

that he would represent our Nation well and contribute to our Federal judiciary, which is globally the gold standard for its capability, its independence, and its integrity.

Greg has practiced for decades in Delaware. He is one of the best respected, leading complex commercial litigators, and an experienced intellectual property litigator.

The District of Delaware is one of the busiest Federal courts in our entire country. Because of our unique place in American corporate law, because of the quality and the competence of our bench, we handle an enormous number of patent cases, a significant number of corporate cases.

I don't know if my colleague has mentioned one of the top-of-the-charts cases about to come to Delaware, but when you make a promise to purchase a company like—I don't know, hypothetically, Twitter—and then the deal comes apart, that ends up in a Delaware court called our chancery court. Our Federal District Court and our Federal Bankruptcy Courts handle significant litigation.

Greg is someone who also, as a family man, as a person of faith, as an outstanding leader in our community, as the past president of the bar association, as the past chairman of the judicial nominating commission on behalf of our Governor, he has served our community.

He brings his heart, his values, his intellect, and his skill to his service each and every day, and I am honored to join my senior Senator in speaking on his behalf on the floor. And I look forward to working with my colleagues across the aisle to ensure a swift confirmation vote today.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant executive clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRESCRIPTION DRUG COSTS

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I am hearing a lot of news reports, and if they are correct, it sounds like the majority party has a very partisan bill that they want to call a drug pricing bill.

And I am also told that this is moving along because it looks like the Parliamentarian is currently reviewing that proposed legislation to see if it fits into the process of reconciliation.

If the majority party passes its partisan bill, it will be bad policy for patients and taxpayers, but that doesn't mean we don't have answers to the problems that they are trying to solve.

But first of all, let me say what the Senate-proposed legislation—what we know about it—would do. It would put taxpayers at risk for more spending. It

would fail to enact any bipartisan accountability of Big Pharma and powerful middlemen that we call pharmacy benefit managers or PBMs for short.

Yes, a bipartisan bill limiting pharmaceutical increases is possible. And their bill has been developed in secret, with no markup or open debate.

Now, this partisan bill and this process are a far cry from bipartisan drug pricing ideas that I have developed over the past few years.

In the past 12 months alone, I have passed five bipartisan drug pricing bills out of committee that will lower prices and create more competition and hold Big Pharma and PBMs accountable.

In addition, I have a comprehensive bill to lower prescription drug prices that could pass the Senate with at least 60 votes. My bill is bipartisan; it has been negotiated; and it is comprehensive.

The bill is called the Prescription Drug Pricing Act. It is also known as Grassley-Wyden, but I want to be fair to Wyden. I am not sure that he would claim that he negotiated that bill, but I still like the bipartisan part of it.

The Senate should act today on this bipartisan bill to lower drug prices because this is what Grassley-Wyden would do: It would lower costs for seniors by \$72 billion. It would save the taxpayers \$95 billion. Those are CBO figures.

It establishes an out-of-pocket cap, eliminates the donut hole, and it redesigns Medicare Part D, that needs some redesigning after 19 years. This legislation will hold Big Pharma and powerful PBMs accountable.

Now, too often, cheaper alternatives like generics are available, but Big Pharma and these middlemen have an incentive to push the patient into higher-cost drugs, and patients pay the cost. My bill ends that incentive and is very pro-consumer.

A third point I want to make, it ends taxpayer subsidies to Big Pharma. It does it by capping annual price increases of Medicare Part B and D drugs at inflation. In other words, drug companies can't raise prices two or three times a year 5 to 10 percent—once a year at no more than CPI.

A Kaiser Foundation study found that half of the drugs in Medicare Part B and D increased higher than inflation over the period of time that Kaiser study covered. Over 600 drugs during the study increased 7.5 percent or more.

Another point of the bill: It establishes accountability and transparency. There are 25 major provisions to my bill to reform how the pharmaceutical industry operates.

