

(b) COMPREHENSIVE REPORT.—The Administrator shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report that provides a detailed discussion of the plans developed under subsection (a)(1) and the recommendations of the Administrator under subsection (a)(2).

(c) BRIEFING.—Not later than 30 days after submission of the report and recommendations under subsection (b), the Administrator shall brief the appropriate committees of Congress on the findings and any recommendations made pursuant to this section.

SEC. 10. REIMBURSEMENT.

Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator shall brief the appropriate committees of Congress regarding the extent to which the Agency is using housing solutions proposed by a State or local government to reduce the time or cost required to implement housing solutions after a major disaster.

SEC. 11. INCREASED CAP FOR EMERGENCY DECLARATIONS BASED ON REGIONAL COST OF LIVING.

Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator shall brief the appropriate committees of Congress regarding the benefits and drawbacks of establishing a maximum amount for assistance provided for an emergency that is based on the cost of living in the region in which the emergency occurs.

SEC. 12. FACILITATING DISPOSAL OF TEMPORARY TRANSPORTABLE HOUSING UNITS TO SURVIVORS.

Section 408(d)(2)(B)(i) of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5174(d)(2)(B)(i)) is amended by inserting “, with priority given to a survivor of a major disaster who suffered a property loss as a result of the major disaster” after “any person”.

SEC. 13. DEADLINE ON CODE ENFORCEMENT AND MANAGEMENT COST ELIGIBILITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 406(a)(2)(D) of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5172(a)(2)(D)) is amended by striking “180 days” and inserting “1 year”.

(b) APPLICABILITY.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to amounts appropriated on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 14. PERMIT APPLICATIONS FOR TRIBAL UPGRADES TO EMERGENCY OPERATIONS CENTERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 614(a) of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5196(a)) is amended—

(1) by inserting “and Indian tribal governments” after “grants to States”; and

(2) by striking “State and local” and inserting “State, local, and Tribal”.

(b) APPLICABILITY.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to amounts appropriated on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

Mr. PADILLA. Madam President, I rise to discuss and explain the matter we just took action on. It is relative to wildfires. All across the Western United States, historic wildfires continue to grow both more frequent and more severe. Every year, in recent years, entire communities have been destroyed by wildfires in a matter of hours. We have seen this in California, New Mexico, and Colorado. Families are forced to flee with only the belongings they could quickly pack into their vehicles.

Last year, I visited the incident command center in Quincy, CA, to see

firsthand the real-time response to the devastating Dixie fire. Separately, I met with local leaders in Santa Rosa, CA, to hear about problems with recovery from previous catastrophic wildfires.

So my bill—the bill we just took action on, the FEMA Improvement, Reform, and Efficiency Act or the FIRE Act—will help ensure FEMA better addresses the unique and increasing danger of wildfires.

FEMA's current procedures and requirements don't always work for postwildfire recovery needs. And this bill will close those gaps.

I give a lot of credit to FEMA. They have gotten pretty good at anticipating and responding to other types of disasters. We are seeing it, as we speak, with the hurricane impact in Florida. They do the same with tornadoes, floods, other disasters.

In all these scenarios, we know that it begins with preparation. The FIRE Act will begin the process of allowing FEMA to predeploy resources during times of extremely high risk. In the West, we know it as red flag warnings.

When it is hot, conditions are dry, and the wind kicks up, it is a recipe for disaster. And so to have FEMA be able to deploy in advance—just as they do already during hurricane warnings, as we are seeing in Florida at this very moment—is a smart thing to do.

Then, as communities rebuild after a devastating wildfire, this bill will work to ensure that FEMA takes wildfire-specific issues into account, like melted infrastructure and burned trees. It will also help local governments work with FEMA to more effectively relocate critical infrastructure away from fire-prone areas.

Now, in the aftermath of a fire, the bill will help provide better housing assistance, case management, and crisis counseling for survivors with a focus on equity for underserved communities and Tribal governments. Oftentimes these underserved communities and Tribal governments suffer the disproportionate impact of these wildfires.

