1	NEAL R. GROSS & CO., INC.
2	RPTS WALTER
3	HIF118000
4	
5	
6	MARKUP OF:
7	H.R. 4978, NURTURING AND SUPPORTING HEALTHY
8	BABIES ACT;
9	H.R. 4641, TO PROVIDE FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT
10	OF AN INTER-AGENCY TASK FORCE TO REVIEW,
11	MODIFY, AND UPDATE BEST PRACTICES FOR PAIN
12	MANAGEMENT AND PRESCRIBING PAIN MEDICATION,
13	AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES, AS AMENDED BY THE
14	SUBCOMMITTEE ON HEALTH;
15	H.R. 3680, CO-PRESCRIBING TO REDUCE
16	OVERDOSES ACT OF 2015, AS AMENDED BY THE
17	SUBCOMMITTEE ON HEALTH;
18	H.R. 3691, IMPROVING TREATMENT FOR PREGNANT
19	AND POSTPARTUM WOMEN ACT;
20	H.R. 1818, VETERAN EMERGENCY MEDICAL
21	TECHNICIAN SUPPORT ACT OF 2015;
22	H.R. 4981, OPIOID USE DISORDER TREATMENT
23	EXPANSION AND MODERNIZATION ACT, AS AMENDED
24	BY THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON HEALTH;
25	H.R. 3250, DXM ABUSE PREVENTION ACT OF 2015;

26	H.R. 4969, JOHN THOMAS DECKER ACT OF 2016,
27	AS AMENDED BY THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON HEALTH;
28	H.R. 4586, LALI'S LAW, AS AMENDED BY THE
29	SUBCOMMITTEE ON HEALTH;
30	H.R. 4599, REDUCING UNUSED MEDICATIONS ACT
31	OF 2016, AS AMENDED BY THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON
32	HEALTH;
33	H.R. 4976, OPIOID REVIEW MODERNIZATION ACT
34	OF 2016;
35	H.R. 4982, EXAMINING OPIOID TREATMENT
36	INFRASTRUCTURE ACT OF 2016;
37	H.R. 4889, THE KELSEY SMITH ACT OF 2016, AS
38	AMENDED BY THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON
39	COMMUNICATIONS AND TECHNOLOGY;
40	H.R. 4167, KARI'S LAW ACT OF 2015;
41	H.R. 4111, RURAL HEALTH CARE CONNECTIVITY
42	ACT OF 2015;
43	H.R. 4190, SPECTRUM CHALLENGE PRIZE ACT OF
44	2015;
45	H.R. 3998, SECURING ACCESS TO NETWORKS IN
46	DISASTERS ACT;
47	H.R. 2031, ANTI-SWATTING ACT OF 2015;
48	H.R. 2589, A BILL TO AMEND THE
49	COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1943 TO REQUIRE THE
50	FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION TO PUBLISH

ON ITS INTERNET WEBSITE CHANGES TO THE RULES
OF THE COMMISSION NOT LATER THAN 24 HOURS
AFTER ADOPTION;
H.R. 2592, A BILL TO AMEND THE
COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934 TO REQUIRE THE
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION TO PUBLISH
ON THE WEBSITE OF THE COMMISSION DOCUMENTS
TO BE VOTED ON BY THE COMMISSION;
H.R. 2593, A BILL TO AMEND THE
COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934 TO REQUIRE
IDENTIFICATION AND DESCRIPTION ON THE
WEBSITE OF THE FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS
COMMISSION OF ITEMS TO BE DECIDED ON
AUTHORITY DELEGATED BY THE COMMISSION; AND
H.R. 5050, PIPELINE SAFETY ACT OF 2016
WEDNESDAY, APRIL 27, 2016
House of Representatives
Committee on Energy and Commerce
Washington, D.C.
The committee met, pursuant to call, at 10:00 a.m., in Room
2123 Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Fred Upton [chairman of
the committee] presiding.

Members present: Representatives Upton, Barton, Whitfield, Shimkus, Pitts, Walden, Murphy, Burgess, Blackburn, Latta, Harper, Lance, Guthrie, Olson, McKinley, Pompeo, Kinzinger, Griffith, Bilirakis, Johnson, Long, Ellmers, Bucshon, Flores, Brooks, Mullin, Collins, Cramer, Pallone, Rush, Eshoo, Engel, Green, DeGette, Capps, Schakowsky, Butterfield, Matsui, Castor, Sarbanes, McNerney, Welch, Lujan, Tonko, Yarmuth, Clarke, Loebsack, Schrader, Kennedy, and Cardenas.

Staff present: Gary Andres, Staff Director; Will Batson, Legislative Clerk, Energy and Power, Environment and the Economy; Mike Bloomquist, Deputy Staff Director; Sean Bonyun, Communications Director; Leighton Brown, Deputy Press Secretary; Allison Busbee, Policy Coordinator, Energy and Power; Rebecca Card, Assistant Press Secretary; Karen Christian, General Counsel; Paige Decker, Executive Assistant; Paul Edattel, Chief Health Counsel; Giulia Giannangeli, Legislative Clerk, Commerce, Manufacturing, and Trade; Tom Hassenboehler, Chief Counsel, Energy and Power; A.T. Johnston, Senior Policy Advisor; Peter Kielty, Deputy General Counsel; David McCarthy, Chief Counsel, Environment and the Economy; Brandon Mooney, Professional Staff Member, Energy and Power; Tim Pataki, Professional Staff Member; Graham Pittman, Legislative Clerk; David Redl, Chief Counsel, Telecom; Annelise Rickert, Legislative Associate; Chris Santini, Policy Coordinator, Oversight and Investigations; Dan Schneider, Press Secretary; Adrianna Simonelli, Legislative Associate,

76

77

78

79

80

81

82

83

84

85

86

87

88

89

90

91

92

93

94

95

96

97

98

99

Health; Heidi Stirrup, Health Policy Coordinator; John Stone,
Counsel, Health; Josh Trent, Professional Staff Member, Health;
Dylan Vorbach, Deputy Press Secretary; Gregory Watson,
Legislative Clerk, Communications and Technology; Jen Berenholz,
Minority Chief Clerk; Jeff Carroll, Minority Staff Director;
Elizabeth Ertel, Minority Deputy Clerk; Kyle Fischer, Minority
Health Fellow; Waverly Gordon, Minority Professional Staff
Member; Tiffany Guarascio, Minority Deputy Staff Director and
Chief Health Advisor; Rick Kessler, Minority Senior Advisor and
Staff Director, Energy and Environment; John Marshall, Minority
Policy Coordinator; Rachel Pryor, Minority Health Policy Advisor;
Alexander Ratner, Minority Policy Analyst; Tim Robinson, Minority
Chief Counsel; Samantha Satchell, Minority Policy Analyst; Andrew
Souvall, Minority Director of Communications, Outreach and Member
Services; Kimberlee Trzeciak, Minority Health Policy Advisor;
Megan Velez, Minority FDA Detailee; and Tuley Wright, Minority
Energy and Environment Policy Advisor.

The Chairman. Good morning, everybody. We have a busy day 118 or two ahead of us, and I just want to say our goal is to try and 119 stop about noon and continue tomorrow on the unfinished numbers 120 of bills we are going to mark up. 121 122 So the committee is going to come to order. At the conclusion of opening statements yesterday, the chair called up 123 H.R. 5050, and the bill was open for amendment at any point. 124 I would like to call up the manager's--the bipartisan manager's 125 amendment offered by myself and Mr. Pallone. If the clerk will 126 127 read the title. The Clerk. Amendment to H.R. 5050 offered by Mr. Upton. 128 129 [The Amendment offered by Mr. Upton follows:] 130

*********INSERT 1*******

The Chairman. The amendment will be considered as read.

The staff will distribute the manager's amendment, and I will recognize myself for a brief statement in support of the amendment.

Basically, this has four main parts to perfect and clarify our language in the bill. First, perhaps one of the more controversial sections, emergency orders. In similar fashion to our friends on the transportation committee--remember, this is a bill that both committees have under their jurisdiction--we clarified the conditions that would allow PHMSA to issue an emergency order, strengthen the definition of "imminent hazard," and align the procedures for reviewing an agency decision with those that govern the transportation of hazardous material.

The section is much stronger and much tighter, but we have also agreed to further clarify a few points in the report language. It is our intent for PHMSA to consult with owners and operators of pipeline facilities before issuing an order. It is also our expectation that PHMSA will issue final regs to carry out this new authority as quickly as possible. The temporary regulations are just that: temporary.

Second, I am proud to say the manager's amendment also includes a new section jointly authored by Mr. Latta and Mr. Welch to find ways to streamline federal regs for small propane facilities that serve communities with affordable and reliable energy. I want to commend both the gentlemen for being leaders.

They represent states that have certainly felt the impact of propane shortages in the winter. Michigan is one of those, by the way, and they also share a commitment to find workable solutions to increase the supply and lower the cost of this valuable fuel, particularly for those in rural areas.

Third, the amendment strengthens a study to look at the integrity management plans for oil pipelines, an issue that Mrs. Capps and others on this committee have been focused on. I share Mrs. Capps' concerns--we spoke last week--that some pipelines should be inspected more frequently than they are currently required.

And, finally, our language contains language--finally, our amendment contains language from Mr. Engel that reaffirms PHMSA's responsibility to consider cyber and other threats to our national security when issue--in minimum safety standards for liquefied natural gas pipelines. It is important to remember the role that energy security plays in national security.

PHMSA has had an important responsibility here for sure, so together these changes amount to significant gains for pipeline safety. And with passage of this amendment and the underlying bill, we are indeed giving PHMSA the tools that they need to get the job done.

And I would yield back on my five minutes and recognize the gentleman from New Jersey for five minutes.

Mr. Pallone. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I move to strike the

last word in support of the manager's amendment.

As I noted in my opening statement last night, the legislation before us today is a reasonable compromise that makes incremental progress in pipeline safety. The amendment before us similarly reflects that spirit of compromise. The amendment addresses a number of concerns raised by Democratic members during the Energy and Power Subcommittee's consideration of the bill.

It also addresses issues raised by Republican members of the subcommittee during that markup. In particular, there is language responding to concerns raised by Representative Capps and others over recent liquid pipeline accidents, such as the Plains All American failure in California last year. There is also a provision responding to issues raised by Representative Engel regarding the need to consider national security and cyber security in setting minimum safety standards for liquefied natural gas, or LNG, facilities.

In addition, the amendment adds language developed by
Representatives Latta and Welch requiring the Secretary of
Transportation to enter into an agreement with the National
Academy of Sciences Transportation and Research Board to conduct
a review of propane gas pipeline regulations and industry best
practices, among other things.

And, finally, the amendment makes changes to the emergency order authority provided to the Secretary of Transportation in Section 15 to address concerns raised by Republicans and industry.

While I would have preferred to leave the emergency order language 207 untouched, these changes resolve a number of those concerns by 208 conforming the language in our bill to that in the pipeline safety 209 reauthorization reported by the Committee on Transportation and 210 Infrastructure by voice vote last week. 211 So this amendment is a true compromise that I hope makes it 212 possible to move quickly to passage with the support of all members 213 on both sides of the aisle of this committee, and I urge my 214 colleagues to adopt the amendment, and I yield back. 215 216 The Chairman. The gentleman yields back. The chair--217 Mr. Pallone. Oh, I am sorry. I would like to yield to our ranking member, Mr. Rush. 218 Good morning. Thank you, Ranking Member, for 219 Mr. Rush. 220 Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to reiterate the point I made yesterday in my opening statement that this bill represents 221 222 a bipartisan compromise that resulted from good faith 223 negotiations between the two sides. I would like to applaud you, Mr. Chairman, and Chairman 224 225 Whitfield, and Ranking Member Pallone, and myself, and I also want to commend the committee staffs on both sides of the aisle for 226 their hard work on this bill. 227 228 Mr. Chairman, I really want to lift up Mr. Green, Mr. Tonko, 229 Mr. Engel, Mr. Pompeo, and Mr. Latta, to name of the few of the

NEAL R. GROSS

Mr. Chairman, I would like to highlight in a special way the

committee members who did extraordinary work on this bill.

230

work of Mrs. Capps and her staff for their valuable contributions 232 to the underlying bill and the manager's amendment. 233 Mrs. Capps has been extraordinary in her leadership. She has been 234 enlightening. She has really been a breath of fresh air in terms 235 236 of this whole process, and I really want to commend her. And I am sure her constituents will be proud of the 237 contribution that she had added to this bill in hopes of preventing 238 239 another catastrophe like the Plains All American bill that referenced parts of her district last year. 240 Mr. Chairman, with that, I yield back to the ranking member. 241 242 Mr. Pallone. Let me just take back my time. I know we are 243 all saying all of these great things about Lois Capps, but I just -- it is really true. Without her making this reauthorization 244 better, you know, it really would not have been possible without 245 the time that she put into it. So, again, I want to thank her 246 247 in particular. Both of us want to thank her. I yield back, Mr. Chairman. 248 249 The Chairman. The gentleman yields back. The chair 250 recognizes Mr. Whitfield, the chairman of the Energy and Power 251 Subcommittee. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. 252 Mr. Whitfield. I would like to ask a question of legal counsel on this matter. 253 We are 254 giving the Secretary the authority to issue an emergency order 255 if he finds an imminent hazard, and then it is my understanding

that there is an opportunity for review under Section 554 of Title

5.

And if the Department receives this petition for review, do they have a certain length of time in which to act? And if they do not act, what are the consequences?

The Counsel. Yes, sir, they do. Upon petition for review from an entity subject to and adversely affected by--

The Chairman. Is your mic on?

The Counsel. The mic is on. So if a petition for review is not heard within 30 days, then the order expires. It is no longer valid.

Mr. Whitfield. Okay. I just wanted that clarification.

The Chairman. The gentleman yields back. Other members wishing to speak on the manager's amendment? The gentlelady from California, Mrs. Capps.

Mrs. Capps. I am in between microphones, but I wanted to strike the last word. I appreciate the comments of my colleagues. Chairman Upton, Ranking Member Pallone, this markup is an incredibly important topic. The bill we are considering today marks such a good step forward to strengthen the safety standards in place for our nation's pipeline hazardous materials infrastructure.

Many of us share this conviction about the need to address this, and far too many of us have been impacted by failures in our oil and gas infrastructure. These oil spills, gas leaks, facility explosions, are a threat to public health, the

environment, and our local economies. And of course it is not an accident.

As long as we rely on fossil fuels for our energy needs, it is only a matter of time until we are faced with another such incident, which is why we need to find ways to minimize the risks associated with this industry, maximize the safety standards, learning from past accidents, ensuring we are instituting the best practices.

In the past, we have not always heeded this, but today the bill before us attempts to correct some of these missed opportunities. I am pleased the bill includes language to clarify the term which has been referenced---"high consequence area"--and a provision to study the underlying causes of corrosion and best methods to prevent it.

As has been noted already, both of these address problems that were highlighted. And when the Plains Pipeline spill occurred in my district last May, immediately after the spill we are faced with questions about whether the Gaviota coast was in fact a high consequence area and how that uncertainty would impact the response of this bill.

Language in this bill will make it clear that this region, but also other sensitive coastal regions around the country, are indeed high consequence areas and subject to more frequent integrity and assessments and additional risk control measures.

