

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, re-starting 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 non-producing 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. TIF-FANY).

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 gentlewoman 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	Houlihan
Axne	Crist	Hoyer
Barragan	Crow	Huffman
Bass	Cuellar	Jackson Lee
Beatty	Dauids (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

**NAYS—202**

Aderholt  
 Allen  
 Amodei  
 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  
 Foxx  
 Franklin, C.  
 Scott  
 Fulcher  
 Gallagher  
 Garbarino  
 Garcia (CA)

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

Spier  
 Stansbury  
 Stanton  
 Stevens  
 Strickland  
 Suozzi  
 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)

Wenstrup  
 Westerman  
 Williams (TX)  
 Wilson (SC)

Wittman  
 Womack  
 Zeldin

NOT VOTING—10

Armstrong  
 Brady  
 Bustos  
 Cheney

Davis, Rodney  
 Fortenberry  
 Hartzler  
 Kinzinger

□ 1406

Messrs. JACOBS of New York, STEWART, COLE, NEWHOUSE, LAM-BORN, WILSON of South Carolina, and SMITH of Missouri changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

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

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on rollcall No. 98.

**MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS**

Baird (Walorski)	Joyce (OH)	Scott, David
Bilirakis (Fleischmann)	(Garbarino)	(Jeffries)
Bowman (Meng)	Kahele (Mrvan)	Sessions (Babin)
Cawthorn (Nehls)	Krishnamoorthi	Sires (Pallone)
Comer	(Beyer)	Soto (Wasserman)
(Fleischmann)	Lawson (FL)	Schultz)
Crist	(Wasserman)	Steel (Oberholte)
(Schultz)	Schultz)	Strickland
Mace (Rice (SC))	(Takano)	
Manning (Beyer)	Suozzi (Beyer)	
McClain	Taylor (Carter	
(Fitzgerald)	(TX))	
Newman (Beyer)	Thompson (MS)	
Owens (Stewart)	(Evans)	
Roybal-Allard	Trone (Beyer)	
Harder (CA)	Waltz (Mast)	
(Gomez)	Schultz)	
Jayapal (Gomez)	Salazar	(Jeffries)
Johnson (TX)	(Gimenez)	
(Jeffries)	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  
 Bourdeaux  
 Bowman  
 Boyle, Brendan  
 F.  
 Brown (MD)  
 Brown (OH)  
 Brownley  
 Bush  
 Butterfield  
 Carbajal

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  
 Kahele  
 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

**NAYS—202**

Duncan  
 Dunn  
 Ellzey  
 Emmer  
 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

Rush  
 Ryan  
 Sánchez  
 Sarbanes  
 Scanlon  
 Schakowsky  
 Schiff  
 Schneider  
 Schrader  
 Schrier  
 Scott (VA)  
 Scott, David  
 Sewell  
 Sherman  
 Sherrill  
 Sires  
 Slotkin  
 Smith (WA)  
 Soto  
 Spanberger  
 Spier  
 Stansbury  
 Stanton  
 Stevens  
 Strickland  
 Suozzi  
 Swalwell  
 Takano  
 Thompson (CA)  
 Thompson (MS)  
 Titus  
 Tlaib  
 Torres (CA)  
 Torres (NY)  
 Trahan  
 Trone  
 Underwood  
 Vargas  
 Veasey  
 Vela  
 Velázquez  
 Pocan  
 Porter  
 Pressley  
 Price (NC)  
 Quigley  
 Raskin  
 Rice (NY)  
 Ross  
 Roybal-Allard  
 Ruiz  
 Ruppersberger

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 Dwayne
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 (Fleischmann)	(Garbarino)	(Jeffries)
Bowman (Meng)	Kahele (Mrvan)	Sessions (Babin)
Cawthorn (Nehls)	Krishnamoorthi (Beyer)	Sires (Pallone)
Comer (Fleischmann)	Lawson (FL)	Soto (Wasserman)
Crist (Wasserman)	(Wasserman)	Schultz)
Cuellar (Pappas)	Schultz)	Steel (Obornolte)
Curtis (Stewart)	Mace (Rice (SC))	Strickland (Takano)
DeGette (Blunt)	Manning (Beyer)	Suozi (Beyer)
Rochester)	McClain	Taylor (Carter (TX))
Esparillat (Correa)	(Fitzgerald)	Thompson (MS) (Evans)
Harder (CA) (Gomez)	Newman (Beyer)	Trone (Beyer)
Jayapal (Gomez)	Owens (Stewart)	Waltz (Mast)
Johnson (TX) (Jeffries)	Roybal-Allard (Wasserman)	Wilson (FL) (Jeffries)
	Schultz)	
	Salazar (Gimenez)	
	(Gimenez)	
	Sánchez (Gomez)	

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