a lifesaving drug that has been around for a century—is outrageous and out of control. That cost is outrageous and out of control. On average, Americans pay more than 10 times for insulin compared to what consumers around the world pay. Here in the United States the price of insulin skyrocketed by 54 percent from 2014 to 2019. Meanwhile, Big Pharma is reaping record-breaking profits; producing insulin at about \$10 a vial, while charging families up to 30 times that amount.

This affordability crisis is taking a severe human toll. One in four Americans who rely on insulin have been forced to ration or skip their dose—a practice that can be dangerous and even deadly. And working parents with a family member on insulin are reporting higher levels of stress and anxiety and are often forced to choose between paying their bills and protecting the health of a loved one.

Indeed, across the country, as I have said on this floor before, I have seen grown men cry about how they cannot meet their family's needs when it comes to prescription drugs. This crisis is a kitchen-table issue for millions of families, and it is a medical, economic, and moral imperative that Congress take action.

The Affordable Insulin Now Act not only requires Medicare and commercial users to cover lifesaving insulin on their plans, but also caps the out-of-pocket costs for families at \$35 per month. In doing so, we put more money back in the pockets of hardworking families and vulnerable seniors. This is crucial right now, as so many Americans struggle to keep up with the burdensome, everyday costs. Of course, this has even been exacerbated with COVID which has, in many instances, spread diabetes more.

House Democrats proudly passed a cap on insulin's cost in the Build Back Better legislation last year. We already did this last year. Today, we, again, take this strong step toward lower health costs for the people. To be clear,

comprehensive reform is urgently needed to lift the crushing burden of prescription drug prices weighing on our families.

Democrats will never ever relent, Mr. Speaker, until we realize our long-standing goal of lowering drug prices across the board. And we are continuing our fight to empower Medicare to negotiate lower drug prices—we have been working on that for decades—and make these lower prices available to Americans with private insurance, too.

We do so in honor of the late Chairman Elijah Cummings, the North Star in Congress and a relentless warrior for lower drug prices, with the Lower Drug Costs Now Act.

Mr. Speaker, as you know, this rule applies not just to lowering the cost of insulin but also to the very important MORE Act.

I also rise today in support of this urgent legislation that will help pave the path toward racial and economic justice.

I thank Chairman JERRY NADLER for his steadfast voice for equity and opportunity for all at the helm of the Judiciary Committee.

I salute Congressman ED PERLMUTTER for his tireless and long-standing leadership on this issue, a relentless persistence to satisfy, as the gentleman says. Thank heaven, we are passing it today.

I also want to commend Congresswoman BARBARA LEE and Congressman EARL BLUMENAUER for their persistence as well.

For far too long, Mr. Speaker, failed Federal drug policies have torn apart families and devastated communities of color. People of color are four times more likely to be arrested on cannabis charges and are often targeted for longer prison terms than others. Tragically, the communities most harmed by criminalization are benefiting the least from the legal cannabis marketplace as prior cannabis convictions are barring too many of them from entering the industry. As a result, only one-fifth of cannabis businesses are minority owned, and only 4 percent of owners are Black. Meanwhile, more than 600,000 Americans are still arrested each year on cannabis charges, threatening to perpetuate this vicious cycle.

With the MORE Act, which the Democratic House proudly passed last Congress, we take strong actions to correct these injustices.

This landmark legislation is one of the most important criminal justice reform bills in recent history: delivering justice for those harmed by the brutal and unfair consequences of criminalization; opening the doors of opportunity for all to participate in this rapidly growing industry; and decriminalizing cannabis at the Federal level so we do not repeat the grave mistakes of our past.

Those of us from California take pride in our State's long leadership in this justice effort, and in recent years,

46 more States have reformed cannabis laws. As the distinguished gentleman from Colorado mentioned in his remarks, 47 States have taken this act. Now it is time for the Federal Government to follow suit.

Both of the bills that the House will pass today that are covered by this rule, the insulin bill and the MORE Act, are overwhelmingly popular with the American people, and they represent strong steps toward building a brighter and fairer future for our children.

Mr. Speaker, I urge strong, bipartisan “yes” votes on both bills and on the rule.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. STAUBER).

Mr. STAUBER. Mr. Speaker, as a law enforcement officer for over 23 years, I have had to make the devastating visit to unsuspecting family members to tell them that their loved one has died because a driver was driving under the influence. We can all sit here and pretend that marijuana is a harmless drug, but it is not. It clouds your judgment and inhibits your reaction time.

The unfortunate reality is if we take steps to legalize marijuana, we will, without question, increase the number of people who will drive under the influence of marijuana on our roads. As we know all too well, there are many angel families in this country who have lost their sons and daughters to people who are unlawfully in this country and drove under the influence.

My amendment would have ensured the MORE Act does not prohibit the deportation of illegal immigrants who are convicted of driving under the influence of marijuana. Unfortunately, Democrats blocked my commonsense and potentially lifesaving amendment.

Mr. Speaker, shouldn't we, at a minimum, ensure this legislation is not weaponized and used as a tool to get criminals who are in this country illegally out of trouble and out of deportation proceedings?

It seems to me that the safety of the American people continues to be a low priority for this Democrat majority.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to vote “no” on the rule.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask my friend from Minnesota if she has any other speakers.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. No, I do not, and I am prepared to close.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I continue to be disappointed in the priorities of my colleagues. They have chosen to spend precious time that could be spent addressing the national debt, inflation, gas prices, or any number of serious issues facing Americans today. Instead, they chose to talk about legalizing marijuana and spending tax dollars on pot stores—which does not take into consideration important elements like

how to protect minors or how to address laws surrounding driving under the influence—and an insincere attempt to address the rising cost of insulin.

Mr. Speaker, I oppose the rule and the underlying bills, I ask Members to do the same, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Colorado has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the remainder of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleagues for joining me here today to speak on the rule, the MORE Act, and the Affordable Insulin Now Act. I especially want to thank Mr. NADLER, Ms. LEE, and Mr. BLUMENAUER with respect to the MORE Act.

Data is clear that patients in the United States pay more than 10 times for their insulin than what patients in other countries pay for this lifesaving drug. There are reports of people paying up to \$1,000 a month just to keep themselves alive. Nobody should face these kinds of difficult decisions about affording their medication and keeping themselves healthy or putting food on the table.

The Affordable Insulin Now Act puts a reasonable cap of \$35 a month on this important drug, and I hope we can advance this bipartisan idea this week.

□ 1330

On marijuana, we are long past due for the reforms in the MORE Act. The MORE Act is about justice, safety, equity, and States' rights. We must decriminalize marijuana at the Federal level and take meaningful steps to address the effects the war on drugs has had, particularly in minority and disadvantaged communities.

To my friends on the other side of the aisle who claim this isn't an important issue to American families, I encourage them to talk to individuals who can't pass a background check to get a job, visit with people who spent time in prison for a low-level marijuana conviction whose lives have been changed forever, talk to a State-legal business owner or employee who faces armed robberies or threats of violence due to all the cash they have since the business can't access the banking system.

The House is acting again this week to urge the Senate to finally pass meaningful cannabis reform legislation. As this body knows, my SAFE Banking Act has passed the House six times now without any Senate action, with big bipartisan numbers. The House will pass the MORE Act this week. It is clear Congress needs to reform our broken cannabis laws to better respond to the 37 States across the country that have some level of legal marijuana use.

The material previously referred to by Mrs. FISCHBACH is as follows:

AMENDMENT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 1017

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 5. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution, the House shall proceed to the consideration in the House of the bill (H.R. 6858) to strengthen United States energy security, encourage domestic production of crude oil, petroleum products, and natural gas, and for other purposes. 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 Energy and Commerce; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 6. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 6858.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I encourage a “yes” vote on the rule and the previous question.

Mr. Speaker, 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.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 219, nays 202, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 98]

YEAS—219

Adams	Correa	Higgins (NY)
Aguilar	Costa	Himes
Allred	Courtney	Horsford
Auchincloss	Craig	Houlahan
Axne	Crist	Hoyer
Barragán	Crow	Huffman
Bass	Cuellar	Jackson Lee
Beatty	Davidson (KS)	Jacobs (CA)
Bera	Davis, Danny K.	Jayapal
Beyer	Dean	Jeffries
Bishop (GA)	DeFazio	Johnson (GA)
Blumenauer	DeGette	Johnson (TX)
Blunt Rochester	DeLauro	Jones
Bonamici	DelBene	Kahele
Bourdeaux	Delgado	Kaptur
Bowman	Demings	Keating
Boyle, Brendan	DeSaulnier	Kelly (IL)
F.	Deutch	Khanna
Brown (MD)	Dingell	Kildee
Brown (OH)	Doggett	Kilmer
Brownley	Doyle, Michael	Kim (NJ)
Bush	F.	Kind
Butterfield	Escobar	Kirkpatrick
Carbajal	Eshoo	Krishnamoorthi
Cárdenas	Espallat	Kuster
Carson	Evans	Lamb
Carter (LA)	Fletcher	Langevin
Cartwright	Foster	Larsen (WA)
Case	Frankel, Lois	Larson (CT)
Casten	Gaetz	Lawrence
Castor (FL)	Gallego	Lawson (FL)
Castro (TX)	Garamendi	Lee (CA)
Cherfilus-	Garcia (IL)	Lee (NV)
McCormick	Garcia (TX)	Leger Fernandez
Chu	Golden	Levin (CA)
Ciilline	Gomez	Levin (MI)
Clark (MA)	Gonzalez,	Lieu
Clarke (NY)	Vicente	Lofgren
Cleaver	Gottheimer	Lowenthal
Clyburn	Green, Al (TX)	Luria
Cohen	Grijalva	Lynch
Connolly	Harder (CA)	Malinowski
Cooper	Hayes	

Maloney,
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Manning
Matsui
McBath
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Mfume
Morelle
Moulton
Mrvan
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Newman
Norcross
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters

Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sewell
Sherman
Sherrill
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (WA)
Soto
Spanberger

Speier
Stansbury
Stanton
Stevens
Strickland
Suozi
Swalwell
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Torres (CA)
Torres (NY)
Trahan
Trone
Underwood
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wexton
Wild
Williams (GA)
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

Walorski
Waltz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)

Armstrong
Brady
Bustos
Cheney

Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams (TX)
Wilson (SC)

Davis, Rodney
Fortenberry
Hartzler
Kinzinger

Wittman
Womack
Zeldin

Moore (WI)
Tonko

Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Golden
Gomez
Gonzalez,
Vicente
Gotthelmer
Green, Al (TX)
Grijalva
Harder (CA)
Hayes
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jacobs (CA)
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (TX)
Jones
Kahale
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim (NJ)
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Leger Fernandez
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lieu
Lofgren

Lowenthal
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Scanlon
Maloney,
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Manning
Matsui
McBath
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Mfume
Moore (WI)
Morelle
Moulton
Mrvan
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Newman
Norcross
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters

Rush
Ryan
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sewell
Sherman
Sherrill
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (WA)
Soto
Spanberger
Speier
Stansbury
Stanton
Stevens
Strickland
Suozi
Swalwell
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Torres (CA)
Torres (NY)
Trahan
Trone
Underwood
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wexton
Wild
Williams (GA)
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NAYS—202

Aderholt
Allen
Amodel
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Bentz
Bergman
Bice (OK)
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (NC)
Boebert
Bost
Brooks
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burchett
Burgess
Calvert
Cammack
Carey
Carl
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cawthorn
Chabot
Cline
Cloud
Clyde
Cole
Comer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Curtis
Davidson
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donalds
Duncan
Dunn
Ellzey
Emmer
Estes
Fallon
Feenstra
Ferguson
Fischbach
Fitzgerald
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Foxy
Franklin, C.
Scott
Fulcher
Gallagher
Garbarino
Garcia (CA)

Gibbs
Gimenez
Gohmert
Gonzales, Tony
Gonzalez (OH)
Good (VA)
Gooden (TX)
Gosar
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Greene (GA)
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Harris
Harshbarger
Hern
Herrell
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Hinson
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
Issa
Jackson
Jacobs (NY)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Katko
Keller
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kim (CA)
Kustoff
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta
LaTurner
Lesko
Letlow
Long
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Mace
Malliotakis
Mann
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClain
McClintock

Baird (Walorski)
Bilirakis
(Fleischmann)
Bowman (Meng)
Cawthorn (Nehls)
Comer
(Fleischmann)
Crist
(Wasserman)
Schultz
Cuellar (Pappas)
Curtis (Stewart)
DeGette (Blunt)
Rochester)
Espallat
(Correa)
Harder (CA)
(Gomez)
Jayapal (Gomez)
Johnson (TX)
(Jeffries)
Joyce (OH)
(Garbarino)
Kahale (Mrvan)
Krishnamoorthi
(Beyer)
Lawson (FL)
(Wasserman)
Schultz
Mace (Rice (SC))
Manning (Beyer)
McClain
(Fitzgerald)
Newman (Beyer)
Owens (Stewart)
Roybal-Allard
Schulz
Salazar
(Gimenez)
Sánchez (Gomez)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 219, nays 202, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 99]

YEAS—219

Adams
Aguilar
Allred
Auchincloss
Axne
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boudeaux
Bowman
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brown (MD)
Brown (OH)
Brownley
Bush
Butterfield
Carbajal

Cárdenas
Carson
Carter (LA)
Cartwright
Case
Casten
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Cherfilus-
McCormick
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Craig
Crist

Crow
Cuellar
Davids (KS)
Davis, Danny K.
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deuth
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael
F.
Escobar
Eshoo
Espallat
Evans
Fletcher
Foster
Frankel, Lois

Aderholt
Allen
Amodel
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Bentz
Bergman
Bice (OK)
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (NC)
Boebert
Bost
Brooks
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burchett
Burgess
Calvert
Cammack
Carey
Carl
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cawthorn
Chabot
Cline
Cloud
Clyde
Cole
Comer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Curtis
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donalds

NAYS—202

Duncan
Dunn
Ellzey
Emmer
Estes
Fallon
Feenstra
Ferguson
Fischbach
Fitzgerald
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Foxy
Franklin, C.
Scott
Fulcher
Gaetz
Gallagher
Garbarino
Garcia (CA)
Gibbs
Gimenez
Gohmert
Gonzales, Tony
Gonzalez (OH)
Good (VA)
Gooden (TX)
Gosar
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Greene (GA)
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Harris
Harshbarger
Hern
Herrell
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Hinson

Hudson
Huizenga
Issa
Jackson
Jacobs (NY)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Katko
Keller
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kim (CA)
Kustoff
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta
LaTurner
Lesko
Letlow
Long
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Mace
Malliotakis
Mann
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClain
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
Meijer
Meuser
Miller (IL)
Miller (WV)
Miller-Meeks
Moolenaar
Mooney

Moore (AL)	Rosendale	Tenney
Moore (UT)	Rouzer	Thompson (PA)
Mullin	Roy	Tiffany
Murphy (NC)	Rutherford	Timmons
Nehls	Salazar	Turner
Newhouse	Scalise	Upton
Norman	Schweikert	Valadao
Obornolte	Scott, Austin	Van Drew
Owens	Sessions	Van Duyn
Palazzo	Simpson	Wagner
Palmer	Smith (MO)	Walberg
Pence	Smith (NE)	Walorski
Perry	Smith (NJ)	Waltz
Pfluger	Smucker	Weber (TX)
Posey	Spartz	Webster (FL)
Reed	Stauber	Wenstrup
Reschenthaler	Steel	Westerman
Rice (SC)	Stefanik	Williams (TX)
Rodgers (WA)	Steil	Wilson (SC)
Rogers (AL)	Steube	Wittman
Rogers (KY)	Stewart	Womack
Rose	Taylor	

NOT VOTING—10

Armstrong	Fortenberry	Tonko
Brady	Hartzler	Zeldin
Bustos	Hollingsworth	
Cheney	Kinzinger	

□ 1417

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.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. TONKO. Madam Speaker, I was detained by legislative business. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 98 and "yea" on rollcall No. 99.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Baird (Walorski)	Joyce (OH)	Scott, David
Bilirakis	(Garbarino)	(Jeffries)
(Fleischmann)	Kahele (Mrvan)	Sessions (Babin)
Bowman (Meng)	Krishnamoorthi	Sires (Pallone)
Cawthorn (Nehls)	(Beyer)	Soto (Wasserman)
Comer	Lawson (FL)	Schultz
(Fleischmann)	(Wasserman)	Steel (Obornolte)
Crist	Schultz	Strickland
(Wasserman)	Mace (Rice (SC))	(Takano)
Schultz	Manning (Beyer)	Suozi (Beyer)
Cuellar (Pappas)	McClain	Taylor (Carter
Curtis (Stewart)	(Fitzgerald)	(TX))
DeGette (Blunt	Newman (Beyer)	Thompson (MS)
Rochester)	Owens (Stewart)	(Evans)
Espallat	Roybal-Allard	Trone (Beyer)
(Correa)	(Wasserman)	Waltz (Mast)
Harder (CA)	Schultz	Wilson (FL)
(Gomez)	Salazar	(Jeffries)
Jayapal (Gomez)	(Gimenez)	
Johnson (TX)	Sánchez (Gomez)	
(Jeffries)		

AFFORDABLE INSULIN NOW ACT

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1017, I call up the bill (H.R. 6833) to amend title XXVII of the Public Health Service Act, the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, and the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to establish requirements with respect to cost-sharing for certain insulin products, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. PORTER). Pursuant to House Resolution 1017, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 117-38, modified by the amendment printed in part C of House Report 117-285, is adopted and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

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

H.R. 6833

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 "Affordable Insulin Now Act".

SEC. 2. REQUIREMENTS WITH RESPECT TO COST-SHARING FOR INSULIN PRODUCTS.

(a) PHSA.—Part D of title XXVII of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300gg-111 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

"SEC. 2799A-11. REQUIREMENTS WITH RESPECT TO COST-SHARING FOR CERTAIN INSULIN PRODUCTS.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—For plan years beginning on or after January 1, 2023, a group health plan or health insurance issuer offering group or individual health insurance coverage shall provide coverage of selected insulin products and, with respect to such products, shall not—

"(1) apply any deductible; or

"(2) impose any cost-sharing in excess of the lesser of, per 30-day supply—

"(A) \$35; or

"(B) the amount equal to 25 percent of the negotiated price of the selected insulin product net of all price concessions received by or on behalf of the plan or coverage, including price concessions received by or on behalf of third-party entities providing services to the plan or coverage, such as pharmacy benefit management services.

"(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

"(1) SELECTED INSULIN PRODUCTS.—The term 'selected insulin products' means at least one of each dosage form (such as vial, pump, or inhaler dosage forms) of each different type (such as rapid-acting, short-acting, intermediate-acting, long-acting, ultra long-acting, and premixed) of insulin (as defined below), when available, as selected by the group health plan or health insurance issuer.

"(2) INSULIN DEFINED.—The term 'insulin' means insulin that is licensed under subsection (a) or (k) of section 351 and continues to be marketed under such section, including any insulin product that has been deemed to be licensed under section 351(a) pursuant to section 7002(e)(4) of the Biologics Price Competition and Innovation Act of 2009 and continues to be marketed pursuant to such licensure.

"(c) OUT-OF-NETWORK PROVIDERS.—Nothing in this section requires a plan or issuer that has a network of providers to provide benefits for selected insulin products described in this section that are delivered by an out-of-network provider, or precludes a plan or issuer that has a network of providers from imposing higher cost-sharing than the levels specified in subsection (a) for selected insulin products described in this section that are delivered by an out-of-network provider.

"(d) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Subsection (a) shall not be construed to require coverage of, or prevent a group health plan or health insurance coverage from imposing cost-sharing other than the levels specified in subsection (a) on, insulin products that are not selected insulin products, to the extent that such coverage is not otherwise required and such cost-sharing is otherwise permitted under Federal and applicable State law.

"(e) APPLICATION OF COST-SHARING TOWARDS DEDUCTIBLES AND OUT-OF-POCKET MAXIMUMS.—Any cost-sharing payments made pursuant to subsection (a)(2) shall be counted toward any deductible or out-of-pocket maximum that applies under the plan or coverage."

(b) IRC.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter B of chapter 100 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

"SEC. 9826. REQUIREMENTS WITH RESPECT TO COST-SHARING FOR CERTAIN INSULIN PRODUCTS.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—For plan years beginning on or after January 1, 2023, a group health plan

shall provide coverage of selected insulin products and, with respect to such products, shall not—

"(1) apply any deductible; or

"(2) impose any cost-sharing in excess of the lesser of, per 30-day supply—

"(A) \$35; or

"(B) the amount equal to 25 percent of the negotiated price of the selected insulin product net of all price concessions received by or on behalf of the plan, including price concessions received by or on behalf of third-party entities providing services to the plan, such as pharmacy benefit management services.

"(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

"(1) SELECTED INSULIN PRODUCTS.—The term 'selected insulin products' means at least one of each dosage form (such as vial, pump, or inhaler dosage forms) of each different type (such as rapid-acting, short-acting, intermediate-acting, long-acting, ultra long-acting, and premixed) of insulin (as defined below), when available, as selected by the group health plan.

"(2) INSULIN DEFINED.—The term 'insulin' means insulin that is licensed under subsection (a) or (k) of section 351 of the Public Health Service Act and continues to be marketed under such section, including any insulin product that has been deemed to be licensed under section 351(a) of such Act pursuant to section 7002(e)(4) of the Biologics Price Competition and Innovation Act of 2009 and continues to be marketed pursuant to such licensure.

"(c) OUT-OF-NETWORK PROVIDERS.—Nothing in this section requires a plan that has a network of providers to provide benefits for selected insulin products described in this section that are delivered by an out-of-network provider, or precludes a plan that has a network of providers from imposing higher cost-sharing than the levels specified in subsection (a) for selected insulin products described in this section that are delivered by an out-of-network provider.

"(d) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Subsection (a) shall not be construed to require coverage of, or prevent a group health plan from imposing cost-sharing other than the levels specified in subsection (a) on, insulin products that are not selected insulin products, to the extent that such coverage is not otherwise required and such cost-sharing is otherwise permitted under Federal and applicable State law.

"(e) APPLICATION OF COST-SHARING TOWARDS DEDUCTIBLES AND OUT-OF-POCKET MAXIMUMS.—Any cost-sharing payments made pursuant to subsection (a)(2) shall be counted toward any deductible or out-of-pocket maximum that applies under the plan."

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for subchapter B of chapter 100 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

"Sec. 9826. Requirements with respect to cost-sharing for certain insulin products."

(c) ERISA.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subpart B of part 7 of subtitle B of title I of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (29 U.S.C. 1185 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"SEC. 726. REQUIREMENTS WITH RESPECT TO COST-SHARING FOR CERTAIN INSULIN PRODUCTS.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—For plan years beginning on or after January 1, 2023, a group health plan or health insurance issuer offering group health insurance coverage shall provide coverage of selected insulin products and, with respect to such products, shall not—

"(1) apply any deductible; or

"(2) impose any cost-sharing in excess of the lesser of, per 30-day supply—

"(A) \$35; or

"(B) the amount equal to 25 percent of the negotiated price of the selected insulin product net of all price concessions received by or on behalf

of the plan or coverage, including price concessions received by or on behalf of third-party entities providing services to the plan or coverage, such as pharmacy benefit management services.

“(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) SELECTED INSULIN PRODUCTS.—The term ‘selected insulin products’ means at least one of each dosage form (such as vial, pump, or inhaler dosage forms) of each different type (such as rapid-acting, short-acting, intermediate-acting, long-acting, ultra long-acting, and premixed) of insulin (as defined below), when available, as selected by the group health plan or health insurance issuer.

“(2) INSULIN DEFINED.—The term ‘insulin’ means insulin that is licensed under subsection (a) or (k) of section 351 of the Public Health Service Act and continues to be marketed under such section, including any insulin product that has been deemed to be licensed under section 351(a) of such Act pursuant to section 7002(e)(4) of the Biologics Price Competition and Innovation Act of 2009 and continues to be marketed pursuant to such licensure.

“(c) OUT-OF-NETWORK PROVIDERS.—Nothing in this section requires a plan or issuer that has a network of providers to provide benefits for selected insulin products described in this section that are delivered by an out-of-network provider, or precludes a plan or issuer that has a network of providers from imposing higher cost-sharing than the levels specified in subsection (a) for selected insulin products described in this section that are delivered by an out-of-network provider.

“(d) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Subsection (a) shall not be construed to require coverage of, or prevent a group health plan or health insurance coverage from imposing cost-sharing other than the levels specified in subsection (a) on, insulin products that are not selected insulin products, to the extent that such coverage is not otherwise required and such cost-sharing is otherwise permitted under Federal and applicable State law.

“(e) APPLICATION OF COST-SHARING TOWARDS DEDUCTIBLES AND OUT-OF-POCKET MAXIMUMS.—Any cost-sharing payments made pursuant to subsection (a)(2) shall be counted toward any deductible or out-of-pocket maximum that applies under the plan or coverage.”

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in section 1 of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (29 U.S.C. 1001 et seq.) is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 725 the following:

“Sec. 726. Requirements with respect to cost-sharing for certain insulin products.”

(d) NO EFFECT ON OTHER COST-SHARING.—Section 1302(d)(2) of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (42 U.S.C. 18022(d)(2)) is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(D) SPECIAL RULE RELATING TO INSULIN COVERAGE.—The exemption of coverage of selected insulin products (as defined in section 2799A-11(b) of the Public Health Service Act) from the application of any deductible pursuant to section 2799A-11(a)(1) of such Act, section 726(a)(1) of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, or section 9826(a)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 shall not be considered when determining the actuarial value of a qualified health plan under this subsection.”

(e) COVERAGE OF CERTAIN INSULIN PRODUCTS UNDER CATASTROPHIC PLANS.—Section 1302(e) of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (42 U.S.C. 18022(e)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(4) COVERAGE OF CERTAIN INSULIN PRODUCTS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding paragraph (1)(B)(i), a health plan described in paragraph (1) shall provide coverage of selected insulin products, in accordance with section 2799A-11 of the Public Health Service Act, before an enrolled individual has incurred, during a

plan year, cost-sharing expenses in an amount equal to the annual limitation in effect under subsection (c)(1) for the plan year.

“(B) TERMINOLOGY.—For purposes of subparagraph (A)—

“(i) the term ‘selected insulin products’ has the meaning given such term in section 2799A-11(b) of the Public Health Service Act; and

“(ii) the requirements of section 2799A-11 of such Act shall be applied by deeming each reference in such section to ‘individual health insurance coverage’ to be a reference to a plan described in paragraph (1).”

(f) IMPLEMENTATION.—The Secretary of Health and Human Services, the Secretary of Labor, and the Secretary of the Treasury may implement the provisions of, including the amendments made by, this section through sub-regulatory guidance, program instruction, or otherwise.

SEC. 3. APPROPRIATE COST-SHARING FOR CERTAIN INSULIN PRODUCTS UNDER MEDICARE PART D.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1860D-2 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w-102) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (1)(A), by striking “The coverage” and inserting “Subject to paragraph (8), the coverage”;

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in subparagraph (A), by striking “and (D)” and inserting “and (D) and paragraph (8)”;

(ii) in subparagraph (B), by striking “and (D)” and inserting “and (D) and paragraph (8)”;

(iii) in subparagraph (C)(i), by striking “paragraph (4)” and inserting “paragraphs (4) and (8)”;

(iv) in subparagraph (D)(i), by striking “paragraph (4)” and inserting “paragraphs (4) and (8)”;

(C) in paragraph (3)(A), by striking “and (4)” and inserting “(4), and (8)”;

(D) in paragraph (4)(A)(i), by striking “The coverage” and inserting “Subject to paragraph (8), the coverage”;

(E) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(8) TREATMENT OF COST-SHARING FOR CERTAIN INSULIN PRODUCTS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—For plan years beginning on or after January 1, 2023, with respect to an individual, the following shall apply with respect to any insulin product (as defined in subparagraph (B)) that is covered under the prescription drug plan or MA-PD plan in which the individual is enrolled:

“(i) NO APPLICATION OF DEDUCTIBLE.—The deductible under paragraph (1) shall not apply with respect to such insulin product.

“(ii) APPLICATION OF COST-SHARING.—

“(I) IN GENERAL.—The coverage provides benefits for such insulin product, regardless of whether an individual has reached the initial coverage limit under paragraph (3) or the out-of-pocket threshold under paragraph (4), with cost-sharing for a one-month supply that is equal to the applicable copayment amount.

“(II) APPLICABLE COPAYMENT AMOUNT.—For purposes of this clause, the term ‘applicable copayment amount’ means, with respect to an insulin product under a prescription drug plan or an MA-PD plan, an amount that is not more than \$35.

“(B) INSULIN PRODUCT.—For purposes of this paragraph, the term ‘insulin product’ means a covered part D drug that is an insulin product that is approved under section 505 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act or licensed under section 351 of the Public Health Service Act and marketed pursuant to such approval or licensure, including any insulin product that has been deemed to be licensed under section 351 of the Public Health Service Act pursuant to section 7002(e)(4) of the Biologics Price Competition and Innovation Act of 2009 and marketed pursuant to such section.”; and

(2) in subsection (c), by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(4) TREATMENT OF COST-SHARING FOR INSULIN PRODUCTS.—The coverage is provided in accordance with subsection (b)(8).”

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS TO COST-SHARING FOR LOW-INCOME INDIVIDUALS.—Section 1860D-14(a) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w-114(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) in subparagraph (D)(iii), by adding at the end the following new sentence: “For plan year 2023 and subsequent plan years, the copayment amount applicable under the preceding sentence for a one-month supply of an insulin product (as defined in subparagraph (B) of section 1860D-2(b)(8)) dispensed to the individual may not exceed the applicable copayment amount (as defined in subparagraph (A)(ii)(II) of such section) for the product under the prescription drug plan or MA-PD plan in which the individual is enrolled.”; and

(B) in subparagraph (E), by inserting the following before the period at the end “or under section 1860D-2(b)(8) in the case of an insulin product (as defined in subparagraph (B) of such section)”;

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) in subparagraph (B), by adding at the end the following new sentence: “For plan year 2023 and subsequent plan years, the annual deductible applicable under such section, including as reduced under the preceding sentence, shall not apply with respect to an insulin product (as defined in subparagraph (B) of section 1860D-2(b)(8)) dispensed to the individual.”;

(B) in subparagraph (D), by adding at the end the following new sentence: “For plan year 2023 and subsequent plan years, the amount of the coinsurance applicable under the preceding sentence for a one-month supply of an insulin product (as defined in subparagraph (B) of section 1860D-2(b)(8)) dispensed to the individual may not exceed the applicable copayment amount (as defined in subparagraph (A)(ii)(II) of such section) for the product under the prescription drug plan or MA-PD plan in which the individual is enrolled.”; and

(C) in subparagraph (E), by adding at the end the following new sentence: “For plan year 2023 and subsequent plan years, the amount of the copayment or coinsurance applicable under the preceding sentence for a one-month supply of an insulin product (as defined in subparagraph (B) of section 1860D-2(b)(8)) dispensed to the individual may not exceed the applicable copayment amount (as defined in subparagraph (A)(ii)(II) of such section) for the product under the prescription drug plan or MA-PD plan in which the individual is enrolled.”

(c) IMPLEMENTATION.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall implement this section for plan years 2023 and 2024 by program instruction or otherwise.

SEC. 4. ONE YEAR-EXTENSION ON MORATORIUM ON IMPLEMENTATION OF RULE RELATING TO ELIMINATING THE ANTI-KICKBACK STATUTE SAFE HARBOR PROTECTION FOR PRESCRIPTION DRUG REBATES.

Section 9006 of the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (P.L. 117-58) is amended by striking “January 1, 2026” and inserting “January 1, 2027”.

SEC. 5. MEDICARE IMPROVEMENT FUND.

Section 1898(b)(1) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395iii(b)(1)), as amended by section 313 of division P of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2022, is amended by striking “\$5,000,000” and inserting “\$9,046,500,000”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill, as amended, shall be debatable for 1 hour equally divided among and controlled by the respective chairs and

ranking minority members of the Committees on Education and Labor, Energy and Commerce, and Ways and Means, or their respective designees.

The gentleman from California (Mr. DESAULNIER), the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX), the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE), the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. RODGERS), the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE), and the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. SMITH) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material on H.R. 6833.

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the Affordable Insulin Now Act, which is critical to protecting more than 7 million American patients who rely on insulin.

Today, one in four Americans who need insulin report either having cut back or skipped doses because the cost is simply too high. That is heart-breaking and unacceptable. No one should have to ration their insulin to help reduce costs, risking their health and, in some tragic cases, actually costing them their lives.

This bill will make insulin more affordable by capping the out-of-pocket cost for consumers in both Medicare and the private insurance market at \$35 a month. This will address the vast disparities between what people pay for insulin in other countries as compared to the United States.

Right now, Americans are paying more than 10 times the price for insulin as people in other high-income countries. That is simply not fair.

Right now, one out of every five Americans who depend on insulin have out-of-pocket costs of significantly more than \$35 per month. That is unconscionable considering that insulin has been in use for over a century.

I have heard my Republican colleagues contend that prices for insulin are coming down but, in reality, prices are going up for the consumer. The list prices set by the manufacturer, which patient cost-sharing is based off of, keep going up. In fact, reports note that the average retail price for insulin rose 54 percent—more than double—from 2014 to 2019.

Now, Madam Speaker, I continue to strongly support comprehensive efforts to rein in the soaring costs of prescription drugs and empowering Medicare to negotiate fair prices, but we cannot afford to wait any longer to address the price of insulin.

I commend Representatives CRAIG, KILDEE, and MCBATH for their leadership and hard work in bringing this important legislation to the House floor.

I urge my colleagues, on a bipartisan basis, to support this lifesaving legislation.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

We all share the goal of reducing the cost of insulin. This bill, however, is not the right answer. This is an attempt to revive Speaker PELOSI's proposed government drug-pricing scheme, part of a socialized medicine approach that would lead to fewer cures.

It is the largest expansion of the Federal Government's role in private health insurance design since ObamaCare. It will cost more than \$11 billion over the next 10 years through higher subsidies for higher premiums.

Just this morning, Axios reported: "But legislation like a House bill from Representative ANGIE CRAIG . . . that will be debated on the floor today wouldn't address the core problem of rising prices for insulin. It would instead shift more of the cost onto health insurers and employers and result in higher premiums, according to experts."

That means people who can't afford day-to-day life because of inflation and spending will face higher costs somewhere else.

Today, it is the government fixing the price on insulin. What is next? Gas? Food?

History tells us that price-fixing doesn't work. It shifts the problem somewhere else so the powerful have the excuse for more subsidies, more spending, and more control.

This bill does nothing to address the real reasons insulin prices are going up. One of those is the pharmacy benefit managers and other middlemen who negotiate for high list prices and then hide the lower costs from the patients. This bill gives the middlemen who are making the money a pass because again, in this bill, the Democrats delay the rebate rule that would ensure that the real savings go into the pockets of the patients.

Madam Speaker, we have a solution. We have a bill that we have been working on for several Congresses. It enjoys bipartisan support. It is H.R. 19, the Lower Costs, More Cures Act.

It would lower the costs of all prescription drugs, including insulin. It caps seniors' out-of-pocket insulin costs at \$50 per month through Medicare. It also allows high-deductible plans to cover insulin before the deductible kicks in. It increases low-cost options with more generic and biosimilar competition. There is exciting innovation on the way being built right now. And it creates more price transparency.

We should be lowering the costs without going down the road of price con-

trols that destroy the hope of so many people in this country for lifesaving cures.

I urge us to reject H.R. 6833. Let's work on a solution for all diseases. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the majority leader, who, along with the rest of the leadership, continues this effort to address affordability.

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

First of all, this is not price control. It is limiting the purchaser on a price, but the companies are still going to charge what they are going to charge, and somebody is going to have to pay, and Medicare is going to have to pay. So, it does increase the cost. But it is not price control on the pharmaceuticals. And I want to say that we have a bill, of course, that will allow negotiation in Medicare, just as the VA does.

□ 1430

Negotiation is not price control. Negotiation is saying, I am going to buy a lot of your product, and I want a better price.

A lot of us do that. We call it Sam's Club, or some other club that we go to. And we buy large volumes and get a cheaper price than our poorer friends who just buy it one at a time. So I am for this bill. It is a good bill.