Accountability in my bill includes, one, ending clawbacks that drive up costs at pharmacy counters for the patient. Second, ending "spread pricing" in Medicaid contracts that drive up taxpayers' costs. Three, requires sunshine on powerful PBM financial audits so the public knows the true net cost of a drug.

Everything with PBMs is opaque. You don't know what goes on between the manufacturer and the consumer.

And, four and lastly, requires sunshine on excessive drug price increases and sunshine on the launch price of a new high-cost drug.

Big Pharma and powerful middlemen benefit from the current system that we have today, and at the same time, patients and taxpayers suffer. My bill's bipartisan reform will change all of that.

Finally, the bill is bipartisan. I suppose Democrats get tired of me talking about a bipartisan bill when they are in the secrecy of their rooms drawing up their own bill.

We have 11 Republicans who supported this bill in the Finance Committee markup or are cosponsors of the bill. Thirteen Democrats supported this bill in markup. It was debated and negotiated in public.

But don't take my word for it, take it from some of my Democratic colleagues. A few months ago, the senior Senator from Delaware said this:

Senator GRASSLEY did, I thought, a masterful job in drafting a bill with broad bipartisan support.

And the chairman of the Finance Committee and senior Senator from Oregon—and he is probably going to hate me for saying this, but I am going to quote him:

Big Pharma was relentless in fighting what Senator GRASSLEY is talking about and has been for 2 years.

My bill will save seniors money, save taxpayers money, hold Big Pharma and powerful middlemen accountable, and enact necessary reform and sunshine; plus, it has bipartisan support.

So we can lower drug prices without having to resort to this partisan reconciliation process. The Grassley Prescription Drug Pricing Reduction Act is a solution. It is a product of a bipartisan, transparent process. Compare that to the secrecy of the Democratic reconciliation process.

I yield the floor.

CLOTURE MOTION

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The senior assistant executive clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 989, Gregory Brian Williams, of Delaware, to be United States District Judge for the District of Delaware.

Charles E. Schumer, Richard J. Durbin, Robert P. Casey, Jr., Sherrod Brown, Tammy Baldwin, Tina Smith, Jeanne Shaheen, Chris Van Hollen, Elizabeth Warren, Catherine Cortez Masto, Benjamin L. Cardin, Christopher Murphy, Maria Cantwell, Christopher A. Coons, Mazie Hirono, Jack Reed, Gary C. Peters, Tammy Duckworth.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Gregory Brian Williams, of Delaware, to be United States District Judge for the District of Delaware, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant executive clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN), and the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) are necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. KENNEDY).

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 52, nays 43, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 262 Ex.]

YEAS—52

Baldwin	Gillibrand	Padilla
Bennet	Graham	Peters
Blumenthal	Hassan	Reed
Blunt	Heinrich	Rosen
Booker	Hickenlooper	Sanders
Brown	Hirono	Schatz
Cantwell	Kaine	Schumer
Capito	Kelly	Shaheen
Cardin	King	Sinema
Carper	Klobuchar	Smith
Casey	Lujan	Stabenow
Collins	Manchin	Tester
Coons	Menendez	Van Hollen
Cortez Masto	Merkley	Warner
Cramer	Murkowski	Warnock
Duckworth	Murphy	Wyden
Durbin	Murray	
Feinstein	Ossoff	

NAYS—43

Barrasso	Hawley	Rounds
Blackburn	Hoeben	Rubio
Boozman	Hyde-Smith	Sasse
Braun	Inhofe	Scott (FL)
Burr	Johnson	Scott (SC)
Cassidy	Lankford	Shelby
Cornyn	Lee	Sullivan
Cotton	Lummis	Thune
Crapo	Marshall	Tillis
Cruz	McConnell	Toomey
Daines	Moran	Tuberville
Ernst	Paul	Wicker
Fischer	Portman	Young
Grassley	Risch	
Hagerty	Romney	

NOT VOTING—5

Kennedy	Markey	Whitehouse
Leahy	Warren	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WARNOCK). The yeas are 52, the nays are 43.