Similarly, the corrosion study language included in this

bill will address the heart of the cause of the Plains spill. And if we are going to minimize the risk for future pipeline failures, we must have a better sense of what causes corrosion and how to best prevent it.

The bill also includes emergency order authority, which provides PHMSA with the authority to address industry-wide or systemic problems that require immediate consideration. These are important provisions that will make a real impact on pipeline safety. There is still, of course, room to strengthen this bill, and I am happy to report that the manager's amendment includes some necessary provisions to do just this.

In particular, the amendment addresses the need to review pipeline inspection frequency. There is bipartisan agreement that there are pipelines such as those highlighted in Section 12 that require more frequent inspection than existing standards. However, exactly how to determine which pipelines should be included continues to be a contentious topic.

The manager's amendment would set the stage to gain a better understanding of how to best set assessment frequency. Some will say this is not the perfect bill. I agree. But this compromise will strengthen safety standards, and for that reason it should be supported.

I want to thank the majority for negotiating a new good faith, so that we were able to arrive at a bipartisan agreement, and also Ranking Member Pallone for his commitment to getting the strongest

possible legislation.

This is a bill that is being watched very carefully by my community, very critical to its future. I urge the committee's full support, and I am yielding back.

The Chairman. The gentlelady yields back. Other members wishing to speak on the manager's amendment? The gentlelady from California, Ms. Eshoo, is recognized for five minutes.

Ms. Eshoo. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want to thank you and Chairman Whitfield and our ranking member, Mr. Pallone, for bringing this bipartisan bill forward.

This pipeline safety issue is one that continues to be a top issue in the county that I reside in in California, San Mateo County. And you have heard me speak on many, many occasions about what took place on September 9, 2010, in the community of San Bruno, where a natural gas pipeline explosion took place. It killed eight people, it injured dozens, and it destroyed 38 homes. If you were to see the area, it really would take your break away in terms of what this explosion did.

Since San Bruno, we know that there have been several other oil and natural gas pipeline failures around the country, including the Plains All American pipeline, which Congresswoman Capps has spoken about where it ruptured in Santa Barbara last year, and it also caused the spilling of thousands of gallons of crude oil into the Pacific Ocean.

Now, following San Bruno, this committee crafted bipartisan

legislation to require PHMSA to address specific issues that contributed to the disaster, including automatic and remote shutoff valves, which is very important, enhanced safety requirements for pipelines, and high consequence areas, and requiring the testing of pre-1970 pipelines which are grandfathered from certain pipeline safety regulations.

And this is a very, very important area because it has--this testing of grandfathered pipelines is so critical. The NTSB concluded in its review of the San Bruno case that hydrostatic testing of grandfathered pipelines would have likely exposed the defective pipe that led to the actual pipeline failure.

And PHMSA has been slow to implement the requirements of the 2011 legislation, but last month it did propose important regulations that would address many of the critical mandates in the 2011 bill and the NTSB's recommendations following San Bruno. So I am very pleased that this bill is before us today.

My only concern with the bill is that I think it should include the language that clarifies the ability of private citizens to force PHMSA to perform its required duties.

Following the San Bruno explosion, the City and County of San Francisco sued PHMSA for failing to enforce pipeline safety standards in the years leading up to the explosion.

So I just want to end with asking a question. Why wasn't this--and I really don't know--why wasn't this included in the bill? Because I think the language should be restored. We had

17 it before, but it is missing now. 382 The answer is we just didn't come to an 383 The Chairman. agreement on it, but there was -- it was on the table, and at the 384 end, as we put it together, it just didn't make it through. 385 386 Ms. Eshoo. But what was the reason for it, though? Will gentlelady yield? 387 Mr. Shimkus. Ms. Eshoo. I asked--388 I wasn't in the negotiations, but my quess is 389 Mr. Shimkus. that we don't have intervenors in every pipeline, in every 390 direction throughout this country to stop the flow of crude oil 391 392 and basic products. I think that is probably why. There is 393 always a fear about the environmental left using every means to 394 stop fossil fuels. 395 So I think my quess is we don't want to give them multiple bites at the apple to just stop the flow where we know there has 396 397 been tragedy, especially with natural gas, but the public doesn't really understand how much product goes -- how many thousands of 398 399 miles of pipeline there are in this country. 400 And so I think that is probably the answer. 401

intervention by the liberal left and the environmental community to shut down the flow of crude oil through pipelines.

But this is not--if I might reclaim my time, this Ms. Eshoo. is not an environmental question. This is about what PHMSA is required to do, what we require them to do. And if they don't, then citizens will be able to take action. So I don't know--

402

403

404

405

407	Mr. Shimkus. If the gentlelady will yield, I think that is
408	Ms. Eshooliberal environment
409	Mr. Shimkus. No, no. I
410	Ms. Eshoo. That is why I am asking the question.
411	Mr. Shimkus. Citizens are citizens, so they could be
412	intervening on behalf of a group that they belong to. So I
413	thinkI am just answering the question that you posed.
414	The Chairman. Time has expired.
415	Ms. Eshoo. Yield back.
416	The Chairman. The gentlelady yields back. Other members
417	wishing to speak on the manager's amendment? Mr. Engel for five
418	minutes.
419	Mr. Engel. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I move to strike the
420	last word. I am pleased that we are working on legislation to
421	improve the safety of our nation's pipelines and pipeline
422	regulation by PHMSA. I want to first of all thank you, Mr.
423	Chairman, and Mr. Whitfield, of course our ranking member, Mr.
424	Pallone and Mr. Rush, for all coming together and really putting
425	forward a good piece of legislation that is a good compromise and
426	something there for everybody and very important, moving in the
427	right direction.
428	I am particularly interested in ensuring that national
429	security and cyber security receive appropriate action in the
430	siting, operation, and maintenance of pipelines. Hostile actors
431	are looking for vulnerabilities in our infrastructure every day.

In fact, the Department of Justice recently indicted seven Iranian hackers for their role in a cyber-attack on a dam in Rye, New York, on the border of my district just outside, and we have to be vigilant about these threats.

For the last 6 months, I have worked with a group of New Yorkers concerned about the construction of a large natural gas pipeline alongside an old and troubled nuclear power plant, Indian Point. I was shocked to discover how little attention was paid to matters of national security and cyber security throughout the regulatory process.

When siting the pipeline, nobody even bothered to ask the Department of Homeland Security whether its proximity to a leaking nuclear power plant made it a bigger terrorist target. That, in my opinion, is not vigilance.

As a result, I have worked with colleagues on both sides of the aisle to include changes in the manager's amendment and additional language in the committee report implicating consultation with DHS to increase our diligence when it comes to the national security and cyber security of our pipeline infrastructure.

Our actions here today are a step in the right direction, but our efforts to defend our infrastructure are far from complete. I look forward to working with members of this committee on additional legislation that addresses this issue in greater detail. I thank you again, Mr. Chairman, for everything

you have done in this regard, and I yield back.

The Chairman. The gentleman yields back. Other members wishing to speak? The gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. Cramer. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just want to--I am going to support the manager's amendment, and I will certainly help get the bill to the floor, but I do have some concerns. I think the manager's amendment is fine as far as it goes, and I should state, too, having been a pipeline regulator for a number of years, I have to tell you, I like PHMSA a lot. I think they do good work. I think they are understaffed, but their problem is not that they don't have enough authority.

And when I came here, I didn't come here to give more authority to the bureaucracy. I came to try to roll back the bureaucracy's authority and then give them the resources to do the job that they had to do. I think this bill gives them some unbridled authority. I would prefer--and it might help answer Ms. Eshoo's question about why certain language isn't in the amendment or in the bill.

This issue of who can be affected, who can be offended, is not a trifling issue. If we open that can of worms up, of course we could see all kinds of opportunity for mischief that has nothing to do with safety. And I think Mr. Shimkus answered that very well.

I would like to see more explicit reference to the pre-consultation of industry, for example. I would like to

clarify or remove the "adversely affected by" language. I would like to clarify who can and who cannot have standing. But that said, those are things that aren't to my clarity or my liking, but I would also say this.

As noble as compromise is, and I think it is a noble goal in a legislative body, I would be all for compromising if we were rolling back regulations and power from the bureaucracy, but we are adding to it. And every compromise doesn't--we are still adding to the bureaucracy, and that concerns me.

So I have an amendment that adds a few things that I am going to not offer later this morning, but I did want to express those concerns and hope that, as this gets to the floor and as we look to bring one of the two bills--either the T&I bill or this one, to the floor--that we can fix it so that it is a little more, you know, pro-development and pro-energy security.

With that, I yield back my time.

The Chairman. The gentleman yields back. Other members wishing to speak on the manager's amendment? The gentleman from California is recognized.

Mr. McNerney. Well, first, I want to thank you, Mr. Chairman, for working with me on the language to provide additional oversight, that of a cost-benefit analysis at OMB and PHMSA. Although I can be certain--although I think that the current structure is somewhat duplicative and can slow the PHMSA ability to move forward quickly, the language we worked on is a

step in the right direction, and I hope that we can keep this language in the bill as we merge with the T&I's version of the bill.

I would also like to talk about lost and unaccounted for gas within the transmission and distribution system. This just doesn't refer to leakage as there are more than a dozen different factors that account--that can affect unaccounted for gas.

However, as we talk about pipeline safety and how to best improve our nation's aging infrastructure, we can't afford to ignore this issue. One of the best ways for us to get things right is to have the best available data and science. The EPA has said that no studies exist that accurately define the percentage of lost and unaccounted for gas. The EPA is just beginning to learn how little it actually knows about leaks in the oil and gas sectors.

We are about to pass a bill that impacts hundreds of thousands of miles of pipeline within the U.S., and we are not addressing lost and unaccounted for gas. This issue deserves additional consideration within our committee, and I hope to work with the chairman on that.

Again, I thank Chairman Upton and Ranking Member Pallone for the Safety Act, and I yield back.

The Chairman. The gentleman yields back. Other members wishing to speak on the manager's amendment? Seeing none, the vote occurs on the amendment offered by Mr. Upton and Mr. Pallone.

	23
532	All those in favor will say aye.
533	Those opposed, say no.
534	In the opinion of the chair, the ayes have it. The amendment
535	is agreed to.
536	Are there other bipartisan amendments to the bill? Are
537	there other amendments to the bill? Seeing none, the question
538	now occurs on favorably reporting H.R. 5050, as amended, to the
539	House.
540	All those in favor will say aye.
541	Those opposed, say no.
542	The ayes appear to have it. The ayes have it, and the bill
543	is favorably reported.
544	The chair now calls up H.R. 4641, as amended by the
545	Subcommittee on Health, and asks the clerk to report.
546	[The Bill H.R. 4641 follows:]
547	
548	*********INSERT 2*******

549 The Clerk. H.R. 4641, to provide for the establishment of an inter-agency task force to review, modify, and update best 550 practices for pain management, prescribing pain medication, and 551 552 for other purposes. The Chairman. So without objection, the first reading of 553 the bill is dispensed with. The bill will be open for amendment 554 555 at any point. 556 Mrs. Brooks. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk. 557 The Chairman. The gentlelady has an amendment at the desk. 558 The clerk will report the title of the amendment. The Clerk. Amendment to H.R. 4641, offered by Mrs. Brooks. 559 [The Amendment offered by Mrs. Brooks follows:] 560 561 562 *********INSERT 3*******

The Chairman. And the amendment will be considered read.

The staff will distribute the amendment, and the gentlelady from Indiana is recognized for five minutes in support of her amendment.

Mrs. Brooks. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want to thank the chairman for continuing the bipartisan momentum that we started last week by swiftly moving this bill and the accompanying addiction bills through the full committee process today. While we are moving quickly on this particular package, the committee has meticulously investigated this issue over the past year with multiple hearings and expert witnesses, and the result is a package of solutions focused on prevention and treatment that will help those facing addiction and their families deal with this growing epidemic.

H.R. 4641, which I introduced with my colleague,
Representative Kennedy, ensures that the recently released CDC
guidelines for opioid abuse are updated and reviewed regularly.
Every year, 260 million opioids, or one for every single United
States adult, with 20 million to spare, is prescribed in America.
We need to make sure the prescribing physicians, pharmacists,
first responders, law enforcement and, most importantly, family
members of addicts have the best guidance, support, and resources
to be successful

Our bill will ensure that opioid prescribing practices are reviewed, modified, and updated, where needed, by an inter-agency

task force and expert stakeholders from the prescriber, patient, addiction, and recovery community, to reflect best practices going forward.

In the course of this debate, I have heard from many of my colleagues, organizations who have demonstrated expertise in this field, that would both enhance the task force's final product and ensure greater stakeholder buy-in. So I am happy that the amendment before us today does that by adding hospitals, pharmacies, state medical boards, and others, to the prescriber task force.

If we are going to start solving this very difficult problem, we need a diverse set of ideas representing different viewpoints to an all-buy-in to the solution. And this amendment draws in more experts, enhances the tenor and the conversation, and broadens the potential impact of our task force's work. And I urge my colleagues to support this amendment and the underlying bill, and I yield back.

The Chairman. Would the gentlelady yield? Mrs. Brooks?
Mrs. Brooks. Yes.

The Chairman. Back here behind you.

Mr. Shimkus. Yes. I just want to add just one of the most moving meetings I had with a constituent was her fear of us moving too quickly and she wasn't representing an association, she came in because she has severe arthritis, chronic pain, and her fear is she is going to lose access to pain medicine that allows her

to live somewhat of a normal life. She made three points, and 613 I just--it is one that I pretty much remember. 614 Chronic pain is chronic pain. It is never going to go away. 615 They are always going to have it. And that because of that, she 616 is dependent upon pain-relieving medicine to have her live as 617 normal a life as she can, but that doesn't mean she is addicted. 618 So I keep those three things in mind as we move forward. 619 620 have got to be concerned about those people who are in chronic They need this to live a normal life. Without this, they 621 pain. are homebound, hospitalized, or they don't add to the society, 622 623 the community, anymore. 624 So I appreciate that and the focus, and I would just plead for those who suffer from chronic pain that we need to be very, 625 very careful that we don't scare doctors and physicians away from 626 627 prescribing this to our constituents. 628 And I yield back to my colleague from Indiana. 629 The Chairman. The gentlelady yields back. Other members 630 wishing to speak on the amendment? The gentleman from Texas, Mr. 631 Green. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank both our 632 633 colleagues, Congressman Kennedy and Congresswoman Brooks, for 634 this legislation, and I think this amendment is an improvement. 635 There is some concern, and I will follow up my colleague from 636 Illinois about--I represent a blue collar district. There are people who work really hard outside, and they get injured, and 637

some of them are barely getting along.

And if they didn't have the pain medication--but I do want to make sure that--I think this legislation is good, but also that the amendment makes it improved so we can make sure we can get the dosage level in, because we do have an addiction issue in our country, and whether it be in urban areas or rural areas. But I am glad this bill is here, and thank you and Representative Kennedy for doing it.

I yield back.

The Chairman. The gentleman yields back. Other members wishing to speak? The gentleman from West Virginia, Mr. McKinley.

Mr. McKinley. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Chairman, strike the last word. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the sponsor of this amendment, Representative Brooks, for working with us to include in her amendment the perspective of rural communities. Mr. Chairman, drug addiction and opioid abuse are a grave and growing concern all across America. But for the most--and for the most part, the last two decades, the deaths resulting from opiates have quadrupled.