Madam Speaker, I thank Representatives CRAIG, KILDEE, and MCBATH for their leadership on this bill. They have long been champions of making healthcare and prescription medications accessible and affordable for all Americans.

More than one in three Americans are at high risk of developing diabetes, and over 37 million Americans already have it. A lot of those folks can't do without insulin. They don't have an option. And insulin has been on the market for decades and is not protected under patent, and the development prices have ages ago been amortized.

Madam Speaker, to treat their condition, the people who have diabetes must rely on insulin injections to regulate their blood sugar levels. Now, if you have no option of not buying a product, those who sell that product can put the price wherever, if it means your life. A lack of insulin can lead to insulin shock, diabetic coma, kidney failure, and death.

It is unacceptable that this lifesaving medication is priced out of reach for many who need it because it costs so little to produce.

This is not a mechanism that has to charge these prices because it took so much to produce it. It costs only \$10 to manufacture a month's supply. Yet, a month's supply can cost hundreds of dollars. However, with out-of-pocket costs as high as over \$600 for a 40-day supply—now, if you extrapolate 40 days, that is 10 days more than a

month, so that is a third more. So let's say it costs \$13 to produce. \$600. Why? Because if they don't have it, they die.

So all we are saying is, let's make sure this is affordable so people can sustain their lives and their health.

Many Americans have resorted to rationing by skipping doses of their insulin because they can't afford it. The legislation before us would cap the out-of-pocket price of insulin at \$35 a month.

Let me again remind you, that is 350 percent of the cost of producing it. This would ease the burden of skyrocketing prices and impossible choices.

Americans should not have to choose between paying the rent or for food, whatever, or paying for their insulin. As a matter of fact, they can't make that choice. They need both. They need to eat, and they need to live. And insulin is so often the way they assure that outcome. The prices will continue to rise unless we choose to act today.

Madam Speaker, House Democrats already voted for this measure once, and Republicans already voted against it. So I guess we don't have any surprise of what's going to happen here.

The Republicans are going to say to those who are using insulin: You are on your own. You are on your own. We are not going to worry about it.

And we are going to say: We are here to help. We are here to make sure you don't get ripped off. We are here to make sure that you have the medicine that you absolutely need to survive.

We voted for this measure as part of the Build Back Better Act in November. We made a promise to the American people that we would address the cost of prescription drugs, and we honored that promise.

Republicans said no. They said once again: Consumer, you need insulin, you are on your own. They voted for higher drug prices. They voted for the status quo where many Americans have to choose between lifesaving insulin and putting food on the table.

Today, my fellow colleagues, is an opportunity to vote to save lives and to provide a lifeline for millions of Americans with diabetes.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, do not say to the American people: You are on your own.

Tell them: We are here to help. Vote to help them. Vote to ensure that they will be able to afford a drug they need to protect themselves from death.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in voting to bring prices down across our economy and our healthcare system. Join me in protecting Americans' ability to access lifesaving medication that prevents needless suffering, extends life, and provides a higher quality of living.

Join me in voting for the Affordable Insulin for All Act. Again, I thank Ms. CRAIG, Mr. KILDEE, Mrs. McBATH, the chairman of this committee, and all

those who brought this bill to the floor.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues, don't say, You are on your own.

Say, We are by your side, and we are here to help.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I would just remind the body that the measure that the majority leader referred to failed in the Committee on Energy and Commerce with opposition from Democrats and Republicans because the proposed capping, price-fixing of drugs that the Democrats are promoting, would jeopardize cures; cures for people with Alzheimer's, cancers, diabetes.

This bill does not bring down the cost. It only shifts the cost. And in fact, their definition of negotiation would allow the government to impose a 95 percent tax on the innovators.

Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. GUTHRIE), leader on the Committee on Energy and Commerce, Health Subcommittee.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Madam Speaker, I am proud to be here today. I worked with my colleague, DIANA DEGETTE. We had hearings on the cost of diabetes and on the supply chain, and we said this is something we can work on together. And we did work on it together. And most of those provisions are in a bipartisan H.R. 19, the Lower Costs, More Cures Act.

Madam Speaker, I am fighting for my constituents to have lower insulin costs. But I think, more importantly, I am fighting for my constituents to deliver a cure for diabetes. Our experts say it is not impossible to have a cure for diabetes in the next decade. And we need to continue to push policies that promote innovation, not slow it down. So the Lower Costs, More Cures Act will help patients, including seniors, afford monthly insulin prescriptions without discouraging future investments in breakthrough medications.

I encourage the majority to come back with H.R. 19, Lower Costs, More Cures Act, and let's work together, instead of the rhetoric that we just heard from our respected leader. Let's work together and do it in a bipartisan way, the way we tried to do it in the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. CRAIG), the prime sponsor of the bill, who is constantly working to address affordability issues for Americans.

Ms. CRAIG. Madam Speaker, I thank Chairman PALLONE for yielding.

Madam Speaker, diabetes does not care if you are a Republican or a Democrat. This disease is an absolute torrential disease inside working families across our country. This bill has been mischaracterized by the other side. This would lead to a \$35 cost for Americans, for Minnesotans, for part D Medicare beneficiaries and commercial plan beneficiaries.

For the vast majority of working families, the price of insulin is simply unsustainable. Many Americans are forced to risk their own lives by rationing doses or skipping treatments entirely. Today, we have an opportunity to save American families thousands of their hard-earned dollars.

Madam Speaker, my bill, the Affordable Insulin Now Act, would cap it at \$35 a month. Certainly, our work to lower drug costs and expand access to healthcare across this Nation is not done. But this is a major step forward in the right direction and a chance to make good on our promises to the American people.

Madam Speaker, I encourage all of my colleagues to vote "yes."

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUCSHON), a great member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

Mr. BUCSHON. Madam Speaker, we all share the same goal of lowering the cost of prescription drugs, especially insulin. But H.R. 6833 doesn't get to the actual factors that drive the pricing.

The bill before us today is just another attempt by Democrats in Washington to pass a political solution and set Federal price controls. And once they open that door, what happens when they don't stop with insulin? What happens when they decide to move on past healthcare, set price controls on other sectors of our economy?

Why not cap what you can sell your house for in order to get the cost of housing down? Congress can't be for government price controls, as that is a slippery slope.

Now, some of my colleagues may bring up the fact that Republicans' bipartisan alternative, H.R. 19, also caps seniors' out-of-pocket costs. But let me point out the distinction, it is Medicare part D.

H.R. 6833 caps Medicare part D and private health plans. That is a direct, government price control on private companies.

Madam Speaker, I am a doctor. I am also the co-chair of the House Kidney Caucus. I have an acute understanding of how expensive prescription drugs are and the need for Congress to act. However, I also understand that it is a structural issue and simply slapping price controls on it would not actually solve the problem. This will only raise premiums and shift the costs to patients with other diseases.

Thankfully, there is a better way. H.R. 19, the Lower Costs, More Cures Act is a truly bipartisan solution to lower costs of all prescription drugs, including insulin. The bill caps out-of-pocket costs on prescription drugs in Medicare part D for seniors, allows high deductible health plans to cover insulin before the deductible kicks in, increases low-cost options by bringing more generic and biosimilar competition to the marketplace, and increases drug price transparency for patients. And the best part: Every provision is bipartisan.

So let's get back to working together on bipartisan solutions that actually lower drug prices rather than resort to government price controls and a march towards government-run healthcare.

Madam Speaker, if we adopt the motion to recommit, we will instruct the Committee on Energy and Commerce to consider my amendment to H.R. 6833, which is H.R. 19, the Lower Costs, More Cures Act of 2022.

Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the table of contents of this amendment in the RECORD immediately prior to the vote on the motion to recommit.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ESHOO), chair of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, Subcommittee on Health.

Ms. ESHOO. Madam Speaker, I rise in full support of this legislation. Seated here on the floor, listening to our Republican friends—price controls, socialists, killing innovation. I am not going to use all of my time using their language.

How about this? Diabetes kills. Diabetics need insulin. They have to be able to afford it. They have paid their taxes all of their lives, hardworking people.

So the cost for this? Sign me up for it. Sign me up for it to help people, to invest in our own people.

This is absurd, the prices in our country, when it costs \$15 to manufacture.

So today, we stand with your constituents as well as ours to lower the price of insulin for those that need it so that they can go on with their lives.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY), the chair of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, Subcommittee on Consumer Protection and Commerce.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, Americans pay 10 times as much for insulin as do any other consumers in countries around the world. The exact same drug. You know, we actually have the names of people who have died because they could not afford their insulin and started to cut back on their prescribed amount. And that is just unacceptable.

Big Pharma has been gouging consumers for a long time, even for lifesaving drugs, and it is time to stop it. The Affordable Insulin Now Act will make insulin \$35 a month for millions of Americans, and it will save life after life after life. This is only the start. We have to make sure that all Americans have access, including those who have no insurance.

□ 1445

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. SCHRADER), a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. SCHRADER. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of the Affordable Insulin Now Act. The bill before us today will finally deliver the financial relief Oregonians whose lives depend on insulin so desperately need.

By capping the costs to no more than \$35 a month in Medicare part D and commercial insurance, Congress is making it clear that no one should have to cut back, ration, or skip doses of lifesaving medication.

I am proud that this policy is a central tenet of my own drug pricing bill that I have worked on with leadership, secured in the House, and passed in the Build Back Better bill. We need to rein in all drug price prescriptions. That is why it is important to negotiate drug prices without stifling innovation, like we do in our bill. Limit the price increases of everyday drugs to the price of inflation, and perhaps more importantly, limit out-of-pocket costs to seniors to \$2,000 or less.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New Hampshire (Ms. KUSTER), a member of Energy and Commerce Committee.

Ms. KUSTER. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of the Affordable Insulin Now Act, critical legislation to cap out-of-pocket costs for insulin at \$35 per month.

I consistently hear from Granite State families about how the rising cost of insulin is forcing them to put their health at risk by cutting back on doses or skipping them all together because it is just too expensive.

We cannot continue to force American families to make impossible decisions between their medication and their well-being. At the end of the day, the work that we do is about our constituents, and I can say right here, right now that I care more about the well-being of my constituents and their health than I do about the profits of certain companies that seem to be protected on the other side of the aisle.

No one should pay more than \$35 a month for their insulin, and I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I would inquire how much time is remaining on each side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New Jersey has 2 minutes remaining, and the gentlewoman from Washington has 3½ minutes remaining.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. SCHRIER), a

member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Ms. SCHRIER. Madam Speaker, I am delighted that today we will be voting to pass the Affordable Insulin Now Act. This is personal for me. I have type 1 diabetes and insulin keeps me alive. This tiny 2 teaspoon bottle that used to cost \$40 now retails for over \$300. Most of us need more than one bottle a month to survive.

No one should have to ration their insulin—taking just enough to stay alive but not enough to stay healthy. That is a dangerous and sometimes deadly tightrope to walk, which is why this bill to cap insulin at \$35 a month is so critical for my patients, as a pediatrician, and for people like me.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER), an outstanding member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Madam Speaker, for over 30 years I was the one who was on the other side of the counter who had to tell the patient how much their insulin costs. I was the one who watched the senior citizens trying to decide whether they were going to buy insulin or buy groceries. I was the one who watched a mother cry because she couldn't afford the medication for her child.

I was the one who watched all this happen, and now I am finally getting the opportunity to address this issue on the House floor. I am saddened that it will do nothing to protect those mothers from the pain of not being able to afford lifesaving medications.

Make no mistake about this. We all agree on the same thing, Madam Speaker. We want lower prices for drugs, particularly for insulin. But instead of fixing a broken system, this bill aims to control it. This Socialist plan of requiring every private insurance company across the country to offer certain insulins, not all but certain, at a mandated price will have disastrous consequences on seniors and the 217 million Americans who rely on private insurance.

We all know that insurance agencies will shift these costs to patients with other diseases. Don't kid yourself. This is like squeezing a balloon, it is going to go somewhere else. We aren't talking about the bipartisan solutions that currently exist, like the Lower Costs, More Cures Act of 2021, H.R. 19. That is what we ought to be talking about.

Why aren't we talking about the PBMs, the middlemen? The Berkeley Institute came out with a study last week, Madam Speaker, that said that 37 percent of the price of a drug goes to the pharmaceutical manufacturer and the rest goes to the middleman, the PBM. The solution is right there before us. This is not going to fix it. This is going to control it, but it is not going to fix it.

Madam Speaker, I oppose this. We all have the same common goal, but this is not the solution.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to gentlewoman from Georgia (Ms. BOURDEAUX).

Ms. BOURDEAUX. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the Affordable Insulin Now Act.

Before his death, my father paid \$300 for a 10 milliliter vial of insulin that cost about \$25 in Canada. Far too many Americans, like my father, are forced to choose between paying for their medication or buying food for their families. No one should have to make that choice.

Georgia has one of the highest diabetes rates in the country, and this measure would provide my constituents with meaningful relief. I urge all of my colleagues to vote "yes" on H.R. 6833 and lower the cost of insulin.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE).

Mr. PAYNE. Madam Speaker, I would like to thank the chairman for giving me this opportunity because I wanted my colleagues on the other side to see what an insulin patient looks like. You are looking at him.

I need insulin in order to stay alive. The boot that I am wearing is not a fashion decision, it is because I have a diabetic ulcer on my foot, the fourth one I have had in 7 years.

I have left my insulin in New Jersey, gone to the drugstore when I arrived down here in Washington, and said: I need insulin. They said: Well, Mr. PAYNE, your insurance isn't ready to cover it. I said: Well, that is all right. I am doing okay in life, I will pay for it. She goes back, she gets the bag and hands it to me and says: \$348. What happens to the people that are not at the level of a Member of Congress? Think about that. It is \$12 in Canada.

We are asking for it to be three times higher than it is in Canada. Think about that. I live it every single day.

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

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I hear the Democrats talking about this helping all Americans. This does nothing to help those without insurance. Let me repeat this. If you do not have insurance, this does not lower your cost, it may actually increase the price of your insulin.

Increasing competition to lower prices, as we do in H.R. 19 is the way, not dictating a price cap. We have break-through biosimilars right now. We had two approved last year; biosimilars that would help bring down the costs; costs savings within all markets so that patients would have access to lower-cost insulin.

The problem is getting those savings to the patients. The PBMs are the ones pocketing the money. Net prices have come down because of innovation. We can lower costs without shifting them.

Let's go to work. Republicans and Democrats, we all want to lower the price of insulin and we can do it without government price controls and we can do it by working together and actually solving the problem.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) and the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. SMITH) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

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

Madam Speaker, I want to thank Chairman NEAL for his leadership on the Ways and Means Committee in helping to bring this important legislation to the floor.

Right now, families and seniors that I represent in Michigan, and all across the country, are paying too much for prescription drugs, in particular, for insulin. That is why Congresswoman CRAIG and Congresswoman MCBATH and I have introduced the Affordable Insulin Now Act to make insulin more accessible and more affordable.

This legislation would lower out-of-pocket costs for Americans with diabetes by ensuring that insurers and Medicare can't charge more than \$35 a month out-of-pocket for this medication.

Insulin was discovered over 100 years ago. Since then, little about this life-saving medication has changed, but the price of insulin in the United States has absolutely skyrocketed. As a result, Americans pay 10 times more for insulin than patients in other developed countries, and one in four Americans who rely on insulin have cut back or skipped their doses due to costs.

No one should have to choose between taking their medication as prescribed and putting food on the table or a roof over their head. People must make that choice because of Big Pharma's unfair pricing practices. This is something I know a little bit about.

As a father of a type 1 diabetic, I have seen firsthand how the high price of prescription drugs like insulin can harm patients and harm families. When my daughter turned 26 and got her own health insurance, there are months where she spends a third of her take-home pay, because she is diabetic, on staying alive. She has her mom and I to back her, but not everybody has that advantage. Either way, it doesn't make it okay.

In Michigan, it is estimated that 1 in 10 people have some form of diabetes. The average sticker price for a month's supply of insulin is \$375, but for some it can be as high as \$1,000 a month, just because they need to take more insulin. That is just not right.

Jill Verdier, a type 1 diabetic from my district, was my virtual guest at the State of the Union this year. She told me that insulin is like air to people with diabetes, they need it to survive.

□ 1500

At a time when Big Pharma is making record profits, Congress has to do more to lower costs, out-of-pocket costs. And that is why I fought to bring this bill to the floor with my colleagues, Representative CRAIG and Representative MCBATH. I urge my colleagues to vote to pass our legislation to lower costs. This is important legislation. I know we need to invest in cures. Obviously we would like to see the total price of insulin come down. But it is difficult to hear my colleagues on the other side who oppose the legislation to bring down the cost will also oppose this legislation to keep Americans from having to spend more out of their pocket. I think this is legislation that makes sense. It would help people. It would save lives.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, this issue is so important I don't think we should automatically accept a partisan proposal that doesn't even get to the heart of the problem.

Today we actually could be voting on H.R. 19, the Lower Costs, More Cures Act, a bipartisan bill that would not only address the root causes of the high insulin prices, but lower costs for all patients.

Instead, and I might say, very sadly, we are voting on a partisan messaging bill to give Washington a greater say in Americans' medical decisions while raising premiums on seniors and the millions of Americans with private health insurance.

This is nothing more than an attempt by my colleagues on the other side to pass just piece by piece their cures-killing Socialist takeover of the entire innovation sector. And worse, despite the misleading title of this current bill, it does nothing to lower the actual price of insulin. Instead, it uses budget games and regulations to disguise the actual cost of insulin for all consumers.

This is just another instance of misguided health and economic policies coming at a time when more than half of Americans are worried about rising prices and the economy. And, of course, like the President's budget released this week, this bill, too, is only "paid for" with gimmicks, adding to our deficit and the core causes of inflation.

We can and should do more for the American people who are struggling. The American people expect us to work together. We could be doing that.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KILDEE. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS), who is my colleague on the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of this legislation. As a type 2 diabetic myself for the last 30 years, I

know firsthand the high cost of this prescription. There is nothing in my district more prevalent as a disease entity than diabetes. I strongly support it. It is an idea whose time not only has come but has passed.

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

Mr. KILDEE. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT), who is also a member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. DOGGETT. Madam Speaker, to assure a stable supply of insulin and better health at \$35 instead of \$300 monthly, I fully support this bill for Yolanda, a retired Texas teacher, and one-quarter of insulin-dependent patients forced to ration their insulin because of predatory pricing.

Yet, instead of addressing pharmaceutical price gouging, this bill really only shifts how Big Pharma is rewarded. Since this bill does not reduce any insulin prices by one penny, all of us who are insured will ultimately pay through our premiums while taxpayers are on the hook for \$11 billion. For Americans who rely on other types of lifesaving drugs, there is also no relief. Big Pharma remains immune from any restraint on its monopoly prices from a Congress that is simply unable to hold it accountable.

My further concern is that this bill widens the coverage gap for nearly 5.5 million Texans and 28 million Americans who are uninsured, wrongly excluded from any benefit, and who do not receive any benefit today. While the uninsured population represents 17 percent of the insulin-dependent population, they constitute 80 percent of the people who pay full, monopoly prices. So, help for some—which is important—but there is a need to do more for the many who are not covered today.

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD letters from numerous groups representing and reflecting the views of millions of Americans.

AMAC ACTION,
Leesburg, FL, March 30, 2022.

Hon. STEVE SCALISE,
House Republican Whip,
Washington, DC.

DEAR WHIP SCALISE: On behalf of the 2.3 million members of AMAC—Association of Mature American Citizens, I write to express our concern with H.R. 6833, the Affordable Insulin Now Act.

Not too long ago, former President Trump made significant gains in lowering insulin costs for Americans. He initiated the Part D Senior Savings Model a voluntary program which allows beneficiaries to choose enhanced Part D plan options that offer lower out-of-pocket costs for insulin. He also signed an Executive Order that delivered inexpensive insulin and epinephrine to lower income patients. Unfortunately, President Biden delayed this Executive Order the day after he took office in 2021 before rescinding it later that year.

Now, the Democrats are considering H.R. 6833 which is an unserious attempt to lower the price of insulin. This bill would exert price controls on private market insulin to

cap the costs paid by patients. H.R. 6833 takes us closer to further pharmaceutical price-fixing, a policy contained the Build Back Better plan. Price-fixing drugs leads to rationing and shortages as evidenced in other countries who have employed this policy. The Democrats' bill is estimated to increase spending by about \$11 billion, and the bill is paid for by delaying the rebate rule for one year. This Trump-era rule compels pharmacy benefit managers to share the rebates they receive from drug manufacturers with Part D beneficiaries to lower their out-of-pocket expenses.

The Affordable Insulin Now Act is an election year messaging act on the part of Democrats. If they were serious about lowering the cost of insulin, they would work with Republicans on innovative programs like the Part D Senior Savings Model, a program that is expanding with robust participation by plan sponsors and offers predictable insulin costs that do not exceed \$35/month.

As an organization comprised of Americans who are age 55-plus, controlling drug costs, especially insulin costs, is paramount to maintaining a good quality of life for AMAC members. H.R. 6833 is a step in the wrong direction for lowering insulin prices and opens the door for further government price-fixing and regulation.

Sincerely,

BOB CARLSTROM,
President, AMAC Action,

COUNCIL FOR CITIZENS
AGAINST GOVERNMENT WASTE,
March 30, 2022,

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: You will soon be considering H.R. 6833, the Affordable Insulin Now Act. On behalf of the more than one million members and supporters of the Council for Citizens Against Government Waste (CCAGW), I urge you to oppose H.R. 6833 and any other measure to institute price controls in the medical marketplace.

In addition to imposing price controls, H.R. 6833 also increases funding for the Medicare Improvement Fund by \$9 billion and adds \$1.5 million to the budget for the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services to carry out the provisions of the bill.

Historically, price controls like those contained in the Affordable Insulin Now Act increase costs and lead to shortages and rationing. H.R. 6833 will lead to increased premiums for seniors and the 217 million Americans who rely on private health insurance. The government has no business setting prices on any good or service, especially not healthcare. Price controls inherently distort the medical marketplace and leave Americans worse off by significantly decreasing future research and development.

Americans are already suffering under the highest inflation in 40 years, and H.R. 6833 will increase this financial hardship. The cost of medicines should be addressed without instituting price controls or threatening future innovation. I again urge you to oppose this legislation. All votes on H.R. 6833 may be among those considered in CCAGW's 2022 Congressional Ratings.

Sincerely,

TOM SCHATZ.

NFIB,
Washington, DC, March 30, 2022.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

Hon. KEVIN MCCARTHY,
Republican Leader, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER PELOSI AND LEADER MCCARTHY: On behalf of NFIB, the nation's leading

small business advocacy organization, I write to express concern regarding H.R. 6833, the Affordable Insulin Now Act.

This legislation has a laudable goal of attempting to make insulin more affordable and accessible to Americans on private and public health plans. Unfortunately, it will have unintended consequences for small businesses and employees by necessitating increased premiums while failing to address the underlying issues that make insulin unaffordable in the first place.

As studies have shown, a limited number of manufacturers, patent evergreening, practices of pharmacy benefit managers (PBMs), and other issues contribute to the high price of insulin. H.R. 6833 does not address any of these problems and instead seeks to solve consumer affordability by pushing significant, additional costs onto employers and health plans by limiting participant cost sharing.

For over 30 years, NFIB members have identified the cost of health insurance as the number one small business problem with 50 percent ranking it as a critical problem. Rising health insurance premiums result in fewer small businesses offering health insurance benefits. Since 2000, the average costs of an employer-sponsored single coverage plan and an employer-sponsored family plan have increased 149 percent and 18 percent, respectively. Unsurprisingly, facing these cost pressures, the number of small businesses with fewer than 50 employees offering coverage has declined from 47.2 percent in 2000 to 31 percent in 2020. Many small employers that are providing insurance have been forced to increase participant cost-sharing and deductibles as the only means to counter unsustainable premium increases and continue to offer coverage. To that end, solutions to affordability that limit cost-sharing without corresponding reforms will only serve to increase premiums and further exacerbate the small business affordability problem.

NFIB continues to advocate for affordable health insurance for small businesses and all Americans. However, if the system of employer sponsored health insurance is to endure in the long-term, Congress must work together to address the underlying cost drivers of the American healthcare system, rather than shift additional cost burdens onto employers seeking to offer health insurance to their employees.

Sincerely,

KEVIN KUHLMAN,
Vice President,
Federal Government Relations.

PARTNERSHIP FOR
EMPLOYER-SPONSORED COVERAGE,
March 30, 2022.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

Hon. KEVIN MCCARTHY,
Minority Leader, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER PELOSI AND LEADER MCCARTHY: The Partnership for Employer-Sponsored coverage (P4ESC) writes to share our strong concerns regarding H.R. 6833 the "Affordable Insulin Now Act." Although P4ESC shares the goal of lowering the cost of insulin, we believe this bill will simply shift costs back to employers and employees, including those who are insulin dependent. A better and more direct solution that addresses excessive profit taking by pharmaceutical manufacturers and others, including pharmacy benefit managers, in the pharmaceutical supply chain would be preferable.

The Congressional Budget Office (CBO) recently found that H.R. 6833 would increase the federal deficit by as much as \$11 billion over ten years and increase health insurance

premiums for all Americans. Indeed, there will not be any curb on future insulin price increases paid by employers and insurers. Every dollar of cost increase will be reflected in ever higher health insurance premiums paid by all Americans, whether privately insured or covered through Medicare. Better approaches that increase competition among insulin manufacturers, address regulatory problems and streamline the supply chain will help reduce the cost of all prescription drugs, including insulin.

The Partnership for Employer-Sponsored Coverage is an advocacy alliance of employment-based organizations and trade associations representing businesses of all sizes and the more than 181 million American employees and their families who rely on employer-sponsored coverage every day. We are committed to working to ensure that employer-sponsored coverage is strengthened and remains a viable, affordable option for decades to come. We look forward to working with you to ensure employer-sponsored coverage continues to thrive.

We would welcome the opportunity to discuss these issues with you or your staffs.

Sincerely,

PARTNERSHIP FOR EMPLOYER-
SPONSORED
COVERAGE (P4ESC).

THE ERISA INDUSTRY COMMITTEE,

Washington, DC, March 29, 2022.

DEAR MEMBER OF CONGRESS: As the House prepares to vote on the “Affordable Insulin Now Act” (H.R. 6833), The ERISA Industry Committee (ERIC) writes to share opposition to this legislation and urges members to vote “NO” when the bill is called for a vote.

ERIC is a national nonprofit organization exclusively representing the largest employers in the United States in their capacity as sponsors of employee benefit plans for their nationwide workforces. With member companies that are leaders in every economic sector, ERIC is the voice of large employer plan sponsors on federal, state, and local public policies impacting their ability to sponsor benefit plans and to lawfully operate under ERISA’s protection from a patchwork of different and conflicting state and local laws, in addition to federal law.

ERIC member companies voluntarily offer comprehensive health benefits to millions of active and retired workers and their families across the country. Our members offer great health benefits to attract and retain employees, be competitive for human capital, and improve health and provide peace of mind. On average, large employers pay around 75 percent of health care costs on behalf of 181 million beneficiaries. As such, ERIC member companies have a significant stake in, and deep commitment to, efforts to curb unsustainable rising costs in the health care system.

Employers oppose H.R. 6833 because the bill imposes government-mandated prices, shifts costs to patients, and will not lower drug costs. The bill may in fact increase the costs of insulin by creating a perverse incentive wherein insulin manufacturers know that no matter how much they increase prices, their customers will pay government-set prices. This action will cause employers, insurers, and other health insurance enrollees to pay more to offset these high costs. This view is supported by the Congressional Budget Office (CBO), which recently found that this policy would increase the federal deficit by around \$11 billion and increase health insurance premiums for all Americans.

ERIC and our member companies support legislation that would actually lower prescription drug costs, including for insulin, rather than shift costs to employers and

other patients. Congress could achieve this by enacting policies to:

Increase competition among insulin manufacturers;

Fix the regulatory problems that misclassify insulin and fail to properly align market exclusivity and patent protections to the drug; and

Address supply chain issues like rebates and bona fide service fees that lead to formularies that do not reflect value for patients.

Many of these proposals are already included in bipartisan legislation that could be quickly passed and sent to the President for his signature. They have been scored by CBO to lower drug costs and health insurance premiums for all Americans.

Because the “Affordable Insulin Now Act” fails to reduce drug prices and raises health insurance costs for all, ERIC urges members to vote NO, and oppose the passage of H.R. 6833. We look forward to working with Congress on productive, effective, value-driven solutions to make prescription drugs—including insulin—affordable for all Americans.

Sincerely,

JAMES P. GELFAND.

FREEDOMWORKS,
March 30, 2022.

KEY VOTE NO ON THE AFFORDABLE INSULIN
NOW ACT, H.R. 6833

On behalf of FreedomWorks’ activist community, I urge you to contact your representative and ask him or her to vote NO on the Affordable Insulin Now Act, H.R. 6833, introduced by Rep. Angie Craig (D-Minn.). This legislation would impose socialist price controls to cap the price of insulin at \$35.

Currently, Americans are grappling with the harsh reality of increased prices on everything from gas to groceries. We see firsthand the consequences of modern monetary theory and the devastation it brings. Unfortunately, the many Americans that struggle with diabetes are no stranger to increased prices. The cost of insulin has been steadily rising for decades.

While progressives are all too eager to blame high prices on “corporate greed,” the reality is that this is an issue created by the federal government. Heavy-handed price controls are a deeply flawed solution that misses the mark when identifying the problem.

Pharmacy benefit managers (PBMs) play a significant role in the dramatic rise in the cost of prescription drugs. PBMs are third-party administrators determining which drugs go on formularies (a list of approved prescription drugs that hospitals can prescribe and are covered under an insurance policy). Ostensibly, PBMs negotiate to obtain the best price. However, these “savings” are often pocketed by PBMs themselves and aren’t passed onto patients. Since they are reimbursed based on the markdown from the original list price, PBMs are incentivized to prioritize drugs with higher list prices, so they can receive a larger markdown.

There are free-market alternatives to lower the cost of insulin and healthcare in general. For example, it was reported in an article in *The Federalist*, “A consortium of hospitals recently announced plans to build a factory that can manufacture insulin within two years. Once their plant gets up and running, the non-profit consortium said it would sell the insulin at a cost of \$30 a vial—a fraction of what pharmaceutical companies currently charge.”

This legislation is a simplistic proposal to address a highly complex problem. We cannot afford half-hearted proposals based on unsound economics like this one for an issue that impacts so many.

FreedomWorks will count the vote for H.R. 6833 on our 2022 Congressional Scorecard and reserves the right to score any amendments, motions, or other related votes. The scorecard is used to determine eligibility for the FreedomFighter Award, which recognizes Members of the House and Senate who consistently vote to support economic freedom and individual liberty.

Sincerely,

ADAM BRANDON,
President, FreedomWorks.

NATIONAL TAXPAYERS UNION

As the calendar turns to April, the U.S. House of Representatives is planning to vote on legislation that would cap insulin costs for all Americans who are privately insured or on Medicare Part D at no more than \$35 per month in out-of-pocket payments. While the bill’s sponsors may have good intentions, and while Congress can certainly act to provide support for Americans facing high prescription drug costs, NTU has several concerns about the impact the “Affordable Insulin Now Act” will have on America’s taxpayers and broader health care system.

The legislation would impose new cost-sharing limits on insulin for almost all privately insured Americans, and would extend these limitations to the tens of millions of Americans on Medicare Part D. According to a Congressional Budget Office (CBO) cost estimate, the bill’s requirements would cost federal taxpayers around \$11 billion (\$6.6 billion in higher spending and \$4.8 billion in reduced revenues). It is likely this cost estimate is due to anticipated higher premiums in both Medicare Part D and the Affordable Care Act individual marketplace. In these programs, higher premiums usually mean higher federal subsidies for health coverage that are paid for by taxpayers.

Indeed, proponents of the legislation have not properly addressed the impact this legislation would have on premiums in both Part D and the private marketplace. The Affordable Insulin Now Act puts a cap on the out-of-pocket costs owed by insured enrollees for insulin products, but it does not ultimately change the price of insulin paid for by health insurers. If insurers face higher costs for covering these drugs, they will likely be forced to pass those costs on to customers in the form of higher premiums or higher cost-sharing on other health products and services. And, as noted above, some higher premiums will result in higher costs for taxpayers, who bear some of the burden for covering seniors under Part D and low- and middle-income Americans on the ACA marketplace.

Perhaps the most troubling part of the legislation, though, is the proposed offset for the cost of the legislation. House Democratic leadership is proposing to “pay for” the legislation’s \$11 billion cost with a shameless budget gimmick that NTU and NTU Foundation have called out before: delaying a Trump administration “rebate” regulation that was projected to raise federal government costs but was never likely to be implemented in the first place.

As NTU wrote in July of last year, when a bipartisan group of lawmakers proposed using rebate rule delay as a pay-for in the major infrastructure bill:

“This phantom \$49 billion ‘pay for’ was called ‘Washington at its worst’ by one health industry lobbyist speaking to *The Washington Post*. In short, the Biden administration has delayed until 2023 a Trump administration regulation that would change how prescription drug discounts are handled by insurers and pharmacy benefit managers (PBMs). Because the Congressional Budget Office projected that the so-called rebate rule would increase federal spending in Medicare and Medicaid by about \$177 billion over

a decade, due to a rise in Medicare premiums (and therefore, taxpayer-funded subsidies for Medicare premiums), lawmakers get to count a further delay in the rule (beyond the Biden administration's one-year delay) as "savings" for the federal government. Reports indicate Congressional Democrats may use additional phantom "savings" from the rebate rule in their larger reconciliation bill by repealing the rebate rule entirely.

... This rule has never been implemented, and there's no clear indication that the Biden administration would have followed through on implementing the regulation even after their one-year delay. And even if the Biden administration had implemented the rule, there's little clarity as to whether the rebate rule would have actually cost federal taxpayers over \$177 billion over the decade. In short, delaying the rebate rule does not present real, tangible savings to taxpayers, like a reduction in federal spending would.'

Unfortunately, it seems like the rebate rule is becoming yet another tried-and-true budget gimmick that Congress dips into again and again, in order to appear as if they are paying for new spending. And according to the CBO estimate cited above, because the rebate rule is projected to offer \$20 billion in phantom savings—not just the \$11 billion needed to cover the insulin bill's costs—the revised insulin legislation proposes spending another \$9 billion on a broad-based Medicare Improvement Fund. That means \$9 billion more will ultimately be spent without real offsets and, in our view, be paid for by taxpayers in the long run with higher debt and deficits.

To be clear, high out-of-pocket costs for insulin are a real issue for many Americans. NTU continues to support several bipartisan and meaningful proposals that would provide relief for many Americans, including:

An out-of-pocket cap in Medicare Part D, along with Part D benefit redesign that would actually save taxpayers money in the long run;

An ongoing Medicare insulin model that represents a public-private partnership between the federal government, insurers, and drug manufacturers that has the potential to meaningfully reduce out-of-pocket insulin costs for up to millions of seniors on Part D; and

Allowing Part D enrollees to spread their out-of-pocket burdens over the 12 months of a plan year, rather than having to owe major bills in the first or second months of a new plan year.

This legislation could undermine the ongoing Medicare insulin model, Part D redesign efforts, and reported bipartisan work in the Senate to provide insulin cost relief for American patients who are struggling. The House should go back to the drawing board and focus on more bipartisan opportunities.

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT), who is an expert in health policy.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Madam Speaker, you do realize what is going on here, and I am going to be a little sarcastic because I am frustrated.

Insulin prices are outrageous.

But why is it outrageous?

The fact of the matter is our regulatory mechanic and our payment mechanic are the very things that broke this, and here you do a piece of legislation that will break it more.

Please, I beg of the majority: Hire an economist. And I will walk you

through some of the facts on it. So, Madam Speaker, you are doing a bill here where you are going to subsidize the dollar amount in the back, but you are still going to keep the regulatory mechanics the way they are in their archaic designs, and then you are going to be joyful that individuals will pay what, \$35 a vial?

At the same time we are subsidizing it billions and billions and billions of dollars.

Does anyone have a subscription to an aggregator on healthcare policy on your side?

You do realize, there is a co-op coming out of the ground right now that is going to be \$50, \$55 for a box of five. It is lower than your subsidized price. And this is their market price.

