

We enacted a new penalty to stop Pharma's outrageous price hikes. We enabled Medicare to finally negotiate lower prices. We also made vaccines, like the shingles vaccine, which costs nearly \$400 a course, entirely free for seniors under Medicare. We have said that no senior on Medicare will pay more than \$2,000 out-of-pocket for medications in a year. Finally, we capped the price of insulin at \$35 a month.

All of these measures were part of the Inflation Reduction Act, which President Biden signed into law and Republican Members of the House are now saying they want to repeal in its entirety. Clearly, our legislation put Big Pharma on notice. It let them know their days of price gouging are numbered.

We are not finished. There are now two very different visions of healthcare in America: the Democratic vision and the Republican vision. Instead of voting to cap insulin prices, Republicans blocked our proposal that would have applied the \$35 premium to all Americans and not just senior citizens. We needed 10 Republican votes on the floor. We got 7. And get this. Now many Republicans are talking about repealing the whole law and raising drug prices—exactly what America does not need.

As long as we are in charge in the Senate and have a President in the White House, we won't let it happen. In fact, we want to work with Republicans, if they are willing, to do more. Let's extend the \$35 insulin cap to all other diabetic patients in America. Is that a radical idea? Senator WARNOCK of Georgia has a bill to do this. The question: Are the Republicans willing to join us? That is what it takes to pass it.

While we are at it, let's put an end to Pharma's scheme to unjustifiably extend monopolies and harm patients' access to drugs. Last month, the Senate Judiciary Committee, which I chair, reported out five bipartisan bills to address patent abuse and other tactics that prevent generic drugs from coming on the market, keeping prices high for American families.

The full Senate should take up and pass these bills, and we should pass the bill that I have introduced with the Republican from Iowa, Senator GRASSLEY, to address the outrageous direct-to-consumer drug ads that we all see on television.

We all see them. On average, every American who watches TV is going to see nine drug ads every single day. How many countries allow the advertising of drugs on television? Two, the United States of America and New Zealand. Go figure. Pharma spent \$6 billion a year flooding the airwaves so that the average American sees all of those ads that promote the most expensive drugs in the world. Pharma thinks, if they bombard you enough with ads so that you finally get to the point you might be able to spell Xarelto, you will insist to

your doctor that that is the blood thinner you want even though there may be less expensive alternatives that are just as effective.

Well, Senator GRASSLEY and I have a radical idea. If they can put all of those disclaimers on those ads and give you all the information and say things that sound nonsensical on their face—if you are allergic to this drug, don't take this drug—how do I know I am allergic? Well, if you put all of that on there, they ought to be able to put for 5 seconds on every ad the cost of the drug—the cost of the drug.

You would be amazed. Some of these drugs cost \$9,000 and \$10,000 a month, and they are peddling them on the air like they are just pretty common, pretty affordable. They are not. If they are advertising a drug and rattling off side effects, they should disclose the price up front. It is a basic step toward transparency for patients. Even former President Trump agreed with us on this one. He supported our efforts.

I am glad we capped the price of insulin, but there is a lot more to do. I hope it will be bipartisan. If it isn't bipartisan, it is going nowhere. I hope the Republicans join us as people across America celebrate the affordability of prescription drugs for Medicare recipients.

#### FREEDOM TO VOTE ACT

Madam President, when I was a college student in 1965—there, I have given away my age—there was this discussion one night about getting in the car here, at Georgetown University in Washington, and having three or four of us drive down to Selma, AL, to participate in the march. Well, things intervened, like work schedules and classes, and we didn't do it, and I have regretted it ever since. I wasn't there for the March from Selma, which was commemorated just this past weekend with President Biden going to Selma, but I did get to the city of Selma, AL, on a fateful morning.

Congressman John Lewis, whom I served with in the House of Representatives—one of the real civil rights heroes of my generation—took a group of us down to Selma, AL. Part of the trip was to march over the Edmund Pettus Bridge, which he had done and had almost lost his life in the process. At the last minute, I had to go back to Illinois, and I had to cancel and catch an early morning plane to take the trip back home.

I told John Lewis: Maybe, next time, I will get a chance to do it.

He said: There may not be a next time. So let's you and I go over there.