So with the FIRE Act, we will be able to better prepare for and respond to the unique challenges of wildfires in California and throughout the Western United States.

The FIRE Act passed out of the Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee by a voice vote on February 2 of this year. And I want to take a moment to thank both Chairman PETERS and Ranking Member PORTMAN and their staffs who contributed to this bill, as well as our partners at FEMA.

This is an overdue, commonsense bill to help communities on the frontlines of our wildfire crisis. And I thank my colleagues for joining me in supporting it.

With that, I yield the floor.

AFFORDABLE INSULIN ACT—
MOTION TO PROCEED—Continued
The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

ENERGY

Mr. CASSIDY. Madam President, I am constantly struggling that when people say there is no consensus in Washington, DC, there is often consensus. It is just a question of a different means by which to achieve the goals and consensus. If I were to say that we would want to have increased national security, lower global greenhouse gas emissions, a booming economy, and energy security, everybody would agree. The difference is how we achieve those means. And so what this process is, is to give the American people the opportunity to judge what is the best set of policies that will allow us to achieve that which we are speaking of.

Clearly, there is a nexus, a connection—you put them all together—between energy security, national security, the economy of our country and the economy of a family, and whether or not a country is lowering or increasing its contribution to global greenhouse gas emissions. This talk will be about that nexus between energy security, national security, global greenhouse gas emissions—how do we decrease them—and the economy of our country and the economy of a family.

Now, I am from Louisiana—I think that is pretty well known; the senior Senator from Louisiana—and we are privileged to host many of the facilities of the Strategic Petroleum Reserve, that connection between energy security and national security.

The Strategic Petroleum Reserve, for those who do not know, is where we have salt domes full of oil, millions of barrels, so that if ever there is another embargo, like there was in 1973, where Middle Eastern countries were attempting to punish the United States, we would have enough in our Strategic Petroleum Reserve so that we could draw from and we could preserve our national security and our economic security—again, that nexus between energy security, national security, and the economy of a country and the economy of a family.

President Biden has decided to drain the Strategic Petroleum Reserve to lower the price of gasoline. I am all for lowering the price of gasoline, but if you think about it, drawing oil from a Strategic Petroleum Reserve is basically the same as pumping it out of the ground if it is in West Texas or off the coast of Louisiana. One is just oil that has been produced and put in a salt dome, and the other is being produced naturally.

So rather than increasing production on Federal lands, the President made the decision to just draw from our Strategic Petroleum Reserve. Unfortunately, we are now at the lowest level of reserves since 1984. To the degree—and it is a great degree—that our national security depends upon being energy independent, we have lowered our

Reserve to the lowest since 1984, which is to say that we are less secure in terms of energy and therefore less secure in terms of our economy and less secure in terms of our national security.

The President needs a plan to refill that from domestically produced oil—period, end of story—and the swing production of that is going to be production on Federal lands, such as that off the coast of Louisiana.

Where does that leave us? Unfortunately, President Biden's energy plan is such that the Biden administration has set the record for the fewest oil leases on Federal lands in the first 19 months of his office. Both Presidents Obama and Trump approved over 10 times the number of leases as the Biden administration has over the same period.

So while Russia is attempting to blackmail the rest of the world by their energy production; where we have drained our Strategic Petroleum Reserve down to its lowest levels since 1984; where Europe is paying record prices for oil and natural gas, which may bring on a recession-depression there, which, of course, hurts our economy, this administration has had the fewest leases on record, and Obama and Trump had 10 times as many in the same period. This is hurting our energy security, which means it hurts our national security, which means it is going to hurt the economy of our country and the economy of a family.

My gosh, just ask what they are paying for their utility bills and what they are paying to fill up their tanks. Ask what they are paying at the grocery store, which is very dependent upon the supply of natural gas and oil in order to keep those prices lower. They would say they are hurting. This anti-energy policy has hurt across the board.

By the way, I think the rationale for not issuing those leases is that in some way, if the United States does not develop our own oil and gas resources, magically, global greenhouse gas emissions are going to decrease. That is the superstition of those who favor that policy—except, unfortunately, logic. You can't ignore facts.