If you were doing something good for society, you would actually be moving this covax to the top of the regulatory stack and say: We want them to get permitted and licensed as fast as possible because they are still a year plus away. But it is being built right now, and you are about to screw up the solution. And if you really, really, really, really care about people—remember, I represent the population with the second highest number of diabetes. I represent a Tribal community that is number two in the world. Come with me some time and let me introduce you to people who have had their feet cut off. If you actually care about solving the misery, then read the science journals that made it clear last November, December, the success.

We know how to cure. And for my friend over here, you have a family member type 1—I know I need to go through the Speaker—but a family member with type 1, we know how to cure it now. And there is even the next generation of this. We have even learned how to do the stem cell, the isolate cell, tag it with a CRISPR so you can do a bio-foundry, meaning it doesn't have to come from your skin cells, we can basically now cure type 1 and the same technology will work for type 2. But we are going to have to deal with some societal issues. If you want to end the misery in society don't build more clinics, don't do a subsidy, get this technology to people.

And for those of us who are fiscal hawks and actually care about where we are going, you do realize that 31 percent of all Medicare spending is just diabetes. Thirty-three percent of all healthcare spending is diabetes. And so the brain trust here decides: Hey, let's subsidize this by billions and billions and billions and billions and billions of dollars, screw up the movement to actually have cures to actually have a co-op provide the product dramatically less expensive.

Remember, the co-op is going to bring it in cheaper than the subsidized price without all the taxpayer money.

Please, I know the virtue signaling here is powerful. The economics are crap.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is reminded to direct his remarks to the Chair.

Mr. KILDEE. Madam Speaker, to my friend from Arizona, I appreciate his passion. I wish it were true that he had somehow cured diabetes. It would be great news for my daughter and so many other Americans who say that they are looking for that cure. In the meantime, while we are working to get there—and I appreciate the effort, I do, because I am on board, I am completely on board with the notion that we ought to cure this terrible disease—however, until that day comes, let's make sure that the people who depend on insulin in order to stay alive can live to see that day that I know he and I both are looking forward to.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL), who is my colleague from the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. PASCRELL. Madam Speaker, the Affordable Insulin Now Act will cap out-of-pocket insulin costs at \$35 a month—not a miracle by any stretch of the imagination. And anyone who supports legislation in this order and others where we address other diseases obviously, we are working on new situations just about every month. So because you are working on it and you are trying to find a balance of the free market, and where the price goes without fixing the price of what something will cost, I mean, we have been called worse things than Socialists. When you come to this debate, I'll settle on that word.

Well, what does that mean?

You want to get into a debate about socialism?

I served in the Armed Forces. I fought for my country. I am tired of being called names.

Seven million Americans who use insulin want to stay alive. The average insulin costs rose 54 percent. We have heard that before.

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

Mr. KILDEE. Madam Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. PASCRELL. Madam Speaker, when insulin was discovered, Warren Harding was the President and the New York Giants won the World Series, yet there was no television to watch the New York Giants.

Insulin costs are a national disgrace. For a drug discovered over 100 years ago, \$1,000 price tag for a single vial is an outrage. You know it, and I know it.

So get beyond the argument that we are all a bunch of Socialists because we want to help people. We are doing what the folks sent us here to do. We can't do it on every drug. We need the technology. The gentleman from Arizona is right on target. It will save lives.

If we can't do that, then what the heck are we doing here?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is reminded to direct his remarks to the Chair.

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Madam Speaker, it is interesting listening to the debate here. Certainly my colleague, Mr. DOGGETT, I think very appropriately pointed out:

This bill does not lower the price of insulin by one penny. It just simply shifts around who pays for what.

We have seen that pattern in healthcare across America for some time now, and I would hope that we could learn from that.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KILDEE. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. CHU), who is a member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Ms. CHU. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 6833, the Affordable Insulin Now Act.

I will never forget the day a constituent in my district showed me his bottle of insulin. He told me that one day while traveling in Canada he found he forgot it, so he went to a pharmacy. He found that that same bottle of insulin that he buys here in the U.S. for \$200 cost only \$25 in Canada, the exact same product.

He started calculating how much it would cost him to fly to Canada once every 3 months, and then asked himself: Why are Americans the only ones paying these exorbitant prices?

Nobody should have to sacrifice just to afford medicine. That is why today's bill is so important. By capping the cost of insulin at \$35 a month, this bill will ensure that monthly costs for millions of families are truly affordable. It is time to prioritize the needs of our people so that every American can afford to stay alive.

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

Madam Speaker, I think that this discussion that we are having here today is important. I also believe that we need to work together on solutions to actually reduce the cost of insulin, again, not just shifting around who pays for what. But certainly I am willing to give my colleague on the other side more information about the information Mr. SCHWEIKERT was sharing. He is very knowledgeable on the subject. He certainly works with his constituents a lot, constituents in need. And we know that literally millions of people across America are in need for lower-cost insulin. We owe them, I think, a much better approach than just simple government intrusion and more government involvement shifting around the cost.

□ 1515

I was a bit alarmed earlier when I heard that we should maybe make Medicare prescription coverage more like the VA. We need to remember that the VA offers roughly 50 percent of the options for participants compared to Medicare. I don't think we want to reduce the choices that seniors would have with their formularies within

Medicare part D. If anything, we should make sure they have more choices. We know that more choices in the marketplace bring down the price, and we need to focus in that direction.

Madam Speaker, I urge a "no" vote on this bill. We owe the American people a diligent effort, working together to truly reduce the cost of insulin.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I appreciate my colleagues' support of this legislation. This is important legislation.

I will say this: I understand the points that have been made on the other side. As a father of a type 1 diabetic, I am one of those many millions of families that pay very close attention to the important research that we think ultimately may lead to a cure for diabetes, so I embrace the suggestion made on the other side that we have hope for a cure. I have hope for a cure. Ever since my daughter was diagnosed, I have been waiting for that moment, as she has, for that cure to appear. If it is just outside our grasp, let's do everything we can to get there.

But that is not what this legislation is intended to attack. It doesn't mean we ignore that. It means we continue to push.

I have worked with my colleague on this side of the aisle, Congresswoman DEGETTE, to try to do everything we can to find these cures. But in the meantime, let's make sure that there is not a diabetic who is standing at the pharmacy counter with lifesaving medication just beyond their reach, not because it is unavailable but because it is unaffordable to them.

I take the point that while this legislation doesn't do what we all would like to do—and that is to reduce the overall cost of medication through the way markets actually work, negotiation between a buyer and a seller. I mean, that is the way the free market works. Let's let the free market work and not have law that allows the seller to dictate to us the price of a drug that can save lives and make huge profits while there are people in a pharmacy reaching for a drug that they can't get because the price is too high. This legislation will help save lives in the immediate term.

I hope there is a day when Democrats and Republicans can come together to establish policy that would allow negotiation on the overall price of these lifesaving medications. That would be a solution. We support it; you oppose it. In the meantime, let's do this and save some lives.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California (Mr. DESAULNIER) and the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from California.

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

Today, I rise in support of the Affordable Insulin Now Act.

On top of weathering the economic fallout of the global pandemic, Americans are still paying far too much for insulin. This is particularly frustrating, given that these are not the prices that consumers in the rest of the world pay. The most commonly used form of insulin costs 10 times more in the United States than in any other developed country.

Tragically, there have been recent reports of deaths of patients with diabetes because they cannot afford the insulin they need to stay alive.

The Affordable Insulin Now Act would take a historic step to lower the cost of insulin and cap out-of-pocket costs at \$35 per month. This means individuals with private insurance could save up to \$500 per year.

This bill ensures affordable access to lifesaving medication for the more than 37 million people in the United States who have diabetes and the over 7 million Americans who rely on insulin to maintain their health and well-being.

Madam Speaker, it is past time, but today it is time to finally deliver on our promise to ensure that all Americans can get the medication they need and they deserve to stay healthy and thrive. The Affordable Insulin Now Act brings us one step closer to that promise.

There is certainly more work to be done. I look forward to working with my colleagues to get the cost of prescription drugs under control and to build upon this important first step.

Madam Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to please support this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 6833.

Americans are rightly concerned about the price of prescription drugs, but Democrats are trying to solve this problem in the wrong way, as usual. Instead of discussing bipartisan, commonsense legislation to address the rising costs of prescription drugs, we are debating H.R. 6833. This radical bill is another attempt by the left to advance a government takeover of prescription drug pricing.

Don't be fooled. This legislation is a Trojan horse. H.R. 6833 claims to address insulin prices, but what it actually does is opens the door to government price controls without addressing the root problem, which is the rising cost of insulin.

H.R. 6833 won't lower costs. It is a smokescreen that will raise premiums for workers and seniors when inflation is at a 40-year high.

Why are Democrats knowingly raising healthcare premiums on the majority of Americans when so many Americans are struggling to pay for gas and put food on the table? Four out of five Americans in large group plans already pay under \$35 a month for insulin. This

bill will raise healthcare costs for the vast majority of working Americans.

When insurers are required by the Federal Government to cover an insulin product, this allows manufacturers to raise the price of insulin indiscriminately. Since insurers can charge only \$35 a month out of pocket to the patient, the insurer must make up for the increased cost of insulin by raising premiums for all beneficiaries. With a lack of competition in the market, this bill removes the bargaining power insurers use to keep insulin prices low, leading to increased insulin prices and higher premiums.

This legislation will only worsen the root problem of high insulin prices, which is a lack of competition in the market. H.R. 6833 will lead to fewer approved generic insulin brands, making the insulin monopoly even worse. If Democrats really want to decrease the price of insulin, they should pave the way for more competition, not less.

This legislation will cost taxpayers \$11 billion, giving the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services \$1.5 million in fiscal year 2022 to administer these drug-pricing caps. Trusting the Washington bureaucracy to manage drug pricing and distribution is a mistake. This legislation would be the largest expansion of Federal control over Americans' private health insurance since ObamaCare.

We must stop the Federal Government from wedging its foot in the door of our healthcare system and moving us one step closer to a socialist, single-payer system for Medicare for All. In fact, this week, the chair of the Progressive Caucus said she was "fighting to make it the law of the land."

H.R. 6833 sets a dangerous precedent. If the Federal Government can set prices for insulin, what is to stop it from implementing price controls for every drug on the market or in every other sector of the economy?

The free market is the reason the United States outpaces every other country in developing lifesaving cures and treatments, particularly countries with socialized medicine. Federal drug-pricing mandates will discourage medical innovation, resulting in fewer cures, which will keep Americans from receiving the therapies they rely upon.

Instead of perpetuating Obama-era schemes to expand Federal controls over Americans' health insurance, the Biden administration and congressional Democrats should bring to the floor H.R. 19, the bipartisan Lower Costs, More Cures Act.

Every single provision in H.R. 19 has bipartisan support. Lawmakers on both sides of the aisle agree that this legislation will lower healthcare costs and protect America's status as a leading healthcare innovator.

Furthermore, H.R. 19 sets a new standard in healthcare affordability. This bill caps seniors' out-of-pocket insulin costs at only \$50 a month in the Medicare program. It also allows for high-deductible insurance plans to

cover insulin before a deductible kicks in, and it increases the availability of low-cost options for treatment in the marketplace.

The cost of insulin, like most healthcare costs in this country, are climbing rapidly. Yet, total Federal control is not the solution.

H.R. 6833 is a perfect example of legislative trickery. This bill will lower out-of-pocket costs for insulin for a minority of Americans by bloating premiums and other healthcare costs for the majority of Americans and leave our healthcare system worse off.

Supporting socialist drug pricing isn't a solution, which is why I am rejecting this one-sided, harmful bill. I urge my Democrat colleagues to support the Lower Costs, More Cures Act, bipartisan legislation that will lower drug costs for Americans without limiting access to cures.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DESAULNIER. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Georgia (Mrs. MCBATH), a lead sponsor of this legislation and a member of the Education and Labor Committee.

Mrs. MCBATH. Madam Speaker, I really appreciate Mr. DESAULNIER giving me a few moments of time.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 6833, the Affordable Insulin Now Act.

I want to take this time just to talk about the cost of healthcare and prescription drugs for all those in our community. It is a topic that I hear about every single day from my constituents, and it is something that touches the lives of every single American, whether you have diabetes or not.

Today, we will be voting on a bill that will actually provide desperately needed relief to some of the most vulnerable patients in the United States, in Georgia and all across this Nation.

There is no time off when you live with diabetes. It is a constant, ever-present disease that influences every aspect of your life. Listen to those who gave testimony about what they live with every single day with this chronic disease.

In 1920, before insulin was discovered, it would have been exceptional for those who had diabetes to live longer than 1 or 2 years. But over the past 100 years, we have been able to save lives with insulin. For over 100 years, it has remained the most effective treatment that we have.

Over 100 years later, some estimates state that diabetics spend around \$6,000 a year alone on insulin. This is just absolutely unconscionable for a drug that has been saving lives for over 100 years. We can and must make it more affordable for Americans who need it to live.

That is why I joined my colleagues, ANGIE CRAIG and DAN KILDEE, who I find to be healthcare champions, in introducing this critical legislation.

It is just really very simple. The Affordable Insulin Now Act would cap

out-of-pocket costs of insulin products at \$35 per month for Americans with health insurance.

This bill brings a measure of certainty and affordability to every American who needs insulin to continue living a healthy life.

Yes, I have heard arguments this afternoon that this doesn't take care of every individual in the country, specifically those who are uninsured. We know that. I assure you, we are not completely satisfied with this either. But if our Republican colleagues would come to the table with us, with any measures that you have—compromise, come to the table, consensus. Help us build the ability to make sure that every American in this country, whether they are insured or not, has the ability to be able to afford this lifesaving drug. We welcome that from you because people every single day are dying right beneath our noses. I am here to save lives.

I look forward to passing this vital legislation out of the House of Representatives today, and I look forward to continuing to fight for passage with Senator WARNOCK in the Senate.

As the President so rightly stated, this legislation can and will save lives, and it is long overdue.

□ 1530

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

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GROTHMAN).

Mr. GROTHMAN. Madam Speaker, it is a good-sounding bill. Everyone knows drug costs in general are too high, and insulin costs in particular are way too high. But it is a bill with a simple answer.

We look at a problem and solve the problem by having the Federal Reserve eventually print more money, \$15.5 billion over 10 years.

I realize you feel you have a pay-for here, but it is just by delaying another program by another year. And as a practical matter, this bill spends \$15.5 billion more over 10 years than we would without the bill.

We are already told this source of funds—we already used this type or source of funds in the infrastructure bill. It is just grabbing another year.

Why don't we just require PBMs to pass on their rebates to the patients as intended? That is something that would cost the Federal Government, in my mind, no new money. It would be a significant reduction in cost for the individual.

I appreciate that so many people on the majority side of the aisle would like to work together with us, and it shouldn't be difficult to find a solution to this problem that is fair to all concerned.

Mr. DESAULNIER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CASTRO), a member of the Education and Labor Committee.

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the Affordable Insulin Now Act which would cap

out-of-pocket insulin costs at \$35 per month and help fight the scourge of diabetes.

In 2019, as chair of the Congressional Hispanic Caucus, I organized meetings with leading insulin producers to confront them about the strain their prices are putting on the American people.

In each of those meetings, I said the same thing; that for millions of Americans, including a disproportionate number of Latinos, access to affordable insulin is a matter of life and death.

And for me and many of us, those aren't just numbers. Four months before I graduated from college in 1996, my grandmother died of complications from diabetes. If we fail to bring down the price of insulin, more families will suffer just like mine did.

But our responsibility is to all our constituents, not just those with insurance. So I co-sponsored Representative DOGGETT's amendment to extend the benefits of this bill to the uninsured, and I hope we will make that happen in the days to come.

But this bill is an important step forward, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOOD).

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. Person Speaker, and I say "Person Speaker" because I am not a biologist. And out of respect to our Supreme Court nominee, I don't feel qualified to say Madam Speaker.

But I do rise in opposition to this bill. The Affordable Insulin Now Act is just more of government controlling your healthcare.

Today, Democrats are using insulin as the gateway to their dream of fully socialized medicine where Joe Biden and his accomplices in Congress have more control over your healthcare than you or your doctor. After all, they got to decide whether or not you got a vaccine, and they fired you if you didn't obey.

If Democrats succeed in setting the price of insulin at \$35, the negative effects will ripple across the entire healthcare market.

I invite my Democrat colleagues to read my sophomore economics textbook to confirm what happens when you implement price controls.

It is estimated the average annual cost for the private sector of compliance with this mandate is \$2 billion. Not that Democrats care about billions of dollars, the way they throw around trillions of dollars. Don't tell them what comes after a trillion.

But we all remember the lies of ObamaCare. Please, say it with me. If you like your doctor, you can keep your doctor. Come on. This is participatory. If you like your healthcare plan, you can keep your healthcare plan. As a matter of fact, costs are going to go down. None of that was true.

And, instead, American families found themselves with plans they

didn't like, but at least they cost more, so it was a lose-lose.

Premiums will rise again if this bill becomes law because setting prices, again, has consequences, something our economically illiterate Democrat friends apparently don't understand, or maybe they do.

American innovation has brought amazing, lifesaving treatments to the healthcare market, but that research and development comes at a cost, like any other good or product or service in this country.

Don't we all want the best drugs, the best medicine, and the best healthcare? Instead of going with the Democrat default government-knows-best, one-size-fits-all mentality, we need to embrace free market principles.

Mr. DESAULNIER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. JEFFRIES).

Mr. JEFFRIES. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

What is the difference between us and them that was just on full display?

We care about everyday Americans. They don't.

We make life better for everyday Americans. They don't.

We get things done for everyday Americans, and they don't.

Insulin is a drug that is lifesaving and life-sustaining. It has been around for more than 100 years. It is off patent. There are no research and development costs associated with it.

Yet so many Americans pay approximately \$4,000 a year for insulin. That is unacceptable, un-American, and unconscionable. And that is why Democrats are doing something about it.

The Affordable Insulin Now Act will lower out-of-pocket costs to \$35 per month. That is not fiction. That is fact. That is not hyperbole. That is help that is game-changing for everyday Americans. Once again, Democrats deliver for the people.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I believe I have the right to close, so I will reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DESAULNIER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York).

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Insulin prices in the United States are the highest in the world. I support the Affordable Insulin Now Act, a bill that would cap patient costs at \$35 a month. It would make lifesaving medicine affordable for millions of Americans living with diabetes.

My committee's investigation found that since the 1990s, insulin manufacturers have been raising the price of this lifesaving medicine despite no improvements to the drug, while making record profits.

The price gouging has harmed Americans. More than one in four Americans with diabetes report having to ration insulin, and some have died.

Nearly 2 million New Yorkers have diabetes. Capping out-of-pocket costs to \$35 a month is an important step that Congress can take to reduce insulin costs for patients with diabetes.

Let's make prescription drugs affordable. Vote for this bill.

I thank Representatives KILDEE, CRAIG, and MCBATH for their leadership in authoring this bill.

Ms. FOXX. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DESAULNIER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Ms. SPANBERGER).

Ms. SPANBERGER. Madam Speaker, I have been so pleased to hear colleagues across the aisle speak in favor of competition and price negotiations.

I hope that they will follow through in their commitment to supporting competition and negotiation and co-sponsor Lower Drug Costs Now, H.R. 3.

But that is not the bill we are talking about today. Today, we are talking about the Affordable Insulin Now Act, a bill that would make changes in the lives of the more than 630,000 Virginians who are living with diabetes.

The Affordable Insulin Now Act would finally make sure that every affected child, teenager, family member, every American can afford the insulin that they need.

People living with diabetes do not have the choice of whether to purchase insulin or not. They depend on it to stay alive. People like my constituent, Joshua Davis, a 13-year-old Virginian with type 1 diabetes who accompanied Dr. Jill Biden to the State of the Union Address earlier this year.

I am proud to co-sponsor this legislation to make sure that no American is skipping lifesaving doses of their insulin or making choices between whether they take their insulin or put food on the table.

I am grateful to my colleagues for leading this effort.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DESAULNIER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. CARTER).

Mr. CARTER of Louisiana. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Louisiana has the second highest diabetes mortality rate but only the 11th highest number of cases. The rate of diabetes among Blacks, Hispanics, and Native American adults in the State is disproportionately high as compared to other populations.

Insulin is a lifesaving medicine, allowing people to live healthy lives, raise families, and do their jobs. However, many can't afford this life-regulating medicine.

Many Louisianans have to pay over \$100 a vial in out-of-pocket costs every single month. And some are forced to ration prescriptions, risking complications or death. The people must always come before Big Pharma.

Today, we are finally taking action to cut the price of insulin. The Affordable Insulin Now Act would cap out-of-

pocket insulin costs for insulin for a month-long supply at \$35 and require plans to cover different types of insulin.

The bill is a strong move in the right direction to ease the burden, and we must do this now.

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

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I cannot let go past one of our colleagues saying before that we don't believe in helping average people. Yes, we do.

Republicans are here every day. We are average people. We are here to help average people. But what we believe in most of all is freedom for Americans.

And we happen to believe that Democrats don't believe in that, and this bill is an exemplar of the fact that they want the government to control our lives in every way they possibly can.

In the past, Democrats and Republicans have worked together to bring down the cost of prescription drugs, but Democrats have once again pursued politics over progress.

H.R. 6833 is a massive power grab that will lead our country one step closer to socialized medicine. That is not what the American people think and want.

There is no such thing as a free-market system when government bureaucrats control prices. This legislation sets an extremely dangerous precedent.

We shouldn't pursue policies that will harm the health and well-being of American patients, and we should not knowingly raise healthcare premiums on American workers and their families when prices for goods are soaring.

Republicans stand ready to work with Democrats to advance legislation that promotes competition, lowers costs for consumers, establishes transparency and accountability in drug pricing, and advances the cause of freedom.

H.R. 6833 is not that legislation. I urge my colleagues to vote "no," and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. NEAL. Madam Speaker, Americans pay too much for insulin. With the price hovering at three times what it was 15 years ago, this vital medication is not just expensive, it can be completely out of reach.

Every day, the more than 37 million Americans living with diabetes must choose between the insulin they need to stay alive and other basic necessities. Just last week, I heard about this issue from a couple who live in my district. Both people have diabetes, but one is forgoing insulin for the time being due to cost. Last year alone, their prescription costs topped \$10,000.

This outrageous expense is unacceptable, particularly since Americans pay far more for insulin than patients in similar countries. In some cases, American patients pay as much as 10 times the price of their counterparts in other nations.

Today's legislation finally rights this wrong. Capping the cost of insulin at \$35 per month will put the medicine within reach for millions of Americans. And we do this responsibly, by

delaying the prior administration's Rebate Rule. Bringing down the cost of insulin will also help to close health inequities that skyrocketing drug costs exacerbated.

This is an important and welcome step in lowering the cost of prescription drugs in this country. More must be done, and that's why in the Build Back Better Act, we empowered the Secretary to negotiate prescription drug prices for Medicare, capped Medicare Part D out-of-pocket costs, and required drug companies to pay a rebate if their prices outpace inflation. We will not stop until these commonsense reforms are signed into law.

I applaud Ways and Means member, Congressman DAN KILDEE, for his work in bringing this legislation to the floor, and I urge all of my colleagues to support the Affordable Insulin Now Act.

Mr. ESPAILLAT. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 6833, the Affordable Insulin Now Act, to cap the out-of-pocket price for one month's supply of insulin at \$35.

Insulin was discovered nearly 100 years ago and costs less than \$10 a vial to manufacture.

Yet there are millions of American families with insurance that are paying hundreds of dollars a vial.

No family in America should be forced to choose between buying insulin for their child and putting food on the table.

It's past time that this Congress says no to big pharma lining their pockets, at the expense of lives of the American people.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I rise to speak in strong support of H.R. 6833, the Affordable Insulin Now Act. The bill is simple and gets to the urgent need to limit cost-sharing for insulin under private health insurance and the Medicare prescription drug benefit.

Specifically, the bill caps cost-sharing under private health insurance for a month's supply of selected insulin products at \$35 or 25 percent of a plan's negotiated price (after any price concessions), whichever is less, beginning in 2023.

The bill caps cost-sharing under the Medicare prescription drug benefit for insulin products at:

\$35 in 2023 regardless of whether a beneficiary has reached the annual out-of-pocket spending threshold, and

\$35 beginning in 2024 for those who have not yet reached this threshold.

The subject of the bill is public knowledge and well known by members of this body.

I have worked closely with the healthcare community that serve Houstonians to ensure that programs are receiving the appropriate level of federal support.

One of the most difficult challenges are the hurdles to healthcare created by lack of health insurance such as a lack of access to necessary medications due to the high costs of many prescription drugs.

Diabetes is a life-threatening disease that disproportionately affects communities of color.

Diabetes is associated with serious health problems, including heart disease and stroke, kidney failure, and blindness.

There are 15,000 Medicare beneficiaries in the Eighteenth Congressional District who have been diagnosed with diabetes.

These individuals are my constituents and I know that on average, each of them pays 4.8 times the cost of similar medication in Australia, 3.6 times the cost in the United Kingdom, and 2.6 times the cost in Canada.

Additionally, in the Eighteenth Congressional District, 26.7 percent of residents are uninsured.

For example, an uninsured resident of this congressional district pays 23 times more for this brand of insulin than their counterparts in Australia, 15 times more than they would in the United Kingdom, and 13 times more than they would in Canada.

The consequences of these staggering costs are not benign.

Many patients often speak of having to make heartwrenching decisions about what to buy with the commonly fixed incomes attendant to seniors.

Many medical professionals indicate that the high prices for prescription drugs are a function of a lack of competition, and authorizing Medicare to create a program to negotiate drug prices may be an estimable way to lower the cost of prescription drugs.

All told this reflects a disturbing trend: in our country, the cost of branded drugs tends to go up, whereas in other countries, the costs tend to go down.

Before insulin the prognosis for diabetics was bleak.

Over the past two decades, manufacturers have systematically and dramatically raised the prices of their insulin products by more than tenfold—often in lockstep.

In 2017, diabetes contributed to the death of 277,000 Americans and was the primary death for 85,000 of those individuals.

That same year diagnosed diabetes cost the United States an estimated \$327 billion—including \$237 billion in direct medical costs and \$90 billion in productivity losses.

Diabetes drugs, including insulin and oral medications that regulate blood sugar levels, play a critical role in helping people with diabetes manage their condition and reduce the risk of diabetes-related health complications.

Although insulin is the most well-known diabetes medication, diabetes patients are often prescribed other oral drugs to use in place of or alongside insulin.

Many of these non-insulin products used to regulate blood sugar levels are brand drugs that lack generic alternatives.

In recent years, the high prices of diabetes drugs have placed a tremendous strain on diabetes patients as well as the federal government, which provides diabetes medications to more than 43 million Medicare beneficiaries.

Because Medicare lacks the authority to negotiate directly with drug manufacturers, Medicare beneficiaries pay significantly more for their drugs than patients abroad.

Patients who are uninsured or underinsured and must pay for their drugs out of pocket bear an even greater cost burden.

I thank the committees on Energy and Commerce, Ways and Means, and Education and Labor for the work they have done to bring H.R. 6833, the Affordable Insulin Now Act to the floor for a vote.

I encourage my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote in support of H.R. 6833.

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

Pursuant to House Resolution 1017, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

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

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

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

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

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Bucshon moves to recommit the bill H.R. 6833 to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

The material previously referred to by Mr. BUCSHON is as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Lower Costs, More Cures Act of 2022”.

SEC. 2. TABLE OF CONTENTS.

The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title.

Sec. 2. Table of contents.

TITLE I—MEDICARE PARTS B AND D**Subtitle A—Medicare Part B Provisions**

Sec. 101. Improvements to Medicare site-of-service transparency.

Sec. 102. Requiring manufacturers of certain single-dose container or single-use package drugs payable under part B of the Medicare program to provide refunds with respect to discarded amounts of such drugs.

Sec. 103. Providing for variation in payment for certain drugs covered under part B of the Medicare program.

Sec. 104. Establishment of maximum add-on payment for drugs and biologicals.

Sec. 105. Treatment of drug administration services furnished by certain excepted off-campus outpatient departments of a provider.

Subtitle B—Drug Price Transparency

Sec. 111. Reporting on explanation for drug price increases.

Sec. 112. Public disclosure of drug discounts.

Sec. 113. Study of pharmaceutical supply chain intermediaries and merger activity.

Sec. 114. Making prescription drug marketing sample information reported by manufacturers available to certain individuals and entities.

Sec. 115. Sense of Congress regarding the need to expand commercially available drug pricing comparison platforms.

Subtitle C—Medicare Part D Benefit Redesign

Sec. 121. Medicare part D benefit redesign.

Subtitle D—Other Medicare Part D Provisions

Sec. 131. Allowing the offering of additional prescription drug plans under Medicare part D.

Sec. 132. Allowing certain enrollees of prescription drug plans and MA-PD plans under Medicare program to spread out cost-sharing under certain circumstances.

Sec. 133. Establishing a monthly cap on beneficiary incurred costs for insulin products and supplies under a prescription drug plan or MA-PD plan.

Sec. 134. Growth rate of Medicare part D out-of-pocket cost threshold.

TITLE II—MEDICAID

Sec. 201. Medicaid pharmacy and therapeutics committee improvements.

Sec. 202. GAO report on conflicts of interest in State Medicaid program drug use review boards and pharmacy and therapeutics (P&T) committees.

Sec. 203. Ensuring the accuracy of manufacturer price and drug product information under the Medicaid drug rebate program.

Sec. 204. Improving transparency and preventing the use of abusive spread pricing and related practices in Medicaid.

Sec. 205. T-MSIS drug data analytics reports.

Sec. 206. Risk-sharing value-based payment agreements for covered outpatient drugs under Medicaid.

Sec. 207. Applying Medicaid drug rebate requirement to drugs provided as part of outpatient hospital services.

TITLE III—FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION**Subtitle A—Pay-for-Delay**

Sec. 301. Unlawful agreements.

Sec. 302. Notice and certification of agreements.

Sec. 303. Forfeiture of 180-day exclusivity period.

Sec. 304. Commission litigation authority.

Sec. 305. Statute of limitations.

Subtitle B—Advancing Education on Biosimilars

Sec. 321. Education on biological products.

Subtitle C—Other Provisions

Sec. 331. Clarifying the meaning of new chemical entity.

TITLE IV—REVENUE PROVISION

Sec. 401. Safe harbor for high deductible health plans without deductible for insulin.

TITLE V—MISCELLANEOUS

Sec. 501. Payment for biosimilar biological products during initial period.

Sec. 502. GAO study and report on average sales price.

Sec. 503. Requiring prescription drug plans and MA-PD plans to report potential fraud, waste, and abuse to the Secretary of HHS.

Sec. 504. Establishment of pharmacy quality measures under Medicare part D.

Sec. 505. Improving coordination between the Food and Drug Administration and the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services.

Sec. 506. Patient consultation in Medicare national and local coverage determinations in order to mitigate barriers to inclusion of such perspectives.

Sec. 507. MedPAC report on shifting coverage of certain Medicare part B drugs to Medicare part D.

Sec. 508. Requirement that direct-to-consumer advertisements for prescription drugs and biological products include truthful and non-misleading pricing information.

Sec. 509. Chief Pharmaceutical Negotiator at the Office of the United States Trade Representative.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XIX, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question are postponed.

□ 1545

MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON H.R. 4521, AMERICA COMPETES ACT OF 2022

Mr. LUCAS. Madam Speaker, pursuant to the order of the House of March 30, 2022, I offer a motion to instruct on H.R. 4521.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Lucas moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the Senate amendment to the bill H.R. 4521 be instructed to agree to section 2502 of the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XXII, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LUCAS) and the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. STEVENS) each will control 30 minutes. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma.

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

I rise today to urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this motion to instruct the conferees on our competitiveness legislation.

This motion instructs conference members to agree to section 2502 of the Senate legislation. This section is simple and common sense. It says that no person or entity of concern can receive grants, awards, or other support from the National Science Foundation, federally funded manufacturing programs, or technology hubs authorized by this legislation.

A person or entity of concern is generally defined by the Department of Defense as directed by Congress in previous Defense Reauthorization Acts.

DOD has identified entities of concern as Communist Chinese military companies and companies owned or controlled by the People's Liberation Army, and they have defined persons of concern as individuals affiliated with these CCP military entities.

Simply put, this motion ensures that we aren't giving taxpayer dollars to the adversaries who are trying to steal U.S. technology and use it against us.

The Senate was right to add this important guardrail, and it is only responsible that we urge our House conferees to ensure it is included in the final conferenced legislation.

I would like to point out that we wouldn't have this particular difference in our bills had the process of passing the House legislation been done in regular order.

The COMPETES Act was developed in a back room by the Speaker's office

with very little input or review from relevant committees.

Although thoroughly vetted and bipartisan Science Committee bills were included in that package, they were sandwiched in among unrelated, partisan spending that added up to a backdoor attempt to pass parts of the Build Back Better Act. Because of this rushed, opaque bill-writing process, unsurprisingly, the COMPETES Act had a lot of flaws.

Despite less than 3 days to review the bill text, Members submitted more than 600 amendments to the bill. But the Rules Committee, with very little input, made in order only 261; and of that number, only three Republican amendments were given individual debate time on the floor, with all other Republican amendments being considered en bloc. Not only did Members have little opportunity to write this bill, but they also had almost no opportunity to fix its flaws.

I could go on about the danger of passing massive bills like this out of regular order, but for now I will focus on this particular issue. This provision preventing funds from going to Chinese military entities and persons of concern was submitted as a part of multiple Republican amendments to the Rules Committee, but none of these amendments were made in order. I fail to see how amendments limiting taxpayer funds from going to China isn't relevant to a bill about competitiveness with China.

Democrats' failure to include similar language in the COMPETES Act is an unfortunate example of an unwillingness to be strong on China and protect our national security. But we have a chance to rectify that now.

Madam Speaker, surely we can all agree that we shouldn't be sending taxpayer dollars to Communist leadership in China. They are already stealing our discoveries and using them to surpass us economically and militarily. We are spending the time, money, and effort to plant the seeds of new technologies, but China is the one harvesting the crop.

We have a once-in-a-generation opportunity to pass legislation to improve U.S. technology and to set us up to be globally competitive for the coming decade.

The Science Committee has spent 2 years preparing for this opportunity. Working together, Republicans and Democrats held meetings with stakeholders, conducted in-depth hearings, and individually marked up more than a dozen bills to strategically scale-up America's research and development capacities.

Those bills all passed out of committee unanimously, and many passed across the floor with strong bipartisan support. They double down on investment in basic research at the National Science Foundation, the Department of Energy Office of Science and National Labs, and the National Institute of Standards and Technology.

They also direct the creation and regular review of a national science and technology strategy, as well as improving STEM education and regional research opportunities.

The Science Committee bills are targeted to the areas where government investment is most needed and will give us the biggest reward. We ensure our approach is strategic, focusing on the technologies of the future like quantum sciences, artificial intelligence, and advanced manufacturing. We will keep America competitive and secure and help create good jobs here at home.

This legislation should be the foundation for the conference legislation, not the COMPETES Act, which is more of a climate change bill than a technology bill, and not the bill formerly known as USICA, which is a grab-bag of special interest provisions cobbled together into a Franken-bill.

There is a lot of chaff to separate from the wheat of this bill, but I believe we can come to smart, consensus policy through the conference. The Science Committee worked together to pass strong bipartisan legislation, and I think our process, as well as our end result, should serve as a model moving forward.

I am looking forward to getting to work and paring down these bills to the smart policies we need. It is urgent that we act now. Democratic leadership delayed the legislation for 9 months. I assure you the Chinese Communist Party isn't doing the same. Let's stop playing politics with something so important.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to pass this motion, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. STEVENS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong and enthusiastic support of moving forward to conference the America COMPETES Act of 2022 with the Senate.

For those watching back at home, a conference committee is a joint committee between the House and Senate, a temporary ad hoc configuration to negotiate elements of a bill; and it is, frankly, the best of legislative action; Congress working for the American people, debating through democracy and deliberation to produce an end result.

As a Member of Congress, I often ask myself, I often pose the question, what will drive our economy for the next 10 years, 20 years, 30 years? What is our moonshot of the next 50 years? What can I do today to ensure that my neighbors in southeast Michigan are on a strong path to a successful future? What are the technologies and research investments that we can make today to ensure the success of the Nation for all of us?