We got up at 6 a.m. and drove over to Selma, AL. In the early morning fog, I walked across the Edmund Pettus Bridge with John Lewis by my side. He pointed out where he was standing when they beat him down with a nightstick and almost killed him. They fractured his skull.

I have thought about that ever since. When I think of Selma, AL, I think of John surviving that and the amazing

courage which he showed. It sometimes escapes us as to why that march was taking place. It sounds like a bunch of people who just wanted to get public attention. There was a lot more to the story.

There is a woman who publishes a column almost every single day—free for those who want to read it. Her name is Heather Cox Richardson. I have come to know her a little bit. She visited our Senate Democratic caucus just a few weeks ago. She published a column on March 5, Sunday, which spoke about Selma, AL, and what was behind that march. It was all about registering African Americans to vote in the State of Alabama.

"In the 1960s," she wrote, "despite the fact that Black Americans outnumbered white Americans among the 29,500 people who lived in Selma, Alabama, the city's voting rolls were 99% white. So, in 1963, local Black organizers launched a voter registration drive."

". . . in neighboring Mississippi, Ku Klux Klan members worked with local law enforcement officers to murder three voting rights organizers and dispose of their bodies."

"To try to hold back the white supremacists, Congress"—and the Senate and the House—"passed the 1964 Civil Rights Act, designed in part to make it possible for Black Americans to register to vote. In Selma, a judge stopped voter registration meetings by prohibiting public gatherings of more than two people."

To call attention to the crisis in their city, they invited Dr. Martin Luther King to come to Selma.

"King and other prominent Black leaders arrived in January 1965, and for seven weeks, Black residents made a new push to register to vote."

The county sheriff in the Selma area, James Clark, "arrested almost 2,000 of them on a variety of charges, including contempt of court and parading without a permit. A federal court ordered Clark not to interfere with orderly registration."

There were some heroic Federal judges who risked their lives and reputations, and one of them was Frank Johnson. John Lewis told me about him as we walked over the Pettus Bridge.

But "a federal court ordered Clark not to interfere with orderly registration, so he forced Black applicants to stand in line for hours" and subjected them to a "literacy" test before they were allowed to register to vote. Not one single person passed.

"Then, on February 18, white police officers, including local police, sheriff's deputies, and Alabama state troopers, beat and shot an unarmed man, 26-year-old Jimmie Lee Jackson, who was marching for voting rights in Marion, Alabama," about 25 miles from Selma. "Jackson had run into a restaurant for shelter along with his mother when the police started rioting."

But they chased him and shot him and killed him at a restaurant kitchen. He died 8 days later on February 26.

“Black leaders in Selma decided to defuse the community’s anger by planning a long march—54 miles—from Selma to the state capitol at Montgomery.”

“On March 7, 1965, the marchers set out. As they crossed the Edmund Pettus Bridge, state troopers and other law enforcement officers met the unarmed marchers with billy clubs, bullwhips, and tear gas.”

They fractured the skull of John Lewis and beat Amelia Boynton unconscious.

“A newspaper photograph of the 54-year-old Boynton, seemingly dead in the arms of another marcher, illustrated the depravity of those determined to stop Black voting.”

I tell that story about Bloody Sunday because, very often, people don’t hear the whole story. It was just a march. What was going on? Why did they do all that? It involved the right to vote—the right to vote in America. Is there anything more fundamental? Is there anything more debated at this point? The Big Lie of the previous President about the results of the last election I hope has been debunked for most Americans who are open to the facts. But we still fight to make sure that States do not restrict the right to vote. And too many still do.

Why do we make it so hard for residents of America to legally vote? It should be the easiest thing in the world. We shouldn’t ask a great personal sacrifice on their part to achieve it.

Heather Cox Richardson makes it a point in her column, and I wanted to recount it on the floor of the Senate. So as we think about Selma, AL, and we think on more than just that picture of people coming over the bridge, we think of the reason they were coming over that bridge: to vote, to be part of America. They have an opportunity to speak in a democracy. It is so fundamental. It is so basic. It is so American.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. DUCKWORTH). The Senator from Alabama.

#### TITLE IX

Mr. TUBERVILLE. Madam President, since coming to Washington 2 years ago, I have learned a lot about the Senate and about how Washington works. Politics can, at times, be like a game. While we may be on different teams politically, we should all be focused on winning for all American people. If there is one thing I know about in my last 40 years as a coach and educator, it is trying to win and how to win.