However, if we are going to be successful, we must make sure that we are just not confronting this problem in our big cities but also in rural America. While addiction is on the rise throughout the United States, the greatest concentration of misuse appears to be in rural areas, much like West Virginia, which

has the highest rate of drug overdose deaths in this country at 12.6 per 100,000, almost double the national average.

One reason the fatality rate is so high in West Virginia is the demographics of our state. Rural America is not the same as big cities. Take, for example, Tucker County, West Virginia, a population of less than 7,000 people living in a land area of 400 square miles. It is twice the size of Chicago, the land mass of Chicago, but yet they don't have a hospital, and they only have two ambulances for the entire county.

These rural homeowners are concerned. Imagine if you are a mother or a father or a grandparent of a child who has overdosed on opioids there. Your options are limited. If your child does not receive the proper care and treatment within that medical golden hour, the chances of a positive outcome dwindle.

For folks living in--for families living in rural communities throughout America, this amendment gives them a voice on the task force by including a representative from the Health Resources and Services Administration, federal Office of Rural Health Policy, this is important. It provides a unique set of challenges, and it is important that they have a voice on the task force looking to combat drug abuse and addiction.

I yield back my time.

The Chairman. The gentleman yields back. Other members wishing to speak on the Brooks amendment? Seeing none, the vote occurs on the Brooks amendment.

688	Those in favor will say aye.
689	Those opposed, say no.
690	In the opinion of the chair, the ayes have it. The ayes have
691	it, and the amendment is agreed to.
692	Are there further amendments to the bill? Seeing none, the
693	question now occurs on favorably reporting H.R. 4641, as amended,
694	to the House.
695	All those in favor will signify by saying aye.
696	Those opposed, say no.
697	The ayes have it. The ayes have it, and the bill is favorably
698	reported.
699	The chair now calls up H.R. 4978 and asks the clerk to report.
700	[The Bill H.R. 4978 follows:]
701	
702	**************************************

703 The Clerk. H.R. 4978, to require the Government Accountability Office to submit to Congress a report on neonatal 704 abstinence syndrome in the United States and treatment under 705 Medicaid. 706 707 The Chairman. Without objection, the first reading of the bill is dispensed with, and the bill will be open for amendment 708 at any point. Are there any bipartisan amendments to the bill? 709 The chair would recognize the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. 710 Pitts--711 Mr. Pitts. Thank you, Mr.--712 713 The Chairman. --who has an amendment at the desk. The 714 clerk will report the title. The Clerk. Amendment to H.R. 4978, offered by Mr. Pitts. 715 716 [The Amendment offered by Mr. Pitts follows:] 717 **********INSERT 5****** 718

The Chairman. And the amendment will be considered as read.

The staff will distribute the amendment, and the gentleman is recognized for five minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. Pitts. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This is a bipartisan amendment offered by myself and Mr. Yarmuth concerning--containing two common sense measures. The first policy would encourage the continued development of abuse deterrent formulations of prescription drugs by exempting these formulations from the definition of "line extension" when calculating the Medicaid rebate.

Today, due to a drafting error in current law, such formulations are subject to a higher rebate under the Medicaid program than Congress intended. The President's fiscal year 2017 budget proposed to correct this error, noting such a change would "incentivize continued development of abuse deterrent formulations." The FDA has said that it "considers the development of these products a high public health priority."

Since abuse deterrent formulations represent a critically important tool in the federal policy toolbox, this policy change will help ensure that there is continued investment in these technologies, which will help reduce the number of patients who abuse opioid drugs.

The second policy in this amendment is a common sense measure from the President's fiscal year 2017 budget that would protect from disclosure the program integrity algorithms used to combat

33 fraud in Medicare, Medicaid, and CHIP. Today, the mathematical 744 algorithms that CMS uses in Medicare are vital to uncovering 745 fraud, waste, and abuse. 746 But if various aspects of these anti-fraud tools were to 747 748 become public fraudsters could utilize the information to harm the program or beneficiaries. And this policy would protect 749 taxpayers, save dollars, by preventing the details of anti-fraud 750 efforts from being disclosed. 751 These two policies are common sense, they are bipartisan, 752 good government policies, that help protect patients and 753 I urge my colleagues to vote for the amendment and 754 yield back. 755 The Chairman. The gentleman yields back. 756 The gentleman 757 from Kentucky is recognized. Mr. Yarmuth. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am very pleased 758 759

Mr. Yarmuth. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am very pleased to joint Mr. Pitts in offering this bipartisan amendment.

Medicaid beneficiaries are at the front and center of the opioid crisis. Unbelievably, though, our nation's most vulnerable populations are twice as likely to be prescribed opioid drugs as compared with the general population.

Moreover, Medicaid enrollees account for 45 percent of overdose deaths and have six times the risk. I am proud of the work that the Medicaid program has done with states over the last year to promote innovation and comprehensive substance abuse treatment strategies, and to address the overprescribing of

760

761

762

763

764

765

766

767

opioids to Medicaid beneficiaries.

However, this amendment builds on those efforts and consists of two common sense bipartisan policies. These policies will incentivize the development of abuse deterrent opioid drugs and will preserve and protect CMS's highly advanced program integrity algorithms that are a key part of our efforts to fight fraud in Medicaid, Medicare, and CHIP.

We must promote the development of abuse deterrent formulations of opioids while aggressively pursuing efforts to combat fraudulent prescribing and dispensing as well as so-called pharmacy shopping by those suffering an opioid addiction. This amendment addresses both concerns, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

I yield back.

The Chairman. Other members wishing to speak? The chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey for five minutes.

Mr. Pallone. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just wanted to say a few words in support of this amendment. Nationwide, prescription drug abuse increased dramatically in the past decade, and the Medicaid program is at the center of the opioid crisis.

As some of my colleagues have mentioned, as we debated this opioid crisis in committee, Medicaid participants are twice as likely to be prescribed painkillers as their privately insured counterparts and account for 45 percent of overdose deaths and

have six times risk of an overdose death. And these are, you know, 794 795 pretty eye-opening statistics. I want to commend the administration's work to address the 796 opioid crisis in the Medicaid program, and the Medicaid program 797 has done a huge amount of work with states over the last year to 798 promote comprehensive substance abuse treatment strategies and 799 address overprescribing of opioids to Medicaid beneficiaries. 800 801 However, this amendment builds on those efforts and consists of two common sense bipartisan policies. 802 These policies will incentivize the development of abuse 803 804 deterrent formulations of opioid drugs and will preserve and 805 protect CMS's highly advanced program integrity algorithms that are a key part of our fraud-fighting efforts for Medicare as well 806 as Medicaid and CHIP. And both policies are recommended in the 807 President's budget, and I support this amendment; again, another 808 example of our bipartisan work here. 809 I yield back. 810 Thank you. 811 The Chairman. The gentleman yields back. Other members 812 wishing to speak on the amendment? Seeing none, the vote occurs on the amendment offered by Mr. Pitts and Mr. Yarmuth. 813 814 All those in favor will say aye. 815 Those opposed, say no. 816 In the opinion of the chair, the ayes have it. The amendment

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

Are there further amendments to the bill? Seeing none, the

is agreed to.

817

819	question now occurs on favorably reporting H.R. 4978, as amended,
820	to the House.
821	All those in favor will say aye.
822	Those opposed, say no.
823	The ayes appear to have it. The ayes have it. The bill is
824	favorably reported.
825	The chair now calls H.R. 1818 and asks the clerk to report.
826	[The Bill H.R. 1818 follows:]
827	
828	**************************************

829 The Clerk. H.R. 1818, to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide grants to states to streamline state requirements 830 and procedures for veterans and military emergency medical 831 training to become civilian emergency medical technicians. 832 833 The Chairman. And without objection, the first reading of the bill is dispensed with. The bill will be open for amendment 834 at any point. Are there any bipartisan amendments to the bill? 835 Are there any amendments to the bill? The chair would recognize 836 the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. Kinzinger. 837 838 Mr. Kinzinger. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have an 839 amendment. 840 The Chairman. And the clerk will report the title of the 841 amendment. The Clerk. Amendment to H.R. 1818 offered by Mr. Kinzinger. 842 [The Amendment offered by Mr. Kinzinger follows:] 843 844 845 *********INSERT 7******

The Chairman. And the amendment will be considered as read. The staff will distribute the amendment, and the gentleman from 847 Illinois is recognized for five minutes in support of his 848 849 amendment. 850 Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This is just a Mr. Kinzinger. simple technical correction to change the title from 2015 to 2016. 851 I want to personally thank Congresswoman Capps for working with 852 me on this for a long time, and thank the committee. 853 This a good bill for veterans and for rural communities that 854 find themselves having a hard time recruiting EMTs for their fire 855 856 departments or their hospitals. And I would request the 857 committee's support on this and thank the chairman for considering 858 it, and I yield back. 859 The Chairman. The gentleman yields back. The chair would recognize the gentlelady from California, Mrs. Capps. 860 861 Mrs. Capps. Thank you. I wanted to have a moment to thank 862 my colleague for working with me on this and me for working--well, we worked together on the Veteran Emergency Medical Technician 863 864 Support Act. I just want to say why this bill is so important to me. 865 866 know that we have some of the most highly trained medical 867 professionals in the world while they are in the military. 868 men and women receive the best technical training in emergency 869 medicine, and it is all tested on the battlefield in very extreme 870 circumstances.

But when they return home, these medics return back to civilized or so-called civilized life, or civilian life, and they attempt to apply their skills to work in the civilian EMT sector. They are forced to start at square one as though they had never had any experience on the battlefield. Repeating coursework isn't just a waste of time; it is also very expensive.

So, similarly, when an EMT leaves to serve in the military, their civilian certifications can lapse while they are away. We have a tremendous need for qualified emergency medical technicians in this country, but this discrepancy is keeping qualified veterans out of the civilian workforce. We need these valuable medical personnel in our communities, especially as we now face this opioid crisis. The two topics go together.

So we need to pass this bill because it provides a small but meaningful step to address these problems. VETS EMT will help our states streamline their certification processes so that the military medical training can be accounted for when applying for civilian licensure.

So I, again, urge full support for this bill to help our talented military men and women join the health workforce and continue to make a difference at home after doing such tremendous work abroad. And I will yield to anyone or I will yield back. I yield back.

The Chairman. The gentlelady yields back. Other members wishing to speak on the amendment? Seeing none, the vote occurs

896	on favorably reporting H.R. 1818, as amended, to the House.
897	All those in favor so say aye.
898	Those opposed, say no.
899	The ayes appear to have it. The ayes have it. The bill is
900	favorably reported.
901	The chair now calls up H.R. 4981, as amended by the
902	Subcommittee on Health, and asks the clerk to report.
903	[The Bill H.R. 4981 follows:]
904	
905	*********INSERT 8******

906 The Clerk. H.R. 4981, to amend the Controlled Substances Act to improve access to opioid use disorder treatment. 907 Without objection, the first reading of the 908 The Chairman. 909 bill is dispensed with. The bill will be open for amendment at 910 any point. Mr. Bucshon. Mr. Chairman? 911 912 The Chairman. Are there amendments? Are there--913 Mr. Bucshon. Mr. Chairman? The Chairman. Dr. Bucshon is recognized for five minutes. 914 915 Yes. Mr. Chairman, H.R. 4981, the Opioid Use Mr. Bucshon. 916 Disorder Treatment Expansion and Modernization Act, is the 917 product of months of stakeholder engagement, expert input, and 918 bipartisan negotiation. The opioid epidemic has left no area of this nation 919 920 untouched. Every week we hear from our constituents and see it 921 in the news, the direct impact this has on Americans' everyday The evidence is clear that this epidemic is growing and 922 lives. 923 it will continue to grow unless immediate action is taken. 924 As a doctor, a father, and a public policymaker, I want to do my part to help our communities overcome this challenge. 925 926 is why I am proud to offer H.R. 4981, the Opioid Use Disorder 927 Treatment Expansion and Modernization Act today with my colleague 928 from New York, Mr. Tonko. 929 We have worked side by side over the past several months to find common ground and move forward with a good policy solution. 930

Again, our final bill represents months of stakeholder engagement and bipartisan work to improve access and quality of treatment for opioid use disorder while limiting diversion.

Our legislation increases access to opioid use disorder treatment where it is needed most by lifting prescribing caps in a responsible and measured manner and provides a new class of capable practitioners and nurse practitioners and physician assistants the opportunity to train to become a waivered a prescriber.

It empowers physicians through education, training, and quality of care measures, allowing them to make informed decisions in the prescribing process for opioid use disorder treatment. It also encourages a multi-prong approach to opioid use disorder treatment by providing physicians and patients education on a wider range of treatment options. And it deters bad actors, both on the physician and patient side, by implementing physician-crafted diversion control plans and giving HHS the tools to ensure physician compliance with best practices to rein in the abusive and overprescription epidemic.

Again, I want to thank my friend, Congressman Tonko, and all those who informed us throughout this process, and I look forward to H.R. 4981's passage here and on the House floor. I yield.

The Chairman. The gentleman yields back. Other members wishing to offer an amendment to the bill?

Mr. Bucshon. Yes. I do have a bipartisan amendment, Mr.

956 Chairman.
957 The
958 The clerk

The Chairman. The gentleman has an amendment to the bill. The clerk will report the title.

The Clerk. Amendment to H.R. 4981, offered by Mr. Bucshon.
[The Amendment offered by Mr. Bucshon follows:]

961

962

960

*********INSERT 9******

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

	44
963	The Chairman. And the amendment will be considered as read.
964	The staff will distribute the amendment, and the gentlemanwho
965	is your bipartisan sponsor, Dr. Bucshon?
966	Mr. Bucshon. No, I think it isI misspoke. It is a
967	manager's amendment type.
968	The Chairman. Okay. It is just a Bucshon amendment?
969	Mr. Bucshon. Yes.
970	The Chairman. And the gentleman is recognized for five
971	minutes in support of his amendment?
972	Mr. Bucshon. Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My amendment
973	is technical in nature and clarifies the scope of the HHS report
974	to Congress required in our bill. I urge my colleagues to support
975	its adoption, and I yield back.
976	The Chairman. The gentleman yields back. Other members
977	wishing to speak on the amendment? The gentleman from New York,
978	Mr. Tonko.
979	Mr. Tonko. Thank you, Mr. Chair. In yesterday's markup
980	proceedings, I thanked Representative Bucshon and his staff for
981	the work, and the staff of the committee, to be able to bring this
982	bill before us. And I think it is a strong bill, it is one that
983	will be of great assistance, and this amendment is solely
984	technical in nature, and ask that the committee members support
985	it. And with that, I yield back.
986	The Chairman. The gentleman yields back. Other members
987	wishing to speak on the amendment? The gentlelady from

California, Mrs. Capps.

Mrs. Capps. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I move to strike the last word. And in support of the Opioid Use Disorder Treatment and Expansion Modernization Act, this bill represents months of work across the aisle to find effective solutions to help people with opioid addiction access the best treatments available.

To combat opioid crisis, we need to support all avenues of prevention, treatment, and care, including access to medication-assisted treatment. But we know that far too many individuals who need and want help to curb their opioid addiction cannot access it.