The legislation that we are moving to conference today, the America COMPETES Act, tackles those big ques-

tions and secures our competitive edge for generations to come. This bill is an investment in our people. It reflects our ability to reach higher, to think deeper, and to invent solutions to not only today's problems but solutions for tomorrow's opportunities.

Americans are known for their hustle, for their ingenuity. My job, our job in Congress is to connect people to the tools to unlock a good life, to connected opportunity for everyone. And, frankly, the tools of the future are in this bill.

The COMPETES Act turbocharges America's scientific research and technological leadership while strengthening America's economic and national security at home and abroad. Even more, this bold investment in innovation ensures our top scientific minds have the tools to rise to the challenge of our climate crisis, from clean energy technologies to emissions measurement.

Not only does this bill look to the future, but it also mends the acute stressors that we are all feeling today due to our years of Federal underinvestment in science and innovation. A conference committee to discuss this, my friends, the America COMPETES Act tackles our supply chain vulnerabilities to make more goods in America and surges production of American-made semiconductors, chips, that which we invented here in this Nation, and in the 1990s were producing 40 percent of a crucial component in everything from cars to computers to medical devices. And the American people are ready; ready for investments that will spur innovative solutions to create jobs across the Nation, support American manufacturing, and build a strong and diverse STEM workforce ready to address the challenges we face as a Nation.

□ 1600

During President Biden's State of the Union Address, he called on Congress to get our innovation package to him for his signature. So we should be proud—I certainly am—to be here as we move to take the next step in this process. There is, frankly, no time to waste in getting the COMPETES Act to the President's desk.

As the chairwoman of the Subcommittee on Research and Technology, I am so proud of the range of bipartisan Science, Space, and Technology Committee provisions that have long been championed that are included in this package.

I am especially proud of the NIST for the Future Act, my legislation. This critical investment in NIST will ensure the agency and its employees have the resources they require to be a key part of bolstering our American technology enterprise: a resilient supply chain, small and midsize manufacturers being brought to the table to deliver for America, and the American workforce that compels them.

Since Michigan's 11th District sent me to Congress, I have been laser-focused on bringing innovation economy

solutions not only to folks in southeastern Michigan but also, obviously, all across the United States.

We built a transformative piece of legislation from the ground up. The ranking member is right—bipartisan years of work on the Science, Space, and Technology Committee to do such legislation. We heard from the science community. We heard from industry. We heard from academia. We heard from other stakeholders. They all told us the same thing: Don't leave Americans behind. Don't leave anyone behind based on geography or demographics. Bring the scientific research enterprise to all.

We are here, and we are here with a lot of hardworking people from the Science, Space, and Technology Committee staff. We have not had a conference committee since 2018, albeit for NDAA. Many people have not been able to be privy to such an action, and they deserve our gratitude. These are the folks writing the text late into the night based on our corrections, the Science, Space, and Technology Committee staff who work so hard and the Science, Space, and Technology Committee members.

The United States has long been a beacon of excellence in science and innovation, and it is long overdue that we restore Federal support for these vital initiatives, that we invest now and lead the world.

The House's and Senate's approaches may certainly have some differences, but we seek the same goal: to deliver for this Nation.

I am very confident that we will have a very productive conference process and hope to get the America COMPETES Act to President Biden's desk for signature very soon.

The U.S. has endless potential to compete globally in science and innovation. The America COMPETES Act provides the critical resources and tools we need to achieve that.

I look forward to working with my colleagues throughout conference to invest in America's most valuable resource, the talent of our people.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LUCAS. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BABIN).

Mr. BABIN. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma for yielding.

Madam Speaker, last month, the House passed the COMPETES Act, better known as the Concedes Act, which was forced through this Chamber in a partisan fashion and lacked the policies needed to truly bolster our scientific infrastructure and combat threats from our foreign adversaries.

The hard work and the bipartisan collaboration of the Science, Space, and Technology Committee were left in the wake of partisan politics.

The House-passed Concedes Act let China off the hook very simply for failing to contain COVID-19. It failed to

ban funding to CCP-tied organizations. It failed to punish the CCP for its blatant human rights abuses. It failed to strengthen America's competitive edge over China.

Today, we have the opportunity to instruct conferees to bolster the language and actually stand up against Communist China.

That is why I support this motion to instruct. It will ensure that no entities identified as Chinese military companies operating in the United States are eligible to receive funds through the new technology directorate, the supply chain resiliency program that we set up through Manufacturing Extension Partnership.

We must put a stop to Communist China spreading misinformation, stealing our technology, and bolstering its economic advantages while weakening ours. The FBI and intelligence agencies have continually warned Congress about these same threats from Communist China.

China's investment in development, and not in basic research, implies that they are building their technological success on the backs of U.S.-funded basic research.

We have even seen the infiltration of Chinese influence in our university systems and academia on several different occasions at the top institutions of America. We must work to ensure that China cannot undermine our open system of research and development.

This time, let's support scientific discovery, advance American technology, and hold our foreign adversaries accountable, and let's not waste the American people's time again.

Ms. STEVENS. Madam Speaker, the ranking member, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LUCAS), has given us a motion to instruct, a negotiation that we will pursue in the conference to come.

Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE).

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, we are at a crucial moment in our Nation's history, and Congress has the chance to reinvigorate our economy and ensure that we can outcompete every other nation.

The America COMPETES Act will put us on a course to lead the pack in creating the strongest and most advanced economy of the 21st century. Today's actions move us one step closer to making this legislation a reality.

Over the past 40 years, America's manufacturing sector has lost market share to economic competitors like China. This decline in manufacturing, coupled with the COVID-19 pandemic, has led to severe supply chain disruptions across our economy that have raised prices for consumers.

As the chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee, I would like to highlight several important provisions in the America COMPETES Act that will help reverse this trend, strengthen our economy, bolster our Nation's sup-

ply chains, and ensure that more critical goods are made right here in the United States.

The legislation invests \$45 billion in grants, loans, and loan guarantees to support supply chain resilience and manufacturing of critical goods, industrial equipment, and manufacturing technology right here in the U.S.

It also invests \$52 billion for the CHIPS for America Act, incentivizing private-sector investments in semiconductor fabrication. This funding will help eliminate disruptions in the semiconductor supply chain from abroad that have hurt American automakers, medical supply chain companies, and manufacturers of heavy machinery.

The bill invests \$3 billion to help build a domestic solar manufacturing supply chain so we can aggressively counter China's control of the solar chain that jeopardizes our energy security interests. The bill also keeps our electric grid secure and resilient in the face of evolving cybersecurity and physical security threats.

Madam Speaker, the America COMPETES Act also improves our medical product supply chain and strengthens our Strategic National Stockpile. During the early days of the COVID-19 pandemic, there were widespread shortages of essential medicines, medical supplies, and some personal protective equipment.

This legislation increases our domestic drug manufacturing base by expanding the use of advanced and continuous manufacturing practices. It also establishes a \$1.5 billion supply chain manufacturing pilot program that will help maintain domestic reserves of critical medical supplies. It creates a \$10.5 billion program that awards grants to States to expand or maintain a State strategic stockpile of products essential in the event of a public health emergency.

Finally, Madam Speaker, the America COMPETES Act will help innovate our wireless supply chain and network security by funding the deployment of cutting-edge technology and ensuring that next-generation mobile wireless networks and technologies are safe and secure from foreign adversaries.

Madam Speaker, for far too long, America has relied heavily on other nations to manufacture critical goods essential to our economy. That must come to an end as we work together to reinvigorate our manufacturing base and create new, good-paying jobs here at home.

Mr. LUCAS. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. KIM).

Mrs. KIM of California. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of Ranking Member LUCAS' motion to instruct.

This motion will agree with section 2502 included in USICA, which prohibits entities identified as Chinese military companies from receiving

funds through the new technology directorate, the supply chain resiliency program, the regional innovation program, or the Manufacturing USA program.

In other words, this motion ensures taxpayer dollars spent in this bill do not go toward the Chinese Communist Party.

On the Science, Space, and Technology Committee, we spent several months working on a series of bipartisan competitiveness bills that we could have gone to conference with. Unfortunately, with little notice, we voted on a 3,000-page bill that was not bipartisan, did not include strong protections to safeguard U.S. investments from CCP, and provided \$8 billion for a climate slush fund that we have zero oversight over and China has already taken \$100 million from.

Republicans offered several amendments with similar language to that of Ranking Member LUCAS' motion to instruct in the Rules Committee, but unfortunately, the majority did not allow them to be considered on the House floor.

The CCP is watching us. Today, we have an opportunity to send a strong bipartisan and bicameral message: We are bolstering American competitiveness and national security to ensure we lead in the development and deployment of the technologies of the future.

It is imperative we have guardrails, such as Mr. LUCAS' motion to instruct, in order to ensure these investments do not fall into the hands of the CCP and to attain a true bipartisan, bicameral agreement.

I thank Ranking Member LUCAS for his leadership and his motion.

Ms. STEVENS. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding and allowing me to speak on this.

I think it is worth the wait to bring these important provisions together to the floor to work on a path forward and maybe a little hint of restoring regular order.

It is important that we invest in innovation for our future. And I would note not just the cutting edge, high-tech future developments that are so important in my State and in many others that are going to help keep us on the front lines, but it is also important to invest in legacy technology, legacy chips.

We had the manufacturing supply chain all over America halt for lack of chips that cost only a few pennies because it wasn't profitable for some to create the legacy chips moving forward. And I hope some of these billions will be invested in opportunities to ramp up that production. It happened very fast, and it will make a difference from automobiles to microwaves and washing machines.

I am proud of the work we have done in the Ways and Means Committee under the leadership of RICHIE NEAL to

develop pro-worker responsive efforts and deal with the Chinese challenge.

Now, because the benefits of trade are broadly understood and spread but the problems are localized, the impacts often hit individual communities. That is why our provision has a strong Trade Adjustment Assistance program. Sadly, it expired a year ago, setting us back, leaving people desperately in need of this help out of luck.

We have a very strong, carefully crafted provision that will help workers and communities alike with an updated, modernized Trade Adjustment Assistance program.

We hear a lot of concerns about China, and I share those concerns. Our provisions are tough on China.

For instance, we closed the de minimis loophole that allows 2 million packages a day to be imported into the United States directly to our consumers, uninspected in the main and evading tariffs. It is time for us to close that de minimis loophole.

I note that the Chinese give Americans \$7 of an exemption, and ours is \$800. The least we ought to do is close that de minimis loophole.

The trade title is strongly supported by American business and organized labor. We are dealing with a TSP and MTB that will improve global standards and strengthen American manufacturing.

The title is supported by AFL-CIO, American Alliance of Manufacturers, the autoworkers, machinists, electricians. People who want to build products in America are advantaged under this.

It meets workers' needs, bolsters America's ability to compete, and is attuned to what Americans want.

Madam Speaker, I look forward to the work with the committee moving this forward, and ultimately, its passage.

□ 1615

Ms. STEVENS. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Oregon for reminding us about the importance of legacy chips and the MTB. I also thank the previous gentlewoman from California for reminding us about Manufacturing USA, which was probably started under the Obama administration.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LUCAS. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Oklahoma (Mrs. BICE).

Mrs. BICE of Oklahoma. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the motion to instruct from my colleague and Oklahoma delegation member, Mr. LUCAS.

Safeguarding our national security, improving our supply chain resiliency, and bolstering American innovation are things that we can all agree on. However, in the COMPETES Act, Democrats took these problems and drafted ineffective, partisan policies in response. As a member of the House Committee on Science, Space, and

Technology, we had previously advanced strong legislation to combat these very issues.

On top of this, when this legislation came to the House floor for a vote in February, Republicans in the House were denied the opportunity to provide input on these important issues through the restrictive processes of the majority.

While over 600 amendments were submitted, less than half of those were made in order by the Committee on Rules. Of the 600, there were a number that would have taken steps to address the ever-growing threat we face from the Chinese Communist Party and their affiliated companies operating in the United States.

This motion to instruct will ensure that the critical investments we are making in America's innovation don't fall into the hands of our foreign adversaries.

Democrats' failure to include similar provisions in the COMPETES Act exemplify their continued, weak policies on China that compromise our strategic advantage and our national security.

It is common sense that U.S. taxpayer dollars should not be lining the pockets of the Chinese Communist Party, and instead, should be used to strengthen our industries here at home. Investing in American companies will strengthen the economy while keeping the Nation safe.

Madam Speaker, this should not be a partisan issue. I encourage the adoption of the motion.

Ms. STEVENS. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS).

Mr. MEEKS. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Michigan for yielding the time.

Madam Speaker, we find ourselves in a competition to lead in the 21st century. And that is a competition that the United States cannot afford to lose, and if we do what we should do here, will not lose.

A month ago, Vladimir Putin and Xi Jinping thought that America was in decline, that America could no longer lead the world, and that they could therefore simply overwhelm smaller states. They believed that they could undermine the rules-based order whenever they chose.

Well, this incredible global coalition, binding and getting us together, working with our allies, that President Joe Biden has put together to condemn Russia and support the Ukrainian people, has proven that their assertion is absolutely wrong. But the events of the past month have underscored the need to position America for this challenge on a long-term basis.

Therefore, it is absolutely critical that Congress get H.R. 4521 to the President's desk. It is an investment in science, innovation, and technology, which would allow us to excel in the global economy for decades, bolster our domestic industry, and create jobs for American workers.

Madam Speaker, I am proud that my bill, the EAGLE Act, serves as the foreign affairs division of America COMPETES. It bolsters our diplomacy to marshal a coalition of states to check the PRC's aggression, its theft of technology, its shirking of global rules, and its gross violation of human rights, of which we need to focus on.

And I know that if we put our minds to it, we can work together in a bipartisan and bicameral way to finalize this critical legislation and get it to the President's desk, and we must do it.

That is because our allies and partners in the Indo-Pacific are watching. They need our help to bolster international rules, combat the PRC's coercion, and address shared global challenges like climate change. And after what we have seen in Ukraine, the people of Taiwan are watching, to ensure that we deepen our economic ties, strengthen its defense, and create greater space for Taiwan globally.

Hong Kongers and Uyghurs are also watching to make sure we get this done because they urgently need the refugee protections that are in the COMPETES Act. They need Congress to send a message to Beijing that its genocide in Xinjiang, its destruction of Hong Kong's autonomy, and its lack of regard for human rights will not stand.

Ms. STEVENS. Madam Speaker, we are lucky to have such a chair of the Committee on Foreign Affairs here in the Congress.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LUCAS. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN).

Mr. WESTERMAN. Madam Speaker, in a peewee sports competition, you can make the case that if you are competing, you are winning. But when it comes to global standing, energy independence, and economic security, there are no participation trophies. Our goal can't be to just compete. We have to dominate because if we are not winning in this area, we are losing. And if America loses, the world loses.

Unfortunately, this so-called COMPETES Act would place America on the loser's bench. I am baffled why, at a time when gas prices are skyrocketing from Putin's war in Ukraine, and more Americans than ever are facing economic instability, this majority is still laser-focused on a blind, green-energy political agenda when America needs a rational, domestic energy plan that results in reliable, affordable, and clean energy.

Our constituents are paying almost \$5 a gallon to fill their cars. Yet, I am hearing my Democrat colleagues suggest the solution is just to buy an electric vehicle. What a slap in the face to thousands of hardworking men and women that President Biden put out of their jobs by canceling pipelines and shuttering American mines, while turning to international adversaries like Russia, China, Iran, and Venezuela

to solve the energy and mineral crisis he created.

Madam Speaker, no, if we really want to win, we must unleash the full power of American energy and mineral development by processing permits, issuing leases, streamlining the regulatory process, and giving our own homegrown industries the ability to use our American resources. We can and we will do that safer, cleaner and faster than anyone else in the world.

Where China uses child and slave labor to mine minerals vital to batteries and computers, we can use state-of-the-art technology to access those minerals that are right here in the U.S.

Where Russia controls oil rights and uses it as political leverage, we can produce energy for our own people and be an exporter to our allies.

Madam Speaker, we have no other option than to win.

I urge my colleagues to give Americans the power to develop, innovate, and unleash our full potential. If you look around, Democrat strategies are proving to be losing strategies. Americans can't afford higher prices and more incompetence. Let's begin to put an end to the madness by passing this motion to instruct.

Madam Speaker, I encourage that.

Ms. STEVENS. Madam Speaker, may I inquire how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. LURIA). The gentlewoman from Michigan has 13¾ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Oklahoma has 15 minutes remaining.

Ms. STEVENS. Madam Speaker, as the gentleman from Arkansas reminds us, I am proud that Michigan is the destination where the combustion engine was invented and innovated, and very proud to be the destination where our workers are manifesting and innovating electric vehicles.

Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BEYER).

Mr. BEYER. Madam Speaker, I confess, I cannot connect my friend from Arkansas' comments with this motion to instruct, but I won't take any time to refute these things.

Madam Speaker, manufacturing has long been a core strength of the American economy. But the decades-long decline of manufacturing jobs in the United States has cut off pathways to economic security for so many families across this country.

Passage of the America COMPETES Act will be a landmark investment in infrastructure, in clean technology, in innovation that will create and preserve high-quality jobs in communities across America, and advance U.S. competitiveness and drive long-term economic growth.

Disinvestment in American home-made products has also contributed to the severe supply chain disruptions during the coronavirus pandemic that have pushed up prices for so many American consumers. The America COMPETES Act will bolster supply

chains, ramp up domestic manufacturing of critical components, like semiconductors, and insulate U.S. workers and families from price volatility and help build their own economic resilience.

Part of the House-passed version is the National Secure Data Service Act, which will allow agencies to link together data collected through surveys, Federal program administration, non-governmental data sources to advance evidence-based policymaking. This will be a great boon for artificial intelligence and machine learning.

Also included in the COMPETES Act, is an amendment I cosponsored with Representative TRAHAN to increase investment in fusion energy, the holy grail for our climate and for world poverty.

The COMPETES Act bottom line gives the U.S. the competitive edge needed to maintain our global leadership in innovation and research.

Madam Speaker, I am not sure why my Republican friends felt the need to offer this motion in the first place. Of course, we all understand that the essential subtext of the COMPETES Act has been to strengthen our competitive position versus communist China or, to restate my friend from Arkansas, to put us in the dominant position to compete against communist China.

Of course, nothing in this landmark initiative in American research, in American innovation, in American manufacturing, American artificial intelligence or American chips is intended to be transferred to the PRC. So if this is meant to show that Republicans are tougher on China than Democrats, that is silly and untrue.

Together, we will fight China's human rights abuses. We will fight its cheating on trade. We will fight its autocratic, dictatorial government. And the COMPETES Act gives us the strength we need to do that today.

Mr. LUCAS. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MCCAUL).

Mr. MCCAUL. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma for yielding.

Madam Speaker, the Chinese Communist Party poses a generational threat to the United States and our freedom-loving allies around the world.

They are brutally oppressing their own people. They are committing genocide against ethnic and religious minorities. They are expanding their military reach and carrying out territorial aggression against their neighbors. We cannot wait any longer to address these issues.

Madam Speaker, I stand before you, quite frankly, disappointed. We had a great opportunity here, and this bill that passed the House is not the bill. I am very hopeful we can get to a good place in our conference committee.

Unfortunately, the Democrat leaders chose not to work with Republicans to pass a substantive, meaningful bill to counter this malign influence. Instead,

they jammed the partisan COMPETES Act through the House.

The COMPETES Act, in my judgment, is a Trojan horse filled with unserious, dangerous, and wasteful provisions.

□ 1630

Those provisions include fringe, progressive priorities, like \$8 billion worth of taxpayer money into an unaccountable U.N. slush fund. This U.N. slush fund has already provided at least \$100 million directly to China, a country that this Congress, former Republican administration, and current Democrat administration have all agreed is committing genocide.

In fact, it is worse. The Xinjiang Province—you get this money to make solar panels and batteries in the Xinjiang Province where they commit genocide itself. That is not good for America and it is certainly not good for the U.S. taxpayer.

Secretary Kerry admitted before our committee that the CCP is using slave labor to make these green energy products—like solar panels and batteries—that could be used by this U.N. fund. In effect, the bill would fund their slave labor and prop up their forced abortions. We tried to stop this from happening—to stop U.S. taxpayers from funding slave labor in my motion to recommit, and shockingly, we were outright rejected by the Democrats.

The motion to recommit prohibited taxpayer money going to slave labor, genocide, and the Wuhan Lab, and every Democrat voted against that measure. This is a test of our time.

Madam Speaker, so I remain the eternal optimist and hopeful that this conference process will be able to rectify these glaring issues that I have outlined. We can start today by supporting this motion that will block billions of dollars going to the CCP military PLA companies and human rights abusers.

Congress owes it to the American people to pass a bill that takes this threat seriously. That includes tough export controls, outbound investment screening and funding for the CHIPS for America Act, which I introduced, to give us a competitive edge, bring manufacturing to the United States to make advanced semiconductor chips and protect our national security at the same time.

This is vitally important to our national security, and it keeps critical U.S. technology out of the hands of the Chinese military, like hypersonics. It ensures U.S. taxpayers are not subsidizing their genocide.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this motion to instruct. I hope we can all work together in a bipartisan manner on what could be the most important legislation of this Congress.

Ms. STEVENS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I join the ranking member in being optimistic because we

are in a conference committee negotiating the America COMPETES Act, we will get this CHIPS legislation done. Proudly, I have led 29 Democrats and 29 Republicans in endorsing the CHIPS Act legislation, so it will be bipartisan. It will get done for the American people, and we will solve some of our supply chain woes.

Madam Speaker, I am delighted to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO).

Mr. TONKO. Madam Speaker, I am very proud of the efforts that have been made by the House to advance COMPETES, an act that is about investment; a bipartisan effort promoted with higher prioritization by the leadership of this House to address investment: investment in research, investment in workforce, investment in manufacturing.

It is so important that we are now investing in research as the COMPETES Act requires so that we create the next generation of product line and chips. It is important to invest in that pipeline of workers that will have those precision-oriented skills in an innovation economy that requires such precision. It is important that we retrofit our manufacturing centers so as to compete and compete effectively.

I am impressed by the fact that we have taken the strengths of so many committees and brought them into the forefront of COMPETES to make certain that we invest in the CHIPS for America Act. I have industries for microelectronics, and certainly the semiconductor industry that are hosted in the 20th Congressional District that I am honored to represent. They deserve and they require, more importantly, a partnership with the Federal Government. Those resources will be there with the passage of this bill as we bring together a consensus.

We will invest in that \$52 billion worth of investment for the chips industry, the CHIPS for America Act. We will make certain that a bill that I authored, the Micro Act, is incorporated in the context of COMPETES, and that will complement the provisions in CHIPS by making certain that we accelerate early stage microelectronics research to feed into the national semiconductor technology center.

It is so important to have that cutting-edge investment so that we can lead the world in innovation, and making certain also that we promote strong global leadership by positioning the interests and the values of our United States, not China, to win on the world stage, including with strong action to hold the PRC accountable for its trade abuses which hurt U.S. workers, and for its human rights violations.

The America COMPETES Act will elevate American leadership in the global arena, putting diplomacy first, strengthening our alliances, combating unfair trade practices, and standing up for our national values.

The COMPETES Act ensures that American goods are made in America

by American workers and boosts competition addressing supply bottlenecks, strengthening U.S. manufacturing, and lowering those kitchen table costs.

This is a measure that is all-inclusive. It is the boldest, strongest statement on competitiveness for America. It is the great strength of COMPETES that I hope will carry us now into an innovation economy with the workforce prepared to go, a research investment that gives us the vision and tethers that vision into future product lines and chips development, and that will allow for us to strengthen our manufacturing partnership. They require that assistance and they require our partnership.

Mr. LUCAS. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT).

Mr. CHABOT. Madam Speaker, I rise today to strongly support Mr. LUCAS' motion to instruct conferees on the American COMPETES Act.

The House-passed version of the bill should really have been called—as a number of my colleagues have mentioned—the American Concedes Act. Democratic leadership cobbled this legislation together from mostly partisan bills without Republican support, in stark contrast to what our colleagues in the Senate did.

As ranking member of the Asia-Pacific Subcommittee, which has jurisdiction over China, I am deeply disappointed by the partisan nature and the substance, in many ways, of this House-passed bill.

Competing with China should not be a partisan issue. On every front, the Chinese Communist Party is aggressively challenging the free world and our belief that open societies and free markets, and, yes, rule of law are the way to a prosperous and equitable civilization.

After decades of inaction, it is time to reevaluate our basic approach toward engagement with China. The Democrats' bill doesn't do that. When Republicans attempted to amend the bill to make it better, the Democrats rejected virtually every one of those attempts.

I would like to highlight two particularly concerning omissions from the House bill. First, we should have adopted provisions to modernize and strengthen our relationship with Taiwan which, by the way, got bipartisan support in the Senate.

Second, we should also have used the opportunity to advance strong export control policies to ensure that our critical technologies do not advance the PRC's own drive for technological supremacy.

Moving forward, as we seek to bridge the gap between the House and Senate bills, let's have these three priorities in mind. First, the CCP, the Chinese Communist Party, is an adversary. No amount of cajoling or diplomacy is going to get them to drop their hegemonic ambitions. They want to be the top dog.

Second, the legislation must not include irrelevant pet projects like money for the U.N. climate slush fund.

Third, at a bare minimum, we must ensure that any new technology or grant funding doesn't end up going to China. A bill aimed at competing with the Chinese Communist Party that simultaneously funds their military modernization simply makes no sense.

Mr. LUCAS' motion to instruct would go a long way towards making sure that American tax dollars don't go to fund the Chinese Communist Party. Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support it.

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Michigan for her leadership, along with my colleague from Texas, Congresswoman JOHNSON, who chairs the Science, Space, and Technology Committee, and the many, many committees that have worked on the COMPETES Act.

As an alum of the House Science, Space, and Technology Committee and a member of the Homeland Security Committee, I could not be more ecstatic for America, for Houstonians, for Texans. To really take the words of President Biden that were said to us in his comment on the COMPETES Act: It is transformational investment in our industrial base as well as research and development. It will help drive not only the American economy, but the global economy. It will, in fact, bring more manufacturing jobs back, and, yes, we will use the terminology, it will reimagine not only the Midwest, but it will reimagine the Southwest, the East, the West, the North, and the South. It will reimagine opportunities for young people.

And the chips we have been waiting for, as indicated by the gentlewoman from Michigan, I know we will have the opportunity to really join in in a bipartisan way in conference for something that nobody disagrees with. In addition, this ugly thing called the supply chain that for a moment clogged the system, raised the prices, which still have not been stabilized, but we will have the opportunity to address that question as well by unclogging the seaways, by investing with the infrastructure bill in ports, and getting products where they need to go.

Let me also suggest that we will be able to build other companies, smaller companies. Small businesses will improve or be able to result in more investment. At the same time, this bipartisan legislation will create opportunities for the next generation and the next generation.

I hope as well that minority businesses, minority scientists, historically Black colleges will have the opportunity to be part of the COMPETES Act, which I know that they will. This idea that we have a distance between us as Republicans and Democrats has to be closed.

This is an American bill. This is a bill to say to China: We are not going to take, sitting down, the unfair competition that you exert on many of the inventions that actually are made right here in the United States. Take the age-old internet and what China has done in many instances.

Madam Speaker, I rise to support the COMPETES Act and it going to conference, and at the same time recognize that any issue dealing with China and the chips dealing with semiconductors will be addressed in conference, and, as well, we will get the job done. It is transformational and we can do no less than to invest in the great mountain of research and development in this Nation.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to support the COMPETES Act ultimately, and to work with conference as we go forward on this legislation.

Mr. LUCAS. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the motion to instruct conferees. I welcome this opportunity to reconcile the differences between the House and the Senate bills. This is an opportunity to finally hold China accountable, and I hope we get to a strong work product that we can be proud of.

The House version of this bill, the COMPETES Act, truly is a nonstarter for House Republicans—no surprise—for both sides of the Senate as well, and actually for the American people—and that is my concern.

While it was messaged as legislation to combat the Chinese Communist Party's predatory practices, the trade provisions in the House bill did little to level the playing field with China, adding hurdles that would hurt American consumers and small businesses.

Instead, that bill actually discourages work during a workforce shortage by expanding and delinking the trade adjustment assistance from new trade opportunities. It adds red tape and narrows eligibility of trade programs like GSP and MTB. These are relief measures that we know help small businesses and manufacturers in the marketplace. The bill also exacerbates our supply chain crisis by making unvetted changes to de minimus; and it also fails to address the administration's lackluster effort to compete with China in the Indo-Pacific and around the world.

The Senate's bipartisan approach, while imperfect, addresses China, promotes small businesses of all sizes across our country, and more than anything, it empowers American consumers right here at home.

□ 1645

It offers a clean renewal of MTB, retroactively extends GSP, mandates a section 301 exclusion process with retroactivity, and does not include the Green New Deal wish list.

Let's work together on a final product that actually holds China accountable.

Madam Speaker, I reiterate my support and certainly urge my colleagues to do the same.

Ms. STEVENS. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LUCAS. Madam Speaker, I have no further requests for time. I am prepared to close, and I believe I have the right to close, so I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. STEVENS. Madam Speaker, I am prepared to close.

We have heard today, Madam Speaker, a commitment to act, a commitment to move into a conference, a commitment to get the America COMPETES Act done for the United States, CHIPS Act funding, investment in scientific research, and more. This is an exciting moment in this Chamber.

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

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

I thank my colleagues for their words of support for this motion.

As I said when we began this debate, we have a once-in-a-generation chance to strengthen U.S. science and technology and secure a place in the global economy. The Science, Space, and Technology Committee has passed strategic, bipartisan legislation to do just that. Our bills double our investment in critical research and technology. They are a strong commitment to America's technological development.

There is no question that our bills should be the core of the final conferenced legislation. We can't afford to pollute these critical policies with partisan poison pills and throw away our deliberate, strategic approach for long-term growth in favor of the one-time spending spree in the COMPETES Act.

There is a difference between empty spending and making an investment. The COMPETES Act is empty, unfocused spending. The Science, Space, and Technology Committee has passed targeted, bipartisan investments in research and technology. They will pay off in more jobs, a stronger economy, and a more secure homeland.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support that approach and to support guardrails to ensure that our taxpayer investments aren't going to Communist leadership in China. That is why this motion is so important.

This isn't a partisan issue. It has been part of Senator SCHUMER's legislative text on competitiveness from day one. That is because this is basic, commonsense policy, and I can't imagine that any of our constituents would disagree with that.

Madam Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to pass this motion, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The question is on the motion to instruct.

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

Ms. STEVENS. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the motion to instruct will be followed by 5-minute votes on:

The motion to recommit on H.R. 6833; and

Passage of H.R. 6833, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 351, nays 74, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 100]

YEAS—351

Adams	Crawford	Guthrie
Aderholt	Crenshaw	Harder (CA)
Aguilar	Crist	Harris
Allen	Crow	Harshbarger
Allred	Cuellar	Hayes
Amodel	Curtis	Hern
Arrington	Daids (KS)	Herrrell
Auchincloss	Davidson	Herrera Beutler
Axne	Davis, Rodney	Hice (GA)
Babin	Dean	Higgins (LA)
Bacon	DeFazio	Higgins (NY)
Baird	DeLauro	Hill
Balderson	DelBene	Himes
Banks	Delgado	Hinson
Barr	Demings	Hollingsworth
Beatty	DeSaulnier	Horsford
Bentz	DesJarlais	Houlihan
Bera	Deutch	Hoyer
Bergman	Diaz-Balart	Hudson
Beyer	Doggett	Huizenga
Bice (OK)	Donalds	Issa
Biggs	Doyle, Michael	Jackson
Bilirakis	F.	Jackson Lee
Bishop (GA)	Duncan	Jacobs (CA)
Bishop (NC)	Dunn	Jacobs (NY)
Boebert	Ellzey	Jayapal
Bost	Emmer	Johnson (GA)
Bourdeaux	Eshoo	Johnson (LA)
Boyle, Brendan	Estes	Johnson (OH)
F.	Fallon	Johnson (SD)
Brooks	Feenstra	Jones
Brown (OH)	Ferguson	Jordan
Brownley	Fischbach	Joyce (OH)
Buchanan	Fitzgerald	Joyce (PA)
Buck	Fitzpatrick	Kahele
Bucshon	Fleischmann	Kaptur
Budd	Fletcher	Katko
Burchett	Foster	Keating
Burgess	Fox	Keller
Calvert	Frankel, Lois	Kelly (MS)
Cammack	Franklin, C.	Kelly (PA)
Carbajal	Scott	Khanna
Cárdenas	Fulcher	Kildee
Carey	Gaetz	Kilmer
Carl	Gallagher	Kim (CA)
Carson	Gallego	Kim (NJ)
Carter (GA)	Garbarino	Kinzing
Carter (LA)	Garcia (CA)	Kirkpatrick
Carter (TX)	Gibbs	Krishnamoorthi
Cartwright	Jimenez	Kuster
Case	Gohmert	Kustoff
Castor (FL)	Golden	LaHood
Castro (TX)	Gonzales, Tony	LaMalfa
Cawthorn	Gonzalez (OH)	Lamb
Chabot	Gonzalez,	Lamborn
Cherfilus-	Vicente	Langevin
McCormick	Good (VA)	Larsen (WA)
Cleaver	Gooden (TX)	Larsen (CT)
Cline	Gosar	Latta
Cloud	Gottheimer	LaTurner
Clyburn	Granger	Lawrence
Clyde	Graves (LA)	Lawson (FL)
Cole	Graves (MO)	Lee (NV)
Comer	Green (TN)	Leger Fernandez
Connolly	Greene (GA)	Lesko
Cooper	Griffith	Letlow
Costa	Grijalva	Levin (CA)
Courtney	Grothman	Lofgren
Craig	Guest	Long

Loudermilk	Panetta	Smucker
Lucas	Pappas	Soto
Luetkemeyer	Pascarell	Spanberger
Luria	Pence	Spartz
Lynch	Perlmutter	Stansbury
Mace	Perry	Stanton
Malinowski	Peters	Staubert
Malliotakis	Pfluger	Steel
Maloney,	Phillips	Stefanik
Carolyn B.	Pingree	Steil
Maloney, Sean	Pocan	Steube
Mann	Porter	Stewart
Manning	Posey	Strickland
Massie	Price (NC)	Swalwell
Mast	Quigley	Taylor
McCarthy	Raskin	Tenney
McCaul	Reed	Thompson (CA)
McClain	Reschenthaler	Thompson (PA)
McClintock	Rice (NY)	Tiffany
McCollum	Rice (SC)	Timmons
McEachin	Rodgers (WA)	Titus
McHenry	Rogers (AL)	Tonko
McKinley	Rogers (KY)	Torres (CA)
McNerney	Rose	Turner
Meijer	Rosendale	Underwood
Meuser	Ross	Upton
Miller (IL)	Rouzer	Valadao
Miller (WV)	Roy	Van Drew
Miller-Meeks	Ruiz	Van Dwyne
Moolenaar	Ruppersberger	Veasey
Mooney	Rutherford	Vela
Moore (AL)	Ryan	Wagner
Moore (UT)	Salazar	Walberg
Moore (WI)	Scalise	Walorski
Morelle	Scanlon	Waltz
Moulton	Schiff	Wasserman
Mrvan	Schneider	Schultz
Mullin	Schrader	Weber (TX)
Murphy (FL)	Schrier	Webster (FL)
Murphy (NC)	Schweikert	Welch
Neguse	Scott, Austin	Wenstrup
Nehls	Sessions	Westerman
Newhouse	Sewell	Wexton
Norcross	Sherman	Wild
Norman	Sherrill	Williams (TX)
O'Halleran	Simpson	Wilson (SC)
Obernolte	Sires	Wittman
Owens	Slotkin	Womack
Palazzo	Smith (MO)	Zeldin
Pallone	Smith (NE)	
Palmer	Smith (NJ)	

NAYS—74

Barragán	Gomez	Roybal-Allard
Bass	Green, Al (TX)	Rush
Blumenauer	Huffman	Sánchez
Blunt Rochester	Jeffries	Sarbanes
Bonamici	Johnson (TX)	Schakowsky
Bowman	Kelly (IL)	Scott (VA)
Brown (MD)	Kind	Scott, David
Bush	Lee (CA)	Smith (WA)
Butterfield	Levin (MI)	Speier
Casten	Lieu	Stevens
Chu	Lowenthal	Suozzi
Cicilline	Matsui	Takano
Clark (MA)	McBath	Thompson (MS)
Clarke (NY)	McGovern	Tlaib
Cohen	Meeks	Torres (NY)
Correa	Meng	Trahan
Davis, Danny K.	Mfume	Trone
DeGette	Nadler	Vargas
Dingell	Napolitano	Velázquez
Escobar	Neal	Waters
Españillat	Newman	Watson Coleman
Evans	Ocasio-Cortez	Williams (GA)
Garamendi	Omar	Wilson (FL)
Garcia (IL)	Payne	Yarmuth
Garcia (TX)	Pressley	

NOT VOTING—6

Armstrong	Bustos	Fortenberry
Brady	Cheney	Hartzler

□ 1724

Mses. CHU, LEE of California, Mr. TRONE, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Messrs. VARGAS, COHEN, Mrs. MCBATH, Messrs. MFUME, GREEN of Texas, SMITH of Washington, LIEU, TAKANO, BROWN of Maryland, Mrs. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mrs. DINGELL, Mses. BLUNT ROCHESTER, and PRESSLEY changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Messrs. MOORE of Alabama, SCHNEIDER, CÁRDENAS, Mses. SEWELL, UNDERWOOD, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. KAPTUR, and Mr. JONES changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the motion to instruct was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Baird (Walorski)	Kahele (Takano)	Sánchez (Gomez)
Bilirakis	Kind (Beyer)	Scott, David
(Fleischmann)	Kinzing	(Jeffries)
Bowman (Meng)	(Meijer)	Sessions (Babin)
Brooks (Green)	Kirkpatrick	Sires (Pallone)
(TN)	(Pallone)	Speier (Scanlon)
Cawthorn (Nehls)	Krishnamoorthi	Steel (Oberholte)
Comer	(Beyer)	Strickland
(Fleischmann)	LaMalfa	(Takano)
Crist	(Palazzo)	Suozzi (Beyer)
(Wasserman)	Lawson (FL)	Taylor (Carter
Schultz)	(Wasserman	(TX))
Cuellar (Pappas)	Schultz)	Thompson (MS)
Curtis (Stewart)	Mace (Rice (SC))	(Evans)
DeGette (Blunt)	Manning (Beyer)	Trone (Beyer)
(Rochester)	McClain	Waltz (Mast)
Españillat	(Fitzgerald)	Wilson (FL)
(Correa)	Mrvan (Takano)	(Jeffries)
Harder (CA)	Newman (Beyer)	Wilson (SC)
(Gomez)	Owens (Stewart)	(Rice (SC))
Jayapal (Gomez)	Roybal-Allard	Yarmuth (Beyer)
Johnson (TX)	(Wasserman	
(Jeffries)	Schultz)	
Joyce (OH)	Salazar	
(Garbarino)	(Gimenez)	

AFFORDABLE INSULIN NOW ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. DEAN). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to recommit on the bill (H.R. 6833) to amend title XXVII of the Public Health Service Act, the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, and the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to establish requirements with respect to cost-sharing for certain insulin products, and for other purposes, offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUCSHON) on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk will redesignate the motion.