Fifty years ago, we discovered a winning strategy for all of American female athletes. It was called title IX, probably one of the most successful pieces of legislation that has ever come out of this body. Signed into law in

1972, title IX’s 37 words empowered women to win by leveling the playing field and providing them access to the same opportunities as young men.

I believe those words are worth repeating today to remind this body of their importance:

No person in the United States shall, on the basis of sex, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any educational program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance.

Those sometimes on the left argue that allowing males to compete against females makes sports more inclusive. I don’t believe that. The opposite, to me, is true. Forcing females to compete against males destroys the level playing field created by law. It would exclude young women from the safety and fairness that they deserve. Title IX’s success would be undone if this continues to happen, and that success that title IX is and has been is undeniable.

Since its enactment, participation in female sports has increased by more than 600 percent. Think about that now. In 50 years, because of title IX, the participation in women’s sports has increased 600 percent, and the number of female college graduates in the United States increased dramatically from 8 to 40 percent. You don’t see things like that happen. Title IX has afforded many women the opportunity to receive athletic scholarships and become our engineers, our doctors, our lawyers, and our leaders, without the burden of having college debt.

Sadly, title IX is being attacked by activists who care more about politics than what is best for women and girls. The U.S. Department of Education is caving—is giving in—to progressive activists and moving ahead with plans to force schools to allow biological males to share locker rooms and compete in women’s sports. This irrational and unprecedented move comes despite record numbers of educators, parents, and athletes who have voiced their concerns about the disastrous impact that this would have on female athletes of all ages.

The Department of Education, President Biden, and my colleagues on the left in Congress have ignored those concerns because they care more about appeasing activists and the progressive left than actually protecting young women. I just can’t understand this. It is shameful.

Beginning next year, coaches will be forced to decide between opening up locker rooms to biological males or face dire consequences. Allowing biological males to compete against young women is unfair, it is unsafe, and it is wrong. We can’t look Americans in the eye and honestly say we support female athletes if we stand by as they are forced into uncomfortable settings they do not deserve, and we can’t tell young women we want them to succeed if we allow the radical left to push them to the sidelines of their

sports and take away their future opportunities for scholarships and fair competition. It is not the American way.

If you visited my hometown of Auburn, AL, on a Friday night over the past few months, you would see an arena—thousands of people—full of excited young girls watching the Auburn gymnastics team. Many of them dream of becoming Olympic gymnasts—gymnasts just like Suni Lee, who is an Olympic Gold medalist.

Others make the trip to the University of Alabama in Tuscaloosa to see the World Games and to see Montana Fouts on the mound, aspiring to one day become a star softball pitcher at a higher level.

Our girls and young women should be able to continue to dream and compete. Taking away their title IX protections by twisting the law could strip those opportunities for female athletes across our great country.

Since 2003, biological men have won 28 women’s sports titles. Let me read that again. Since 2003, biological men have won 28 women’s sports titles. We have all heard from athletes like Riley Gaines, the college swimmer who, this past year, bravely spoke out after being forced to share a locker room and the awards podium with a swimmer who had the unfair advantage of swimming in a male body.

Over the weekend, we learned that a judge in Minnesota has ordered the U.S.A. power lifting teams to allow biological men to compete against female power lifters.

Where will this end? When will we step up and say enough is enough? Congress must act to save title IX and make sure competition is safe and fair for everyone, including girls and women. This is why, last week, I reintroduced the Protection of Women and Girls in Sports Act. This legislation would require institutions to recognize an athlete’s gender solely based on what it is at birth or else be banned from receiving Federal funding.

You know, it sounds absurd even to me to say, but, sadly, this legislation is now necessary to preserve title IX for current and future female athletes. It is really sad.

I am thankful for those colleagues here in the Senate who have joined me in standing up for women’s sports, and I hope that others will join our efforts in the future.

We have to save title IX. We have to save young girls and women to be able to participate on the same level, with the same funding and access to coaches, as men. Millions of young girls and women are looking to us in this body and to the people across this country, looking to us to stand up for them and that starts with action to ensure that the playing field remains level for generations and generations to come.

This Senate must take up this crucial legislation and help every young woman and young girl in this great country that we live in.