The bill before us recognizes this lack of capacity and would correct a longstanding omission that keeps certain providers, namely nurse practitioners and physician assistants from being a part of the solution. I am pleased that this has already been referenced in our discussion.

Nurse practitioners and physician--PAs, physician assistants, are the primary care providers for millions of Americans. They have extensive training and the ability to work meaningfully with patients affected by opioid abuse. And while their scope of practice, including prescribing abilities, are traditionally regulated at the state level, federal law needlessly prohibits them from prescribing Schedule 3, 4, or 5 drugs for treatment of opioid addiction, even when they can prescribe these drugs for other indications.

This is detrimental to our fight against this opioid epidemic. In communities all across America, individuals are suffering because a shortage of providers exists who can treat them with buprenorphine. This bill before us would fix this discrepancy and allow these valuable health care providers to join the fight against opioid abuse in line with their current prescribing allowance as determined by their state. Health professionals play a vital role in ensuring patient health and safety.

With this bill, we would make meaningful progress by expanding the number of health care providers who are able to help those in need. I urge my colleagues to support this bill, so we can continue the momentum in combatting this crisis and expand access to care. We have to knock down artificial barriers such as the one this amendment addresses to care once and for all for everyone.

I yield back.

The Chairman. The gentlelady yields back. The chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Dr. Murphy, for five minutes.

Mr. Murphy. Thank you, Mr. Chair. I will just be brief. I wanted to strike the last word, but I want to comment on some wording added in the manager's amendment which is extremely important. We know that when someone is on buprenorphine, or the medication, I know a study was done in Pennsylvania and found that

like 59 percent of patients did not have any counseling in the
year that buprenorphine was prescribed.

That is a concern because we know from our hearings we had
here in the Oversight and Investigations Subcommittee--and as you

here in the Oversight and Investigations Subcommittee--and as you mentioned before, Mr. Chairman--that very few people are getting any treatment. Only 10 percent have evidence-based care. It is extremely essential that to make medication-assisted treatment work, to have other counseling that is done by someone who is a counselor dealing with drug and alcohol because we want these people to not just have government-sponsored drugs but to make sure that we are helping them on the road to recovery.

So the language is going to require a report to Congress access to the use of counseling and recovery support services, including the percentage of patients receiving such services, is extremely important in this bill, and I thank you, Mr. Chairman, for including that information in the bill. And with that, I yield back.

The Chairman. The gentleman yields back. Other members wishing to speak on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana, Dr. Bucshon? Seeing none, the vote occurs on the amendment offered by Dr. Bucshon.

All those in favor will say aye.

Those opposed, say no.

In the opinion of the chair, the ayes have it. The amendment is agreed to.

1063	Are there further amendments to the bill? The gentlelady
1064	from Colorado has an amendment at the desk.
1065	Ms. DeGette. Thank you.
1066	The Chairman. The clerk will report the title.
1067	The Clerk. What is the number of the amendment?
1068	The Chairman. I think it is 2.
1069	Ms. DeGette. It should be Amendment 2 on this bill.
1070	The Clerk. Amendment to H.R. 4981, offered by Ms. DeGette.
1071	[The Amendment offered by Ms. DeGette follows:]
1072	
1073	*********INSERT 10******

The Chairman. And the amendment will be considered as read.

The staff will distribute the amendment, and the gentlelady from

Colorado is recognized for five minutes in support of her

amendment.

Ms. DeGette. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. What this amendment does is it increases the cap on the number of patients physicians can treat at a given time with buprenorphine to 500.

I want to thank Mr. Bucshon and Mr. Tonko for doing this bill.

It is a very important bill. And as Mr. Murphy said, we had a number of hearings in the Oversight and Investigations

Subcommittee last year on the subject of the opioid epidemic.

What we heard was really sobering.

Every day, 78 Americans die from an opioid-related overdose, and between 1999 and 2010 the death rate from prescription opioids more than quadrupled. And we also know that the epidemic is worsening. Just last year, the number of prescription opioid overdoses jumped another 9 percent, and overdoses due to heroin increased by 26 percent. But as we heard in our series of O&I hearings, the public health and treatment infrastructure hasn't kept pace with this expanding epidemic.

We had federal, state, and local health officials and public health experts who told us of widespread and pervasive shortages in treatment capacity throughout the United States, in urban areas, in rural areas, everywhere. Only 1 in 10 individuals suffering from substance abuse receive any form of treatment, and

only a fraction of those receive evidence-based treatments, including Medication-Assisted Treatment or MAT, such as bupe.

Now, bupe has been proven both safe and effective in decreasing the number of fatal overdoses, increasing patients' retention in treatment, and reducing the risk of infectious disease transmission. Coupled with prenatal care in pregnant women who are addicted to opioids, it also reduces the risk of obstetrical, fetal, and neonatal complications. But despite strong evidence supporting the use of this as a public health intervention, access to bupe remains limited.

There was one study that the University of Washington did, which said that 53 percent of U.S. counties don't have a single physician who can prescribe this drug. The situation is particularly dire in rural counties where over 80 percent don't have a single waivered bupe prescriber. So when you expand access to bupe, it is going to be critical to addressing this crisis, and I support strongly this bill which expands access by increasing the cap on the number of patients.

But the problem is, when you only increase the cap of patients to 250 as this bill does, then you are not going to be able to get the kind of access to treatment that patients, particularly in rural areas, need. So I think that if you give addiction specialists and physicians who have taken extensive continuing medical education the ability to prescribe bupe, if you increase that up to 500 patients per physician, that will actually give

patients the access that they need to this type of treatment.

And as Mr. Murphy said, this type of treatment is a very skilled medical treatment that you need, and so not just every doctor can do it. They don't have that medical training to do it. These are providers with specialized knowledge and training to treat patients struggling with addiction. They can be trusted to exercise their professional judgment and manage their patient loads appropriately.

I think probably we should remove the cap entirely. I don't know of any other situation where we have arbitrary limits on the number of patients that a provider can treat with a particular prescription drug. And in any other area of medicine, we wouldn't even consider proposals that amount to rationing of medical care, especially when there are so few trained professionals.

But here is why I am offering this amendment is the Senate Heath Committee has passed an amendment on a bipartisan basis that sets a 500-patient cap. And I think we could do that now very safely while protecting the integrity of this training and counseling that we are having, and also adding the new set of guardrails under H.R. 4981.

I suspect that once we pass these bills through the House and the Senate with a cap of 500, we may want to go back at some point and revisit that, but in the meantime 500 will vastly improve our ability to respond to this crisis on a widespread geographic basis. And so I would urge my colleagues to support this

1149 amendment, and I yield back. 1150 The Chairman. The gentlelady yields back. The chair would recognize the gentleman from Indiana, Dr. Bucshon. 1151 1152 Mr. Bucshon. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This bill is a bipartisan agreement born of good faith and negotiations over a 1153 number of months, and informed by experts and stakeholders in a 1154 1155 transparent process. We had assistance from Department of Health 1156 and Human Services, and they noted proposals for higher caps than the 200 they proposed, specifically noting a cap of 500, and said 1157 they do not believe a provider could actually treat that number 1158 of patients while providing high quality care. 1159 1160 Given the data from HHS, which they clearly did their 1161 homework, and outside experts and other stakeholders, I believe 1162 that 250 patients is a reasonable compromise to ensure patients 1163 can find the care they need and that physicians can maintain 1164 quality practices. 1165 For these reasons, I urge my colleagues to vote no on this 1166 amendment, and I yield back. 1167 The Chairman. The gentleman yields back. Other members wishing to speak on the amendment? Seeing none, the vote occurs 1168 1169 on the amendment offered by the gentlelady from Colorado. recorded vote has been asked for. The clerk will call the roll. 1170 1171 The Clerk. Mr. Barton.

[No response.]

Mr. Whitfield.

1172

1174	Mr. Whitfield. No.
1175	The Clerk. Mr. Shimkus.
1176	[No response.]
1177	Mr. Pitts.
1178	<u>Mr. Pitts.</u> No.
1179	The Clerk. Mr. Walden.
1180	<u>Mr. Walden.</u> No.
1181	The Clerk. Mr. Murphy.
1182	Mr. Murphy. No.
1183	The Clerk. Mr. Burgess.
1184	Mr. Burgess. No.
1185	The Clerk. Ms. Blackburn.
1186	Mrs. Blackburn. No.
1187	The Clerk. Mr. Scalise.
1188	[No response.]
1189	Mr. Latta. Mr. Latta.
1190	<u>Mr. Latta.</u> No.
1191	The Clerk. Mrs. McMorris Rodgers.
1192	[No response.]
1193	Mr. Harper.
1194	<u>Mr. Harper.</u> No.
1195	The Clerk. Mr. Lance.
1196	<u>Mr. Lance.</u> No.
1197	The Clerk. Mr. Guthrie.
1198	Mr. Guthrie. No.

1199	The Clerk. Mr. Olson.
1200	[No response.]
1201	Mr. McKinley.
1202	Mr. McKinley. No.
1203	The Clerk. Mr. Pompeo.
1204	Mr. Pompeo. No.
1205	The Clerk. Mr. Kinzinger.
1206	[No response.]
1207	Mr. Griffith.
1208	[No response.]
1209	Mr. Bilirakis.
1210	<u>Mr. Bilirakis.</u> No.
1211	The Clerk. Mr. Johnson.
1212	<u>Mr. Johnson.</u> No.
1213	The Clerk. Mr. Long.
1214	Mr. Long. No.
1215	The Clerk. Mr. Bucshon.
1216	Mr. Bucshon. No.
1217	The Clerk. Mr. Flores.
1218	Mr. Flores. No.
1219	The Clerk. Ms. Brooks.
1220	Ms. Brooks. No.
1221	The Clerk. Mr. Mullin.
1222	Mr. Mullin. No.
1223	The Clerk. Mr. Hudson.

1224	[No response.]
1225	Mr. Collins.
1226	Mr. Collins. No.
1227	The Clerk. Mr. Cramer.
1228	[No response.]
1229	Ms. Ellmers.
1230	Mrs. Ellmers. No.
1231	The Clerk. Mr. Pallone.
1232	<u>Mr. Pallone.</u> Aye.
1233	The Clerk. Mr. Pallone votes aye.
1234	Mr. Rush.
1235	<u>Mr. Rush.</u> Aye.
1236	The Clerk. Mr. Rush votes aye.
1237	Ms. Eshoo.
1238	<u>Ms. Eshoo.</u> Aye.
1239	The Clerk. Ms. Eshoo votes aye.
1240	Mr. Engel.
1241	<u>Mr. Engel.</u> Aye.
1242	The Clerk. Mr. Engel votes aye.
1243	Mr. Green.
1244	<u>Mr. Green.</u> Aye.
1245	The Clerk. Mr. Green votes aye.
1246	Ms. DeGette.
1247	<u>Ms. DeGette.</u> Aye.
1248	The Clerk. Ms. DeGette votes aye.

1249	Mrs. Capps.
1250	<u>Mrs. Capps.</u> Aye.
1251	The Clerk. Mrs. Capps vote aye.
1252	Mr. Doyle.
1253	[No response.]
1254	Ms. Schakowsky.
1255	<u>Ms. Schakowsky.</u> Aye.
1256	The Clerk. Ms. Schakowsky votes aye.
1257	Mr. Butterfield.
1258	<u>Mr. Butterfield.</u> Aye.
1259	The Clerk. Mr. Butterfield votes aye.
1260	Ms. Matsui.
1261	<u>Ms. Matsui.</u> Aye.
1262	The Clerk. Ms. Matsui votes aye.
1263	Ms. Castor.
1264	<u>Ms. Castor.</u> Aye.
1265	The Clerk. Ms. Castor votes aye.
1266	Mr. Sarbanes.
1267	<u>Mr. Sarbanes.</u> Aye.
1268	The Clerk. Mr. Sarbanes votes aye.
1269	Mr. McNerney.
1270	<u>Mr. McNerney.</u> Aye.
1271	The Clerk. Mr. McNerney votes aye.
1272	Mr. Welch.
1273	<u>Mr. Welch.</u> Aye.

1274	The Clerk. Mr. Welch votes aye.
1275	Mr. Lujan.
1276	<u>Mr. Lujan.</u> Aye.
1277	The Clerk. Mr. Lujan votes aye.
1278	Mr. Tonko.
1279	<u>Mr. Tonko.</u> Aye.
1280	The Clerk. Mr. Tonko votes aye.
1281	Mr. Yarmuth.
1282	Mr. Yarmuth. Aye.
1283	The Clerk. Mr. Yarmuth votes aye.
1284	Ms. Clarke.
1285	<u>Ms. Clarke.</u> Aye.
1286	The Clerk. Ms. Clarke votes aye.
1287	Mr. Loebsack.
1288	[No response.]
1289	Mr. Schrader.
1290	<u>Mr. Schrader.</u> Aye.
1291	The Clerk. Mr. Schrader votes aye.
1292	Mr. Kennedy.
1293	<u>Mr. Kennedy.</u> Aye.
1294	The Clerk. Mr. Kennedy votes aye.
1295	Mr. Cardenas.
1296	<u>Mr. Cardenas.</u> Aye.
1297	The Clerk. Mr. Cardenas votes aye.
1298	Chairman Upton.

1299	<u>The Chairman.</u> Votes no.
1300	The Clerk. Chairman Upton votes no.
1301	The Chairman. Other members wishing to cast a vote? Mr.
1302	Shimkus.
1303	Mr. Shimkus. No.
1304	The Clerk. Mr. Shimkus votes no.
1305	The Chairman. Mr. Olson.
1306	Mr. Olson. No.
1307	The Clerk. Mr. Olson votes no.
1308	The Chairman. Other members? Mr. Cramer.
1309	<u>Mr. Cramer.</u> No.
1310	The Clerk. Mr. Cramer votes no.
1311	The Chairman. Other members wishing to cast a vote? Seeing
1312	none, the clerk will report the tally.
1313	The Clerk. Mr. Chairman, on that vote there are 17 ayes and
1314	29 noes.
1315	The Chairman. All right. Can you just check that count
1316	again, justis that right?
1317	The Clerk. Mr. Chairman, on that vote there are 21 ayes and
1318	25 noes.
1319	The Chairman. 21 ayes, 25 noes. The amendment is not
1320	agreed to.
1321	Are there further amendments to the bill? The gentleman
1322	from New Jersey has an amendment at the desk?
1323	Mr. Pallone. I do. Yes, I think there is only one, 01.
	1

1324	The Chairman. The clerk will report the title of the
1325	amendment 01.
1326	The gentleman was not recorded, but the vote has been closed.
1327	Sorry. We have called up the next amendment already.
1328	The clerk will report the title of the amendment.
1329	The Clerk. Amendment to H.R. 4981, offered by Mr. Pallone.
1330	[The Amendment offered by Mr. Pallone follows:]
1331	
1332	*********INSERT 11*******

The Chairman. And the amendment will be considered as read.

The gentleman from--staff will distribute the amount. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for five minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. Pallone. Mr. Chairman, I would like to offer an amendment. It is simple. It would increase the cap on the number of patients physicians can treat at a given time with bupe to 300.