The Clerk redesignated the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 197, nays 225, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 101]

YEAS—197

Aderholt	Budd	Davis, Rodney
Allen	Burchett	DesJarlais
Amodel	Burgess	Diaz-Balart
Arrington	Calvert	Donalds
Babin	Cammack	Duncan
Bacon	Carey	Dunn
Baird	Carl	Ellzey
Balderson	Carter (GA)	Emmer
Banks	Carter (TX)	Estes
Barr	Cawthorn	Fallon
Bentz	Chabot	Feenstra
Bergman	Cline	Ferguson
Bice (OK)	Cloud	Fischbach
Bilirakis	Clyde	Fitzgerald
Bishop (NC)	Cole	Fitzpatrick
Bost	Comer	Fleischmann
Brooks	Crawford	Fox
Buchanan	Crenshaw	Franklin, C.
Buck	Curtis	Scott
Bucshon	Davidson	Fulcher

Gallagher	Kustoff	Rice (SC)	Newman	Rush	Swalwell	Casten	Johnson (GA)	Phillips
Garbarino	LaHood	Rodgers (WA)	Norcross	Ryan	Takano	Castor (FL)	Johnson (TX)	Pingree
Garcia (CA)	LaMalfa	Rogers (AL)	O'Halleran	Sánchez	Thompson (CA)	Castro (TX)	Jones	Pocan
Gibbs	Lamborn	Rogers (KY)	Ocasio-Cortez	Sarbanes	Thompson (MS)	Cherfilus-	Kahele	Porter
Jimenez	Latta	Rose	Omar	Scanlon	Titus	McCormick	Kaptur	Posey
Gohmert	LaTurner	Rosendale	Pallone	Schakowsky	Tlaib	Chu	Katko	Pressley
Gonzales, Tony	Lesko	Rouzer	Panetta	Schiff	Tonko	Ciциlline	Keating	Price (NC)
Gonzalez (OH)	Letlow	Rutherford	Pappas	Schneider	Torres (CA)	Clark (MA)	Kelly (IL)	Quigley
Good (VA)	Long	Salazar	Pascarell	Schrader	Torres (NY)	Clarke (NY)	Khanna	Raskin
Gooden (TX)	Loudermilk	Scalise	Payne	Schrier	Trahan	Cleaver	Kildee	Rice (NY)
Granger	Lucas	Schweikert	Perlmutter	Scott (VA)	Trone	Clyburn	Kilmer	Ross
Graves (LA)	Luetkemeyer	Scott, Austin	Peters	Scott, David	Underwood	Cohen	Kim (NJ)	Roybal-Allard
Graves (MO)	Mace	Sessions	Phillips	Sewell	Vargas	Connolly	Kind	Ruiz
Green (TN)	Malliotakis	Simpson	Pingree	Sherman	Veasey	Cooper	Kirkpatrick	Ruppersberger
Greene (GA)	Mann	Smith (NE)	Pocan	Sherrill	Vela	Correa	Krishnamoorthi	Rush
Griffith	Mast	Smith (NJ)	Porter	Sires	Velázquez	Costa	Kuster	Ryan
Grothman	McCarthy	Smucker	Pressley	Slotkin	Wasserman	Courtney	Lamb	Sánchez
Guest	McCaul	Stauber	Price (NC)	Smith (WA)	Schultz	Craig	Langevin	Sarbanes
Guthrie	McClain	Steel	Quigley	Soto	Waters	Crist	Larsen (WA)	Scanlon
Harris	McClintock	Stefanik	Raskin	Spanberger	Watson Coleman	Crow	Larson (CT)	Schakowsky
Harshbarger	McHenry	Steil	Rice (NY)	Speier	Welch	Cuellar	Lawrence	Schiff
Hern	McKinley	Steube	Ross	Stansbury	Wexton	David (KS)	Dawson (FL)	Schneider
Herrell	Meijer	Stewart	Roy	Stanton	Wild	Davis, Danny K.	Lee (CA)	Schrader
Herrera Beutler	Meuser	Taylor	Roybal-Allard	Stevens	Williams (GA)	Dean	Lee (NV)	Schrier
Hice (GA)	Miller (IL)	Tenney	Ruiz	Strickland	Wilson (FL)	DeFazio	Leger Fernandez	Scott (VA)
Higgins (LA)	Miller (WV)	Thompson (PA)	Ruppersberger	Suoizzi	Yarmuth	DeGette	Levin (CA)	Scott, David
Hill	Miller-Meeks	Tiffany				DeLauro	Levin (MI)	Sewell
Hinson	Moolenaar	Timmons				DelBene	Lieu	Sherman
Hollingsworth	Turner	Mooney	Armstrong	Cheney	Hartzler	Delgado	Lofgren	Sherrill
Hudson	Moore (AL)	Upton	Brady	Fortenberry	Smith (MO)	Demings	Lowenthal	Sires
Huizenga	Moore (UT)	Valadao	Bustos	García (IL)	Spartz	DeSaulnier	Luria	Slotkin
Issa	Mullin	Van Drew				Deutch	Lynch	Smith (NJ)
Jackson	Murphy (NC)	Van Dwyne				Dingell	Malinowski	Smith (WA)
Jacobs (NY)	Nehls	Wagner				Doggett	Malliotakis	Soto
Johnson (LA)	Newhouse	Walberg				Doyle, Michael	Maloney, Carolyn B.	Spanberger
Johnson (OH)	Norman	Walorski				F.	Maloney, Sean	Speier
Johnson (SD)	Obernolte	Waltz				Escobar	Manning	Stansbury
Jordan	Owens	Weber (TX)				Eshoo	Matsui	Stanton
Joyce (OH)	Palazzo	Webster (FL)				Espallat	McBath	Stevens
Joyce (PA)	Palmer	Wenstrup				Evans	McCollum	Strickland
Katko	Pence	Westerman				Fitzpatrick	McEachin	Suoizzi
Keller	Perry	Williams (TX)				Fletcher	McGovern	Swalwell
Kelly (MS)	Pfuger	Wilson (SC)				Foster	McNerney	Takano
Kelly (PA)	Posey	Wittman				Frankel, Lois	Meeks	Thompson (CA)
Kim (CA)	Reed	Womack				Gallo	Meng	Thompson (MS)
Kinzinger	Reschenthaler	Zeldin				Garamendi	Meuser	Titus

NAYS—225

Adams	Cuellar	Kaptur
Aguilar	David (KS)	Keating
Allred	Davis, Danny K.	Kelly (IL)
Auchincloss	Dean	Khanna
Axne	DeFazio	Kildee
Barragán	DeGette	Kilmer
Bass	DeLauro	Kim (NJ)
Beatty	DelBene	Kind
Bera	Delgado	Kirkpatrick
Beyer	Demings	Krishnamoorthi
Biggs	DeSaulnier	Kuster
Bishop (GA)	Deutch	Lamb
Blumenauer	Dingell	Langevin
Blunt Rochester	Doggett	Larsen (WA)
Boebert	Doyle, Michael	Larson (CT)
Bonamici	F.	Lawrence
Bourdeaux	Escobar	Lawson (FL)
Bowman	Eshoo	Lee (CA)
Boyle, Brendan	Espallat	Lee (NV)
F.	Evans	Leger Fernandez
Brown (MD)	Fletcher	Levin (CA)
Brown (OH)	Foster	Levin (MI)
Brownley	Frankel, Lois	Lieu
Bush	Gaetz	Lofgren
Butterfield	Gallago	Lowenthal
Carbajal	Garamendi	Luria
Cárdenas	García (TX)	Lynch
Carson	Golden	Malinowski
Carter (LA)	Gomez	Maloney
Cartwright	Gonzalez,	Carolyn B.
Case	Vicente	Maloney, Sean
Casten	Gosar	Manning
Castor (FL)	Gottheimer	Massie
Castro (TX)	Green, Al (TX)	Matsui
Cherfilus-	Grijalva	McBath
McCormick	Harder (CA)	McCollum
Chu	Hayes	McEachin
Ciциlline	Higgins (NY)	McGovern
Clark (MA)	Himes	McNerney
Clarke (NY)	Horsford	Meeks
Cleaver	Houlihan	Meng
Clyburn	Hoyer	Mfume
Cohen	Huffman	Moore (WI)
Connolly	Jackson Lee	Morelle
Cooper	Jacobs (CA)	Moulton
Correa	Jayapal	Mrvan
Costa	Jeffries	Murphy (FL)
Courtney	Johnson (GA)	Nadler
Craig	Johnson (TX)	Napolitano
Crist	Jones	Neal
Crow	Kahele	Neguse

NOT VOTING—9

□ 1735

Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Baird (Walorski)	Kahele (Takano)	Sánchez (Gomez)
Bilirakis	Kind (Beyer)	Scott, David
(Fleischmann)	Kinzinger	(Jeffries)
Bowman (Meng)	(Meijer)	Sessions (Babin)
Brooks (Green)	Kirkpatrick	Sires (Pallone)
(TN))	(Pallone)	Speier (Scanlon)
Cawthorn (Nehls)	Krishnamoorthi	Steel (Obernolte)
Comer	(Beyer)	Strickland
(Fleischmann)	LaMalfa	(Takano)
Crist	(Palazzo)	Suoizzi (Beyer)
(Wasserman)	Lawson (FL)	Taylor (Carter
Schultz)	(Wasserman)	(TX))
Cuellar (Pappas)	Schultz)	Thompson (MS)
Curtis (Stewart)	Mace (Rice (SC))	(Evans)
DeGette (Blunt	Manning (Beyer)	Herrera Beutler
Rochester)	McClain	Higgins (NY)
Espallat	(Fitzgerald)	Himes
(Correa)	Mrvan (Takano)	Horsford
Harder (CA)	Newman (Beyer)	Houlihan
(Gomez)	Owens (Stewart)	Hoyer
Jayapal (Gomez)	Roybal-Allard	Hudson
Johnson (TX)	(Wasserman)	Huffman
(Jeffries)	Schultz)	Jackson Lee
Joyce (OH)	Salazar	Jacobs (CA)
(Garbarino)	(Gimenez)	Jayapal
		Jeffries

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

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 232, nays 193, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 102]

YEAS—232

Adams	Beyer	Brown (OH)
Aguilar	Bishop (GA)	Brownley
Allred	Blumenauer	Buck
Auchincloss	Blunt Rochester	Bucshon
Axne	Bonamici	Budd
Bacon	Bourdeaux	Burchett
Barragán	Bowman	Burgess
Bass	Boyle, Brendan	Calvert
Beatty	F.	Cartwright
Bera	Brown (MD)	Case

NAYS—193

Aderholt	Carl	Fitzgerald
Allen	Carter (GA)	Fleischmann
Amodei	Carter (TX)	Foxx
Arrington	Cawthorn	Franklin, C.
Babin	Chabot	Scott
Baird	Cline	Fulcher
Balderson	Cloud	Gaetz
Banks	Clyde	Gallagher
Barr	Cole	Garbarino
Bentz	Comer	García (CA)
Bergman	Crawford	Gibbs
Bice (OK)	Crenshaw	Gimenez
Biggs	Curtis	Gohmert
Bilirakis	Davidson	Gonzales, Tony
Bishop (NC)	Davis, Rodney	Gonzalez (OH)
Boebert	DesJarlais	Good (VA)
Bost	Diaz-Balart	Gooden (TX)
Brooks	Donalds	Gosar
Buchanan	Duncan	Granger
Buck	Dunn	Graves (LA)
Bucshon	Ellzey	Graves (MO)
Budd	Emmer	Green (TN)
Burchett	Estes	Greene (GA)
Burgess	Fallon	Griffith
Calvert	Feenstra	Grothman
Cammack	Ferguson	Guest
Carey	Fischbach	Guthrie

Harshbarger	Mast	Scalise
Hern	McCarthy	Schweikert
Herrell	McCauley	Scott, Austin
Hice (GA)	McClain	Sessions
Higgins (LA)	McClintock	Simpson
Hill	McHenry	Smith (MO)
Hinson	McKinley	Smith (NE)
Hollingsworth	Meijer	Smucker
Huizenga	Miller (IL)	Spartz
Issa	Miller (WV)	Staubert
Jackson	Moolenaar	Steel
Jacobs (NY)	Mooney	Stefanik
Johnson (LA)	Moore (AL)	Steil
Johnson (OH)	Moore (UT)	Steube
Johnson (SD)	Mullin	Stewart
Jordan	Murphy (NC)	Taylor
Joyce (OH)	Nehls	Tenney
Joyce (PA)	Newhouse	Thompson (PA)
Keller	Norman	Tiffany
Kelly (MS)	Obernolte	Timmons
Kelly (PA)	Owens	Turner
Kim (CA)	Palazzo	Valadao
Kinzinger	Palmer	Van Drew
Kustoff	Pence	Van Duyn
LaHood	Perry	Wagner
LaMalfa	Pfluger	Walberg
Lamborn	Reed	Walorski
Latta	Reschenthaler	Waltz
LaTurner	Rice (SC)	Weber (TX)
Lesko	Rodgers (WA)	Webster (FL)
Letlow	Rogers (AL)	Wenstrup
Long	Rogers (KY)	Westerman
Loudermilk	Rose	Williams (TX)
Lucas	Rosendale	Wilson (SC)
Luetkemeyer	Rouzer	Wittman
Mace	Roy	Womack
Mann	Rutherford	Zeldin
Massie	Salazar	

NOT VOTING—6

Armstrong	Bustos	Fortenberry
Brady	Cheney	Hartzler

□ 1747

Mrs. WAGNER changed her vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. CHENEY. Madam Speaker, I missed all votes on 3/31 due to illness. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall No. 98, "nay" on rollcall No. 99, "yea" on rollcall No. 100, "yea" on rollcall no. 101, and "yea" on rollcall No. 102.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Baird (Walorski)	Kahele (Takano)	Sánchez (Gomez)
Bilirakis	Kind (Beyer)	Scott, David
(Fleischmann)	Kinzinger	(Jeffries)
Bowman (Meng)	(Meijer)	Sessions (Babin)
Brooks (Green)	Kirkpatrick	Sires (Pallone)
(TN)	(Pallone)	Speier (Scanlon)
Cawthorn (Nehls)	Krishnamoorthi	Steel (Obernolte)
Comer	(Beyer)	Strickland
(Fleischmann)	LaMalfa	(Takano)
Crist	(Palazzo)	Suozy (Beyer)
(Wasserman)	Lawson (FL)	Taylor (Carter
Schultz)	(Wasserman)	(TX))
Cuellar (Pappas)	Schultz)	Thompson (MS)
Curtis (Stewart)	Mace (Rice (SC))	(Evans)
DeGette (Blunt)	Manning (Beyer)	Trone (Beyer)
Rochester)	McClain	Waltz (Mast)
Espallat	(Fitzgerald)	Wilson (FL)
(Correa)	Mrvan (Takano)	(Jeffries)
Harder (CA)	Newman (Beyer)	Wilson (SC)
(Gomez)	Owens (Stewart)	(Rice (SC))
Jayapal (Gomez)	Roybal-Allard	Yarmuth (Beyer)
Johnson (TX)	(Wasserman)	
(Jeffries)	Schultz)	
Joyce (OH)	Salazar	
(Garbarino)	(Gimenez)	

RESIGNATION FROM THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TORRES of New York) laid before the House the following resignation from the House of Representatives:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, March 31, 2022.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: I write to inform you that I have notified Texas Governor Greg Abbot of my resignation from the U.S. House of Representatives, effective today at 11:59 PM EST.

It has been a profound honor to represent the people of the 34th Congressional District of Texas for the last nine years, and my distinct pleasure to serve under your leadership.

Please let me know if I can be of assistance during this period of transition.

Sincerely,

FILEMON VELA,
Member of Congress.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, March 31, 2022.

Hon. GREG ABBOTT,
Governor of Texas,
Austin, TX.

DEAR GOVERNOR ABBOTT: I write to inform you that I am resigning my position as the U.S. Representative for the 34th Congressional District of Texas, effective today at 11:59 PM EST.

It has been a profound honor to represent the people of the Rio Grande Valley of Texas for the last nine years.

Please let me know how I can be of assistance during this transition.

Sincerely,

FILEMON VELA,
Member of Congress.

SUPPORTING CAP ON INSULIN PRICES

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

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support the Affordable Insulin Now Act.

In America, a unit of insulin costs almost \$100. I paid \$348 for a vial. Across the border in Canada, it costs \$12 for the same insulin.

This enormous price difference causes diabetics to take drastic steps to survive. They ration their insulin to make it last. Some of them stop taking it for days to save money. These are life-threatening financial decisions.

As a diabetic myself, I know the importance of insulin to daily life. This boot on my foot is not a fashion choice. It is for a diabetic ulcer that I have been fighting for 8 months, and I have had seven in 10 years. I am one of the more than 37 million diabetics in America.

If we can cap insulin payments to \$35 per month, it saves lives. That is why we need the Affordable Insulin Now Act.

COMMEMORATING THE LIFE OF RICHARD ROY KELLEY, M.D.

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

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commemorate the life of Richard Roy Kelley, M.D., a true "keiki o ka aina," "a child of the land," son of Hawaii, just lost to us at age 88.

Doc Kelly was born to Hawaii's original hoteliers, Roy and Estelle Kelley, founders of Outrigger Hotels and Resorts. He grew up in their Waikiki ho-

tels, graduated from Stanford and Harvard, and practiced in Honolulu before helming Outrigger through its second generation.

On Doc's watch, Outrigger expanded throughout Hawaii and the Pacific into a world-famous iconic beach resort brand; success for any life.

But Doc Kelley did far more. He pioneered true cultural tourism in "Ke Ano Wa'a," or "the Outrigger Way," through which the entire lifeblood of each property embraces and embodies its special values and place. He led the World Travel and Tourism Council and advised our own Travel and Tourism Council. And he endlessly loved Hawaii and his "ohana," "family," and never stopped giving back.

Richard "Doc" Kelley, an amazing and unforgettable life. From all of us to you and yours, mahalo, and aloha.

CHRISTIAN NATIONALISM IS A DANGEROUS IDEOLOGY

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

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring attention to a dangerous ideology threatening our democracy: White Christian nationalism.

Most Members of Congress don't even know what it means, but experts from the Freedom From Religion Foundation and the Baptist Joint Committee for Religious Liberty have studied it for years, and their new report shows this movement was at the heart of the January 6 insurrection.

White Christian nationalism fuses Christianity with a rigid view of civic life, a view that true Americans are White, native-born, and conservative. On January 6, it was the connective tissue that tied disparate groups together and propelled them to action.

It is infecting our government, from Members of Congress and top officials in the previous administration to the wife of a Supreme Court Justice, whose messages to the President's Chief of Staff leading up to the insurrection smacked of White Christian nationalism.

Thankfully, good Americans, people of faith and nonbelievers, are standing up to this violent ideology.

Mr. Speaker, I call on Members of Congress to educate themselves about White Christian nationalism and reaffirm the separation of church and State.

SUCCESS OF AMERICAN MANUFACTURING HELPS WORKING FAMILIES

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

Ms. BROWNLEY. Mr. Speaker, from day one, House Democrats have been working with the Biden administration to build a stronger and more secure future for the American people. That is why we recently passed the COMPETES Act to fix our national supply chains, boost competition, and strengthen U.S. manufacturing.

Last week, I had the opportunity to visit Haas Automation in my district in Oxnard, California. Haas manufactures over 90 percent of all American-made precision manufacturing tools and is the last standing major American manufacturer of the machines

that are essential to most manufacturing in America.

We are working to ensure American manufacturing companies like Haas can continue to compete globally and continue to thrive.

That includes ensuring a level playing field with foreign competitors and ensuring U.S. manufacturers have access to adequate supplies of essential semiconductor chips.

That is why we must get the America COMPETES Act across the finish line, because the success of American manufacturing will lead to the success of American working families.

□ 1800

REMEMBERING THE LIFE OF JACK LUMPKIN

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

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember the life of Georgia golfing legend, Jack Lumpkin.

Jack was a master at the game of golf and a pillar of what Sea Island and Glynn County is today. When it came to the game, Jack was unparalleled in his understanding and knowledge. He spent his life coaching others and was recognized for his teaching ability numerous times.

In 1995, Jack was named PGA National Teacher of the Year, and he was named a Top 50 Golf Teacher in America every year since 2000.

I will always remember Jack teaching students at the first tee box at the Golf Performance Center, which is now known as Lumpkin's Tee. Jack would take his students to where the Golf Performance Center now stands because the area naturally blocked out the north wind coming from the ocean.

It was Jack's ideas, passion, and prowess that made this center possible.

My prayers are with his family, friends, and the staff of Sea Island, as well as those that he mentored.

WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH

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

Ms. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to mark the end of Women's History Month and highlight the contributions of women in my community:

From education leaders like Joliet-native, Margaret Haley, a teacher who led the Chicago's Teachers Federation to become the largest women's union in the country by 1900; and

Katharine Lucinda Sharp of Elgin, a founder of the Illinois Library Association who ran the Midwest's first library school;

To entertainers like Plainfield-native, Melissa McCarthy, whose comedy has graced our screens for two decades; and

Businesswomen, like Mary Foot Seymour of Aurora, who founded the Business Women's Journal, a publishing company led entirely by women.

These are just a few of the amazing women who have made a mark on my Northern Illinois community and our country, and I am proud to honor them.

AFFORDABLE INSULIN NOW

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to applaud the passage of the Affordable Insulin Now Act and urge the other body to swiftly take up the bill.

Millions of Americans depend upon insulin every single day, but too many are forced to ration or cut back on their other essential needs just to pay for the medication that keeps them alive.

In Ohio, the cost of insulin can cost hundreds of dollars a month, and the pens that are used can cost between \$45 and \$600. It is simply unaffordable. Capping the price of insulin at \$35 a month means no longer will families have to choose between grocery and rent or their own lives. No longer should a diabetic be forced to ration out their injections just to ensure they have enough until next month.

Congress must act to pass the Affordable Insulin Now Act. Let's save people real money, improve their lives, and afford them the dignity that they deserve.

HORNET GIRLS ARE STATE BASKETBALL CHAMPIONS

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

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, what a great honor for me to be here today and pay tribute to the fighting Hornets of East Hartford High. The girls' team has won the State championship in the State of Connecticut for the first time in the school's history.

Mr. Speaker, 50 years ago, Maureen Rodgers ushered in modern-day girls' basketball at then-Penney High School. The crown today is that these young women demonstrated that vision and brought home the State championship to East Hartford, Connecticut.

REMEMBERING CONGRESSMAN DON YOUNG

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember the dean of this House, Congressman Don Young, and to remember him from a perspective of far-reaching diversity and love of the institution.

I offer my deepest sympathy to his wife, his family, his extended family, and all of the people of Alaska and all of the people of the Nation.

Everyone who has offered a word of salute to Congressman Young emphasizes his 49 years, but most of all, his love of getting the job done—getting something done.

And, of course, when I was having the privilege of being in the Chair, Mr. Speaker, I could always be reminded of that voice "regular order." And often you wanted to just do what Don Young said: Regular order. Gavel it down. But, again, he did so because of a respect for this institution.

I thank him for all of the introductions to Alaska that he made and, really, all of the work for the Alaskan people. No matter who they were, where they lived, in far reaches or inner cities, Don Young represented the State so ably.

I am grateful to have spent just a small amount of time—two decades—with Don Young in the House. And he will be remembered, and we will be reminded of what love of the institution truly means; unselfish commitment, and the commitment to work and get the job done.

Mr. Speaker, I salute the late Congressman Don Young. I thank him for teaching us how to get the job done.

ISSUES OF THE DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2021, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOONEY).

PARTISAN GAMES—SUPREME COURT JUSTICE THOMAS

Mr. MOONEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT) for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, one of the latest partisan games being pushed by the radical left is the call for Supreme Court Justice Clarence Thomas to recuse himself from certain cases or face impeachment.

These demands stem from an email and other digital private communications of Justice Thomas' wife to and from government officials at the time.

If it becomes the standard that an elected official or a judge or a commissioner or other government appointees can be attacked because of the views and political actions of a spouse, then everyone is fair game.

How many members of the Democratic Caucus would like to be held accountable for the politics or actions of their spouse? How many governors, State legislators, or judges at any level would be able to withstand an assault based on the beliefs of their husband or wife? No good will come of this effort.

There are those who argue that the radical left wants such a toxic environment. The feeling is that those who

wish to radically transform America know that they are facing a harsh verdict from the American people come this November. These activist partisans are willing to literally throw our country into a frenzy of hate, suspicion, and personal vendetta in order to divert attention from the failure of their policies.

I pray that the members of the Democratic Caucus making these extremist demands are ignored and that statesmen can take the lead. But if, once again, the Democrat leadership is so beholden to the extremist fringe that they send us into such a fight, you will not succeed.

I thank the gentleman from Arizona for yielding me the time.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, tonight is going to be a tricky presentation, and I want to apologize immediately to those who have to try take down our words. But tonight, I am going to actually try to focus on solutions.

Last week, I spent an hour behind this microphone begging our friends on the left, begging our Democrat colleagues to stop doing much of what they have been doing. And I demonstrated that it has been hurting people. Last year was miserable for the working poor, for the poor, for the middle class.

And in some ways, it is our own fault in this body because intellectually, this place is calcified—that is my word of the day. Because we see the math. We see the facts. And we have the folks lay out what is going to happen. But because it is already part of, particularly in this case, the left's dogma, we do it anyway. And then we act surprised here a year later when my community had 10.9 percent inflation last year.

Year over year, how many people is that crushing? And now we are seeing some data. And this is important; this isn't transitory. A number of the most powerful modelers in the economic world in this country are now starting to ring the alarm bells of both: We are heading towards a recession and that inflation may now be with us for decades because of how we have screwed things up in this place.

First, this is as of almost today, you have Goldman Sachs now saying there is a 27½ percent chance of a recession—not a slowdown, a recession, which means two quarters of negative GDP by the end of this year.

Citi is at 25 percent.

J.P. Morgan is still at 15, which were the numbers from last week.

These numbers have skyrocketed. If you and I looked at this three weeks ago, it was 9 percent.

Does anyone here actually care about people? Do you care about working men and women? Do you understand what a recession does to people? How long it takes to get your feet back underneath you? Let alone the head kick we are giving to the American public with inflation.

So here is my goal. I am going to race through just a boatload of slides here, and I am going to throw out concept after concept after concept. Some of them are marginal. Some of them you are going to go, Oh, that makes sense.

But the point is, there are actually solutions. If the left would ever allow us to offer a genuine amendment in committee, to actually have a genuine discussion and debate, maybe we could change some hearts and minds in this place, or just even enlighten some intellect around here. But that isn't what this place does.

So let's actually start to walk through the bill that a number of folks are so giddy about today.

I am fixated on diabetes because of what it does and the misery to parts of my district. I represent a Tribal community that is number 2 as a percentage of population who suffer from diabetes. Come to the reservation. I will introduce you to families that I have known where mom has her feet cut off.

But to tout the bill that was passed here today as a solution is an absolute fraud. You do realize the con job that the Democrats are touting here? And I am not sure it is purposeful. I don't think they spent time understanding.

First, you basically created a subsidy bill for Big Pharma. Congratulations. You didn't reduce the price. What you did is you created, functionally, \$20 billion of subsidy to buy down the price of insulin. And you bought it down with a fraud because you are doing a—well, we are going to pretend that the Trump administration's rule in regard to rebates is in effect, which it was never going into effect. So you made magic money again.

And at the same time, you just took away the pressure we could have done together to actually get a real solution on the price of insulin. And some of that solution could have been something as simple as the co-op that is in construction right now, that is saying they are going to bring \$30 a vial, \$55 a box—and a box is 5 vials—of insulin to market in a year.

So if we were actually doing solutions here, the Democrats' bill, working with Republicans, would have been. We are going to put it in the stack for licensing and permitting. We are going to put aside some money to make sure that they get their factory up and running in Virginia as soon as possible.

And, oh, by the way, this is substantially less expensive than the subsidized version that is going to cost society \$20 billion. And you are handing that to Big Pharma. Isn't that amusing?

I mean, amusing the speechifying here. And the Democrats' approach to helping people who can't afford their insulin is to blow up the market, screw up the incentives, and then screw up the actual solution. And the solution is coming.

Does anyone actually subscribe to something where they read?

And you have got to understand, we need to go—and the whole debate around diabetes, we have got to go much, much further.

Mr. Speaker, 31 percent of all Medicare spending is diabetes; 33 percent of all healthcare spending. Understand, in 29 years, the United States is scheduled to have about \$112 trillion of borrowed money in today's dollars.

Mr. Speaker, 75 percent of that is just Medicare, but if 31 percent of Medicare spending is diabetes, cure it. And you go, But, David, how would we do that?

Well, I have been to this floor a dozen times over the last 12 months saying the research is happening. The early numbers look good.

Guess what? It succeeded. Hey, the phase 1s worked. Now we are actually on another set of phase 1s where they are actually using CRISPR to tag the stem cell that has become an isolate cell to make it so you can do a bio-foundry. And it could be a production line, so it doesn't even need to come from your skin to get the stem cells.

□ 1815

Meaning, if we would get our reimbursement sets straight here, our licensing sets straight here, our incentives lined up. The modelers say in about 5 years you could actually be rolling out—the cure to type 1 is actually the easy part, it is the cure to type 2 which is much more difficult. We have to have a brutal conversation of nutrition support and maybe nutrition support that is healthy.

Encouraging our brothers and sisters in my Tribal communities, the lifestyles and things, to be ready to actually accept the cure. But the fact of the matter is it is here. So what did the Democrats just do? They did a subsidy bill for insulin that is going to cost \$20 billion. How about if they had taken that \$20 billion and put it into the price for getting this cure to market?

It is just an example we don't seem to get our heads around. The world works in incentives and disincentives. We have made it so bureaucratic and so expensive that we are in an incumbent protection racket here. It is not incumbent Members of Congress, it is incumbent bureaucracies, incumbent business models, and the disruptions like this that would end so much misery and also be the single biggest thing we can do to affect the debt in this country.

We applaud ourselves for voting through a bill that actually will have made things worse. If there is an economist in the room and you walk through saying, well, because you just functionally government-subsidized this, you just took away the pricing pressure to actually have the revolution of both the cost and the cure.

I am begging my brothers and sisters here to think. There is this incredible hope. They have already had the successes in the phase ones, and now the ability to actually tag it and make it

so you don't need to be on anti-rejection drugs. Think about what it means to the health of the country.

Why would I go to diabetes right after showing you that the projections of a recession at the end of this year are skyrocketing because you are heading in an approach where you are making a substantial portion of our population—making them available to participate in the economy.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to throw out a really uncomfortable subject for a second. I am the senior Republican on the Joint Economic Committee and we have been trying a little side project for almost a year. What makes people poor? What is the real cause of income inequality? And unlike the rhetorical crap virtue signaling that is said around here, we are actually starting to find out there are a lot of things, but health, education, things of that nature that we can affect are actually major precursors, then you look at the amount of the population that is in the lower quartiles that either they or their family or because they have someone who is horribly sick substantially because of renal failure or diabetes.

My other side of the argument is why this is moral to pursue. It also would end lots of misery. It would actually really help the poor. It actually might squeeze down income inequality. It is sort of the trifecta. Yet, I will do these presentations on how it works and that it would be amazing for economic growth, and if it truly brought more of our brothers and sisters to be able to participate in the economy, it would also be really good for inflation, too.

I have done this slide multiple times. I'm trying to sort of explain the mechanisms of a stem cell and you can now direct—think of it as a biofoundry mechanism, sort of like CRISPR. You can direct that stem cell to become an insulin-producing cell. In the previous slide you can walk through how you can actually do this in a fashion that it can be almost a factory production. So even beyond the personalized medicine concept.

Why this is so important is we are on the cusp of a revolution to make people's lives so much better—so much healthier. Instead, what we have done in this place over the last 12 months is we have set off inflation. We have set off crime. We have set off homelessness because of really, really bad policies. Lots of great virtue signaling. There have been beautiful speeches behind these microphones telling you how much we care and how we feel, and then the economics are just horrible.

Some more of the disruption that I believe would be great for the country—and the technology is already here, we just have to learn how to legalize it—is your ability to wear something on your wrist. This is one of my favorites. I am just going to walk you through a concept.

This is a breath biopsy. A couple versions of this out there think it

would be a couple hundred dollars, at most, and you could have functionally a medical lab in your medicine cabinet at home. Blow into it. Within a couple moments it tells you: Hey, guess what, you have a virus. It can then bang off your medical records, order your antivirals, and maybe Lyft or someone can drop it off at your house in a couple hours.

Would that make your life easier? Would that give you more time with your family and faster to get healed? Would it help crash parts of healthcare costs? Remember, three-quarters of that \$112 trillion is healthcare, it is Medicare. Healthcare is what is substantially bankrupting this country.

Do you know what the problem with that technology is? It is illegal. The fact of the matter is you would let this breath biopsy be able to order your antivirals, allow the algorithm—and the data says the algorithm is more accurate than those of us that are humans. I know that just hurt a bunch of people's feelings.

If you legalize the technology you could have a disruption in the price of healthcare. You could make this society—our country—dramatically more efficient and give us more time with our families and be healthy. It would be an economic virtuous cycle and a healthy one. It would just require us around here to actually have to deal with the avalanche of lobbyists that hate this technology. As I said before, we are sort of calcified intellectually around here, aren't we?