A national laboratory has said that if you are speaking about oil, that which has the lowest life cycle of greenhouse gas emissions is the oil produced off the coast of Louisiana, which is far lower than the oil that we import from other countries.

If you are really concerned about lowering global greenhouse gas emissions, it is the environmental standards that we use in our country to produce our national resources—and, by the way, creating our American jobs—that have the lowest life cycle carbon emissions.

So that completes our nexus. We spoke about energy security related to national security, which in turn creates better jobs and a better economy for us all and actually has the effect of

lowering global greenhouse gas emissions. That is our nexus.

Unfortunately, this administration's policy is hurting American families, as they pay more through inflation; hurting our national security, as our Strategic Petroleum Reserve is at its lowest level, and therefore our energy security; and also contributing to increased global greenhouse gas emissions, as we have to import from countries without our environmental standards. Because we are unable to increase our production and supply, say Europe—they are burning coal instead of our oil and gas and, with that, increasing global greenhouse gas emissions.

There are some bright spots. On a bipartisan basis, the Congress just passed the Kigali Amendment, which recognizes—which is a form of hydrocarbons which were used in refrigerants. The use of this will lower global greenhouse gas emissions. The U.S. Congress just passed that. So other countries that persist in using older technology which increases global greenhouse gas emissions will be at a competitive disadvantage because Congress passed that. So in the midst of this kind of bad news—boy, it is just not working out the way it should—we actually have an example of how we can make it work better.

I am an advocate for a carbon border adjustment, not a carbon tax. I think carbon taxes are the wrong way to go. Let me explain. If we have a carbon border adjustment where the U.S. chemical industry, using our environmental standards, using natural gases of feedstock, everything we have done and invested in to lower global greenhouse gas emissions—we are competing with countries in Asia, specifically China, which don't use those measures, which pollute far more than we, but because they don't use their environmental standards, they have a lower cost of manufacturing. We are competing against cheaper goods, but they are cheaper precisely because they are producing more global greenhouse gas emissions.

The Kigali Amendment tells us what to do. If we had a carbon border adjustment where we say that this is the carbon intensity of our goods that are produced, and if a country in Asia—say, specifically, China—has a carbon emission profile that may be 5 to 10 times higher, if they want to import their goods, they would have to pay a fee based upon how their carbon intensity is greater than ours.

That is great. One, it is going to help us with our economy. Our workers who are losing their jobs to those in China because they don't enforce their environmental standards and we enforce ours and therefore our cost of production is higher—those jobs begin to return. It will be cheaper to produce here after all if China is forced to pay for the pollution they are putting into the atmosphere. It creates more jobs. That is good for Americans and good for our economy. It strengthens us relative to the Chinese, who are using their profits

to build a bigger army. It is good for greenhouse gas emissions. Now China is actually incentivized to lower emissions as opposed to now, where they have no incentive to do anything but to increase their emissions.

So we begin to decrease global greenhouse gas emissions. That is good for our national security. The stronger our economy is and the relative weakness of the Chinese economy means that we are better able to invest relative to the Chinese, which means that we are better able to spread Western values as opposed to the Chinese values, which involve bribery, which involve corruption of government, which involve coercion. Just look at what has happened in Hong Kong if someone thinks the Chinese Communist Party is a better system of government. We are able to export our values and push back upon theirs.

So if we are trying to have a policy, as I said at the outset, which combines the best instincts of the right and the left, where we all want to have energy security, national security—we want to have a better, stronger economy for working Americans, and we want to lower global greenhouse gas emissions—the Kigali Amendment, which passed on a bipartisan basis, gives us an example of how to do that.

Let's make a strength of our environmental regulations, and let's make others pay for their ignoring those same regulations. In so doing, we begin to attract jobs back here for Americans to strengthen our economy, lowering global greenhouse gas emissions, strengthening our energy security, our economy, and therefore our national security.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. OSSOFF). The Senator from Ohio.

REMEMBERING MAX AND BEN MORRISSEY

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I rise to ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Max Morrissey and Ben Morrissey, two brothers who went to work on September 20 at the BP-Husky oil refinery in Oregon, OH, and never returned home.