As I have stated before, I find the existence of a cap on the number of patients a provider can treat with a particular medication to be totally nonsensical. In every other area of medicine, we trust health care providers to manage their patient load responsibly. In this instance, we are not trusting doctors who are on the front lines of this crisis to use their professional judgment in order to provide treatment for individuals facing the battle of their lives with opioid addiction.

The DATA 2000 framework is outdated, unscientific, and seems to be rooted in stigma and prejudice against people with substance abuse disorders rather than scientific evidence. Proposals to ration the amount of prescription drugs a provider can dispense for any other medical condition would be uniformly met with consternation from members on both sides of the aisle.

But we treat addiction differently because society continues to view it as a moral failing or a flaw of character rather than as a medical condition and a chronic disease. So I think it is time for our attitudes and for this outdated statutory regime to

catch up with the science.

As a result of this misguided policy, patients suffering from heroin and opioid abuse face a critical lack of access to evidence-based treatments, particularly bupe. As I mentioned during the subcommittee markup, Dr. Waller provided written testimony on the TREAT Act that with regards to treatment with bupe, over half of physicians surveyed by the American Society of Addiction Medicine had a wait list of over 100 patients.

Personally, I find the existence of wait lists for patients in crisis to be unconscionable. Every day a patient is left waiting for treatment is another day that patient remains at risk for a potentially fatal overdose. I think it is important to note that in addition to the clear detriment to public health these wait lists create ripple effects on our criminal justice system.

During our discussions of the regulations surrounding bupe in the DATA 2000 framework, many have tried to weigh the risks of Medicaid diversion. While this is an important concern, I am worried that we are viewing diversions through the wrong lens. A recent study by the Journal of American Medicine noted that, and I quote, "Attempting but failing to enter an outpatient bupe treatment program has been identified as a risk factor for use of diverted bupe." We should not be surprised when the authors found that over three-quarters of the users of diverted bupe were for individuals attempting to self-treat symptoms of withdrawal or addiction.

The researcher's conclusion was striking, and I quote, "The high percentage of use of diverted medical for self-treatment may be a sentinel public health signal that treatment needs are not being met and that improved access to and/or expansion of treatment are essential." Although diversion of bupe is certainly a legitimate concern, this suggests that much of this problem is one of our own creation. Because of an inflexible, arbitrary cap on treatment, wait-listed patients are actually turning to their drug dealers for bupe treatment rather than to their doctors, and we have the power to change this.

Our nation's addiction specialists and health care providers are in agreement that the bupe cap should be raised significantly. Increasing the cap would increase both the access to care for patients as well as the quality of care that patients receive.

So I strongly urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this amendment. Again, you know, I don't even think we should have any cap. The Senate and Ms. DeGette suggested the 500 minus 300, which is only 50 more than the 250. So I would like to see it as a sort of compromise, a little above the compromise that is in the legislation.

And I yield back.

The Chairman. The gentleman yields back. The chair would recognize the gentleman from Indiana, Dr. Bucshon.

Mr. Bucshon. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Again, this bill is a bipartisan agreement born of good faith negotiations over a

number of months and informed by experts and stakeholders in a transparent process.

The administration, Health and Human Services, landed at a number of 200, doubling the current number. We saw a subcommittee and amendment to move caps to 200 and one to move them to 300. And as part of our good faith effort to reach a compromise, we went further than Health and Human Services to 250. But the Secretary maintains the authority to change that cap however she sees fit.

Given the data from Health and Human Services, as I mentioned--clearly did their homework--outside experts, and other stakeholders, 250 is a reasonable compromise to ensure patients can find the care they need and physicians aren't undertaking too large of a patient population compromising the quality of medical care.

For these reasons, I urge my colleagues to vote no on this amendment, and I yield back.

The Chairman. The gentleman yields back. Other members wishing to speak on the amendment? The gentleman from New York, Mr. Tonko.

Mr. Tonko. Thank you, Mr. Chair. I move to strike the last word. Thank you, Mr. Chair. I rise in support of the amendment. At the outset, let me say that I respect the diversity of opinions on this issue. Dealing with the patient cap number is one of the most vexing problems that we had to deal with in crafting this

bill.

There simply isn't a whole lot of data or rationale for why a 250-patient limit is better than 200 or 300, or 500 for that matter. A lot of the frustration on both sides stems from the fact that no matter where you land you are still imposing some sort of arbitrary limit. No matter where you land someone struggling with addiction will be denied treatment because of an obscure government rule.

In other areas of medicine, Federal Government-mandated patient limits would not be tolerated. We don't put a cap on the number of patients with mental illness that psychiatrists can treat, even though these individuals are going to require the same level of care and attention and wrap-around services that those grappling with addiction will need.

We don't put limits on the number of pain patients a pain specialist can see, even though some of the bad actors in this space are the same that are helping to drive this opioid crisis. In each of these cases, we trust the doctors to do their job and provide appropriate care--appropriate care--to their patients.

So what it really comes down to is the fact that we still have an enduring stigma surrounding addiction medicine, that somehow these doctors and these patients are not to be treated as part of our medical system. They shouldn't be trusted and instead should be watched with a wary eye from the Federal Government.

If diversion is the main concern, we should also be putting patient limits on the most commonly diverted drugs, which are the opioids themselves. At some point, if we are going to talk the talk about treating addiction like a public health crisis, I believe we also need to walk the walk.

That being said, I understand the political realities of the situation, and I do believe that lifting the cap, even to 250, will do immense good, especially when you factor in expanding prescribing privileges to nurse practitioners and to physician assistants. We worked in good faith to arrive at the 250 number, and it is certainly better than what we have now, and I will respect the committee's decision-making on this issue.

However, at the end of the day, 250 is still an arbitrary number. As we vote on this amendment, I would urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to ask themselves this simple question. If we are going to err when assigning these arbitrary numbers, isn't it better to err on the side of opening up treatment to more individuals, to do all we can to ensure people aren't dying while waiting weeks, if not months, for treatment? If you agree, I would urge you to support this very modest amendment.

And with that, I thank you, Mr. Chair, and yield back the balance of my time.

The Chairman. The gentleman yields back. Other members wishing to speak on the amendment? The gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. Murphy. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Actually, myself, I am feeling that even going up to 250 I think is too high right now. And I know that members are deeply concerned about this issue.

So it comes down to this. When I have gone to some of these clinics in my district and others, I have talked to the prescribers to try and get some sense of how much time they are actually spending with these patients struggling with this major disease. It is actually very limited.

And when we have had hearings here in our oversight committees and health committees, subcommittees, and have asked, "How much time do the doctors actually spend with patients?" they didn't know. When I have asked some, they said, "Perhaps a couple minutes." Now, of course, if you are only seeing someone for a couple of minutes, you can crank through quite a few every day.

But let's keep a couple of things in mind. That the key is to get people into recovery, and that means not just writing prescriptions or making sure they are getting other treatment, as Ms. DeGette talked about, how you have to have people very qualified doing this work. This is not simple work to help someone.

We also know when someone has an addiction disorder they get their family members to be enablers and co-dependent on them. They game the system. Sadly, when you are dealing with a serious addiction, these are folks who would sell their children,

literally, who bankrupt their families, who lie in many cases, just to maintain their addiction. They divert their medication, buprenorphine, the third most diverted drug.

When you have a clinic that does this right, and a doctor that does it right, they will randomly call their patients and say, "Stop at a pharmacist now. We want a pharmacy to do a pill count. How many are left? Is it too few? Did you sell those off?" They will make sure they do urine drug screens on a regular basis. Do they have the proper levels of buprenorphine? Did they suddenly take one just before they came in so it shows, or do they have proper levels? Do they have a mixture of other opiates in there as well?

This takes a lot of time to do this right, and I understand the issue the ranking member has there, and I think this is where we want to make sure we have more providers doing this and more trained professionals in the area of addiction and drug abuse, so we are helping people deal with this terrible epidemic in America which is so deadly.

But I think raising it more, I have concerns even getting to 250. I am willing to accept that for now, provided we do these other studies. In the future, I think as we get more providers, as we get people to spend more time with patients, we can make more progress on this deadly disease.

And with that, I yield back.

The Chairman. The gentleman yields back. Other members

1533	wishing to speak on the amendment? Seeing none, the vote occurs
1534	on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York. Roll
1535	call has been requested. The clerk will call the roll.
1536	The Clerk. Mr. Barton.
1537	[No response.]
1538	Mr. Whitfield.
1539	Mr. Whitfield. No.
1540	The Clerk. Mr. Whitfield votes no.
1541	Mr. Shimkus.
1542	Mr. Shimkus. No.
1543	The Clerk. Mr. Shimkus votes no.
1544	Mr. Pitts.
1545	<u>Mr. Pitts.</u> No.
1546	The Clerk. Mr. Pitts votes no.
1547	Mr. Walden.
1548	Mr. Walden. No.
1549	The Clerk. Mr. Walden votes no.
1550	Mr. Murphy.
1551	Mr. Murphy. No.
1552	The Clerk. Mr. Murphy votes no.
1553	Mr. Burgess.
1554	[No response.]
1555	Mrs. Blackburn.
1556	<u>Mrs. Blackburn.</u> No.
1557	The Clerk. Mrs. Blackburn votes no.

1558	Mr. Scalise.
1559	[No response.]
1560	Mr. Latta.
1561	<u>Mr. Latta.</u> No.
1562	The Clerk. Mr. Latta votes no.
1563	Mrs. McMorris Rodgers.
1564	[No response.]
1565	Mr. Harper.
1566	[No response.]
1567	Mr. Lance.
1568	Mr. Lance. No.
1569	The Clerk. Mr. Lance votes no.
1570	Mr. Guthrie.
1571	Mr. Guthrie. No.
1572	The Clerk. Mr. Guthrie votes no.
1573	Mr. Olson.
1574	Mr. Olson. No.
1575	The Clerk. Mr. Olson votes no.
1576	Mr. McKinley.
1577	Mr. McKinley. No.
1578	The Clerk. Mr. McKinley votes no.
1579	Mr. Pompeo.
1580	[No response.]
1581	Mr. Kinzinger.
1582	<u>Mr. Kinzinger.</u> No.

1583	The Clerk. Mr. Kinzinger votes no.
1584	Mr. Griffith.
1585	[No response.]
1586	Mr. Bilirakis.
1587	Mr. Bilirakis. No.
1588	The Clerk. Mr. Bilirakis votes no.
1589	Mr. Johnson.
1590	Mr. Johnson. No.
1591	The Clerk. Mr. Johnson votes no.
1592	Mr. Long.
1593	Mr. Long. No.
1594	The Clerk. Mr. Long votes no.
1595	Mrs. Ellmers.
1596	Mrs. Ellmers. No.
1597	The Clerk. Mrs. Ellmers votes no.
1598	Mr. Bucshon.
1599	Mr. Bucshon. No.
1600	The Clerk. Mr. Bucshon votes no.
1601	Mr. Flores.
1602	Mr. Flores. No.
1603	The Clerk. Mr. Flores votes no.
1604	Mrs. Brooks.
1605	[No response.]
1606	Mr. Mullin.
1607	Mr. Mullin. No.

1608	The Clerk. Mr. Mullin votes no.
1609	Mr. Hudson.
1610	[No response.]
1611	Mr. Collins.
1612	[No response.]
1613	Mr. Cramer.
1614	[No response.]
1615	Mr. Pallone.
1616	<u>Mr. Pallone.</u> Aye.
1617	The Clerk. Mr. Pallone votes aye.
1618	Mr. Rush.
1619	<u>Mr. Rush.</u> Aye.
1620	The Clerk. Mr. Rush votes aye.
1621	Ms. Eshoo.
1622	Ms. Eshoo. Aye.
1623	The Clerk. Ms. Eshoo votes aye.
1624	Mr. Engel.
1625	<u>Mr. Engel.</u> Aye.
1626	The Clerk. Mr. Engel votes aye.
1627	Mr. Green.
1628	<u>Mr. Green.</u> Aye.
1629	The Clerk. Mr. Green votes aye.
1630	Ms. DeGette.
1631	<u>Ms. DeGette.</u> Aye.
1632	The Clerk. Ms. DeGette votes aye.

1633	Mrs. Capps.
1634	<u>Mrs. Capps.</u> Aye.
1635	The Clerk. Mrs. Capps vote aye.
1636	Mr. Doyle.
1637	[No response.]
1638	Ms. Schakowsky.
1639	<u>Ms. Schakowsky.</u> Aye.
1640	The Clerk. Ms. Schakowsky votes aye.
1641	Mr. Butterfield.
1642	Mr. Butterfield. Aye.
1643	The Clerk. Mr. Butterfield votes aye.
1644	Ms. Matsui.
1645	<u>Ms. Matsui.</u> Aye.
1646	The Clerk. Ms. Matsui votes aye.
1647	Ms. Castor.
1648	<u>Ms. Castor.</u> Aye.
1649	The Clerk. Ms. Castor votes aye.
1650	Mr. Sarbanes.
1651	<u>Mr. Sarbanes.</u> Aye.
1652	The Clerk. Mr. Sarbanes votes aye.
1653	Mr. McNerney.
1654	Mr. McNerney. Aye.
1655	The Clerk. Mr. McNerney votes aye.
1656	Mr. Welch.
1657	<u>Mr. Welch.</u> Aye.

1658	The Clerk. Mr. Welch votes aye.
1659	Mr. Lujan.
1660	<u>Mr. Lujan.</u> Aye.
1661	The Clerk. Mr. Lujan votes aye.
1662	Mr. Tonko.
1663	<u>Mr. Tonko.</u> Aye.
1664	The Clerk. Mr. Tonko votes aye.
1665	Mr. Yarmuth.
1666	Mr. Yarmuth. Aye.
1667	The Clerk. Mr. Yarmuth votes aye.
1668	Ms. Clarke.
1669	<u>Ms. Clarke.</u> Aye.
1670	The Clerk. Ms. Clarke votes aye.
1671	Mr. Loebsack.
1672	Mr. <u>Loebsack</u> . Aye.
1673	The Clerk. Mr. Loebsack votes aye.
1674	Mr. Schrader.
1675	<u>Mr. Schrader.</u> Aye.
1676	The Clerk. Mr. Schrader votes aye.
1677	Mr. Kennedy.
1678	<u>Mr. Kennedy.</u> Aye.
1679	The Clerk. Mr. Kennedy votes aye.
1680	Mr. Cardenas.
1681	[No response.]
1682	Chairman Upton.

1683	<u>The Chairman.</u> Votes no.
1684	The Clerk. Chairman Upton votes no.
1685	The Chairman. Other members wishing to vote? Mr.
1686	Cardenas.
1687	<u>Mr. Cardenas.</u> Aye.
1688	The Clerk. Mr. Cardenas votes aye.
1689	The Chairman. Mr. Griffith.
1690	Mr. Griffith. Votes no.
1691	The Clerk. Mr. Griffith votes no.
1692	The Chairman. Mr. Pompeo.
1693	<u>Mr. Pompeo.</u> No.
1694	The Clerk. Mr. Pompeo votes no.
1695	The Chairman. Mr. Harper.
1696	Mr. Harper. No.
1697	The Clerk. Mr. Harper votes no.
1698	Mr. Burgess.
1699	The Chairman. Mr. Burgess. Dr. Burgess.
1700	Mr. Burgess. No.
1701	The Clerk. Dr. Burgess votes no.
1702	The Chairman. Other members wishing to cast a vote? Seeing
1703	none, the clerk will report the tally.
1704	The Clerk. Mr. Chairman, on that vote there are 22 ayes and
1705	24 noes.
1706	The Chairman. 22 ayes, 24 noes, the amendment is not agreed
1707	to.
	II I

1708	Are there other amendments to the bill? The gentlelady from
1709	New York.
1710	Ms. Clarke. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have an amendment
1711	at the desk.
1712	The Chairman. The clerk will report the title.
1713	The Clerk. Amendment to H.R. 4981, offered by Ms. Clarke.
1714	[The Amendment offered by Ms. Clarke follows:]
1715	*********INSERT 12******

The Chairman. The amendment will be considered as read.