Mr. Speaker, now I want to talk about the heresy that is in President Biden's budget and the solutions. How many times have you gotten up here and seen the Speaker herself, multiple times—tax reform in 2017 was for the rich. No, it wasn't. CBO—more revenues came in. Corporate tax receipts leaped 75 percent after we reformed the tax code a couple years ago.

The fact of the matter is—what we call receipts in Ways and Means, revenues as most people would think of—coming into in government went up dramatically. Why that was so important is that 2018 and 2019 were our most successful years in modern economic history of poor people getting less poor, the middle class doing better, income inequality shrinking, food insecurity shrinking.

Minority populations had the biggest movement ever in U.S. history in getting less poor, getting wealthier. That income inequality gap shrank because we got the tax incentives correct. But because it was Republicans that did it, there is this running away from it—we have seen—great job, guys. Think about what has happened to this country in 1 year.

You are poorer today than you were 1 year ago. The fact of the matter is the setting off of inflation—God knows some of the other things that have gone on and we are going to touch on them—we are poorer today than we were 1 year ago. Yes, there was COVID.

We stood behind these microphones a year ago and said, you don't want to keep dumping money the way you are doing, you are going to set off inflation. They told us to go jump in the lake. Congratulations, they did it.

Now some of the economists are telling us a recession by the end of the year, oh, and maybe 10 years of an inflationary cycle before we can squeeze it out of the system.

Once again, if you actually look at the charts, it was actually working women that exploded. This big of a movement here—I know this chart doesn't express it—that type of steep curve increasing is remarkable. It is just remarkable in what happened after tax reform.

It was actually working women, substantially those from minority populations, that had just remarkable increases in income. They are the ones that also got crushed during the way we approached the pandemic. Anyone that tells you, oh, it was this huge give-away of money.

Well, it is sort of amazing because it was the second and the third highest receipts or revenues in 2018 and 2019. You got to remember there was a little bit of a con in 2017 because the expensing went in—you could expense in the last quarter before the tax reform. So the fourth quarter of 2017 you could begin expensing. So this actually had some of the economic growth effects pulled into the previous year—I know I am geeking out a bit—but it continued.

One of the reasons we actually economically held up pretty well is the Democrats haven't been able to repeal the 2017 tax reform. And I know this slide is a little hard to see, but it is the best one we could put together in the short timeframe. Guess what? We crossed over \$4 trillion in revenues and receipts.

If you go back—think about that, it was only a couple years earlier that we were at \$3.3 trillion. You understand, that is like a \$700 billion increase in receipts in a time when the Democrats told us we had eviscerated the tax code and gave it all away. At some point the calculator does tell the truth.

So back to our earlier thesis. Getting the tax system correct is amazing for the economics. This is the other side of the question I want to ask. How many here believe growth is moral? I will try to argue over and over that economic growth creates opportunity, and those opportunities driven by that growth is moral. I wish I could just get us to focus on—that growth also is a way we survive the debt bubble that is expanding like an alligator mouth. Here is the size of our economy and here is the scale of the debt.

You do understand that CBO basically says in 9 years, every single year just our interest payment will be \$1 trillion. That is where we are heading. Here is a crazy thought. If I needed to tap down inflation today but I wanted to do it by not solely having the Federal Reserve do monetary policy, which

is squeezing cash out of the system—remember, inflation is what, too many dollars chasing too few goods. You have the monetary side of inflation pull the dollars out of the economy. The other side is to make more stuff.

This year, expensing. The reality of it—tax reform—it was the expensing that drove much of the economic expansion, the investment in productivity, it goes to 80 percent this fiscal year and then drops down I think to 60 percent the next year. Do a mechanism where you add a bonus.

If you say: Business, if you are willing to take some of that cash functioning out of the system and go invest it in productivity capital, buy a new plant, put in new equipment, do things that will make it so you can pay workers more. We make more stuff because when we have more stuff you knock down inflation because it is now the number of dollars divided by numbers of stuff. Crazy idea.

□ 1830

Do a tax adjustment.

Mr. Speaker, say we are going to give you a bonus on your expenses to encourage you to take that money out of liquidity and buy things that make us more productive as a country. It is a win-win, and it has the benefit of being a long-term benefit to society.

It is sort of. We have been working on this. This is just as a thought experiment. And it may not be brilliant, but it is more the concept of right now. Today there are too many dollars chasing too few goods. Then create a deal with business in America saying, Hey, if you take some cash, set it aside, functionally, ah, screw it, and you are going to put it into new equipment that makes it more efficient so you can have more goods, better transportation, better supply chains, that is what we want to incentivize instead of trying to buy things today and shove them in a warehouse because you are worried the price is going to go up tomorrow.

This is the type of thought experiments policy we should be pursuing, Mr. Speaker, if you need to knock down inflation but you want to do it by growing as an economy.

Instead, around here, we are going to sit around on our backsides and let the Federal Reserve basically squeeze us out and put many people through months and months and months of recessionary misery because that is how we are going to knock down inflation.

Another part of the thought experiment: I have some new areas—if I am blessed enough to represent in the coming cycle—and we did some polling. And they came back that crime is their number one issue.

I went on a ride-along with a sergeant who is actually a friend. He was showing me neighborhoods saying, You do realize the homelessness in these neighborhoods has doubled in a year. Doubled. He is explaining to me that someone now can get high for a frac-

tion of the cost they could a year ago. Every single one of those are what we call knockoff effects, second-degree, third-degree effects.

Do you all remember your high school economics class?

You opened up the borders. What did you think was going to happen?

My community of Phoenix is flooded with narcotics. As a matter of fact, we just had a bust a couple months ago. There was enough fentanyl to kill every single resident in Arizona.

So the compassion that this administration and Speaker PELOSI wanted to show for the border, thank you, because you are killing my neighbors.

The homelessness—I don't believe the Phoenix market is the only area that is seeing incredible increases in homelessness. The crime—go on to the city of Phoenix's heat map and click, click, click, and you can see the expansion of the crime and where it is moving and the number of overdoses.

The fact of the matter is when you screw up a policy, then you need to think through the knockoff effects.

You screwed up the border policy.

How much misery did you bring to society?

Remember, we have done a number of presentations.

What are the two ways you make the working middle class or the working lower class poorer?

Inflation. We are doing a great job at that. And you flood the marketplace with people with similar skill sets. So if you are that individual who may not have finished high school, but you are a good drywall and you are busting your backside—and it is hard work; I hung drywall as a young man—we just flooded the marketplace with people of similar skill sets.

Does anyone around here own a basic economics book?

So let's go to a couple other things. So the principle there is, get the border policy right because there is this incredible irony—legal immigration for individuals with specific talent sets that we actually need in this society, the young man who just got his Ph.D. at Arizona State University and is leaving because the State Department's ability to process visas and ability to be immigration has functionally become nonexistent in the last 2 years. But over here, a couple million cross the border.

Does anyone see just the weird irony of the Democrats' policies of, they hurt?

I don't think they were meant to hurt. I think they had the virtue signaling quality of sounding compassionate, but that is not what has happened.

So let's actually walk through a couple of things that are actually additional solutions.

How many times do we talk about supply chains?

And you have seen the latest data. It basically says—and I am not going to argue with it because I haven't had a

chance to break down the numbers—half of inflation is we spent too damn much money. But half of inflation is second degree knockoff effects in supply chains.

So we just did the transportation bill. The transportation bill was substantially green oriented, very little of the money actually went to roads and bridges. None of it actually went to disruptive technologies.

But there are ideas like this, where this was some SpaceX engineers who are out raising capital to build this, where you would actually have autonomous trains. So you pull a container off, stick it on one of these, the autonomous lorry right underneath it on the track drives it to the warehouse it is supposed to be dropped off at.

So you are telling me we have a crisis in truck drivers in the Alameda Corridor outside L.A. Our ability to use technology, why didn't we incentivize this sort of thing?

But do you want to know what the Democrats chose to incentivize in their Build Back Better, Mr. Speaker?

It wasn't creative things to make us more productive as a society. It was ideas like this: in their legislation it is illegal for the ports to automate.

Huh?

But they just told us that they were trying to fix the supply chains—except for the numbers of giveaways to the unions they put into their legislation that you can't automate the ports.

So on one hand, Mr. Speaker, you have breakthrough technology that says that we think we have a way to move these containers. And then the next thing that the brain trust around here does policy-wise is, we are going to make it illegal for you to do the automation that would move the supply chains that you are telling us is half the inflationary spike.

There are solutions. Stop putting up these impediments and start embracing the technology to fix the problem.

Mr. Speaker, may I ask how much time I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Arizona has 29 minutes remaining.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. So in the President's proposal, in the Democrats' proposals, they want to tax the rich more. The new President Biden's budget, I think, has 36 new taxes in it. But here is the great irony. Okay. So they want to do this one tax where they want to functionally tax unrealized capital or unrealized gains which is the taking—it will be ruled unconstitutional. But it is an interesting concept. We want to make a simple proposal that something both Republicans and Democrats might agree upon, stop subsidizing the rich. We have come here to this floor a couple of times and shown there are \$1.4 trillion every 10 years that the left subsidizes the rich.

And so what do the Democrats do?

They say: We need to tax the rich more.

Okay. And then they put in Build Back Better you can make \$800,000 a

year and we are going to hand you \$125,000 of tax credits—not tax deductions—credits.

Does anyone see the lunacy going on here?

So the virtue signaling is rich people aren't paying enough, and then over here we are going to give them 1 trillion-plus dollars in subsidies, and then they are going to add more in their Build Back Better for more rich people to have more subsidies. It is just infuriating.

Does anyone actually read this stuff?

Does anyone own a calculator?

Mr. Speaker, you start to see the numbers.

I have a number of these slides here, and the point is really simple: policy after policy, if you can afford your fourth \$6-million house on a beach somewhere, do you deserve subsidized flood insurance?

But all through this government there are items like that where we wink and nod, we say we are going to tax rich people more, and then we are handing out massive subsidies.

As a Republican, I want to cut spending. You say you want more revenues, Mr. Speaker. Great. Stop putting through the Tax Code, regulatory code, these programs of wink, wink, nod, nod, a bunch of subsidies to people who write checks.

So, Mr. Speaker, you have had a number of, particularly, Republicans who have come behind the microphone and said: You canceled the Keystone pipeline. You made it really hard to put new land into production for pulling hydrocarbons out.

That is actually not the big thing that the left did. What the left did are things like this where the Securities and Exchange Commission is functionally adding new rules that if you invest in hydrocarbons or you are a pension system or these, you are going to have to fill out paperwork to explain your effect on global warming.

What are your effects on carbon?

They functionally did what we call, they screwed up the capital stack. So you could have a natural gas field that was substantially shut down when prices collapsed during the pandemic. It is ready to go, but you need a bunch of capital to put it back into production.

And where do you go to get a loan, Mr. Speaker?

The Democrats did something brilliant, if the goal was to make us much poorer and dependent on foreign countries' hydrocarbons like Venezuela. They said, Okay. We can do the regulatory side, by that is a little bit obvious, but if we make it so no one can get capital to actually put these fields into production, they have succeeded.

Do not let someone try to con you, Mr. Speaker, that what you are paying at the gas pump today and what you had to pay for your heating bill yesterday happened because of Putin's invasion. Natural gas prices exploded last September, October.

Mr. Speaker, do you remember this room being full of people wanting to talk about how we are going to survive the winter heating bills?

That was because if this. It didn't just happen.

But my proposal is, okay. I am fascinated with the use of natural gas. Our friends on the left, our brothers and sisters on the left, say, But, David, yes, it may burn about half the CO₂ emitting as coal, but there is methane.

Let's see if I can find this slide. The technology that is out there to basically gobble up methane—and maybe this works, maybe it doesn't work, but the fact that the technology exists and it has been scientifically proven to work, why wouldn't we pursue that saying: If you could get your natural gas out—because remember, President Biden just promised we are going to ship a bunch of liquified natural gas to Europe, except we don't really have the production right now and you can't get capital for it and the left is going to protest leakage from methane. Well, it turns out you can take clay, a copper oxide—so it is kitty litter. Think about that. It is a cheap solution to absorb that methane.

Why wouldn't we bring the brain trusts around here and say, We need the natural gas desperately. Some are worried about the methane bleed. Fine. Let's find a solution. It turns out there may be a really inexpensive one.

Why don't we invest and pursue it?

There are solutions.

Instead, around here, it is the Malthusian economics of let's just shut it down and see how long people are willing to live in poverty and misery.

The transportation bill again: What is one of the most powerful things you can do to move traffic in urban areas and suburban areas, Mr. Speaker?

Technology. It turns out if you actually care about the environment and you want to move more traffic, invest in the technology that synchronizes the stoplights that tell you when school is out, so it synchronizes the lights, the on-ramps to a freeway that tell you when an ambulance is coming. The studies over and over and over say whether it be in an algorithm or an AI-managed smart grid system for traffic is one of the most impactful things you can do, Mr. Speaker, to clean the air because you move the traffic.

We couldn't get anyone here willing to even listen to one of our amendments on the left about promoting that type of technology.

There is a biotech revolution going on around us and substantially this is happening because of what we did in that 2017 tax reform which moved—exploded—the investments. Whether it be messenger RNA, my fascination with synthetic biology, the stem cells, there are disease after disease after disease and misery after misery we are about to cure. We know how to cure hemophilia now. I think we are on the cusp of knowing how to cure sickle cell anemia, an incredibly painful disease. They are here.

This place should be doing everything we can to promote getting those things to market safely and quickly, as fast as we can to end the misery. By the way, it has amazing financial benefits to the economy and to our tax base.

And you start to look at the innovations that are coming right now from the biotech industry.

□ 1845

One of the reasons I did this—and I didn't bring the other slides. Then, the left offers their H.R. 3, which, functionally, the economists, even the leftwing economists, said, yes, it will lower some drug prices, because we are basically going to do scarcity pricing. Functionally, we are going to say you can't have certain drugs if it costs more than a certain amount, like they do in Europe. But it will also crash the capital stock once again. A lot of you are going to die because you are not going to get this next generation of cure, and this amazing cycle of cures that are coming goes away—great virtue signaling.

The left will tell you they are about to do a piece of legislation to lower drug prices, and we all go “yay,” because they are too high. But by the end of the decade, there are fewer cures, and the value goes away because you didn't remove people from being sick.

It is all about curing people. In the misery, help bring those cures to market.

Personalized medicine, let's legalize it. I showed you the wearables, those things. This here should be part of your ability to stay healthy. Legalize it.

Mr. Speaker, may I ask how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 19 minutes remaining.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Forgive me. I have been trying to talk fast so as to not chew it all up.

Mr. Speaker, in a couple of the pieces of legislation that passed here, we have put aside boatloads of cash to run wire to rural America, and they deserve to have internet access.

I thought this slide was amusing, but you are actually seeing it happening in Ukraine right now. These are a bunch of little kitties in a Starlink satellite dish because apparently a Starlink satellite dish stays a bit warm in the winter so it defrosts itself. See, it is cute—kitties.

But the fact of the matter is, every inch of North America now has broadband internet. It is a bunch of satellites flying over us.

So, let me get this straight: In Ukraine, they are now using this, Starlink, to be able to communicate, but we can't seem to get our brothers and sisters here in the House of Representatives to understand there is a solution to broadband all over the country. They just happen to be flying in low-Earth orbit above our heads. It is here.

Instead, we are going to turn around and put out billions and billions and

billions and billions of dollars of subsidies to put more fiber and more wire in the ground to the middle of nowhere.

Mr. Speaker, there is a huge disruption coming. We need to make sure that our regulatory and policy sets are ready for this.

This is another thing that would also dramatically help this coming decade's inflation cycle. Researchers, particularly at the University of Illinois, have done this remarkable thing. I did a series of presentations on this a year ago. I will do this real quick.

You-all remember your high school biology class. You remember a C4 plant, plants that really, really want carbon to turn it into a sugar and grow. But they accidentally grab an oxygen molecule, and they have to spend all of this energy purging that oxygen molecule and go back and try to get a carbon molecule. I know this is a little geeky, but it is important to get our heads around it.

They have come up with a way to tweak the plant so, every time, it always grabs the carbon so it turns it into a sugar. Some plants will grow 40 percent more efficiently on the same land, the same fertilizer, and the same water. You do realize, just that basic math—and it won't turn out this way, but just conceptually—that is like removing every car off the face of the Earth.

If our brothers and sisters really care about the environment, they would be running as fast as they can to allow these types of available technologies to feed the world and feed our country. Yes, it would be a disruption, but these things exist.

Mr. Speaker, the other topic I want to touch on is a tax policy. This is a conceptual one.

How many of you have ever heard of a VAT tax, a value-added tax? Okay, so much for the enthusiasm.

A value-added tax is what substantially most of the rest of the world uses. If we are going to have a conversation about: We want businesses back in the United States; we want manufacturing back in the United States; we want to take on China; we are going to do tariffs; we are going to do these regulations; and we are going to do import and export controls—great. Realize most of those aren't really going to do much. Here is how I am going to try to explain what the rest of the world does to stick it to the United States.

This is a picture of a beautiful Audi. Let's pretend it is a \$100,000 car. My guess is, this one is a little more expensive. It is being made in Germany, but someone in Scottsdale, Arizona, is about to buy this Audi.

When it is in Germany, there is a 19 percent VAT tax on it, a value-added tax. But the moment it leaves the shore of Germany and is on its way to the United States, the car has been exported. They give them back the \$19,000, that 19 percent. When it comes to the United States, it is \$19,000 less

than it was sitting there in Germany. When it hits our shore, we put a small tariff or duty on it.

But the \$100,000 Tesla that is made in Texas, when someone in Germany is buying it, it has all the tax load—corporate tax, income tax, all the other things that we would do in the United States—in that price. When this car leaves the United States, we don't refund 19 percent of the taxes. It hits the German shore, and they put that \$19,000 on top of the price.

So, we get it both ways, coming and going. When we want to export, other countries put their VAT tax on our products. But when they send a product to us, they take it off.

We can be incredibly competitive. We can automate in ways to make up for labor differential costs. Our energy costs are actually much more competitive than the rest of the world.

Why isn't all manufacturing in the United States right now? It is because we are basically getting arbitrated on the value-added tax because the rest of the world refunds it. Until we fix that, all the talk of "we want made in America," the math doesn't work.

There are a couple of creative solutions. They are technically difficult, where you would have to take that refunded VAT and put it back on at our shore, so, functionally, everyone is treated exactly the same. The \$100,000 American-made car and the \$100,000 German-made car have the same tax load when they are being sold in their respective countries.

I have been trying to figure out a way to try to explain this concept simply, but the tax system, the current tax system as it is, is one of the reasons it is so difficult to compete with other countries' manufacturing, because they refund that value-added tax.

Mr. Speaker, the last thing is, I am truly worried about something. I believe it is going to affect the United States, but I fear it is going to affect the entire world.

How many of you have seen the stories that a number of the agrarian economists, food economists, believe that this coming fall, parts of the world are going to starve?

The price of fertilizer is up dramatically. The price of grain is up dramatically. Putin's war on Ukraine has screwed up the grain markets.

Do we have a moral obligation to step up and understand that, 6 months from now, part of the world may be starving? What happens in the world when you have people going hungry? You have violence and horrible things happening.

We see it coming. All the things we are seeing in the futures markets, the price of fertilizer blowing up, if they don't actually affect food supplies, if I am wrong, it is a free option. But if I am right, we should be pulling the alarm cord.

We should be begging farmers—in our farm policy, our ag committee, we should be removing set-asides, encour-

aging ways to take corn that would be used to make corn-based ethanol and turn it into animal feed, using the rotation that is already happening to soy because soy only uses—it is not my specialty—a quarter or a third of the amount of fertilizer.

If this is about to happen to the world, and we see it 6 months ahead, what is our moral obligation to pull that alarm cord and get it right? By getting it right, we also help our own inflation and maybe a couple of million people don't die in sub-Saharan Africa.

Mr. Speaker, I know that was a lot of different subjects thrown really quickly. If someone is interested, almost everything I touched on, we have done much longer presentations on how the policy would work, how it would help inflation, how it would make people's lives healthier and better.

But my point tonight is a really simple one. Stop doing the things that ultimately are hurting people. Start looking for the optimism and the opportunity that can make America more prosperous, that can make the poor less poor, and that can actually knock down inflation. It would actually be able to be done together.

A lot of these ideas aren't actually Republican or Democrat. They are just disruptive. If we would embrace the disruption, this could be an amazing decade. Right now, the data we are getting today, we may be in for years of misery because of policy from this last year.

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

RENAMING THE RUSSELL SENATE OFFICE BUILDING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2021, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, and still I rise. Mr. Speaker, and still I rise. And I rise as a proud Member of this august body.

I rise with gratitude for the time that I have been afforded. I rise, understanding that time is precious. And I rise understanding that tonight, I have a topic that is going to be of interest to many and provocative to some, but still I rise.

I rise with the topic of institutionalized racism emanating from Capitol Hill. Institutionalized racism emanating from Capitol Hill.

This is hardly where one would expect institutionalized racism. And there are a good many people who say there is no such thing as institutionalized racism.

I trust that after tonight's message, many minds will be changed, and perhaps some hearts will be changed because if you know the truth, it can set you free. It can free your heart, it can free your mind, it can free your body, and it can free your soul.

So let's take the acts of truth to-night and slam it into the tree of circumstance and let the chips fall where they must. And still I rise.

Mr. Speaker, it is said that a picture is worth a thousand words. A picture is worth a thousand words. Here is a picture. This is a picture of the Russell Senate Office Building. The Russell Senate Office Building.

I think it appropriate that we get a better understanding of who Russell was. In 1972, some 50 years ago, the Old Senate Office Building, that would be this building, was named after Senator Richard Brevard Russell, Jr., an unapologetic racist, a white supremacist.

He was the chief legislative architect of the South's bitter opposition to the civil rights. He claimed that America was a White man's country. And he said:

And we are going to keep it that way.

Richard Brevard Russell, Jr., a Senator.

During his first run for the State legislature in 1920, he solicited the support and influence of every White voter and pledged he would serve only them, he would serve only them, if elected.

Russell said while campaigning in 1936:

As one who was born and reared in the atmosphere of the old South, with six generations of my forebearers now resting beneath southern soil, I am willing to go as far and make as great a sacrifice to preserve and ensure white supremacy and the social, economic, and political life of our State as any man who lives within her borders.

These are the words of Richard Russell, Senator Richard Russell. Senator Richard Russell whose name is on the Russell Senate Office Building, a building maintained with tax dollars. A building constructed with tax dollars. A building that I have to go into from time to time.

I try to limit my traversing through the building, but from time to time I must. But at some point, I am going to limit all of my movement into the building. I won't be going into it at some point.

And at some point, people of African ancestry are not going to go into this building. It is a symbol of national shame, not national pride. A symbol of national shame. The Russell Senate Office Building.

Senator Richard Russell successfully filibustered anti-lynching bills. We just passed an anti-lynching bill after many decades. One of the reasons why it took so long is because of Senator Richard Russell.

He blocked bills to eliminate poll taxes. He stood in the way of voting rights, especially for people of color. He also blocked bills to desegregate public schools, and this was done after *Brown v. Board of Education*.

He co-authored the "Southern Manifesto" to slow the integration of public schools after the Supreme Court unanimously ordered in its *Brown* case that schools would be desegregated with all

deliberate speed. Senator Richard Russell. Russell Senate Office Building.

Senator Russell proclaimed:

There is no such thing as a little integration.

This is what he said in 1957, he said:

They, meaning Black people, are determined to get into our White schools, and into White restaurants, and into White swimming pools.

He went on and indicated that he would warn his Senate colleagues that this would mean a mongrel race which would result in destroying America. Senator Richard Russell. A Senate office building named in honor of Senator Richard Russell.

He proposed a voluntary racial relocation program to adjust the imbalance of the Negro population between the South and the rest of the country, literally proposed moving Black people to some other States because there were too many in the South. Senator Richard Russell. The Russell Senate Office Building.

When President Truman fought to end segregation in the military, Russell responded with vile, racial libels. Here is what he stated, Senator Richard Russell, these are his words:

The incidence of syphilis, gonorrhea, chancre, and other venereal diseases is appallingly higher among members of the Negro race.

One would say that by this standard, all of us have been maligned, those of us who are members of the Negro race, as he called it.

He declared:

And allowing Black and White troops to serve together is sure to increase the numbers of men who will be disabled through communicable diseases.

The words of Senator Richard Russell.

Yes, the Senate Russell Office Building is named after a self-proclaimed white supremacist. It is a symbol of national shame.

On March 30, 1964, the Southern Bloc of 18 Democratic Senators and one Republican Senator, led by Senator Richard Russell, launched a filibuster to prevent the passage of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, stood in the way of what we now consider some of the great legislative actions that were taken up by the House and the Senate.

Senator Russell proclaimed:

We will resist to the bitter end any measure or any movement which would tend to bring about social equality—some things bear repeating—we will resist to the bitter end any measure or any movement which would tend to bring about social equality and intermingling and amalgamation of the races in our States.

He voted against the 1964 Civil Rights Act which he called short-sighted and disastrous. He added that the civil rights bill's true intended effect was to intermingle races, eliminate States' rights, and abolish the checks and balance system.

A great President from the State of Texas, the Honorable President Lyndon B. Johnson, signed the Civil Rights Act

into law. And, as a result, Senator Richard Russell led a southern boycott of the 1964 Democratic National Convention.

I would that many who contend that there is no institutionalized racism could walk in the shoes of those of us who face it, who understand that for us, racism is more than a word.

It can sometimes be a way of life that you have to contend with, even into 2022. The Russell Senate Office Building.

You think I get great pleasure walking through a building named after a person who proclaimed himself a white supremacist? I get no great pleasure in moving through the facility.

And I find this to be very interesting. What the Senate does—the Senate named it. It was the Old Senate Office Building. What the Senate does, the Senate can undo.

This building does not have to bear the name of a white supremacist. This can be changed. We but only have to have the will to do it.

And, unfortunately, too many of us find ourselves having to deal with our concerns of this nature siloed. Siloed. Well, this concerns Black people, and as a result, Black people ought to solve this problem.

That is not the approach that I have taken. Long before I came to Congress, I thought that and still believe that if invidious discrimination exists against anyone, it is everyone's duty, responsibility, and, indeed, an obligation to challenge it. Not for myself, but for humanity.

And there are times when, in so doing, you have to stand alone. But I sincerely believe in the inner sanctum of my soul that it is better to stand alone than not stand at all.

So I stand here tonight acknowledging that on many occasions when it has come to the rights of others, check my voting record. Check my voting record. Where were you, AL GREEN, when we took up the rights of the LGBTQ community? I was there.

Where were you when we took up the rights of the Latino community? I was there. Babies at the borders.

Where were you when we took up the rights of the Jewish community, those standing up against those who are anti-Semitic? I was there.

So I ask tonight: Where are we, friends, on the Russell Senate Office Building that, to this day, honors a self-proclaimed white supremacist?

This is institutionalized. It is institutionalized because the Congress, by and through the Senate as an institution, made it so.

You want to see institutionalized racism? A picture is worth a thousand words. There it is. That is it. The Russell Senate Office Building. All people of good will ought to want to see this changed.

I am not the first person, by the way, to say that it should be changed. I may be one of many, but as long as I am here, I am going to be fighting to

change the name of the Russell Senate Office Building.

Institutionalized racism. A picture of it, worth a thousand words. Emanating from Capitol Hill, a place where we passed civil rights laws, a place where we stand, one would assume, against all forms of invidious discrimination.

No one would have a building on Capitol Hill bear the name of a self-proclaimed white supremacist, but there it is. The Russell Senate Office Building.

Now, friends, I have not said what we should name the building after the name Senator Richard Russell is removed. I have not said that we should name it after any given person. I have not said that we should have a certain process in place to select the name.

I have said let it revert to the name that was there before we named it after a self-proclaimed white supremacist. Let it revert to what it was before, and that was the Old Senate Office Building.

Let it revert and then establish the proper protocols and all of the processes and whatever methodology you choose to select the name.

I believe that we won't make that mistake again, the mistake that we made with Senator Richard Russell, but let's let it revert, and that, we could do overnight. That, we could do overnight.

There is no requirement that we wait months, years, weeks. No requirement. We could change the name to the Old Senate Office Building overnight. We would only have to have the will to do it and believe that in so doing, it won't look like someone made us do it.

You know, that always enters into politics it seems. I shouldn't say always. Too often, we don't do things because we don't want it to seem as though someone made us do it. We have to find our own way to get it done.

We have to allow the parade to turn the corner and then run out in front of it and claim that we were there all the time.

Do whatever you must, but let's take the name off. Let's take Richard Russell's name off of the building.

□ 1915

Friends, if a picture is worth a thousand words, I contend that a song speaks for itself and its writer. A song speaks for itself and its writer. Let's now move on from the Russell Senate Office Building, and let's move on to Stephen Foster. Stephen Foster.

Stephen Foster has a memorial day. Stephen Foster Memorial Day in the United States is a Federal observance day, and we do observe Stephen Foster Day on January 13 annually. Stephen Foster Memorial Day.

Who, pray tell, was Stephen Foster? Well, let's talk about Mr. Foster and some of the lyrics in some of his songs. Not all of his songs, but too many of his songs contained lyrics that are offensive to people of color.

Before we examine the lyrics, let's do this. Let's just explain that you don't

get a day in your honor without the consent of the House and the Senate and the President of the United States of America. You don't get a day in your honor without voting. People have to vote. The President has to sign an order.

I will be reading for you the resolution in just a moment, but for now let's look at some of the songs, songs by Stephen C. Foster. Stephen C. Foster. Songs by Stephen C. Foster containing the n-word. Some of you may be familiar with "Oh! Susanna."

"Oh! Susanna." I trust at home that you can read this. He uses what I consider a demeaning vernacular.

I jump'd aboard the telegraph and
trabbled down de ribber.
De lectrick fluid magnified, and kill'd
500 n-words.

We are not allowed to say the word on the floor, and I appreciate that. I never say it. I am not one of those persons who—in my private life I don't use that word. Song by Stephen C. Foster.

Stephen C. Foster, by the way, was declared the Father of American Music. The Father of American Music. The date that we commemorate or celebrate, however you choose, is January 13 annually. The date was created by H.J. Res. 308, 82nd Congress, introduced in the House on August 2, 1951, passed the House on October 15, 1951, some 74 days after introduction. But 74 days after its introduction, it passed the House. It passed the Senate on October 19, 1951, some 78 days after introduction, and was signed into law by the President of the United States on October 27, 1951, some 86 days after introduction.

One can only but pray that legislation, righteous legislation that benefits people who have been demeaned, people who have been discriminated against, righteous legislation that would benefit them and prevent future discrimination, righteous legislation, would only pray that we could get such timelines for righteous legislation.

Stephen Foster performed in blackface. For those who are not familiar—and by the way, he started this at the age of 9, so he was influenced—blackface, this is a form of art—and I am being kind—wherein persons who are of European ancestry paint their faces black, and in a sense they perpetrate a vision of Black people as happy-go-lucky dancers, jumping around, simple and good-natured creatures in minstrel shows.

Minstrel shows were a form of racist entertainment developed in the early 19th century consisting of comic skits, variety acts, dancing, and music performances that depicted people specifically of African descent. The shows were performed by mostly White people in makeup, or blackface as I have explained, for the purpose of playing the role of Black people. Minstrel shows lampooned Black people as dimwitted, lazy, buffoonish, superstitious, and happy-go-lucky. Stephen Foster was a master of minstrel music.

Christy's Minstrels, the most successful minstrel shows of the time, made an arrangement with Foster for the show to be the first to sing his songs. Mr. Foster, if you have a song, a minstrel song, we want to be the first. I can imagine Mr. Christy saying that. He would have the rights to be the first to sing these songs, present these plays demeaning Black people. And Mr. Foster complied.

Before I read the resolution, let's take a look at another song, another song written by the Father of American Folk Music to this day, with a day that is celebrated on January 13 in his honor. The father.

"Old Uncle Ned," an excerpt:

Dere was an old n-word,
Dey call'd him Uncle Ned.
He's dead long ago, long ago!
No more work for poor Old Ned.
He's gone where the good n-words go.

The Father of American Folk Music institutionalized racism in song, institutionalized racism because this institution made it so. We. Not us personally, but this House made it so. More about that in just a moment.

Let's look at another song.

"Oh! Lemuel!" These are excerpts. It reads:

Go down to de cotton field!
Go down, I say!
Go down and call de n-word boys all:
We'll no more today.

The Father of American Folk Music. Proclaimed as such by the United States House of Representatives. Institutionalized as such with the concurrence of the United States Senate. Ordered as such with the signature of the President of the United States of America.

One final one. I shall not read it. I will simply place it before you. I trust that the camera allows you to see the words. "Away Down Souf," s-o-u-f.

So now we find ourselves with a day honoring Stephen Foster by way of a joint resolution, joint resolution authorizing the President—of the United States of America, I might add parenthetically—to proclaim January 13 of each year as Stephen Foster Memorial Day.

It reads, in part, not in total:

"Whereas Stephen Collins Foster has become a national expression of democracy."

"Stephen Collins Foster has become a national expression of democracy through his clear and simple embodiment of American tradition in his world-famous lyrics."

So says the House, the Senate, and the President such that we honor him on January 13 every year.

The resolution reads:

"Whereas the songs of Stephen Collins Foster belong to the people"—don't count me among the people that these songs belong to—"belong to the people and are the musical essence of democracy. . . ." This is the musical essence of democracy. What a sad state of affairs that we have to contend with.

"Whereas the songs of Stephen Collins Foster belong to the people and are

the musical essence of democracy so that he is now recognized as the father of American folk music and the true interpreter of the fundamental spirit of music."

Stephen Collins Foster. "Whereas Stephen Collins Foster symbolizes in his works the unity of mankind through music." This is the unity of mankind through music, so says the House, the Senate, and the President, and a day in honor of Stephen Collins Foster. His works symbolize the unity of mankind.

"Resolved by the Senate," these are the words. Do a little bit of research, and you can read it in its entirety. I have given you excerpts, but these are the words. "Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled: That the President of the United States is authorized to issue a proclamation designating January 13 of each year as Stephen Foster Memorial Day, and calling upon the people throughout the United States of America to observe such day with appropriate ceremonies, pilgrimages to his shrines, and musical programs featuring his compositions." I assume that would be minstrel shows. "Approved October 27, 1951."

□ 1930

I was alive when this was approved. I am the son of a segregated South. I know what racism looks like. I have seen the cross that the Klan burned in my yard. I know what it sounds like having been called these words. I know what it hurts like. I have been to some funerals.

Now, my dear friends, my dear brothers and sisters—and I say such because I am a student of Dr. King. I believe, as he proclaimed, that there really is but one race, and that is the human race. I believe that all persons were created equal from a base black, as Dr. King put it, to a treble white. He went on to say:

Fleecy locks and black complexion
Cannot forfeit nature's claim;
Skins may differ, but affection
Dwells in White and Black the same.

And, "Were I so tall as to reach the pole or grasp the ocean at a span, I must be measured by my soul. The mind is the standard of the man" and woman.

I believe this. Because I believe it, I believe that we all have a responsibility to eliminate this institutionalized racism emanating from the Capitol of the United States of America, institutionalized by the Congress, signed into law by the President, institutionalized by the Senate Russell Office Building.

I love my country. I sing the national anthem. There are some parts of it that we may want to address at some point, but I love my country. I say the Pledge of Allegiance. I love my country. It means something to me to have been born in the United States of America. I just want to make America

the beautiful a more beautiful America for all Americans.

I want every little Black baby to grow up in a world where we don't have a self-proclaimed white supremacist honored with our tax dollars on a building built with our tax dollars. They deserve that. I would do it for any other subset of this society. I would stand up for you.

When will we stand up against institutionalized racism emanating from the Capitol of the United States of America?

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

THE STRENGTH OF AMERICAN AGRICULTURE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2021, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MANN) for 30 minutes.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their marks and submit extraneous material on this Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to host this Special Order during National Agriculture Month on the strength of American agriculture. I am inspired by the American farmers, ranchers, and agricultural producers who feed, fuel, and clothe not only this country but the entire world.