In the tragic explosion at the refinery that night, Max and Ben were fatally injured. At 34 and 32, their lives were cut short. Max and Ben were loving husbands and fathers, proud union steelworkers with Local 1-346, and lifelong Ohioans. They spent their lives serving their families, their community, their union, and their country through their dedication to their jobs and through Max Morrissey's distinguished service in the U.S. Navy. Their work at the plant powered our State, our economy, and provided for their families.

Family was everything to Max and Ben. They shared a dedication and commitment to each other, to their parents, to their wives, and to their young children.

On Friday, I visited the steelworkers hall. I had the honor of speaking with the Morrissey family and Max and

Ben's steelworker brothers and sisters in Local 1-346. From all I learned about Max and Ben, I know their memories will live on. I know their legacies will be upheld by those whom they loved and who loved them so.

We talked about this pin I wear, a canary pin given to me years ago at a Workers Memorial Day in Lorain, OH, by a steelworker honoring the workers who lost their lives on the job, working and supporting their economy and building a life, a future for their families.

This pin is a depiction of a canary in a birdcage. If you know labor history—and I know the Presiding Officer from Georgia knows this—the mineworkers used to take the canary in a cage down into the mines. If the canary died from lack of oxygen or toxic gas, the mineworker got quickly out of the mine. He had no union strong enough in those days to protect him and no government that cared enough to protect him. A strong union changed that because of worker safety laws and because of the labor movement.

This tragedy reminds us that our work to protect workers and make our workplaces safer never ever ends. No worker should ever have to worry about not returning home at the end of the day. No family should ever have to be concerned about that, not steelworkers like Max and Ben, not first responders who rush to their aid—no one.

I want to recognize those first responders—the steelworkers, the fire brigade, the Oregon Fire Department—those first responders at the scene whose bravery made a difference.

Today, we rededicate ourselves to Max and Ben's example of dignity of work, importance of family and community. Our thoughts are with the Morrissey family, with all those who knew and loved Max and Ben, and with those who worked alongside them.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I want to compliment my friend the Senator from Ohio for always being willing to speak out on behalf of important people all across the country. I agree with him that organized labor for literally decades has always protected working people. We need to bear that in mind as we sort through the issues that confront us on a regular basis. So I thank him for his comments.

JOINT CONSOLIDATION LOAN SEPARATION ACT

Mr. President, I rise today to actually celebrate a major accomplishment for thousands of Americans who have been trapped for, many times, decades in exploitative joint student loans.

This is an issue that is actually near and dear to me because I have been working on it for 7 years, since hearing from a constituent way back in 2015.

Sara from Northern Virginia was part of a group of student loan borrowers who entered into something called a joint consolidation loan, which allowed married couples to combine

their student debt into a single loan. The truth was, though, that sounded good, but Congress didn't allow anyone to unwind those loans in the event of a divorce or an abusive relationship.

So finally, in 2006, Congress got rid of the whole program. But when they got rid of the whole program, they didn't retroactively create an option for those folks who had entered into these joint consolidation loans between 1993 and 2006.

So when my constituent Sara had divorced from her husband when she was living in Texas, she was still responsible for this loan. So all of the debt that had originally been his suddenly fell upon her shoulders. The divorced husband stopped paying the debt. Yet she was still responsible, and she, Sara, had to continue facing the consequences.

Now, she was a single mom of two, a public school teacher. Sara was financially on the hook for her defaulting husband's student debts. Her credit suffered dramatically. She even thought she was going to lose her teacher's license.

Now, she did a lot—great researcher. I talked to her a couple times. After looking for a way out, she found that the only way to fix this problem was for an act of Congress.

Well, she contacted my office, and we found out that this was not a one-off circumstance, but, literally, there were thousands of Americans all across the country who had fallen into this trap. A lot of them were domestic violence survivors, who, even though they had gotten out of an abusive relationship, were still stuck with paying off the debts of their abuser. Many of these were people who were victims of financial abuse and, again, completely responsible for a loan, in many cases, that they had never even taken out.