The staff will distribute the amendment, and the gentlelady from

New York is recognized for five minutes in support of her

amendment.

Ms. Clarke. Thank you, Mr. Speaker--Mr. Chairman. I would like to offer an amendment which would provide for additional educational requirements for health care providers who the Secretary identifies as overprescribing opioid pain medications.

I would like to make clear that I believe and I support mandatory continuing medical education for all practitioners who prescribe opioid medications. In fact, I have introduced a bill, H.R. 3889, the Safer Prescribing of Controlled Substances Act, to do just that.

My bill would require all practitioners to take continuing medical education as part of the granting or renewal of the DEA license to prescribe controlled substances. I continue to believe that this is a critical component to addressing the opioid crisis, since most public health experts agree that the current crisis is being driven by the overprescribing of prescription pain medication.

I understand that my bill faces opposition from some provider groups who oppose mandated continuing medical education at the federal level. Today, I am offering a narrower amendment, one that I hope represents a balanced approach that members on both sides of the aisle can support.

One of the difficulties in addressing the opioid epidemic is ensuring a proper balance between the appropriate treatment of pain and the risk of an excessive supply of opioids in our communities. In the face of this, we know there is tremendous variation between doctors that practice in the same field or even in the same hospital or office.

According to the CDC, in all states surveyed, the top 10 percent of prescribers wrote half or more of the opioid prescriptions in their states. This is not limited to any one specialty. In a survey of family physicians, 41 percent felt a colleague in their own practice overprescribed opioids for chronic non-cancer pain.

Given that historically very few medical schools offer training in pain management, and even fewer offer any coursework in addiction, we should not be surprised that the New England Journal of Medicine recently found that many doctors do not feel confident in how to prescribe opioids safely.

This amendment will ensure that high-volume prescribers are armed with the additional training on the best practices of pain management, tools to manage adherence and diversion of opioids, as well as tools to detect patients with signs of addiction and link them to treatment.

It is important to note that this amendment is flexible and designed to be specialty-specific. Family doctors will be compared to other family doctors, orthopedic surgeons to

orthopedic surgeons, and so on.

This amendment will have several effects. First, it will raise awareness among prescribers on the current norms of opioid prescribing. Second, it will increase patient safety. If a prescriber begins to prescribe opioids in volumes that are well outside the norms of their practice or specialty, it is common sense that they will be provided with additional training to ensure that they are up to date on current practices and standards and are prescribing safely.

I thank you, and I urge you to pass this very important amendment.

The Chairman. The gentlelady yields back. The chair would recognize Mr. Pitts. Dr. Bucshon.

Mr. Bucshon. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Within the scope of the dialogue on this bill today, between myself and Mr. Tonko over the past several months, this issue has not come up. Our bill is focused on prescribing medication for substance abuse disorder. We have been in discussion on this bill for months, and we have continued those discussions on amendments since the subcommittee markup.

This amendment was not part of those discussions. Given we are just seeing this amendment this morning, and it is outside the scope of an already-complicated bill, I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

I yield back.

1791 The Chairman. The chair would recognize the gentleman from 1792 New Jersey, Mr. Pallone. I move to strike the last word. 1793 1794 to speak in favor of this important amendment that would require provider education for physicians who prescribe opioid pain 1795 1796 medication in volumes exceeding the norms of their field. 1797 In 2014, pharmacies in the U.S. dispensed approximately 245 1798 million prescriptions for opioids. This is enough to provide a 1799 script to every adult in our entire nation. At the same time, 1800 we know that over five million Americans use prescription pain relievers either recreationally or to satisfy an opioid 1801 1802 addiction. This combination has produced tragic results. 2014 1803 produced the highest number of drug overdose deaths than any 1804 previous year on record, with opioids and heroin driving the 1805 recent surge. 1806 Unfortunately, our nation's doctors and health care 1807 providers have not been provided the tools and education necessary 1808 to safely prescribe these medications in the midst of an opioid 1809 epidemic. Recently, an article in New England Journal of Medicine 1810 1811 examined this topic and found, I quote, "That very few medical 1812 schools offer adequate training in pain management, and still fewer offer even one course in addiction." The consequences are 1813

The same authors discovered that, and I quote, "Many

unsurprising.

1814

physicians admit that they are not confident about how to prescribe opioids safely, how to detect abuse or emerging addiction, or even how to discuss these issues with patients."

And as a result, we have created a patchwork of prescribing practices with tremendous variation both geographically as well as even within the same field.

So the Clarke Amendment would ensure that providers who disproportionately prescribe opioids compared to their peers receive the additional education and training to match the needs of their clinical practice. This education will ensure that providers are equipped to prescribe pain medications in the safest manner available, recognize signs of abuse, and are equipped with the best available knowledge to care for patients who are struggling with addiction.

I believe this thoughtful approach will target the highest priority prescribers and avoids a rigid solution that may interfere with appropriate pain management.

And I would urge my colleagues to support this important amendment. It is basically a common sense step that will assist doctors in their ability to provide high quality pain management while at the same time minimizing the risk of misuse and addiction.

I yield back.

The Chairman. The gentleman yields back. Other members wishing to speak on the amendment? Seeing none, does the gentlelady withdraw her amendment?

1841	Ms. Clarke. I do, Mr. Chairman.
1842	The Chairman. Ask unanimous consent to withdraw?
1843	Ms. Clarke. I do.
1844	The Chairman. The amendment is withdrawn.
1845	Other amendments to the bill?
1846	Mr. Lujan. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.
1847	The Chairman. The gentleman from New Mexico is recognized.
1848	The clerk will report the title of the bill.
1849	The Clerk. Amendment to H.R. 4981, offered by Mr. Lujan.
1850	[The Amendment offered by Mr. Lujan follows:]
1851	
1852	*********INSERT 13******

The Chairman. And the amendment will be considered as read, and the staff will distribute the amendment. The gentleman is recognized for five minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. Lujan. Mr. Chairman, my home State of New Mexico has been especially hard hit by the drug crisis. The drug overdose rate in New Mexico is at 27.3 per 100,000. This is the second highest in the country and roughly double the national average. In two counties in my home district, the overdose rate is more than four times the national average.

In 2014, drug overdoses claimed the lives of 547 New Mexicans--547 lives, 547 people who missed Thanksgiving dinner or their child's softball game, 547 people who weren't able to help their kids with their math homework or kiss their spouse goodnight, 547 brothers, sisters, parents, and friends that we lost too soon.

And while the crisis has hit New Mexico hard, this crisis touches everyone, whether they live in rural communities, the suburbs, or the inner city. According to the American Society of Addiction Medicine, drug overdose is the leading cause of accidental death in the United States with 47,055 lethal drug overdoses in 2014--47,055 legal drug overdoses.

Each member of this committee represents someone who suffered this tragedy or lost someone that they love. These are our constituents, our friends, and our loved ones. This is why the work we are doing today is so important, and I thank the

chairman, the ranking member, the authors of the legislation, and my colleagues for their efforts to address this crisis.

But I think it is abundantly clear that we have to do more. That is why I am offering an amendment that reflects the President's proposal for new and expanded funding of \$1 billion to combat the drug crisis plaguing our country. This funding will provide needed support to states to help them expand treatment capacity and make services more affordable and available.

But this only represents a down payment to address this crisis. No single solution will solve this crisis. One thing is clear: right now, there just are not enough resources to go around, and I urge adoption of this amendment.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Chairman. The gentleman yields back. Other members

wishing to speak? The gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. Pitts.

Mr. Pitts. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment as it is fiscally irresponsible and represents bad process. The amendment would add \$1 billion, with a B, in new authorizations over 2 years. This amendment was filed at the last minute without detailed discussions between the majority and minority. And while we believe targeted new authorizations make sense, the committee should not adopt last-minute, hurried amendments that create a new \$1 billion authorization.

After a lot of bipartisan work and discussion, the committee

is working together to find new authorizations for residential treatment programs, co-prescribing, and promoting the availability of naloxone.

I believe we will successfully reach bipartisan agreement on those new authorizations during our markup and pay for those new authorizations, and that agreement will be reached after discussion and give and take from the majority and minority. That is the way to achieve bipartisan consensus, to get targeted resources to programs to fight the opioid epidemic while being fiscally responsible.

So I urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment, and I yield back.

The Chairman. The gentleman yields back. The chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. Pallone. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want to speak in favor of the amendment. We are here today because we are in the midst of an unprecedented opioid and heroin crisis. Sadly, 2014 saw the highest number of drug overdose deaths than any other year on record. Our public health and treatment systems have not kept pace with the expanding epidemic.

Over this committee's hearings on the opioid epidemic, we have learned of the significant shortage of substance abuse providers nationwide. Those struggling with heroin or opioid addictions suffer from critical shortages in treatment access. Only 1 in 10 individuals suffering from substance abuse disorders

receive any form of treatment.

Medication-assisted treatment is an evidence-based strategy that helps patients recover from addiction and reduces the risk of overdose. Yet only 9 percent of all substance abuse treatment facilities nationwide offer medication-assisted treatment.

And this issue is directly tied to our workforce. One study showed that 74 percent of substance abuse treatment organizations found it either somewhat difficult or very difficult to find physicians in the local community with experience in treating individuals with substance abuse disorders.

Now, given the tremendous gap between the supply and demand for substance abuse treatment, it is a farce to believe that we can mount a forceful response to this epidemic without providing additional resources, and that is why I support the amendment to provide a billion in mandatory funding to modernize our treatment systems and provide critical tools to attack the opioid epidemic head on.

This proposal tracks the President's mandatory funding request released earlier this year. Most of this money would go directly to the states to enable them to increase treatment capacity through cooperative agreements to expand access to medication-assisted treatment for opioid use disorders.

And this proposal provides for a targeted response where funding is allocated to the areas hit the hardest by the epidemic. It is going to empower states to adopt innovative solutions, to

increase treatment capacity, as well as make treatment more affordable.

Now, we also know that rural areas face added difficulties. Rural areas have been hit hardest by the epidemic, and patients in these rural areas face heightened barriers to accessing care. This amendment provides funding for physicians with training in opioid use disorders to participate in the National Health Service Corps. This important program brings health care providers to underserved areas to address critical gaps in care.

And, finally, as we modernize our treatment system, we need to learn what strategies are most effective. That is why this amendment provides funding to evaluate the effectiveness of different treatment programs in reducing opioid use disorders, overdose, and death.

I would urge my colleagues to vote in favor of the amendment. Let's not make any mistake about it. If we don't bring resources to the table in our fight against this epidemic, we are going to fail. Anything less than a robust response to address this crisis will result in increased deaths and place tremendous emotional and financial burdens upon our families.

And if we do as my Republican colleagues propose and wait until that normal appropriation cycle to provide more funding, we will be essentially turning a blind eye to the deaths and devastation this crisis is posing to individuals, families, and communities each day.

We still have about 5 months left in the fiscal year. That means at a different—at the current rate of 78 lives lost each day to opioid overdoses, almost 12,000 more people will have died from opioid epidemic while we waited around. And these are just the deaths. There are thousands more that will be left to battle the disease without treatment and recovery support, because in the richest country in the world we decided that fiscal austerity trumped saving lives and protecting the public health. And I just find this unacceptable.

And, finally, if Congress doesn't take a proactive approach

And, finally, if Congress doesn't take a proactive approach in providing the necessary resources, we will also pay for the collateral consequences of this epidemic to our emergency departments and the criminal justice system, meaning that we save money today at the expense of lives lost and increased spending.

So I think it is time for Congress to step up and provide states and communities and families with the tools that they need, and, therefore, I would urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Did the gentlewoman--I will yield to the gentlewoman.

Ms. Eshoo. I agree with the gentleman, and I thank him for yielding just a moment to me. You know, we are an authorizing committee, and our work is always done in that frame.

But I think, too, a member that has spoken on this whole issue of opioids and we have heard the stories from members and how their congressional district and rural areas, urban, suburban, how this

2003 is a real epidemic that is taking a toll on our country. 2004 If there are not dollars attached to this to do something about it, I know that \$1 billion is something that none of us have 2005 2006 in our checking account, but we do have 50 states. So any time there is an amount that comes up, divide it by 50 and see what 2007 2008 would be coming to your state. 2009 I am from California. We are nation state. 2010 \$200 million take care of the issue in California? I doubt it. 2011 Do I think it would put a dent in it? Yes, I do. 2012 So when you hear these numbers and just reject them out of hand, divide it by 50, and then think of how those dollars would 2013 2014 apply to your constituents, to the stories that you are telling. 2015 I think that, you know, if people want to go out and brag 2016 that the committee did something on this, then it is language. 2017 It is just words. You have to put resources. We have to put 2018 resources in this to actually meet the challenge that is legitimately called an epidemic, and I would yield back. 2019 2020 Thank you. 2021 The Chairman. The gentleman's time has expired. The gentleman from Illinois is --2022 2023 Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word. Mr. Rush. 2024 The gentleman is recognized for five minutes. The Chairman. Mr. Chairman, first of all, I want to applaud the 2025 2026 committee, you and the ranking member, for really paying some

attention to this critical problem that we are concerned with as

a nation, this problem in terms of addiction.

And I know I think we can go much further than we have gone. I think that some of the amendments that have been forwarded to--for the consideration of this committee are indeed of service, great service to our nation, and should be--should have passed and should pass. Other amendments should pass that are being brought up.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to say that it is--the issue of addictions, be it opiates or heroin, other kinds of addictions, this is an issue that I hope and I pray that this committee will really take under serious consideration in the immediate future.

Mr. Chairman, this committee and this Congress, the Federal Government, failed miserably when the issue of crack cocaine was at the forefront of addictions in districts like mine throughout the nation. Pleas and pleadings, the pain and suffering of so many Americans, were completely ignored by this Congress, by past Congresses, and by the Federal Government in particular.

As a result, you had--we had just the opposite emphasis when we were--when this nation was confronted by the epidemic of crack cocaine. Rather than using this as--and viewing this as a medical issue, as an issue of public health, it was viewed as an issue of criminal justice left to the law enforcement agencies throughout America to address this issue of crack cocaine.