I grew up on a farm south of Quinter, Kansas, that my parents and brother still operate. Growing up there meant that I spent thousands of hours on a tractor working in fields and on horseback doctoring sick cattle in the family feed yard. Those hours turned into love of country and lessons about the values of hard work, creativity, flexibility, and putting others before ourselves.

My district, the Big First of Kansas, is home to more than 60,000 farms where farmers, ranchers, feedlot managers, ethanol producers, ag lenders, and agribusiness owners ensure that America remains the most food-secure country in the world.

As Congress becomes increasingly urban, the distance from farm to fork has never been greater, and since America's national security depends in large part on our food security, we need strong voices for agriculture in this Congress, which is why I am honored to serve on the House Agriculture Committee and to host this Special Order tonight.

If Congress is going to legislate effectively on matters relating to agriculture, Congress must first understand the agricultural perspective in America. There is something about being in the middle of the country where farmers pray for rain, parents

drive 30 miles both ways just to take their kids to school, and communities shrink and grow with oil and gas prices that gives you a greater perspective.

House Agriculture Committee Republican leader GT THOMPSON and I just returned from a trip to my district. While there, we saw an American heartland infused with both the innovative energy that creates new ideas and the love of tradition that respects tried-and-true methods. We saw the USDA National Bio and Agro-Defense Facility that will take American agriculture into the future, and we met with the family who owns and operates Brookover Feed Yards, one of the first feedlots in Kansas. We also saw oil production, ag lending, ethanol production, wheat innovation, and the next generation of leaders in food and agriculture at Kansas State University.

I look forward to celebrating the culmination of National Agriculture Month with my colleagues here tonight as we celebrate the force, passion, and strength of American agriculture.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON), a descendant of dairy farmers, a champion of rural development, my friend who joined me just last week on an agriculture tour of my district in Kansas, and the Republican leader of the House Agriculture Committee.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman MANN for yielding and for hosting this Special Order tonight on an industry that I believe is the most important industry in America. It is the industry that impacts and touches the lives of American families more times in a given day than any other. It is not just the food. It is the fiber; it is the building materials; it is the energy resources; it is the economy.

I am honored to be here. I am proud to be the Republican leader of the House Agriculture Committee, where we celebrate the contributions of American farmers, ranchers, producers, and foresters all year long.

Farm country is no stranger to struggle, and the past couple of years have been a punch to the gut. Between a global pandemic, historic fires and floods, wind events, and a President who is waging a never-ending war on agriculture, times have been particularly tough.

The supply chain crisis paired with skyrocketing inflation is kicking our farm families while they are down—folks who buy retail, sell wholesale, and pay shipping each way; the men and women who work around the clock to provide us with a safe and reliable food supply.

But rural America is tough; rural America is resilient; and rural America is the backbone of this Nation.

I am grateful to Congressman MANN for being on our farm team, as well as all the other agriculture advocates who will be speaking this evening.

Before I go, I specifically recognize Pennsylvania's contribution to agriculture, which is the Commonwealth's

number one industry. One out of every seven jobs is directly or indirectly related to agriculture: 59,000 farms; 280,500 direct jobs; and more than \$135 billion in revenue, or about 18 percent of Pennsylvania's economy. Agriculture's impact in the Keystone State is undeniable.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the families, the men and women who work 24/7, 365 days a year to feed, to clothe, and to fuel this great Nation. Once again, thanks to Congressman MANN for leading this important Special Order.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. THOMPSON for being here tonight and sharing with us thoughts about Pennsylvania agriculture. It is very important to this country.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NEWHOUSE), who is a third-generation family farmer and good friend. I always appreciate his perspectives of Washington State agriculture and what he brings to this body.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. MANN for his leadership and also for hosting us tonight on this special occasion to talk about American agriculture.

I am truly proud to stand with my colleagues to talk about something that affects and impacts every single person not only in this room but listening tonight: the American agriculture industry.

In central Washington, where I am from, I know our industry is made up of honest, hardworking, freedom-loving Americans that provide food and fiber for this Nation. My community is home to some of the most dedicated, innovative agricultural producers in the entire country.

Washington farmers and ranchers produce over 300 different commodities, including high-quality hay, wheat, beef, dairy, wine grapes, hops—which I raise—potatoes, cherries, mint, and, of course, Washington's iconic apples.

Blessed with the conditions to produce such a diverse range of crops, central Washington is proud to share its natural abundance to help feed the country and feed the world. Those of us who live there have a deep appreciation for our Nation's farmers and recognize how important it is that we have a strong domestic agricultural sector.

But lately, unfortunately, the President and his far-left Democrats are so focused on radically altering the country with their trillion-dollar spending proposals, they are blind to the impacts their own policies are already having on Americans across the country. The cost of living is at a 40-year high and still going up. Now, they are looking to raise taxes again on small businesses, on family farms.

As a lifetime farmer and former director of the Department of Agriculture for the State of Washington and current chairman of the Congressional Western Caucus, I understand the vested interests that we all share in supporting our agricultural pro-

ducers. I am proud to join my House Republican colleagues in advocating against burdensome regulations that impact rural communities and for real solutions, not just empty promises, to help our farmers and our ranchers, our farmworkers, and all Americans, who deserve a strong food supply chain.

I introduced the first serious agricultural labor reform bill to pass the House in over 30 years, the Farm Workforce Modernization Act, to ensure that those who wish to come to our country, abide by our laws, and contribute to our farms, ranches, and local communities are able to do so.

I, along with my Republican colleagues, am leading efforts to stop our foreign adversaries, such as Communist China, from gobbling up American farmland and taking control of our food supply chain.

I am protecting our hydroelectric dams in the Northwest that provide irrigation water, baseload power for central Washington and beyond, and serve as a sustainable and efficient way to transport our Nation's crops. The Columbia River barges carry more than 50 percent of U.S. wheat destined for export, and barging on the Columbia and Snake Rivers system keeps—get this—700,000 semitrucks off the roads and their emissions out of the air each and every year.

I am leading the entire Congressional Western Caucus in fighting against this administration's efforts to revive the single-most overreaching Federal regulatory action in history. It is called the waters of the United States rule, or the WOTUS rule. This dangerous policy empowers Federal bureaucrats to place every single body of water—every ditch, every puddle, every stream—under Federal regulation. As a result, the livelihoods of our farmers and rural communities across the Nation—not just in Washington; all over the country—are at stake.

While it is clear to me, just as I know it is clear to my constituents, President Biden and Democrats are failing to display the leadership America needs and deserves, there is a silver lining here. American agriculture is strong. We have overcome far worse, and we will not let these radical policies hold us back from the job of feeding this Nation.

I call on the administration to take a good long look at how their policies are harming us here in central Washington and in rural communities across the country and take immediate steps to reverse them. We deserve far better.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. MANN for helping recognize the importance of American agriculture, and I appreciate his leadership.

□ 1945

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman. His leadership in agriculture, his leadership for the Western Caucus are very, very important, and I thank him for joining us tonight.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLER), a

staunch defender of farmers in his district and a fellow Congressional FFA Caucus member.

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman MANN for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, as National Agriculture Month comes to a close, I am reminded of a speech Paul Harvey delivered to the FFA in 1978. No truer words have ever been spoken about America's farmers.

Listening to the speech brings back memories of the days spent working with my stepdad on his farm. This is a tribute, again, to America's farmers, the work they do. And when I read this speech, it reminds me, I can see my stepdad those days working. But it is a tribute to all of the farmers in our great country.

So here are a few of the excerpts that I really like from this speech, and it goes like this.

It begins:

And on the 8th day, God looked down on his planned paradise, and said, "I need a caretaker."

So God made a farmer.

God said, I need somebody who can shape an ax handle from a persimmon sprout, shoe a horse with a hunk of car tire, who can make a harness out of haywire, feed sacks and shoe scraps. Whose planting time and harvest season will finish his 40-hour week by Tuesday noon, and then pain'n from tractor back, put in another 72 hours.

So God made a farmer.

It had to be somebody who'd plow deep and straight and not cut corners. Somebody to seed, weed, feed, breed, and rake and disc and plow and plant and tie the fleece and strain the milk and replenish the self-feeder and finish a hard week's work with a 5-mile drive to church.

Somebody who would bale a family together with the soft, strong bonds of sharing, who would laugh, and then sigh, and then reply, with smiling eyes, when his son says that he wants to spend his life doing what dad does.

So God made a farmer.

Thank you to America's farmers. This is a tribute to the work that you do every day on behalf of not just the United States, but our world.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for joining us tonight. And as you were reading that, I thought about my family, my grandparents and many producers all over America that that describes. Thank you very much for sharing that.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mrs. MILLER), who runs a grain and livestock farm with her husband and who has raised her children to be the 4th generation of farmers on her family farm in Illinois.

Mrs. MILLER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman MANN for hosting this Special Order.

Mr. Speaker, at the conclusion of National Agriculture Month, I would like to share how strongly I believe in the family farm as part of the American way of life. It has truly been a blessing to have our sons—who are the 4th generation—and their children—the 5th generation—working our land.

I am proud to be an Illinois farmer and to represent the farmers' needs in

Congress and on the Ag Committee. If Americans are hungry, really, what else matters?

The agriculture industry keeps Americans and the world fed, fueled, and clothed. I am so thankful for the work that the ag industry does and for their contributions to the GDP and Illinois and across our Nation.

America is on a dangerous path, losing our self-sufficiency in farming, which is why I introduced a bill in Congress to prevent China from buying up our farmland. Biden and the Democrats continue to push policies that promote Chinese-made batteries and solar panels instead of American biofuels.

National Agriculture Month is a great time to thank our farmers, ranchers, and agriculture professionals for their tireless work.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Illinois for joining us tonight.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. VALADAO), who represents our Nation's largest dairy district. He and his family operate a dairy farm; lives at the dairy.

Mr. VALADAO. Mr. Speaker, this is a great honor to be able to speak about the great people that feed our country.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to represent the farmers that feed the world. With less than 1 percent of our Nation's farmland, the Central Valley supplies a quarter of our Nation's food. Our well-deserved reputation as America's breadbasket comes from the help of nature and a whole lot of hard work and skill from our farmers, ranchers, and producers. But without water, we cannot grow our Nation's food at all.

Our Central Valley farming community has endured drought conditions and low water allocations for years. At a time when even the President is warning about global food shortages, we need to be supporting our agriculture producers here at home. That includes making sure that the Central Valley has the water they need to continue providing food for the world. We must fix complex and contradictory laws, court decisions, and regulations, and improve water storage infrastructure to bring more water to the Valley.

The livelihoods of my constituents and our global food supply depend on it.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for joining us tonight.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ELLZEY), the pride of Levelland, Texas, who farmed and ranched in the Texas Panhandle before he came to Congress.

Mr. ELLZEY. Mr. Speaker, I come before the House of Representatives to bring attention to National Agriculture Month. And, of course, before I begin my prepared remarks, I want to talk about what we see going on in Ukraine and Russia.

Ukraine is the breadbasket of that region. And 30 percent of all of the world's grain, wheat, is produced in that region. And as we talk about this

today, and in a few months we are going to be talking about it even more, about how the farms and ranches of the United States feed the entire world.

Over the past couple of years our farmers have faced unprecedented obstacles from COVID, COVID lockdowns, labor shortages, supply chain disruptions, high fuel prices, and record-high fertilizer prices. But as always, they have overcome those challenges, and they have kept Americans and the world fed during a time of great uncertainty.

Each American farmer feeds more than 165 people. Texas leads the Nation in the number of farms and ranches, with 248,416 farms and ranches covering 127 million acres. The ag industry is the pillar of a healthy and prosperous nation. And in the 6th Congressional District of Texas, we have a long history of farming and ranching. We are home to families like the Beeklys, the Patmans, the Buchholzes, the Borns, and the Dineens.

Many of them have earned the title of a "Texas Century Farm" or Texas Century Ranch. Those titles are only given to families that have served our country as farmers and ranchers for over 100 years. Families who get up before dawn to tend to crops and herd cattle. They are part of over 5,000 farms and ranches in my district.

So if you fed your family today, thank a farmer. Thank a rancher. And in Texas, thank a neighbor.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for joining us, and representing Texas in such a legacy of agriculture in a great State.

Mr. Speaker, I thank everyone who spoke today for helping Congress understand an agricultural perspective. As Dwight Eisenhower—who was from my State, from my district—said, Farming looks mighty easy when your plow is a pencil, and you are a thousand miles away from a cornfield. Today, it felt like the Members who spoke on this floor brought the farm a little closer to Capitol Hill, and for that, I thank them.

Congress uses the reauthorization of the farm bill every 5 years to determine the nature of our support for the men and women who feed, fuel, and clothe the world. America's food security is so important because it determines the strength of our national security. We will never be a secure country if we have to rely on other countries to feed ourselves.

Because of the tenacity of the American farmer, we are the most food secure country in the world, and I will do everything in my power to keep it that way.

As Congress determines how we will support farmers, ranchers, and agricultural producers in the 2023 farm bill, I encourage Members to imagine how different their lives would be without healthy American agriculture. From the food on our tables to the fuel in our cars to the fibers in our clothing to the roofs over our head, agriculture is all

around us, and we tend to take it for granted.

Well, it isn't granted. It is gifted. Every day American farmers, ranchers, and agricultural producers give us the gift of our quality of life in this country. Our comforts come from the sweat of their brows. The least this Congress can do is support their efforts wholeheartedly with a strong thoughtful 2023 farm bill and related legislation. The future of America depends on it.

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

RESCINDING TITLE 42 OF THE SOUTHERN BORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2021, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ROY) for 30 minutes.

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues for coming down here and talking about the importance of farming in the United States. One of the things we are dealing with, obviously, and talked about, is some fertilizer shortages. I know that firsthand, seeing some of the farms in the district I represent, West Texas and so forth. And we have got a lot of issues we have got to address.

And I just want to note, as a Texan—we had my fellow Texan down here just a little bit ago—that here we sit again. Here it is, March 31, in an empty Chamber again. It is the close of a quarter, a fiscal quarter. Members got their places to go, their dinners to go to.

We just ran through a handful of votes today. No amendments. No debates.

Here is the people's House in all its glory. No debate. No discussion.

Did we have a single debate here in the people's House about what is happening at our southern border today? Any discussion at all?

Does the Speaker of the House of Representatives give a rat's rear-end about South Texas or the rest of this country; about the ranchers that are dealing with a flood of people coming across our border, endangering them and their families? No, they don't care. They don't care at all. But I can tell you, we in Texas care. And the leadership of this body better start caring soon.

And let me just say something to all my fellow Republicans who just funded this government two weeks ago. Those of you who cut a deal, a deal with the devil, you are responsible for this, too. You funded this government. You funded the government that is allowing people to come across our border, that is empowering cartels, that is allowing migrants to get abused, that is causing ranchers to lose their livestock, ranchers to be endangered, fentanyl to pour across our border.

And now this administration has the gall to shut down Title 42 while Americans are still wearing masks on airplanes, while we still have men and

women in uniform being forced to get a needle stuck in their arm from the power of government. And the leadership, so-called leadership, of our government has the gall to shut down Title 42. The one thing allowing us to stop the flood at our border, even partially.

March of this year. This year. Right now. March, 200,000 apprehensions; 100,000 turned away under Title 42. But now the head of the CDC, in coordination with the Department of Homeland Security Secretary, is saying we are going to stop using Title 42.

Well, then what in the hell are you going to do? Nothing. Other than process more immigrants coming across our border who are not truly seeking asylum. But that is what is happening. And what is actually happening at our border right now is there are shootouts going on as we speak on a daily basis, between the Gulf Cartel—technically, the Jalisco New Generation Cartel, but Gulf Cartel CDG warring with Cartel del Noreste de Los Zetas.

And we are talking about dead people, dead bodies. People getting shot in their car. Bullets firing, flying all over our southern border. Dead individuals.

This young girl here, head blown off. All of this is happening every single day. All while American kids are dying from Xanax laced with fentanyl.

And again, I want to be clear here. When you take Title 42 away—you, Secretary Mayorkas; you, CDC Director Walensky; you, my Democratic colleagues who are countering and funding it; you, President Biden—when you take away Title 42, the blood is on your hands.

□ 2000

And we're talking about dead Americans, dead migrants, destroyed communities in Texas, empowered cartels. Literally last night in talking to people coming across the border, saying they are spending \$3,000 to \$5,000 to come up from Nicaragua, Venezuela, Cuba. There were 13,000 apprehensions from Russia in the last 5 months.

We are about to see an unprecedented explosion on our southern border. Again, this administration not only doesn't care, it is purposeful. It is 100 percent purposeful. Endangering the people of the United States, endangering migrants while—in the false name of compassion saying it is good for them, empowering cartels, knowing they are doing it. Knowing for the most part you do not have a legitimate claim for asylum.

They are purposely not enforcing the laws of the United States. They are purposely not using the tools at their disposal, like now ending Title 42. For what reason? For crass political purposes. That is your modern Democratic Party. Using migrants for political purposes and endangering them and Americans in the process.

It is a gross violation of the oath taken to defend the Constitution of the United States. It is fully and entirely

impeachable and every Republican should be agreeing to impeach Secretary Mayorkas on day one when we come into this body and we are in charge of the House of Representatives next January after the absolute feckless destruction of this country by an incompetent, destructive Democratic majority in this body, an incompetent destructive and flat out reckless administration refusing to enforce the laws of the United States. That is what is happening.

Oh, you going down there ranting on the floor again about the border? Well, excuse me, but it is Texas. And Texas needs to be starting to take a little action to tell the rest of this country to shove it up its rear end because Texas is taking it on the chin because the leadership of this country is forsaking Texas, hurting Texas, hurting my neighbors, hurting my community.

It is about time that it stops. It is about time that Republicans on this side of the aisle stop giving lip service to border security, choose to actually do their job and not fund the government that is refusing to enforce the laws.

I listened to Republican leadership down here on the floor a few weeks ago trying to tell me, oh—thank me for giving us more money for ICE and Border Patrol. Well, how the heck is that working out now? More money for more processing of more migrants getting abused by cartels. More money for more processing of more migrants to come into Uvalde, Texas, where the mayor just texted me 5 minutes ago. Tell them—in case you are wondering, that is you Democrats across the other side of the aisle, and by the way, Republican leadership—Tell them to come and see the—I will edit his remarks—crap show they have created 500 to 1,000 a day in Eagle Pass in Del Rio. No vetting.

These are human beings, Texans, people we represent, our communities. I promise my colleagues on the other side of the aisle they don't give a whit. They sit in their smug chairs in their committee hearings saying: Oh, this is all made up. There is nothing to it. It is all lies.

Just like the lie that President Biden said and his press secretary said when he accused Border Patrol agents of whipping people. They are flat out lies. Where are those Border Patrol agents now? Have they been returned to their job? Has a report come out? No.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOOD), my friend who accompanied me on a trip to the border about a month ago or so. He is a good friend and he understands what is actually happening at our border.

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas. We don't have a finer patriot and a more courageous warrior for freedom in the Congress, and I appreciate his leadership on this and so many issues. I appreciate him leading this discussion here on the floor tonight.

Never in the history of the country has our own President done more to intentionally harm the country than this President has done in his first year in Congress. Never in the history of the country has a President done more to harm the United States than this President has done willfully and intentionally than what he has done with the border in his first year.

We are averaging 7,000 illegals across the border a day right now. The administration is admitting that. They are allowing 7,000 illegals across the border a day. I had a constituent say to me on the phone just 2 days ago: Nothing this administration is doing makes sense unless they hate the country. Nothing that this administration is doing makes sense unless they hate the country.

Whether you are talking about the crime crisis, the inflation crisis, our diminished standing on the national stage, the spending crisis, the energy crisis, what we are doing to American energy and making us depend on foreign nations who hate us. I think at the top of that list is what we are doing at the border.

When I ran for the first time 2 years ago I identified the greatest threats to the country. I believe those threats are our education system, indoctrination of our kids K to 12 and college campuses, our runaway radical spending that is bankrupting our future, and then our immigration and border situation. Nothing has changed my mind to that effect in my first year here.

Mr. Speaker, I have been to the border four times and I am well-aware that Virginia's Fifth District is not geographically physically located at the border. We just had an MS-13 gang member convicted of murder in my hometown of Lynchburg, Virginia, who illegally came across the border. This President's policies are making every town a border town, every State a border State.

Everything and everyone that comes across that border comes under the control of the Mexican crime cartels. It has threatened the security of our Nation. It is an economic security issue. It is a health security issue. It certainly is a national security issue.

The projection that I am seeing with the ending of Title 42—the egregious attempt to end Title 42—the projections I am seeing is it will take it from 7,000 a day to 18,000 a day. That is 7,000 a day to 18,000 a day, perhaps even tripling what has already happened. We had 2 million crossings a year ago. Extrapolate that out for 4 years.

Are we going to allow this President to have 8 million come across at the current pace? My most recent trip to the border that my friend from Texas was mentioning was to Del Rio, Texas. He led a trip to Del Rio, Texas. You might remember, that is where we had Bidentown just a few weeks ago with 20,000 Haitian migrants assembled under the bridge there in Bidentown in Del Rio, Texas.

While we don't have that still today because they distributed those migrants—those illegals—into the interior of the country, which they are doing all the time, by the way. Flying and bussing illegal aliens in the dark of night wherever they want to go throughout the country with no requirement of a court date to appear. It is a pinky promise that we will get back with you in the future and give you a date to appear.

While we don't have 20,000 in Bidentown under the bridge right now in Del Rio, Texas, right through that corridor, Border Patrol and the ranchers and the sheriffs that were there told us it is 1,000 a day through there. So every 3 weeks you got a repeat of what we saw with Bidentown just a few weeks ago in Del Rio, Texas.

Does this administration care? Every resource they have committed or directed to that border has been to facilitate—to willfully, purposely facilitate—more illegals crossing into our country and to hide it from the American people.

There has been no effort by this administration in this President's first year to stem it, to stop it, instead, they try to facilitate and hide it from the American people. Now they want to make it worse, two or three times worse with what they are doing with Title 42.

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, before I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, I just want to pick up on something that the gentleman from Virginia said and see if he would agree. If Title 42 goes away, our country is completely open to anyone who wants to come. Would the gentleman agree?

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. Absolutely.

Mr. ROY. Everyone who has been turned away, it has almost entirely been done under Title 42.

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. That is right.

Mr. ROY. Now, for the listeners at home, Title 42 is a health code provision allowing our officials in government to turn people away if we have a communicable disease environment, like we do during the COVID pandemic. Now, we can do it for any number of communicable diseases, but we got that in place now.

Roughly half of the folks have been turned away under Title 42. Would the gentleman agree?

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. Yes, but they are turnarounds coming right back.

Mr. ROY. So to that point, would it surprise the gentleman that under the administration we have turned away 1.7 million people under Title 42?

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. Since 2019 when that was instated, right?

Mr. ROY. Yeah, including the time under the Trump administration. So 1.7 million times during the pandemic all the people that were turned back would likely have been let in and released into the United States under this administration. Some of those are repeats.

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. That is right.

Mr. ROY. Something along the lines of a million people that would have been released into the United States last year. Does the gentleman agree?

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. Absolutely.

Mr. ROY. Another point. Of the people that have come into the United States and are being encountered, these are all not just nice people looking for a job, are they?

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. There are 160 different countries.

Mr. ROY. One hundred sixty different countries. Roughly, 10,763 criminal noncitizens and at least 3,662 have been arrested thus far in fiscal year 2022. The combined timeframes include roughly 85 convictions of manslaughter or homicide, 604 sexual offenses, and 2,892 convictions of illegal drug possession and trafficking. Based on reports at least 14 illegal migrants who are on the terrorist watch list were stopped at the southern border in fiscal year 2021.

The biggest problem is what?

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. The got-aways.

Mr. ROY. The got-aways. The more than half a million known got-aways—known—known got-aways—last year. So if we have got people we are catching on the terrorist watch list, if we have got criminals convicted of sex crimes, convicted of murder and manslaughter that we are catching—but that is all people the Border Patrol is running across and they are often turning themselves in. All of those known got-aways, do you think those are just the angels seeking a nice job?

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. These aren't the ones dressed head to toe in camo with the carpet shoes on who are evading capture, are they?

Mr. ROY. It would be.

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. How about that.

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY), one of the great patriots and I am proud to call him my friend.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Texas, he has been the consummate crusader on this issue. If not for him, this would even be more ignored in Washington, D.C., than it is already. I just think about a scant month ago—a month and a half ago or so—the President of the United States stood right there and talked about securing the border.

It is unfathomable to me. We used to not say lie in the world of politics about your opponent or the other party, but I don't know what else that is other than a lie. I come from Pennsylvania, we are not on the border where Mr. ROY represents, where his communities and his State is being completely overrun. Pennsylvania is far from the border. We got Route 81. We got Route 83. The fentanyl comes up.

The President took an oath to faithfully discharge the laws of this country, but just abrogating them. You just wonder who is he representing? Whose citizens is he representing because the

people in my community, the people all across the country are dying at record levels from drugs coming across the southern border, and nothing is happening to stop it.

It is not only people coming here illegally and taking your jobs—all these different languages that your school has to teach now. Somebody is going to pay for that. Who can afford this? Whose job is it to safeguard America? If it is not the President's job, whose job is it? CHIP ROY is trying. BOB GOOD is trying.

We can't keep Title 42 in place. Even better yet, the question should be: Why isn't Remain in Mexico in place? Seek asylum the correct way. Stay in the first country you come to if you are indeed oppressed and you are suffering political retribution for your beliefs or religious persecution—the first country you come to.

The first country you come to when you travel through Mexico—when you fly into Mexico from one of the other 160-190 countries on the planet isn't the United States, it is Mexico. Yet, the President says the border is open. These people aren't coming to the White House, ladies and gentlemen, they are coming to your house. They are coming to your community. They are not going to Joe Biden's house in Delaware. They are not coming to Pennsylvania Avenue. They are coming to your house and your community and they are bringing the drugs with them, human trafficking.

And for goodness sakes—your taxes—75 percent of the people on this side of the aisle just supported more spending for this. You know what it does? BOB GOOD is right. You are not going see them all piled up under the bridge in Del Rio because we are going to hire more people to move them more efficiently into your town because they don't like that look.

They are not hired to stop them, they are hired to more efficiently have them come to your town and your community, including the people on the terrorist watch list, criminals, the fentanyl, the human trafficking coming to your town. Well, thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. ROY. I would ask my friend from Pennsylvania if he is aware that our colleague and colleague in the House Freedom Caucus, our friend YVETTE HERRELL from New Mexico, introduced legislation a year ago—actually over a year ago to require the use of Title 42. Is that right?

□ 2015

Mr. PERRY. That is right. And all we need is enough people to sign it. Whether you are a Democrat or you are a Republican, these folks are coming. The fentanyl is coming to your town. The overdoses are coming to your town. All you have to do, if your leadership says: We refuse to move this bill that the American people want, maintain this Title 42, all you have to do is go down and sign that piece of paper,

and we can do it. Leadership can't hold us up.

But they don't want to do it, do they?

Mr. ROY. They do not. And I want to make sure for every American out there to understand the truth. If you are disgusted about what is happening at our border, if you are concerned about what is actually happening to our communities, there is a way we can solve the problem without Speaker PELOSI making the decisions. Because that is how things work. We don't ever debate, we don't ever amend, and we don't actually have discussion in the people's House. The Speaker in a back-room decides what happens on the floor, vote "yes" or "no," walk out, and give a press conference.

But we can do something about that. There is a tool. It is called a discharge petition. We have a discharge petition at the desk to try to empower the actual Representatives of this country. We have 200 and I think now eight Republicans on that discharge petition.

Mr. PERRY. How many Democrats?

Mr. ROY. We have zero Democrats—not one Democrat—on that discharge petition. Now, I want everybody to think about that. The Democrats in this body apparently are so beholden to the radical idea of wide-open borders and not implementing Title 42 while Americans are being forced to wear masks on airplanes, and while Americans are getting a jab needle stuck in their arm by force of government if they are in the military or Border Patrol or any other Federal employee while there is still a Federal health emergency in place under order of the President.

Mr. PERRY. We are firing people who were on the front lines at the beginning of the pandemic without it, where there was no vaccine present, right?

They went out. They went out and risked their lives not knowing what they were dealing with, and now unless they take the jab, now they are out of work.

Mr. ROY. So while that is in place, we have a discharge petition where we can bring to the floor and vote to force enforcement of Title 42 in this country, and not one of our Democratic colleagues will join us in that.

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. How many Democrat Members have we got from Texas?

Mr. ROY. We have 13.

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. That would get us past 218, wouldn't it, 13 plus 8, 208?

Mr. ROY. It sure would. I think there are somewhere around 50 Democratic Members from border States if you count New Mexico, Arizona, California, and Texas.

So where are my Democratic colleagues in border States?

I think they ought to be asked. I want to know why won't my Democratic colleagues from border States or anywhere else in the country say they believe that we ought to enforce Title 42?

Because guess what? There are a few Senators who have said so.

Isn't that right?

Mr. PERRY. There are a few Senators. I think there are a few Representatives who said so, too. They can put their money, so to speak, where their mouth is. You can say it, but you can take some action. Talk is cheap, right? Take some action and walk down there and sign the paper. And once one does, maybe a few more will because their constituents—their bosses, their citizens, and their communities—are being wrecked, too.

Mr. ROY. It is a way to wrestle control of the people's House away from a handful of self-anointed individuals who are wrecking this country in the name of so-called democracy.

Does my friend from Virginia agree?

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. Absolutely. You mentioned Secretary Mayorkas. He has said the border is secure. The border is secure he has said, when as you know we have lost operational control of our border.

The Mexican crime cartels are making hundreds of millions of dollars a month off sex trafficking, drug trafficking, child trafficking, human trafficking, you name it. Everyone and everything that comes across that border comes under the control of the Mexican crime cartel.

There is no humane component to it. They are finding dead bodies at the border of people who were trying—they starved or they got dehydrated or they just couldn't make the journey or something happened to them on the way. And you talk about Remain in Mexico policy, instead of Remain in Mexico policy, the MPP, that was in place under the Trump administration. We have got the United Nations using our own resources that we pay the United Nations to help illegals cheat our asylum system. So the United Nations is taking resources that the United States is giving to them to use to train illegals on how to cheat our asylum system and how to gain access into our country by claiming asylum.

Then the Democratic Party 20 years ago passed a law that prohibits the requirement of proof of citizenship to vote. Now, of course, they don't want any ID in order to vote, and you have got the President promising amnesty to anybody who is here illegally.

Do you think there is incentive to cheat our voting system and to vote illegally when there is no requirement of proof of citizenship, there is no ID to vote, and you have got the promise of amnesty?

We have essentially got illegals with a license to vote here in this country right now, and here we want to continue to ramp it up, to take it from 7,000 a day to an estimate of maybe 18,000 a day by eliminating Title 42.

Mr. PERRY. Would the gentleman also agree that it is not only the U.N. that your tax dollars are going for, actually in this body they voted recently to pay for attorneys to go help those

folks who came across the border illegally navigate the system.

Now, you go try that. You go break the law wantonly and then appeal to your Federal Government to pay for your attorney to get around the law that you just broke wantonly.

Mr. ROY. Both my friends, the gentleman from Pennsylvania and the gentleman from Virginia, you guys are both fathers, correct?

Mr. PERRY. Indeed.

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. ROY. Do you think that there is anything compassionate—when my colleagues on the other side of aisle like to talk about their compassion for migrants who are seeking to come to this country, do my friends think there is anything at all compassionate about a little girl getting raped in a stash house in Houston, Texas, as we speak?

Or being driven up and put into the sex trafficking trade up I-35 or across I-10 in the southern part of the United States?

Or trafficked to anywhere throughout the rest of this country?

Do you think that is compassion?

Do you think it is compassionate for a young woman to be getting shot up in a cartel warfare happening at south Texas, happening along the Rio Grande in northern Mexico?

Is that compassion?

Is it compassion?

Mr. PERRY. What about the rape trees?

We have been to the border. We have seen the little shoes all stacked up at the border. These are little children. And Representative Roy is absolutely right, as trophies, can you imagine little girls, or somebody's—anybody's—little girls, little girl panties hanging from a tree as a trophy?

This is what our colleagues on the other side of the aisle refuse to acknowledge, like it is not happening, like it has never happened. But it is happening every single day. Somebody—somebody—has got to do something about it.

Mr. ROY. Is it compassionate for the young man or young woman of the 100,000 or so last year who died from drug overdoses to take Xanax and it be laced with fentanyl and die?

Is that something that is compassionate?

My friend from Virginia, do you think these are compassionate things to be doing?

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. The number one killer of Americans between the age of 18 and 45 last year was drug overdoses. And yet we are allowing the most dangerous drugs, fentanyl and other dangerous drugs, to stream across the border.

The only way you get across the border, the Mexican border, into the United States is to pay the Mexican crime cartels. Border Patrol and the local sheriffs will tell you: If you try to cross apart from the cartels, they will kill you. You come either beholden to them, essentially an indentured servant, with pledge of your family back

home if you don't have the cash up front—they will kill your family if you don't pay—or you work it off. You work it off by trafficking drugs across or trafficking children or trafficking women across the border. There is nothing compassionate about that.

Mr. ROY. One of my good friends who was a former Texas Department of Public Safety expert on these issues dealing with cartels just sent me a text showing me video from last night at the border, and individuals they were recording were saying they were paying \$3,000 or \$5,000 to get across the river.

How is that compassionate?

They are going to have to make a monthly payment to cartels. A lot of those payments are going to come in the form of sex trafficking and labor trafficking.

I have about 1½ minutes remaining. I would just say—and I thank my friends for joining me down here on the House floor—that this is a solvable problem right now. This could be stopped right now. It could be stopped right now.

Mr. PERRY. This hour.

Mr. ROY. This hour. This moment.

But where is President Biden?

Where is Secretary Mayorkas?

Other than purposely ignoring the laws of the United States to endanger the American people and the migrants who seek to come here, where are they?

And why shouldn't we be impeaching Secretary Mayorkas for failing to faithfully execute the laws of the United States and causing death and destruction to Americans' property and to American people in the form of drug overdoses, in the form of the endangerment of our citizens and, again, the migrants who seek to come here?

I would ask that question of all my colleagues on the other side of the aisle: You can take this back and wrestle it away from the administration. Sign that discharge petition. Let's have a vote. Let's have a debate.

What are my colleagues afraid of?

The truth?

What are they afraid of?

The rule of law?

What are they afraid of?

A secure America?

Migrants who get to come here safely?

Put aside the politics and stand up for our country. That is our job as Members of the House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlemen from Virginia and Pennsylvania for their leadership.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair, not to a perceived viewing audience.

PUBLICATION OF BUDGETARY MATERIAL

REVISIONS TO THE AGGREGATES, ALLOCATIONS, AND OTHER BUDGETARY LEVELS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2022 RELATED TO LEGISLATION REPORTED BY THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET,
Washington, DC, March 31, 2022.

MADAM SPEAKER: Pursuant to the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (CBA) and the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2021 (S. Con. Res. 14 (117th Congress)), I hereby submit for printing in the Congressional Record a revision to the aggregates and allocations set forth in the Statement of Aggregates, Allocations, and Other Budgetary Levels for Fiscal Year 2022 published in the Congressional Record on October 27, 2021, as revised.

This adjustment responds to House consideration of the bill, the Marijuana Opportunity Reinvestment and Expungement Act, or the MORE Act (H.R. 3617), as provided for consideration in the House pursuant to H. Res. 1017. This adjustment is allowable under sections 3003(b) and 4007 of S. Con. Res. 14 (117th). It shall apply while that legislation is under consideration and take effect upon the enactment of that legislation.

Accordingly, I am revising the aggregate revenue level for fiscal years 2022–2031 and the allocation for the House Committee on the Judiciary for fiscal years 2022–2031. For purposes of enforcing titles III and IV of the CBA and other budgetary enforcement provisions, the revised aggregates and allocation are to be considered as aggregates and allocations included in the budget resolution, pursuant to the Statement published in the Congressional Record on October 27, 2021, as revised.

Questions may be directed to Jennifer Wheelock or Kellie Larkin of the Budget Committee staff.

Sincerely,

JOHN YARMUTH,
Chairman.