Others were unable to save for retirement, for their kids. We had a lot of teachers who were otherwise eligible for the public service loan forgiveness programs, but because they had entered into the joint consolidated student loans, they suddenly weren't eligible.

So we did some research and spent some time looking into it. In 2017, I introduced the Joint Consolidation Loan Separation Act to solve this problem and find a way for, oftentimes, innocent borrowers to get out of these consolidations.

Now, starting back in 2015—I have got to acknowledge, it took 7 years. Something that was this much of a no-brainer shouldn't have taken that long, but I am proud to be here today and report that we did get it through Congress on a bipartisan basis.

Here in the Senate, I am grateful for a lot of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle. I am grateful for the Presiding Officer. We actually passed it on a unanimous basis, and in the House we passed it with a broad bipartisan coalition.

That is a testament to what a critical, commonsense fix this is—one that

will actually change the lives of thousands of Americans, literally, overnight.

Now, since we introduced this law the first time, my office has heard from so many Americans who are desperate to get this done.

I remember hearing from Chris from Indiana, who said he spent over 16 years thinking about this loan every day and waking up at night trying to create a strategy to pay this loan off.

He got back to us and he said:

For the first time, I may be able to put my mind at peace.

We heard from Sharon, who is a seventh grade teacher, whose former partner was totally unresponsive on meeting their obligations on this joint consolidation. Now, she said:

I don't have to do this anymore. I get to live my life.

She gets to actually retire this year because, once President Biden signs this law, it will immediately relieve her of this obligation.

Or Jessica, who said:

I am finally about to be free . . . of one last way my ex controls me.

Again, I can't imagine entering into this arrangement and then getting out of a relationship, often sometimes an abusive relationship, and that ex still trying to control this person by not meeting their share of the obligations. It just was wrong.

Next, Amy, who falls into the category of otherwise—because, I believe, she was a teacher, she was able to get public service loan forgiveness and worked for years on something she should qualify for, but if you had entered into one of these joint consolidations, you didn't get this benefit.

So Amy said:

I've never been able to take advantage of a single debt-relief program.

This bill will change that, obviously in terms of public service loans but also in terms of some of the proposals that President Biden has put forward.

All these people have been asking for is a chance to not unduly bear the joint burden of a program that even the Congress and the Federal Government decided in 2006 wasn't fair, but when we unwound it, we didn't unwind it, literally, for thousands of people who had fallen into this program between 1993 and 2006.

Now, we are through the House. We are through the Senate. We still have to hit one thing. And while the White House has indicated that the President supports this legislation, we have to get it signed right away because, when we think about these teachers and nurses and other folks who met their goal of what they have to qualify in critical areas to qualify for public student debt forgiveness, you know, the truth is, if they are going to get that benefit this year, they have got to make that application by October 31.

So before Halloween, these folks and countless others are waiting for them to simply apply for a right that, in

many cases, they should have been granted 5, 10, 15 years ago.

And as I said, many of the folks in this category are public school teachers. They are government workers. They are nurses. They all have met the otherwise, oftentimes, stringent requirements for public service loan forgiveness, but this law has to be a law in time for them to be able to timely apply for this relief before Halloween.

So I am hoping—the President has indicated he supports this bill, but the President has got to sign this law as soon as possible so borrowers can finally experience freedom from financial and domestic abuse, freedom to control their own financial future, and freedom to enjoy the exact same benefits that other teachers and public servants have across the country.

I would like to close by saying that, this week, I actually had a chance to call Sara, who originally brought this issue to my attention. She told me that, without this law, and even if she had continued making all of her monthly payments for her divorced husband, it would have been impossible for her to get rid of this debt in her lifetime. She would literally have been tied to her ex-husband, and she left Texas to get away from that ex-husband, to move to Virginia. She would literally be tied to that former spouse for the rest of her life.