And what we have seen as a result of that is the mass incarceration of minorities, blacks, African Americans, Latino

2053 Americans, and resultant explosion of the cost of keeping these individuals in prisons, to the federal budget. And we have also 2054 seen the destruction of families throughout the nation, 2055 2056 particularly in districts like mine. So there are some families in my district who have and are 2057 dealing with issues of opioid addictions, but they aren't at the 2058 level that they are in terms of dealing with the issue of crack 2059 2060 cocaine. 2061 And I just want to remind members of this committee that you 2062 have to look beyond that which is familiar to you, and Americans are suffering, no matter what corner, what community, no matter 2063 2064 what race, creed, or religion that they may respond to or they 2065 may express. We have an underlying responsibility to deal with addictions 2066 2067 that are ripping the basic social fabric of our nation apart. We 2068 have a responsibility to deal with all the addictions, not just 2069 this addiction, that affects families who are familiar to us and 2070 who have similar preoccupations that we do. 2071 Mr. Chairman, I just want to say let's deal with the 2072 Let's deal with heroin addiction and not just playing 2073 around the edges of it. Let's really take this issue up and deal 2074 with this addiction, as well as other addictions, not just opiate addictions. 2075

> **NEAL R. GROSS** COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

I yield back.

Thank you.

The Chairman.

2076

2077

The gentleman yields back. Other members

wishing to speak on the amendment? The gentlelady from Illinois.

Ms. Schakowsky. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I will be brief. I am proud to support Congressman Lujan's amendment. You know, there is so much we agree on today, that we have an opioid abuse epidemic, that every single day 78 people die from opioid overdoses, that there is not a community that hasn't been impacted by this horrible crisis.

And yet my Republican colleagues continue to oppose meaningful investments to expand access to treatment, and this comes on top of years of insufficient funding for our existing substance abuse programs.

Just one example. The Substance Abuse Prevention and Treatment Block Grant within SAMHSA, and that of course is the primary federal program that funds substance abuse prevention and treatment programs, has actually been cut in real dollars by 25 percent in the last 10 years. So Congressman Lujan's amendment will help to end the cycle of underinvesting by providing \$1 billion in mandatory funding to expand access to treatment, expand our behavioral health workforce, and evaluate treatment methods.

And I think we can all agree that this is a worthy investment. We all have those horrific stories of families who have lost loved ones to the disease of addiction. We have also heard the stories of people who are ready to seek treatment and can't access it due to both the cost and the lack of availability of treatment.

So I strongly support this amendment, urge my colleagues to

vote for it, and yield the balance of my time to Mr. Lujan.

Mr. Lujan. Thank you, Ms. Schakowsky. Mr. Chairman, you know, as we look at this as well and look at the numbers that are included in the amendment, these are not pie-in-the-sky numbers. These are numbers that were looked at not only by SAMHSA, by HRSA for the National Health Service Corporation, looking at state-targeted response cooperative agreement studies, to see the maximum way that we can make sure we are looking after the constituents that we all represent.

And what concerns me is, as we look at the notion that providing an investment this size to help our constituents with the overdose problem that is a health crisis facing America, I don't understand.

Some of the same words have been used when we are having debates about providing support for the millions of people in Puerto Rico, to offer them support, that it is fiscally irresponsible to help the people of Puerto Rico where septic systems in schools are overflowing because they have to--the leadership of Puerto Rico has to make a decision as to where they are going to put their resources. But it is fiscally irresponsible to go and help the people of Puerto Rico.

The Zika dilemma that is facing and crushing lives as we speak, taking lives, that it is fiscally irresponsible to go and help the victims of Zika and to help stop this from happening.

And Flint, Michigan, that it is fiscally irresponsible to

2128	go and help the people of Flint with the recommendations that have
2129	come forward, and now we are hearing the same thing with the opioid
2130	crisis facing the country.
2131	If we are looking for a pay for, maybe we should look to the
2132	lives that have been lost that have paid for this. And so I hope
2133	that we take a minute to understand this, that when we describe
2134	these programs and the importance of these investments, that maybe
2135	we find a different way to describe them.
2136	With that, Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.
2137	I still hope that we might be able to get some support here, find
2138	a way to work on this as we get to the floor as well.
2139	And I yield back to Ms. Schakowsky.
2140	The Chairman. The gentlelady yields back. Other members
2141	wishing to speak on the amendment? Seeing none, the vote occurs
2142	on the amendment. A recorded vote has been asked. The clerk will
2143	call the roll.
2144	The Clerk. Mr. Barton.
2145	<u>Mr. Barton.</u> No.
2146	The Clerk. Mr. Barton votes no.
2147	Mr. Whitfield.
2148	Mr. Whitfield. No.
2149	The Clerk. Mr. Whitfield votes no.
2150	Mr. Shimkus.
2151	<u>Mr. Shimkus.</u> No.
2152	The Clerk. Mr. Shimkus votes no.

2153	Mr. Pitts.
2154	Mr. Pitts. No.
2155	The Clerk. Mr. Pitts votes no.
2156	Mr. Walden.
2157	Mr. Walden. No.
2158	The Clerk. Mr. Walden votes no.
2159	Mr. Murphy.
2160	Mr. Murphy. No.
2161	The Clerk. Mr. Murphy votes no.
2162	Mr. Burgess.
2163	Mr. Burgess. No.
2164	The Clerk. No Burgess votes no.
2165	Mrs. Blackburn.
2166	Mrs. Blackburn. No.
2167	The Clerk. Mrs. Blackburn votes no.
2168	Mr. Scalise.
2169	[No response.]
2170	Mr. Latta.
2171	<u>Mr. Latta.</u> No.
2172	The Clerk. Mr. Latta votes no.
2173	Mrs. McMorris Rodgers.
2174	[No response.]
2175	Mr. Harper.
2176	Mr. Harper. No.
2177	The Clerk. Mr. Harper votes no.

2178	Mr. Lance.
2179	<u>Mr. Lance.</u> No.
2180	The Clerk. Mr. Lance votes no.
2181	Mr. Guthrie.
2182	Mr. Guthrie. No.
2183	The Clerk. Mr. Guthrie votes no.
2184	Mr. Olson.
2185	Mr. Olson. No.
2186	The Clerk. Mr. Olson votes no.
2187	Mr. McKinley.
2188	Mr. McKinley. No.
2189	The Clerk. Mr. McKinley votes no.
2190	Mr. Pompeo.
2191	<u>Mr. Pompeo.</u> No.
2192	The Clerk. Mr. Pompeo votes no.
2193	Mr. Kinzinger.
2194	<u>Mr. Kinzinger.</u> No.
2195	The Clerk. Mr. Kinzinger votes no.
2196	Mr. Griffith.
2197	Mr. Griffith. No.
2198	The Clerk. Mr. Griffith votes no.
2199	Mr. Bilirakis.
2200	<u>Mr. Bilirakis.</u> No.
2201	The Clerk. Mr. Bilirakis votes no.
2202	Mr. Johnson.

2203	<u>Mr. Johnson.</u> No.
2204	The Clerk. Mr. Johnson votes no.
2205	Mr. Long.
2206	Mr. Long. No.
2207	The Clerk. Mr. Long votes no.
2208	Mrs. Ellmers.
2209	[No response.]
2210	Mr. Bucshon.
2211	Mr. Bucshon. No.
2212	The Clerk. Mr. Bucshon votes no.
2213	Mr. Flores.
2214	<u>Mr. Flores.</u> No.
2215	The Clerk. Mr. Flores votes no.
2216	Mrs. Brooks.
2217	[No response.]
2218	Mr. Mullin.
2219	<u>Mr. Mullin.</u> No.
2220	The Clerk. Mr. Mullin votes no.
2221	Mr. Hudson.
2222	[No response.]
2223	Mr. Collins.
2224	[No response.]
2225	Mr. Cramer.
2226	[No response.]
2227	Mr. Pallone.

2228	<u>Mr. Pallone.</u> Aye.
2229	The Clerk. Mr. Pallone votes aye.
2230	Mr. Rush.
2231	<u>Mr. Rush.</u> Aye.
2232	The Clerk. Mr. Rush votes aye.
2233	Ms. Eshoo.
2234	<u>Ms. Eshoo.</u> Aye.
2235	The Clerk. Ms. Eshoo votes aye.
2236	Mr. Engel.
2237	<u>Mr. Engel.</u> Aye.
2238	The Clerk. Mr. Engel votes aye.
2239	Mr. Green.
2240	<u>Mr. Green.</u> Aye.
2241	The Clerk. Mr. Green votes aye.
2242	Ms. DeGette.
2243	<u>Ms. DeGette.</u> Aye.
2244	The Clerk. Ms. DeGette votes aye.
2245	Mrs. Capps.
2246	<u>Mrs. Capps.</u> Aye.
2247	The Clerk. Mrs. Capps vote aye.
2248	Mr. Doyle.
2249	[No response.]
2250	Ms. Schakowsky.
2251	<u>Ms. Schakowsky.</u> Aye.
2252	The Clerk. Ms. Schakowsky votes aye.

2253	Mr. Butterfield.
2254	Mr. Butterfield. Aye.
2255	The Clerk. Mr. Butterfield votes aye.
2256	Ms. Matsui.
2257	<u>Ms. Matsui.</u> Aye.
2258	The Clerk. Ms. Matsui votes aye.
2259	Ms. Castor.
2260	<u>Ms. Castor.</u> Aye.
2261	The Clerk. Ms. Castor votes aye.
2262	Mr. Sarbanes.
2263	<u>Mr. Sarbanes.</u> Aye.
2264	The Clerk. Mr. Sarbanes votes aye.
2265	Mr. McNerney.
2266	Mr. McNerney. Aye.
2267	The Clerk. Mr. McNerney votes aye.
2268	Mr. Welch.
2269	<u>Mr. Welch.</u> Aye.
2270	The Clerk. Mr. Welch votes aye.
2271	Mr. Lujan.
2272	<u>Mr. Lujan.</u> Aye.
2273	The Clerk. Mr. Lujan votes aye.
2274	Mr. Tonko.
2275	<u>Mr. Tonko.</u> Aye.
2276	The Clerk. Mr. Tonko votes aye.
2277	Mr. Yarmuth.

2278	Mr. Yarmuth. Aye.
2279	The Clerk. Mr. Yarmuth votes aye.
2280	Ms. Clarke.
2281	<u>Ms. Clarke.</u> Aye.
2282	The Clerk. Ms. Clarke votes aye.
2283	Mr. Loebsack.
2284	Mr. <u>Loebsack</u> . Aye.
2285	The Clerk. Mr. Loebsack votes aye.
2286	Mr. Schrader.
2287	<u>Mr. Schrader.</u> Aye.
2288	The Clerk. Mr. Schrader votes aye.
2289	Mr. Kennedy.
2290	<u>Mr. Kennedy.</u> Aye.
2291	The Clerk. Mr. Kennedy votes aye.
2292	Mr. Cardenas.
2293	[No response.]
2294	Chairman Upton.
2295	<u>The Chairman.</u> Votes no.
2296	The Clerk. Chairman Upton votes no.
2297	The Chairman. Other members wishing to cast a vote? Seeing
2298	none, the clerk will report the tally. Oh, Mr. Cardenas.
2299	Mr. Cardenas. I vote aye.
2300	The Clerk. Mr. Cardenas votes aye.
2301	Mr. Chairman, on that vote there are 22 ayes and 24 noes.
2302	The Clerk. 22 ayes, 24 noes, the amendment is not agreed

2303 to. Are there further amendments to the bill? Seeing none, the 2304 2305 vote -- the question now occurs on favorably reporting H.R. 4981, as amended, to the House. 2306 2307 All those in favor shall signify by saying aye. Those opposed, say no. 2308 2309 The ayes appear to have it, and the bill is favorably 2310 reported. The chair now calls up H.R. 4969, as amended by the 2311 Subcommittee on Health, and asks the clerk to report. 2312 [The Bill H.R. 4969 follows:] 2313 2314 2315 *********INSERT 14******

2316	The Clerk. H.R. 4969, to amend the Public Health Service
2317	Act to direct the Centers of Disease Control and Prevention to
2318	provide for informational materials, to educate and prevent
2319	addiction in teenagers and adolescents who are injured playing
2320	youth sports and subsequently are prescribed opioids.
2321	The Chairman. Without objection, the first reading of the
2322	bill is dispensed with. The bill will be open for amendment at
2323	any point. Are there any bipartisan amendments to the bill? The
2324	gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. Pitts.
2325	Mr. Pitts. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.
2326	The Chairman. The clerk will report the title of the
2327	amendment.
2328	The Clerk. Amendment to H.R. 4969, offered by Mr. Pitts.
2329	[The Amendment offered by Mr. Pitts follows:]
2330	
2331	********INSERT 15******

2332 The Chairman. And without objection, the reading of the amendment is dispensed with, and the staff will distribute the 2333 The gentleman is recognized for five minutes. 2334 2335 Mr. Pitts. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to offer a bipartisan amendment that simply makes technical changes to H.R. 2336 2337 4969, the John Thomas Decker Act. H.R. 4969 directs the Secretary 2338 of HHS to provide informational materials to educate and prevent 2339 opioid addiction in teenagers and adolescents who are prescribed 2340 opioids due to a sports injury. 2341 One study found that adolescents and teenagers who played a high injury competitive sport and were prescribed an opioid had 2342 a 50 percent higher chance of non-medical use of prescription 2343 2344 opioids than their peers who did not participate in these types 2345 of sports. 2346 So I urge my colleagues to support the amendment and the 2347 underlying legislation and yield back. The Chairman. The gentleman yields back. Are there other 2348 2349 members wishing to speak on the amendment? Seeing none, the vote 2350 occurs on the amendment offered by Mr. Pitts. 2351 All those in favor will say aye. 2352 Those opposed, say no. 2353 In the opinion of the chair, the ayes have it, and the amendment is agreed to. 2354 2355 Further amendments to the bill? Seeing none, the question 2356 now occurs on favorably reporting H.R. 4969, as amended, to the

	103
2357	House.
2358	All those in favor shall signify by saying aye.
2359	All those opposed, say no.
2360	In the opinion of the chair, the ayes have it, and the bill
2361	is favorably reported.
2362	The chair now calls up H.R. 4599, as amended by the
2363	Subcommittee on Health, and asks the clerk to report.
2364	[The Bill H.R. 4599 follows:]
2365	
2366	*********INSERT 16******

2367	The Clerk. H.R. 4599, to amend the Controlled Substances
2368	Act to permit certain partial fillings of prescriptions.
2369	The Chairman. Without objection, the reading of the bill
2370	is dispensed with. Are there amendments to the bill?
2371	Mr. Kennedy. Mr. Chairman?
2372	The Chairman. The gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr.
2373	Kennedy, has an amendment at the desk or strike the last word?
2374	Mr. Kennedy. An amendment at the desk, please.
2375	The Chairman. The clerk will report the title of the
2376	amendment.
2377	The Clerk. Amendment to H.R. 4599, offered by Mr. Kennedy.
2378	[The Amendment offered by Mr. Kennedy follows:]
2379	
2380	*********INSERT 17*******

2381 The Chairman. And the amendment will be considered as read, 2382 and the staff will distribute the amendment. And the gentleman 2383 is recognized for five minutes. 2384 Mr. Kennedy. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, this 2385 amendment would make a small technical correction to clarify the bill's language on partial fill prescriptions. Specifically, it 2386 2387 removes some unnecessary language while preserving the bill's 2388 goal of reducing the number of unused Schedule 2 drugs that are 2389 at high risk of diversion. 2390 I was proud to support this legislation offered by my 2391 Massachusetts colleague Katherine Clark at the subcommittee 2392 markup last week, and I believe this clarifying amendment will 2393 only make the bill stronger. By passing this bipartisan bicameral bill, we can give providers and patients the ability 2394 to reduce the amount of unused opioids that remain in their 2395 2396 medicine cabinets within reach of those battling substance use 2397 disorder. 2398 Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I yield back. 2399 The Chairman. The gentleman yields back. Other members wishing to speak on the amendment? Seeing none, the vote occurs 2400 2401 on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts. 2402 All those in favor will say aye. Those opposed, say no. 2403 2404 In the opinion of the chair, the ayes have it. The amendment 2405 is agreed to.