The motion is agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

(The remarks of Mr. CARDIN pertaining to the introduction of S. Res. 713 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

CHIPS ACT

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, our economy is as resilient as any in the world. At the same time, we know that it is important to always look to modernize key economic policies, particularly as it relates to fundamental questions of research and development and also production and manufacturing, in order to create high-skilled, high-wage jobs from sea to shining sea.

Now, I come from a State that is a leader in technological innovation, not just for our country but for the world. Oregonians know how important it is to invest and make sure that the United States stays at the forefront of technological breakthroughs.

The reality is, when it comes to chips, we have some important work to do, so I want to take just a few minutes to describe why it is so essential for the Congress to get this legislation done now.

First of all, our bill is going to bring down costs for consumers and businesses. Everybody knows there are chips in laptops, phones, and cars, but there are also chips in refrigerators and even vacuum cleaners, as we saw at Stark's in Southeast Portland recently.

From the time you pick your head up off your pillow until the time you go to bed at night, you are interacting with chips. That is what made it such an economic nightmare when the pandemic hit and the supply of semiconductors got cut short. Prices for a host of important goods went into the stratosphere. Some products weren't available at all. Factories in America went dark because they couldn't get component parts. Anybody who has had to buy a car in the last few years probably can tell you a horror story about the buying process.

This legislation is going to go a long way to increasing the production and manufacturing of chips in this country and bringing down consumer costs and addressing the shortages by increasing the supply here in America.

That leads to my second point. Investing in domestic chip production is going to create a huge, huge number of good-paying jobs. Oregonians know well that the jobs at these chipmakers can become an economic fuel for a whole region in the country. We need to guarantee that investment happens here in America instead of overseas.

Third, the bill is going to help shore up our national security and our economic security. With respect to the economy, when there aren't enough chips to keep our factories running and our shelves stocked, workers and the American economic system suffer.

And when the vast majority of chips are produced in just a few sites overseas, there is a big risk that the United States won't be able to get its hands on the chips needed to keep the American people safe in a conflict.

I am a member of the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence. I can't get involved in classified matters that I

have some access to. But I want everybody in the Senate to know this is a top-tier national security issue. Producing more chips here at home means that our economy will be more resilient for the days ahead and our country will be safer and more secure.

One last comment in this short statement. The Senate passed a larger version of this bill last year, and it included a trade package that Senator CRAPO and I, our colleague from Idaho, worked together on. It focused on cracking down on China's worst trade abuses, including the horrendous practice of forced labor, including proposals that went after authoritarian censorship overseas and a growing danger of freedom of speech here in America.

I also sought to update the system for job training and workers' support, so key to our workers having access to high-skill, high-wage jobs. That trade package is not included in this slimmed-down version of the CHIPS legislation. I can promise, however, as chairman of the Finance Committee, we will keep working on these issues.

Cracking down on trade cheats, fighting for investments and jobs in America is at the top of the priority list for the Finance Committee. I look forward to continuing our work on those issues in the weeks and months ahead.

This legislation is long overdue. It is a serious, fresh commitment to innovation in America. I am proud that I was able to lead the effort in the Senate Finance Committee to focus on producing and manufacturing more semiconductors in America. It is hugely important for my State, which really does research and development for the entire country. But it is important for all Americans every single day because, from the time you get up in the morning until the time you go to bed at night, you are using these chips. This is, in my view, the first step of many that we have to take to promote more innovation and the path to creating high-skill and high-wage jobs in America.

Let's take the first step with this important legislation. Pass this bill. I urge my colleagues to vote for it later when we get to the final vote.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

INFLATION

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to talk about the economic crisis that this Nation is facing, all as a result of the actions of the Democrats and Joe Biden.

Right now, Joe Biden is on his way to Massachusetts. He is expected to announce, while he is there, even more restrictions on American energy. One New England Senator has lobbied him to go "executive Beast Mode." The Senator might forget that we still have a Constitution. The Supreme Court just ruled that the President can't do that. The Constitution says Congress writes the laws and it is up to the President to enforce them.