For Sara and for literally thousands of other borrowers impacted by this program, it is time for the President to sign this law and provide these borrowers the relief they deserve.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNIZING HUMBOLDT, KANSAS

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, this evening, I want to highlight a community in my State of Kansas that is a model for rural towns across our State and around the country. It is timely because, just yesterday, the New York City mayor joked that my home State of Kansas has “no brand” and then chuckled at his joke. I had planned to give this floor speech before the mayor of New York City used Kansas as a punch line, but now it seems a little more fitting and means even more.

Located in Allen County, KS, Humboldt is the home to about 2,000 residents. Like many small communities in rural America, Humboldt was facing declining population numbers as businesses moved away and buildings on Main Street were abandoned. Even the locally owned newspaper, which began business in 1864 and was the State’s longest continuously running paper, the Humboldt Union, had to close its doors.

However, in the last couple of years, Humboldt has defied the odds. The vacant buildings on Main Street now boast thriving businesses and welcoming storefronts. Since 2020, Humboldt has gained a coffee shop, a variety of bars and restaurants, a fitness center, a microbrewery, a grocery store, a hotel, and the Humboldt Union has been reestablished. Even as the pandemic created new challenges for many small businesses, Humboldt’s businesses were able to persevere.

In January, the travel desk of the New York Times selected Humboldt as a top destination in the world, alongside places like Greece, Australia, and Argentina—pretty ironic now.

The majority of growth and economic development in the community can be attributed to a civic organization called A Bolder Humboldt. This group was formed a few years ago by leaders like Paul Cloutier and is still going strong today.

Paul recently took me on a tour of downtown with the mayor, Mayor Nobby Davis, to see firsthand the renovations being done and to meet the owners of small businesses that are reshaping the town square.

Paul said:

I’ve lived in a lot of big cities, and the thing I loved about them was that they had complete neighborhoods, with a grocery store and a dry cleaner’s and a bar and little restaurants, which is basically what a small town is or used to be.

A Bolder Humboldt is working to rebuild that ideal—that ideal American small town—for the 21st century.

I visited a cafe and a coffee shop owned by Josh Works, who is also involved in A Bolder Humboldt. His father owns B&W Trailer Hitches, and he set a standard during the recession in 2008 to prioritize and care for his staff and his community.

In addition, the community has rebuilt 10 blocks of the downtown streetscape with the help from a local business, Monarch Cement Company. Owned and run by Walter Wulf, this is a 110-year-old business, and it is a staple of this community.

The city has also developed Southwind Industrial Park, with the latest addition of Murphy Tractor and Equipment Company, providing new jobs for locals and new residents.

Humboldt has also gained fame as the hometown of Biblesta, which is an annual festival taking place this weekend, that has been going for six decades and features the world’s largest Bible-themed parade.

Each year, City Manager Cole Herder addresses graduating high school seniors and presents them with mailboxes in the school’s colors—black boxes with orange lettering. Each box has the student’s name and “Humboldt, Kansas” stenciled in orange letters. Inside, there is an invitation. He appeals to students to pursue an education and new experiences, but he also encourages them to consider their hometown of Humboldt as the place to establish

their careers and raise their own families.

The community of Humboldt is a success story, and it is a role model. It demonstrates how teamwork, creative thinking, hard work, treating others with respect, and caring about the future of your community can make a positive difference for your city, the State, and for our entire Nation. That is our brand in Kansas.

I am proud to recognize the efforts of Humboldt with what we have called the Building Better Communities Award.

Today, in the U.S. Senate, I offer my congratulations and my gratitude for the kind of leadership and effort among all residents of the community to see that Humboldt is a good place to live today and, perhaps even more importantly, a great place to live tomorrow.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The majority leader.

VOTE ON MOTION

Mr. SCHUMER. Now, Mr. President, I know of no further debate on the motion to proceed to H.R. 6833.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

AFFORDABLE INSULIN NOW ACT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A 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.

AMENDMENT NO. 5745

(Purpose: In the nature of a substitute.)

Mr. SCHUMER. I call up substitute amendment No. 5745.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New York [Mr. SCHUMER] proposes an amendment numbered 5745.

Mr. SCHUMER. I ask to dispense with further reading of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The amendment is printed in the RECORD of September 27, 2022, under “Text of Amendments.”)

Mr. SCHUMER. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.