2406	Further amendments to the bill? Seeing none, the question
2407	now occurs on favorably reporting H.R. 4599, as amended, to the
2408	House.
2409	All those in favor will signify by saying aye.
2410	Those opposed, say no.
2411	The ayes appear to have it. The ayes have it, and the
2412	amendmentthe bill is favorably reported.
2413	The chair now will call up 4976. By the way, we are going
2414	to dothis is the last of three bills. Then we will stop. Two
2415	more after this.
2416	So the chair will ask the clerk to report the title.
2417	[The Bill H.R. 4976 follows:]
2418	
2419	**************************************
	i e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e

2420	The Clerk. H.R. 4976, to require the Commissioner of Food
2421	and Drugs to seek recommendations from an advisory committee of
2422	the Food and Drug Administration before approval of certain new
2423	drugs that are opioids without abuse deterrent properties, and
2424	for other purposes.
2425	The Chairman. Without objection, the first reading of the
2426	bill is dispensed with. The bill will be open for amendment at
2427	any point. Are there any bipartisan amendments to the bill? Any
2428	amendments to the bill? Seeing none, the question now occurs on
2429	favorably reporting H.R. 4976 to the House.
2430	All those in favor shall signify by saying aye.
2431	Those opposed, say no.
2432	In the opinion of the chair, the ayes have it, and the bill
2433	is favorably reported.
2434	The chair now calls up H.R. 4982 and asks the clerk to report.
2435	[The Bill H.R. 4982 follows:]
2436	
2437	**************************************

2438	The Clerk. H.R. 4982, to direct the Comptroller General of
2439	the United States to evaluate and report on the inpatient and
2440	outpatient treatment capabilities, availabilities, and needs of
2441	the United States.
2442	The Chairman. Without objection, the first reading of the
2443	bill is dispensed with. The bill will be open for amendment at
2444	any point. Are there any bipartisan amendments to the bill? Are
2445	there any amendments to the bill? The gentleman from West
2446	Virginia, Mr. McKinley, has an amendment at the desk?
2447	Mr. McKinley. Mr. Chairman, I do have an amendment at the
2448	desk.
2449	The Chairman. And the clerk will report the title.
2450	The Clerk. Amendment to H.R. 4982, offered by Mr. McKinley.
2451	[The Amendment offered by Mr. McKinley follows:]
2452	
2453	**************************************

The amendment--it will be considered as read. 2454 The Chairman. The staff will distribute the amendment, and the gentleman is 2455 2456 recognized for five minutes in support of his amendment. Mr. McKinley. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 2457 I would like to thank the majority and minority staff for working with us on this, 2458 particularly my friend Peter Welch from Vermont, on this effort 2459 to try to get this added, included in this legislation. 2460 2461 What we are hearing about when we travel around the district, and around the country actually, is the actual -- the concern for 2462 having real-time access to some of this data. And what we are 2463 2464 worried about, what we are trying to do, is get to that so that 2465 people have access to information that is in real time, not 2466 something maybe 2 or 3 months late with that. 2467 So what this amendment has proposed today is a byproduct of 2468 having heard from people around the district and around the

country that they want instant information, so our effort here is to give them this real-time data reporting of opioid abuse at the federal, state, and local levels. We can save lives, we can be more efficient in our operation with it.

So in deference to time, Mr. Chairman, I would ask that we support this amendment and with the hopes that a study can be conducted to indicate the advantages of having real time, removing those barriers that prevent us from having real-time data on opioid abuse.

I yield back the balance of my time.

2469

2470

2471

2472

2473

2474

2475

2476

2477

The Chairman. Yields back. Other members wishing to speak? Mr. Welch.

Mr. Welch. I thank Mr. McKinley. The opioid scourge has hit Vermont hard. In fact, it was our Governor, Governor Shumlin, I think 3 years ago devoted his entire State of the State Address to the opioid catastrophe in Vermont. And I remember a lot of my colleagues asking me why he did that and was he worried that in so doing it would hurt the reputation of Vermont.

And what it did is mobilized Vermont. Our communities have plunged into providing community-based support to help people who have a wicked problem, oftentimes a result of getting prescription medication, like a nurse who injured her back when she was moving a patient and she became addicted, like a 44-year-old hardworking man who was injured in an automobile accident and he became addicted, and then he died ultimately of an overdose.

But when I was talking to my colleagues, when they were asking me about the governor doing this, it became clear that all of us were facing this huge challenge in our own districts.

So, Mr. Chairman, I am delighted that the committee together, Republicans and Democrats, are focusing so much attention on a problem that is plaguing all of our communities. This is one small additional element that would provide, as Mr. McKinley said, real-time information that would help our law enforcement get to the bottom of where there are bad batches of heroin and enable them to help stop additional overdoses.

2504	So I want to thank Mr. McKinley, and I want to thank the
2505	chairman and my colleagues for the hard work that is being done
2506	for us to make a contribution to stemming this opioid abuse.
2507	And I yield back the balance of my time.
2508	The Chairman. The gentleman yields back. Other members
2509	wishing to speak on the amendment? Seeing none, the vote occurs
2510	on the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia.
2511	All those in favor will say aye.
2512	Those opposed, say no.
2513	In the opinion of the chair, the ayes have it, and the
2514	amendment is agreed to.
2515	Further amendments to the bill? The gentleman from Oklahoma
2516	has amendment to the bill. The clerk will read the title of the
2517	amendment.
2518	The Clerk. Amendment to H.R. 4982, offered by Mr. Mullin.
2519	[The Amendment offered by Mr. Mullin follows:]
2520	
2521	********INSERT 21******

2522 The Chairman. And without objection, the amendment will be considered as read. The staff will distribute the amendment, and 2523 2524 the gentleman from Oklahoma is recognized for five minutes in 2525 support of his amendment. I will be quick. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 2526 Mr. Mullin. Ιt is extremely concerning to see how substance abuse is impacting 2527 2528 Indian country. Many Native Americans reside on reservations or 2529 in rural areas where drug treatment programs are not readily But as we have seen an epidemic on our hands, we need 2530 2531 to do something about it. I am offering this amendment to make sure that the 2532 2533 Comptroller General evaluates the availability of residential and 2534 outpatient treatment programs for American Indians and Alaska Natives and a report -- and the report of an opioid treatment 2535 2536 infrastructure. We need a full picture of the infrastructure we 2537 currently have, so we can identify and fill the gaps. 2538 I want to thank my colleague Mr. Foster for writing this 2539 important piece of legislation and for working with me to make 2540 sure the needs of American Indians and Native Americans are included in this bill. 2541 2542 I yield back. 2543 The gentleman yields back. The Chairman. The chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey for five minutes. 2544 Mr. Pallone. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to 2545

strike the last word in support of the bill and also speak in favor

of this amendment.

Research indicates that a majority of people in need of treatment for substance use disorders do not receive anything that approximates evidence-based care. And as we have heard from a number of experts who have testified before this committee, a majority of individuals who receive treatment for substance use disorders are receiving care that is ineffective, outdated, and not evidence-based.

So each day we are losing lives because of our inability to provide the treatment capacity necessary to deal with this epidemic, and that is why I am glad to co-sponsor H.R. 4982, which directs GAO to evaluate and report on the inpatient and outpatient treatment's capacity, availability, and needs. It directs the agency to examine treatment capacity for substance use disorders across the continuum of care as well as to examine the availability of treatment options based on reliable scientific evidence of efficacy.

In terms of Mr. Mullin's amendment, this is a good amendment.

It is going to include in the GAO study an examination of residential and outpatient treatment programs available to American Indians and Alaska Natives through our system of Indian health programs.

Unfortunately, we know that significant health disparities exist between Native American populations and other groups.

Although no American community is immune from the heroin and

opioid epidemic, it appears the problem has disproportionately 2572 2573 affected American Indians. According to SAMHSA, American 2574 Indians and Alaska Natives report twice the rate of prescription 2575 drug abuse compared to Caucasians. Despite knowing these broad generalizations, researchers 2576 admit they have insufficient data on the issue of substance abuse 2577 2578 in these communities, and this has limited our ability to provide 2579 an appropriate response. One study in the Journal of Ethnicity found that access to substance abuse treatment on rural 2580 2581 reservations was generally described as scarce, underfunded or, 2582 even worse, nonexistent. We have to do better, and it is 2583 imperative that we supply these communities with the necessary 2584 resources. And the first step in combatting this epidemic is learning 2585 2586 which areas are most in need and where to best target our 2587 resources, and this amendment will provide us with this So I would urge also support for Mr. Mullin's 2588 2589 amendment. 2590 The Chairman. The gentleman yields back. Other members 2591 wishing to speak on the amendment? Seeing none, the vote occurs 2592 on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma. 2593 All those in favor will say aye. Those opposed, say no. 2594 2595 In the opinion of the chair, the ayes have it. The amendment

is agreed to.

2597	Further amendments to the bill? Seeing none, the question
2598	now occurs on favorably reporting H.R. 4982, as amended, to the
2599	House.
2600	All those in favor shall signify by saying aye.
2601	Those opposed, say no.
2602	The ayes appear to have it. The ayes have it, and the bill
2603	is favorably reported.
2604	The last bill of today's markup. The chair will now call
2605	up H.R. 3250 and ask the clerk to report.
2606	[The Bill H.R. 3250 follows:]
2607	
2608	*********INSERT 22******

2609 The Clerk. H.R. 3250, to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and 2610 Cosmetic Act to prevent abuse of dextromethorphan, and other 2611 purposes. The bill will be considered as read, and the 2612 The Chairman. chair will ask if there are amendments to the bill. The gentleman 2613 from Ohio, Mr. Johnson, is recognized. 2614 2615 Mr. Johnson. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word 2616 in support of this bill. 2617 The Chairman. Strike the last word. The gentleman is 2618 recognized for five minutes. Mr. Johnson. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The DXM Abuse 2619 2620 Prevention Act, H.R. 3250, helps close the gap in addressing a 2621 very serious problem with teen abuse of over-the-counter drugs 2622 and medicines. Kids mistakenly think that if it is an 2623 over-the-counter medicine it can't hurt them. Unfortunately, 2624 they are wrong. 2625 While 10 states have laws on the books restricting sales to 2626 those under the age of 18, there is still work to be done in 2627 preventing the start of addictive behavior at such an early age. 2628 We have had great engagement from stakeholders up to this 2629 point, which I thank them for, particularly CHAP, and I look 2630 forward to continuing these discussions and refining the bill's language as it makes its way to the floor. 2631 2632 Finally, I would also like to thank Chairman Upton, Ranking Member Pallone, and especially my colleague, Representative 2633

2634 Matsui, for their support. 2635 The Chairman. Will the gentleman yield? 2636 Mr. Johnson. I certainly will yield to you, Mr. Chairman. 2637 The Chairman. I want to thank you and the other sponsors for your commitment to this issue. It is one that we have 2638 certainly been trying to address for a lot of years. We are moving 2639 this bill hopefully out of the committee today, knowing that we 2640 2641 have got more work today before the floor to do, but I know that 2642 the committee and sponsors are committed to working through the 2643 remaining issues. 2644 We know that kids are abusing these medicines, and it is a 2645 common sense way to fix the problem. Ten states already have 2646 passed laws just like this one to combat the abuse. We know that many retailers have systems in place. I applaud the private 2647 2648 sector investment in these technologies, and this bill will build 2649 off of state and private sector efforts to prevent the kind of 2650 abuse. 2651 So we look for probably a couple of changes yet, but I thank 2652 you, and I yield back to you. Well, thank you, Mr. Chairman, again, for your 2653 2654 support. And I urge my colleagues to support this legislation. 2655 And with that, I yield back the balance of my time. 2656 The gentleman yields back. Other members The Chairman. 2657 wishing to speak on the bill? The gentlelady from California, 2658 Ms. Matsui.

2659 Ms. Matsui. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and I move to strike 2660 the last word. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and Congressman Johnson, and 2661 2662 Ranking Member Pallone, for your work on this important 2663 It is vital that we move forward to address the legislation. 2664 public health consequences of dex abuse by teens. I appreciate the feedback we received from stakeholders on this bill. 2665 2666 working together on a common sense solution to ensure cough 2667 medicine remains accessible to those that use it appropriately 2668 and inaccessible to those who seek to abuse it. 2669 I look forward to working with my colleagues to refine this 2670 legislation as we move it out of committee and onto the House floor 2671 for passage as part of our efforts to address the substance abuse 2672 crisis in this country. 2673 Congress must not wait for tragic stories of children being 2674 hurt due to dex abuse before we act. I urge my colleagues to 2675 support H.R. 3250. 2676 Thank you, and I yield to Ranking Member Pallone. 2677 Mr. Pallone. I just want to--thank you. I just wanted to 2678 thank Congresswoman Matsui and Congressman Johnson for the work 2679 on this legislation. 2680 Yesterday I had a -- I visited a pharmacy, Beaut's Pharmacy, 2681 in Metuchen, New Jersey, in my district, with a state legislator, 2682 Assemblyman Pat Diegnan, who sponsored a similar bill in New 2683 Jersey that is now law.

119 2684 And, I mean, it was just talking to the pharmacist, talking to others, they just thought that this legislation was so valuable 2685 2686 in New Jersey and should be done nationwide. And basically, as 2687 Chairman Upton said, we have about 10 states now, including New Jersey, who have passed legislation restricting sales of DXM to 2688 2689 those 18 and over. And this bill would build on the work of those states and 2690 2691 2692

establish the national requirement that retailers who sell DXM have verification systems in place to help ensure that those under age 18 can't purchase DXM and would prevent the possession, receipt, and distribution of unfinished DXM by entities not registered or licensed with the federal or state government.

I know Chairman Upton mentioned that some stakeholders have concerns, and obviously we are going to continue to work on that. But this is really an important bill, so I think it--I really do want to thank the sponsors, so Ms. Matsui and Mr. Johnson, for putting this together, because even though some states have it, others don't, and this will just make it easier even for those states that do have it.

Thank you. I yield back.

Ms. Matsui. Thank you. I yield back.

The gentlelady yields back. Other members The Chairman. wishing to speak on the bill? Seeing none, are there further amendments to the bill? Seeing none, the question now occurs on favorably reporting H.R. 3250 to the House.

2693

2694

2695

2696

2697

2698

2699

2700

2701

2702

2703

2704

2705

2706

2707

2709	All those in favor shall signify by saying aye.
2710	Those opposed, say no.
2711	The ayes have it, appear to have it, they have it, and it
2712	is favorably reported.
2713	The committee now stands in recess until 10:00 a.m. tomorrow
2714	where we are going to take up a dozen bills that complete the markup
2715	schedule.
2716	With that, we stand in recess.
2717	[Whereupon, at 12:17 p.m., the committee recessed, to
2718	reconvene at 10:00 a.m., the following day.]