TABLE 1.—BUDGET AGGREGATE TOTALS

[On-budget amounts in millions of dollars]

	2022	2022–2031
Current Aggregates:		
Budget Authority	4,167,897	n.a.
Outlays Total	4,505,271	n.a.
Revenues	3,401,380	38,957,374
Revision for the MORE Act (H.R. 3617):		
Budget Authority	0	n.a.
Outlays Total	0	n.a.
Revenues	n.a.	8,075
Revised Aggregates:		
BA	4,167,897	n.a.
OT	4,505,271	n.a.
Revenues	3,401,380	38,965,449

n.a. = Not applicable because annual appropriations for fiscal years 2023 through 2031 will not be considered until future sessions of Congress.

TABLE 2.—REVISED ALLOCATON OF SPENDING AUTHORITY TO THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

[On-budget amounts in millions of dollars]

	2022	2022–2031
Current Aggregates:		
BA	16,626	145,384
OT	15,627	146,339
Revision for the MORE Act (H.R. 3617):		
BA	0	8,095
OT	0	5,167
Revised Allocation:		
BA	16,626	153,479
OT	15,627	151,506

PUBLICATION OF BUDGETARY MATERIAL

REVISIONS TO THE AGGREGATES, ALLOCATIONS, AND OTHER BUDGETARY LEVELS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2022 RELATED TO LEGISLATION REPORTED BY THE COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET,
Washington, DC, March 31, 2022.

MADAM SPEAKER: Pursuant to the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (CBA) and the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2021 (S. Con. Res. 14 (117th Congress)), I hereby submit for printing in the Congressional Record a revision to the aggregates and allocations set forth in the Statement of Aggregates, Allocations, and Other Budgetary Levels for Fiscal Year 2022 published in the Congressional Record on October 27, 2021, as revised.

This adjustment responds to House consideration of the bill, the Affordable Insulin Now Act (H.R. 6833), as provided for consideration in the House pursuant to H. Res. 1017. This adjustment is allowable under sections 3003(b) and 4007 of S. Con. Res. 14 (117th). It shall apply while that legislation is under consideration and take effect upon the enactment of that legislation.

Accordingly, I am revising the aggregate spending level for fiscal year 2022 and the aggregate revenue level for fiscal years 2022 and 2022–2031 and the allocation for the House Committee on Energy and Commerce for fiscal years 2022 and 2022–2031. For purposes of enforcing titles III and IV of the CBA and other budgetary enforcement provisions, the revised aggregates and allocation are to be considered as aggregates and allocations included in the budget resolution, pursuant to the Statement published in the Congressional Record on October 27, 2021, as revised.

Questions may be directed to Jennifer Wheelock or Kellie Larkin of the Budget Committee staff.

Sincerely,

JOHN YARMUTH,
Chairman.

TABLE 1.—BUDGET AGGREGATE TOTALS

[On-budget amounts in millions of dollars]

	2022	2022–2031
Current Aggregates:		
Budget Authority	4,167,897	n.a.
Outlays Total	4,505,271	n.a.
Revenues	3,401,380	38,957,374
Revision for the Affordable Insulin Now Act (H.R. 6833):		
Budget Authority	9,044	n.a.
Outlays Total	5,788	n.a.
Revenues	n.a.	– 3,500
Revised Aggregates:		
BA	4,176,939	n.a.
OT	4,511,059	n.a.
Revenues	3,401,380	38,953,874

n.a. = Not applicable because annual appropriations for fiscal years 2023 through 2031 will not be considered until future sessions of Congress.

TABLE 2.—REVISED ALLOCATION OF SPENDING AUTHORITY TO THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE

[On-budget amounts in millions of dollars]

	2022	2022–2031
Current Allocation:		
BA	640,914	8,627,826
OT	663,681	8,667,118
Revision for the Affordable Insulin Now Act (H.R. 6833):		
BA	9,044	– 4,793
OT	5,788	– 4,793
Revised Allocation:		
BA	649,958	8,623,033
OT	669,469	8,662,325

ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 11(b) of House Resolution 188, the House stands adjourned until 9 a.m. tomorrow.

Thereupon (at 8 o'clock and 25 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, April 1, 2022, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS,
ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV,

EC-3701. A letter from the Senior Bureau Official, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's interim final rule — International Traffic in Arms Regulations: Consolidation and Restructuring of Purposes and Definitions [Public Notice: 11657] (RIN: 1400-AE27) received March 30, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868), was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON
PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. PERLMUTTER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 1017. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3617) to decriminalize and deschedule cannabis, to provide for reinvestment in certain persons adversely impacted by the War on Drugs, to provide for expungement of certain cannabis offenses, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 6833) to amend title XXVII of the Public Health Service Act, the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, and the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to establish requirements with respect to cost-sharing for certain insulin products, and for other purposes; and for other purposes (Rept. 117-285). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. PALLONE. Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 1218. A bill to require the Federal Communications Commission to incorporate data on maternal health outcomes into its broadband health maps; with an amendment (Rept. 117-286). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PALLONE. Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 2501. A bill to require the National Telecommunications and Information Administration and the Federal Communications Commission to update the memorandum of understanding on spectrum coordination; with an amendment (Rept. 117-287). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Ms. VAN DUYNE (for herself, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas, Mr. STAUBER, Mr. MEUSER, Ms. TENNEY, Mr. GARBARINO, Mrs. KIM of California, Mr. DONALDS, Ms. SALAZAR, and Mr. FITZGERALD):

H.R. 7307. A bill to require the Administrator of the Small Business Administration

to ensure that the small business regulatory budget for a fiscal year is not greater zero, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mrs. GREENE of Georgia:

H.R. 7308. A bill to direct the Inspector General of the Department of Health and Human Services to investigate and report on the Vaccine Adverse Event Reporting System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SCOTT of Virginia (for himself, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mrs. CHERFILUS-McCORMICK, Mr. COURTNEY, Mrs. HAYES, Mr. JONES, Mrs. MCBATH, Mr. MFUME, Mr. MORELLE, Mr. MRVAN, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. SABLON, Ms. STEVENS, Ms. SHERRILL, Mr. TAKANO, and Mr. LEVIN of Michigan):

H.R. 7309. A bill to reauthorize the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. MCBATH (for herself, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. UNDERWOOD, and Ms. MANNING):

H.R. 7310. A bill to protect America's retirement security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MEEKS (for himself, Mr. McCAUL, Ms. BASS, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey):

H.R. 7311. A bill to direct the Secretary of State to develop and submit to Congress a strategy and implementation plan outlining United States efforts to counter the malign influence and activities of the Russian Federation and its proxies in Africa, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KEATING (for himself, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. GIMENEZ, Mr. MEIJER, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. WILD, Mr. VICENTE GONZALEZ of Texas, and Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York):

H.R. 7312. A bill to prohibit the use of Federal funds to support or facilitate the participation of the Russian Federation in the Group of Seven, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. ADAMS (for herself, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Ms. SEWELL, Mr. TURNER, and Mr. BOWMAN):

H.R. 7313. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to improve programs for minority students in STEM fields, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BARR:

H.R. 7314. A bill to require the Secretary of State to submit to Congress a report on the People's Republic of China's support to the Russian Federation with respect to its unprovoked invasion of and full-scale war against Ukraine, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. MURPHY of North Carolina, Mr. GOSAR, and Mr. BUCK):

H.R. 7315. A bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to formally recognize caregivers of veterans, notify veterans and caregivers of clinical determinations relating to eligibility for caregiver programs, and temporarily extend benefits for veterans who are determined ineligible for the family care-

giver program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. MURPHY of North Carolina, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. FITZPATRICK, and Mr. BUCK):

H.R. 7316. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to furnish hyperbaric oxygen therapy to veterans with traumatic brain injury or post-traumatic stress disorder; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. BROWN of Ohio (for herself, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. KELLER, and Mr. BALDERSON):

H.R. 7317. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to incentivize food donation through tax credits and deductions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CASTRO of Texas:

H.R. 7318. A bill to amend the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act to clarify the career services provided to adults and dislocated workers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CAWTHORN (for himself, Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina, Mr. BUDD, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. FOXX, Mr. HUDSON, Ms. MANNING, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. MURPHY of North Carolina, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Ms. ROSS, and Mr. ROUZER):

H.R. 7319. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 33 Coxe Avenue, in Asheville, North Carolina, as the "Dorothy Hansine Andersen Post Office"; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. COHEN (for himself, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. BOWMAN, Ms. TLAB, and Ms. McCOLLUM):

H.R. 7320. A bill to help local educational agencies replace zero-tolerance disciplinary policies and punitive discipline in elementary and secondary schools with restorative practices; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DEFAZIO (for himself, Mr. BACON, Ms. BROWNLEY, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Mr. KATKO, Ms. MALLIOTAKIS, Mr. MCKINLEY, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PAPPAS, Mr. SIREN, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. VAN DREW):

H.R. 7321. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to require certain air carriers to provide reports with respect to maintenance, preventive maintenance, or alterations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. DELAURO:

H.R. 7322. A bill to require coverage for scalp cooling items under group health plans and group and individual health insurance coverage, specified Federal health care programs, and the Federal Employees Health Benefits Program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, Armed Services, Veterans' Affairs, and Oversight and Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ESPAILLAT:

H.R. 7323. A bill to amend the Workforce Innovation Opportunity Act to codify the Department of Labor's Reentry Employment Opportunities grants, authorizing a competitive grant program that aims to assist justice-involved adults and youth returning from incarceration with achieving academic success, employment, reducing the involvement of youth in crime and violence, and

avoiding recidivism; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. FISCHBACH (for herself, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS, Mr. PFLUGER, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. ESTES, Mr. LAMALFA, and Mr. STAUBER):

H.R. 7324. A bill to delay the effectiveness of certain new rules or regulations relating to the United States energy sector; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. FITZGERALD (for himself, Mr. ISSA, Mr. WALTZ, Mr. C. SCOTT FRANKLIN of Florida, Mr. BUCK, Ms. STEFANIK, and Mr. GOHMERT):

H.R. 7325. A bill to direct the Attorney General to prepare a report on the Department of Justice activities related to countering Chinese national security threats, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GALLEGO (for himself, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. CURTIS, and Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ):

H.R. 7326. A bill to amend the Help America Vote Act of 2002 to explicitly authorize distribution of grant funds to the voting accessibility protection and advocacy system of the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands and the system serving the American Indian consortium, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HILL:

H.R. 7327. A bill to encourage the timely use of funds provided under the emergency rental assistance programs administered by the Secretary of the Treasury, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH:

H.R. 7328. A bill to establish reporting requirements for issuers of fiat currency-backed stablecoins, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. HUFFMAN (for himself and Mr. DEFAZIO):

H.R. 7329. A bill to amend the Smith River National Recreation Area Act to include certain additions to the Smith River National Recreation Area, to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to designate certain wild rivers in the State of Oregon, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. JACKSON (for himself, Mrs. MURPHY of Florida, Ms. SALAZAR, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mrs. MILLER of West Virginia, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. BUDD, Mrs. RODGERS of Washington, Mr. ELLZEY, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. C. SCOTT FRANKLIN of Florida, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. MANN, Mr. CARL, Mr. FALLON, Mr. ZELDIN, Mr. MEIJER, and Mr. RUTHERFORD):

H.R. 7330. A bill to require annual reports on the military capabilities of Iran-backed entities and the impact of lifted sanctions on such capabilities, prohibit the availability of Federal funds to such entities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KILMER (for himself, Mr. TIMMONS, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. COMER, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. MACE, Mr.

KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mr. NORMAN, Ms. PORTER, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. AUCHINCLOSS, and Mr. RUTHERFORD):

H.R. 7331. A bill to require the Comptroller General of the United States to provide certain information with respect to unimplemented priority recommendations as part of the Comptroller General's annual reporting to Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mrs. KIM of California (for herself, Mr. BERA, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mrs. STEEL):

H.R. 7332. A bill to reauthorize the North Korean Human Rights Act of 2004, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. LEE of Nevada (for herself and Mr. TONY GONZALES of Texas):

H.R. 7333. A bill to direct the Secretary of Education to establish a program to assist certain schools with respect to the implementation of wraparound services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. LUETKEMEYER (for himself and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ):

H.R. 7334. A bill to extend the statute of limitations for fraud by borrowers under certain COVID-19 economic injury disaster loan programs of the Small Business Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mrs. LURIA:

H.R. 7335. A bill to improve coordination between the Veterans Health Administration and the Veterans Benefits Administration with respect to claims for compensation arising from military sexual trauma, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York (for herself, Ms. SPEIER, and Ms. SHERRILL):

H.R. 7336. A bill to establish a Gender Equity in College Sports Commission; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York (for herself, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. BUSH, and Mr. COOPER):

H.R. 7337. A bill to require the Archivist of the United States to submit a plan to Congress to eliminate the records backlog at the National Personnel Records Center, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. MEEKS (for himself and Mr. MCCAUL):

H.R. 7338. A bill to require congressional notification prior to payments of Department of State rewards using cryptocurrencies, authorize the appointment of a Director of Digital Currency Security in the Office of Economic Sanctions Policy and Implementation of the Department of State, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MEIJER (for himself, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. NEWHOUSE, and Mr. BACON):

H.R. 7339. A bill to establish the Office of the Special Inspector General for Infrastructure Projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MEUSER (for himself and Ms. WILD):

H.R. 7340. A bill to provide for congressional oversight of certain sanctions imposed with respect to the Russian Federation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. NEWHOUSE:

H.R. 7341. A bill to move the taxpayer bill of rights to the front of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, to establish minimum competency standards for tax return preparers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NORCROSS:

H.R. 7342. A bill to amend the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act relating to adult education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PERRY:

H.R. 7343. A bill to exempt certain vessels transporting crude oil and petroleum products from certain coastwise endorsement requirements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. PERRY:

H.R. 7344. A bill to amend title 46, United States Code, to prohibit certain grants from financing or refinancing projects that support the development, manufacturing, staging, maintenance, or deployment of offshore wind energy infrastructure, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD (for herself, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Ms. BASS, Mr. CARSON, Ms. CHU, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. DELAULO, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KHANNA, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. NORTON, Ms. PORTER, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. WILSON of Florida, and Ms. JAYAPAL):

H.R. 7345. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to strengthen the provisions relating to child labor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. SALAZAR (for herself and Ms. PINGREE):

H.R. 7346. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage and payment of Alpha-1 Antitrypsin Deficiency Disorder treatment under part B of such title, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. SHERRILL:

H.R. 7347. A bill to reauthorize workforce development innovation grants for the implementation, expansion, and evaluation of evidence-based workforce programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. SPANBERGER (for herself and Mr. GALLAGHER):

H.R. 7348. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to establish a refundable tax credit for commercial truck drivers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. STEFANIK (for herself, Mr. ALLEN, Mrs. STEEL, and Ms. LETLOW):

H.R. 7349. A bill to amend the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act to identify or develop assessments to measure the prior knowledge, skills, competencies, and experiences of an individual, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. THOMPSON of California (for himself, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. SWALWELL, Ms. BROWNLEY, Ms. CHU, Ms. PORTER, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. PANETTA, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. BARRAGAN, and Ms. BASS):

H.R. 7350. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt certain late unemployment payments from taxation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ:

H.R. 7351. A bill to amend the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 to provide for the supervision of nondepository persons offering or making small business loans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ (for herself and Mr. LUETKEMEYER):

H.R. 7352. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to extend the statute of limitation for fraud by borrowers under the Paycheck Protection Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mrs. WALORSKI (for herself, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. WALBERG, Ms. CRAIG, and Ms. SHERRILL):

H.R. 7353. A bill to amend title XXVII of the Public Health Service Act, the Employee Retirement Income and Security Act of 1974, and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to treat benefits for telehealth services offered under a group health plan or group health insurance coverage as excepted benefits; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Education and Labor, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. LOFGREN (for herself, Mr. JEFFRIES, and Mr. BUTTERFIELD):

H. Con. Res. 82. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of a revised and updated version of the House document entitled "Black Americans in Congress, 1870-1989"; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Ms. MACE:

H. Con. Res. 83. Concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2022 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2023 through 2031; to the Committee on the Budget.

By Ms. WEXTON (for herself, Ms. NEWMAN, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia, Mr. MOULTON, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas, Mr. WELCH, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. QUIGLEY, Ms. JACOBS of California, Mr. CASTEN, Mr. SWALWELL, Mr. POCAN, Mr. TORRES of New York, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. PAPPAS, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. HORSFORD, Ms. MENG, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Ms. TITUS, Ms. CRAIG, Mr. KILMER, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. EVANS, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. KAHELE, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, and Mr. LARSON of Connecticut):

H. Con. Res. 84. Concurrent resolution supporting the goals and ideals of International Transgender Day of Visibility; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARDENAS (for himself, Mr. AGUILAR, Ms. BASS, Ms. BARRAGAN, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Ms. CHU, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. EVANS, Mr. GALLEGO, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mr. GOMEZ, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. MCNERNEY, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. NADLER,

Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. NORTON, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. PETERS, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. RUIZ, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. STANTON, Ms. TITUS, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. VELA, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. CARBAJAL, Ms. BROWNLEY, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. CARSON, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. CORREA, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. JACOBS of California, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, and Mr. SCHIFF):

H. Res. 1018. A resolution recognizing March 31 as "César Chávez Day" in honor of the accomplishments and legacy of César Estrada Chávez; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. EVANS (for himself, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. SCANLON, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. PAPPAS, Ms. CRAIG, Mr. TORRES of New York, Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. TAKANO, and Mr. JONES):

H. Res. 1019. A resolution expressing support for the designation of May 2, 2022, as "Dr. John E. Fryer Day"; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

ML-151. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the House of Representatives of Arkansas, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 1001, expressing support of requests for federal grant funding for companies creating innovative technologies that benefit Arkansas' agricultural value chain through mitigating bio-security risks; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture.

ML-152. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of Missouri, relative to House Resolution No. 3658, urging the United States to take prudent and responsible measures to ensure that the required force posture is present in Europe to deter and, if necessary, defeat Russian aggression against any NATO member; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

ML-153. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of Missouri, relative to House Resolution No. 3658, urging the United States to take prudent and responsible measures to ensure that the required force posture is present in Europe to deter and, if necessary, defeat Russian aggression against any NATO member; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

ML-154. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Michigan, relative to Senate Resolution No. 113, condemning the Russian invasion of Ukraine and urging the world community to join together in sanctioning Russia; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ML-155. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of Colorado, relative to House Joint Resolution No. 22-1002, requesting that Congress allow the State of Colorado to conduct an analysis of and possibly move forward on harmonizing the gross vehicle weight for trucks on the interstate highway system in Colorado with that of other state highways; which was referred to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representa-

tives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Ms. VAN DUYNE:

H.R. 7307.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mrs. GREENE of Georgia:

H.R. 7308.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, United States Constitution

By Mr. SCOTT of Virginia:

H.R. 7309.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mrs. MCBATH:

H.R. 7310.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Commerce Clause:

To regulate commerce with states, other nations, and Native American tribes.

Necessary and Proper Clause:

Authority to create laws that are necessary and proper to carry out the laws of the land

By Mr. MEEKS:

H.R. 7311.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution

By Mr. KEATING:

H.R. 7312.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Ms. ADAMS:

H.R. 7313.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Under Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution.

By Mr. BARR:

H.R. 7314.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. BIGGS:

H.R. 7315.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article one Section 8

By Mr. BIGGS:

H.R. 7316.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article one Section 8

By Ms. BROWN of Ohio:

H.R. 7317.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section VIII

By Mr. CASTRO of Texas:

H.R. 7318.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Constitutional Authority—Necessary and Proper Clause (Art. I, Sec. 8, Clause 18)

THE U.S. CONSTITUTION

ARTICLE I, SECTION 8: POWERS OF CONGRESS

CLAUSE 18

The Congress shall have power . . . To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof.

By Mr. CAWTHORN:
H.R. 7319.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8
By Mr. COHEN:
H.R. 7320.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8
By Mr. DEFazio:
H.R. 7321.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 1, Clause 3, and Clause 18 of the Constitution.
By Ms. DELAuro:
H.R. 7322.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.
By Mr. ESPAILLAT:
H.R. 7323.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Clause 3 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.
By Mrs. FISCHBACH:
H.R. 7324.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8
By Mr. FITZGERALD:
H.R. 7325.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8
By Mr. GALLEGRO:
H.R. 7326.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18
By Mr. HILL:
H.R. 7327.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution
By Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH:
H.R. 7328.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, of the U.S. Constitution.
By Mr. HUFFMAN:
H.R. 7329.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Clause 1, Section 8, Article I of the U.S. Constitution
By Mr. JACKSON:
H.R. 7330.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I Section 8 of the United States Constitution
By Mr. KILMER:
H.R. 7331.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8
By Mrs. KIM of California:
H.R. 7332.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8
By Mrs. LEE of Nevada:
H.R. 7333.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 provides Congress with the power to "lay and collect

Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises" in order to "provide for the . . . general Welfare of the United States."

By Mr. LUETKEMEYER:
H.R. 7334.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8
By Mrs. LURIA:
H.R. 7335.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution
By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York:
H.R. 7336.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8
By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York:
H.R. 7337.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution of the United States grants Congress the power to enact this law.
By Mr. MEEKS:
H.R. 7338.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution
By Mr. MELJER:
H.R. 7339.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1
By Mr. MEUSER:
H.R. 7340.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States
By Mr. NEWHOUSE:
H.R. 7341.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8, Clause 4 of the United States Constitution
By Mr. NORCROSS:
H.R. 7342.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1 Section 8
By Mr. PERRY:
H.R. 7343.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8
By Mr. PERRY:
H.R. 7344.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8 of the US Constitution
By Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD:
H.R. 7345.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 18
By Ms. SALAZAR:
H.R. 7346.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1 Section 8
By Ms. SHERRILL:
H.R. 7347.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Clause 18 of Section 8 of Article 1 of the Constitution of the United States of America
By Ms. SPANBERGER:
H.R. 7348.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8
By Ms. STEFANIK:
H.R. 7349.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States

By Mr. THOMPSON of California:
H.R. 7350.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I
By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ:
H.R. 7351.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 1
The Congress shall have Power to . . . provide for the . . . general Welfare of the United States; . . .
By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ:
H.R. 7352.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 1
"The Congress shall have Power to . . . provide for the . . . general Welfare of the United States; . . ."
By Mrs. WALORSKI:
H.R. 7353.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Section 8 of Article 1 of the United States Constitution.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 19: Mr. WALTZ, Mr. ZELDIN, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. CAREY, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, and Mr. GARCIA of California.
H.R. 95: Mr. KELLER and Mr. LATURNER.
H.R. 234: Mr. NEAL.
H.R. 336: Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia.
H.R. 580: Ms. TITUS and Mr. PANETTA.
H.R. 608: Mr. GUEST.
H.R. 829: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
H.R. 1219: Mr. CARL.
H.R. 1229: Ms. GRANGER.
H.R. 1255: Mr. BACON and Mr. ZELDIN.
H.R. 1332: Mr. HORSFORD.
H.R. 1334: Ms. DELAuro, Mr. POCAN, Mrs. FLETCHER, Ms. ROSS, Mr. LEVIN of California, and Mrs. LEE of Nevada.
H.R. 1348: Mrs. CHERFILUS-MCCORMICK.
H.R. 1397: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.
H.R. 1436: Mr. GOTTHEIMER.
H.R. 1481: Ms. SPEIER and Ms. BARRAGÁN.
H.R. 1569: Mr. SHERMAN.
H.R. 1623: Mr. LIEU.
H.R. 1624: Mr. LIEU.
H.R. 1696: Mr. WELCH.
H.R. 1730: Mr. MULLIN.
H.R. 1803: Mr. KAHELE and Mr. BACON.
H.R. 1813: Mr. PANETTA and Mr. THOMPSON of California.
H.R. 1842: Mrs. FLETCHER, Mr. BARR, Mrs. CHERFILUS-MCCORMICK, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. MEUSER, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. PENCE, Mr. ELLZEY, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. STAUBER, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Ms. SLOTKIN, Mrs. STEEL, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Ms. MACE, Mr. OBERNOLTE, Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana, Mr. BURCHETT, Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. SCANLON, Mr. BOST, Mr. LATTI, Mr. LATURNER, Mr. BALDERSON, and Mr. GOTTHEIMER.
H.R. 1916: Mr. BOWMAN, Mr. HUIZENGA, Ms. STANSBURY, Mrs. WAGNER, and Mr. SHERMAN.
H.R. 1918: Mr. SCHNEIDER.
H.R. 1957: Ms. TLAB.
H.R. 2144: Mr. DESAULNIER.
H.R. 2145: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York and Mr. PAYNE.
H.R. 2161: Ms. ROSS and Ms. SCANLON.
H.R. 2223: Mrs. MILLER of Illinois.
H.R. 2228: Mr. HUFFMAN.
H.R. 2244: Mr. BURGESS.
H.R. 2252: Mr. PALAZZO.

H.R. 2256: Mr. GIMENEZ, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, and Mr. KINZINGER.
 H.R. 2280: Mr. LOWENTHAL.
 H.R. 2289: Mr. MELJER.
 H.R. 2294: Mr. CARTER of Louisiana and Mr. KELLY of Mississippi.
 H.R. 2303: Mr. VEASEY.
 H.R. 2489: Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois.
 H.R. 2517: Mrs. CAMMACK.
 H.R. 2542: Mr. COHEN.
 H.R. 2565: Ms. ADAMS, Ms. PORTER, Mr. MULLIN, Ms. KUSTER, and Mr. RESCHENTHALER.
 H.R. 2648: Mr. DEUTCH.
 H.R. 2654: Mr. KHANNA.
 H.R. 2718: Mr. ALLEN.
 H.R. 2773: Mr. PALLONE.
 H.R. 2784: Mr. LYNCH.
 H.R. 2876: Ms. MCCOLLUM.
 H.R. 2916: Mr. STEUBE and Mr. PAPPAS.
 H.R. 2965: Mr. DESAULNIER.
 H.R. 2974: Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, and Mr. GREEN of Texas.
 H.R. 3054: Mr. PAYNE.
 H.R. 3108: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
 H.R. 3271: Mr. McEACHIN.
 H.R. 3342: Mr. SHERMAN.
 H.R. 3352: Mr. AGUILAR and Mr. MOULTON.
 H.R. 3440: Mr. CONNOLLY.
 H.R. 3488: Ms. SHERRILL.
 H.R. 3509: Mr. PAYNE.
 H.R. 3525: Mr. SABLAN and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.
 H.R. 3577: Mr. CONNOLLY.
 H.R. 3588: Ms. SHERRILL.
 H.R. 3753: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. TITUS, and Mr. DOGGETT.
 H.R. 3808: Mrs. LESKO.
 H.R. 3897: Mr. COLE.
 H.R. 3962: Mr. HUIZENGA.
 H.R. 3990: Mr. KIND.
 H.R. 4003: Mr. FITZPATRICK.
 H.R. 4058: Mr. RYAN.
 H.R. 4085: Mr. SMUCKER.
 H.R. 4122: Ms. STANSBURY.
 H.R. 4130: Ms. SÁNCHEZ.
 H.R. 4134: Mr. SIRES.
 H.R. 4277: Mr. GREEN of Texas.
 H.R. 4410: Mr. LIEU.
 H.R. 4442: Mr. SCHIFF.
 H.R. 4479: Mr. POSEY and Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.
 H.R. 4693: Mrs. HAYES and Mr. AGUILAR.
 H.R. 4705: Mr. TIFFANY.
 H.R. 4750: Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. WILD, and Mr. PAYNE.
 H.R. 4756: Mr. COSTA, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. CARSON, and Mr. GRIJALVA.
 H.R. 4766: Ms. ADAMS, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. ESHOO, Mrs. CHERFILUS-McCORMICK, Ms. CLARKE of New York, and Ms. ROSS.
 H.R. 4794: Ms. TLAIB.
 H.R. 4831: Mr. GARBARINO.
 H.R. 4832: Mr. OWENS.
 H.R. 4870: Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. WILD, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. COLE, Mr. COHEN, and Ms. SEWELL.
 H.R. 4871: Mr. COHEN, Ms. BOURDEAUX, Mr. AUCHINCLOSS, and Mr. COURTNEY.
 H.R. 4943: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.
 H.R. 4944: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN and Ms. SCHRIER.
 H.R. 4965: Ms. SEWELL and Ms. ROSS.
 H.R. 5008: Mr. GOMEZ and Mr. CROW.
 H.R. 5019: Mr. PAYNE.
 H.R. 5064: Mrs. DINGELL.
 H.R. 5227: Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia and Mr. LEVIN of California.
 H.R. 5232: Mr. BROOKS and Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas.
 H.R. 5313: Mr. WALTZ, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mr. SOTO, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, and Mr. VEASEY.
 H.R. 5444: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.
 H.R. 5502: Mr. HARDER of California and Mr. MOORE of Utah.

H.R. 5585: Mr. CARBAJAL.
 H.R. 5587: Mr. BACON and Mr. COHEN.
 H.R. 5760: Mr. GOTTHEIMER.
 H.R. 5768: Ms. CASTOR of Florida.
 H.R. 5775: Mr. SHERMAN.
 H.R. 5801: Mr. SARBANES.
 H.R. 5874: Mrs. BOEBERT and Mr. TIFFANY.
 H.R. 5984: Ms. JACOBS of California.
 H.R. 6015: Mr. BOWMAN, Mr. BERGMAN, and Mr. LAMALFA.
 H.R. 6026: Mr. POSEY, Ms. ESCOBAR, and Mr. KIND.
 H.R. 6068: Mr. MCGOVERN and Ms. NORTON.
 H.R. 6072: Mr. BACON.
 H.R. 6104: Mr. KIM of New Jersey.
 H.R. 6145: Mr. ARMSTRONG, Mr. FEENSTRA, and Mr. GIBBS.
 H.R. 6161: Mr. SCHWEIKERT.
 H.R. 6235: Mrs. BOEBERT.
 H.R. 6268: Mrs. CHERFILUS-McCORMICK and Mrs. BEATTY.
 H.R. 6375: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio and Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN.
 H.R. 6381: Mr. PAYNE.
 H.R. 6398: Ms. BROWN of Ohio and Ms. TITUS.
 H.R. 6410: Mr. NEGUSE.
 H.R. 6448: Mrs. HAYES.
 H.R. 6492: Mr. PAYNE.
 H.R. 6509: Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. BOWMAN, and Mr. LOWENTHAL.
 H.R. 6570: Mr. DAVIDSON.
 H.R. 6584: Mr. DESAULNIER.
 H.R. 6600: Ms. TITUS.
 H.R. 6613: Ms. SCHRIER, Mrs. BUSTOS, and Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.
 H.R. 6639: Mr. PETERS.
 H.R. 6686: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.
 H.R. 6699: Mr. NADLER.
 H.R. 6722: Ms. JACOBS of California.
 H.R. 6732: Mr. FEENSTRA.
 H.R. 6737: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
 H.R. 6738: Mr. MCKINLEY.
 H.R. 6757: Mr. VAN DREW.
 H.R. 6785: Mr. AGUILAR.
 H.R. 6823: Ms. NORTON.
 H.R. 6833: Mrs. AXNE.
 H.R. 6858: Mr. BARR and Mr. GARCIA of California.
 H.R. 6862: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
 H.R. 6872: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.
 H.R. 6922: Mr. PALLONE.
 H.R. 6926: Mr. DONALDS.
 H.R. 6930: Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. CRENSHAW, Ms. HOULAHAN, Mr. LIEU, Mr. CROW, and Mr. PHILLIPS.
 H.R. 6938: Mr. RYAN.
 H.R. 7018: Mr. NEGUSE and Mr. VEASEY.
 H.R. 7038: Mr. CARBAJAL, Ms. MENG, and Ms. PORTER.
 H.R. 7041: Mr. CAWTHORN, Mr. OWENS, Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana, and Ms. KUSTER.
 H.R. 7062: Mr. CORREA and Mrs. AXNE.
 H.R. 7073: Mr. GARBARINO, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. BACON, and Mr. SOTO.
 H.R. 7076: Mr. RASKIN and Mr. KAHELE.
 H.R. 7077: Mr. GARBARINO and Mr. TONKO.
 H.R. 7099: Mr. DESAULNIER and Mr. SHERMAN.
 H.R. 7116: Mr. KILMER and Mr. RUSH.
 H.R. 7144: Mrs. RODGERS of Washington.
 H.R. 7151: Ms. STEFANIK.
 H.R. 7155: Mr. CARSON.
 H.R. 7163: Mr. CAREY.
 H.R. 7180: Mr. RYAN.
 H.R. 7185: Mr. COOPER, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. SWALWELL, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. TONKO, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. TRONE, and Mr. KEATING.
 H.R. 7188: Mr. ELLZEY.
 H.R. 7236: Ms. WILD.
 H.R. 7267: Ms. DELBENE, Mr. RUSH, Mr. GALLEGO, Ms. BROWNLEY, and Ms. BARRAGÁN.
 H.R. 7276: Mr. FITZPATRICK and Ms. SALAZAR.

H.R. 7283: Mr. TRONE and Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 7285: Mr. BENTZ and Mr. GOHMERT.
 H.R. 7302: Mr. ELLZEY, Mr. C. SCOTT FRANKLIN of Florida, and Mr. GUEST.
 H.R. 7303: Ms. MALLIOTAKIS, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Ms. MENG, Mr. MORELLE, Mr. NADLER, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Mr. TORRES of New York, Mr. SUOZZI, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. MEEKS, and Mr. TONKO.
 H.R. 7304: Mr. MCKINLEY and Mr. BENTZ.
 H.J. Res. 53: Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER.
 H.J. Res. 72: Mr. FALLON and Mr. BUCHANAN.
 H.J. Res. 79: Mr. NORMAN, Mr. GUEST, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. PFLUGER, Mr. BUCK, and Mr. KELLER.
 H.J. Res. 80: Mr. ESPAILLAT.
 H. Con. Res. 65: Mr. BEYER.
 H. Con. Res. 78: Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois.
 H. Res. 237: Mrs. FLETCHER.
 H. Res. 289: Mr. GREEN of Tennessee.
 H. Res. 302: Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia.
 H. Res. 306: Mr. SHERMAN.
 H. Res. 366: Mrs. MILLER of Illinois.
 H. Res. 583: Mr. KILMER, Mr. COHEN, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Ms. PRESSLEY, and Mr. CONNOLLY.
 H. Res. 629: Mr. LOWENTHAL.
 H. Res. 821: Mr. MCGOVERN and Ms. NORTON.
 H. Res. 832: Mr. LYNCH.
 H. Res. 981: Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. YARMUTH, and Ms. BROWN of Ohio.
 H. Res. 987: Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. STANTON, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. LEVIN of California, Ms. TITUS, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. WEXTON, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. CORREA, Mr. COSTA, Mr. ARRINGTON, Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS, Mrs. MURPHY of Florida, Mrs. LEE of Nevada, Mr. PAPPAS, Mr. WELCH, Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mrs. BEATTY, Mrs. MCBATH, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. NADLER, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. PHILLIPS, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. PLASKETT, Ms. ESCOBAR, Ms. MENG, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. MORELLE, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. TLAIB, Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ, Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. TURNER, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. TORRES of New York, Ms. MANNING, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. STEVENS, Mrs. TORRES of California, Ms. STRICKLAND, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. MOULTON, Ms. ADAMS, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. BEYER, Mr. COURTNEY, Mrs. HAYES, Mr. TONKO, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Ms. NEWMAN, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. ARMSTRONG, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. BROWNLEY, Ms. PINGREE, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. PANETTA, Ms. BOURDEAUX, Mr. PETERS, Mr. HIMES, Mr. SIRES, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. SOTO, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. CUCELLAR, Mr. KILMER, and Mr. FEENSTRA.
 H. Res. 998: Mr. VARGAS, Ms. ROSS, Mr. GARAMENDI, and Mr. GARBARINO.
 H. Res. 1000: Mr. VEASEY.
 H. Res. 1008: Ms. BOURDEAUX.
 H. Res. 1010: Mr. GOODEN of Texas, Mr. LAMALFA, and Mr. ARMSTRONG.
 H. Res. 1015: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. FULCHER, and Mr. KUSTOFF.
 H. Res. 1016: Mrs. GREENE of Georgia and Mr. GAETZ.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII,
 PT-107. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the Guam Legislature, relative to Resolution No. 260-36, relative to expressing the

support of the Guam Legislature for the pas- ers of America Equity Act”; which was re- ferred jointly to the Committees on Natural
sage of H.R. 6504, the “Native Pacific Island- Resources and Small Business.