Throughout the world, Juneteenth celebrations lift up the spirit of freedom and rail against the forces of oppression.

At long last, Juneteenth is beginning to be recognized as both a national event and a global celebration. The end of slavery marked a major step towards achieving equal rights for every American, regardless of race, creed or color.

Just as the Fourth of July marks the beginning of a journey that continues even today, we must not forget that the long march to freedom that started on June 19 is far from over.

Our progress along this path and our progress as a Nation can be measured in many ways, but none so dramatic as the popular election of an African American to the Presidency of the United States.

America has come a long way since that first Juneteenth, and yet we have a long way still to go.

Juneteenth should be a day of reflection—a day to remember those who came before, who fought and suffered and died. But it should also be a day of action; a day for all of us to stand together and hold up the liberties we hold so dear; a day to look ahead to the future, to continue the fight for freedom and equality; a day to think of our children as much as our forefathers.

Together, we must ensure that our sons and daughters know an America that is even more free, more fair, and more equal than the America we live in today.

When we leave this place, let us share in the joy of those who greeted General Granger's arrival into Galveston on that fine June day more than 140 years ago. And let us stand with our forefathers to continue this journey in our own lives.

Madam President, I urge my colleagues to join with me in supporting this resolution observing the historical significance of Juneteenth Independence Day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized.

Mr. SPECTER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent, on behalf of the leader, that no further points of order be in order during the pendency of the conference report to accompany H.R. 2346, and that at 4:40 p.m. the Senate proceed to vote on adoption of the conference report, with the time until then equally divided and controlled in the usual form. That is the consent request, which would have been offered earlier but a Senator had the floor so it was not. The hour of 4:40 having arrived, it is now the time specified for commencement of the vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SPECTER. Madam President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. BYRD) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY) are necessarily absent.

Mr. KYL. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Nevada (Mr. ENSIGN).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 91, nays 5, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 210 Leg.]

YEAS—91

Akaka	Gillibrand	Mikulski
Alexander	Graham	Murkowski
Barrasso	Grassley	Murray
Baucus	Gregg	Nelson (NE)
Bayh	Hagan	Nelson (FL)
Begich	Harkin	Pryor
Bennet	Hatch	Reed
Bennett	Hutchison	Reid
Bingaman	Inhofe	Risch
Bond	Inouye	Roberts
Boxer	Isakson	Rockefeller
Brown	Johanns	Schumer
Brownback	Johnson	Sessions
Bunning	Kaufman	Shaheen
Burr	Kerry	Shelby
Burris	Klobuchar	Snowe
Cantwell	Kohl	Specter
Cardin	Kyl	Stabenow
Carper	Landrieu	Tester
Casey	Lautenberg	Thune
Chambliss	Leahy	Udall (CO)
Cochran	Levin	Udall (NM)
Collins	Lieberman	Vitter
Conrad	Lincoln	Voinovich
Corker	Lugar	Warner
Cornyn	Martinez	Webb
Crapo	McCain	Whitehouse
Dodd	McCaskill	Wicker
Dorgan	McConnell	Wyden
Durbin	Menendez	
Feinstein	Merkley	

NAYS—5

Coburn	Enzi	Sanders
DeMint	Feingold	

NOT VOTING—3

Byrd	Ensign	Kennedy

The conference report was agreed to.

Mrs. LINCOLN. Madam President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mrs. LINCOLN. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BROWN. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. BROWN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak in morning business.

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

HEALTH CARE REFORM

Mr. BROWN. Madam President, as Members of the Senate and the House tackle health reform, two overriding objectives have become apparent. We must bring down cost and we must expand access, while allowing people who are happy with their health care to stay in the plan they are in now. Fix what is broken; preserve what works. Perhaps nowhere are these needs more obvious than the area of biopharmaceuticals or so-called biologics. Biologics are the fastest growing segment of prescription drug spending. With costs to biologics ranging anywhere from $10,000 to $200,000 per patient per year, biologic treatments pose a significant financial challenge for patients, for insurance companies, for employers who are paying the bills, and for Federal and State governments that are also paying the bills. Let me give examples.

If you suffer from an inflammatory condition such as rheumatoid arthritis or psoriasis or Crohn's disease, you probably would be prescribed Enbrel or Humira or Remicade. These biologics cost about $14,000 a year, more than $1,000 a month. Do you know what that does to an individual's pocketbook, an insurer or taxpayer? If you are diagnosed with multiple sclerosis—as 200 Americans are per week, some 30 Americans every day—you would probably be prescribed an interferon like Avonex, Betaseron, or Rebif, at a cost of $19,000 per year. If you need Zevalin to treat lymphoma, which strikes nearly 75,000 Americans every year, it costs up to $30,000 for a full round of treatment.

When other prescription drugs go off patent, after they have had patent protections for many years, there is a process at the Food and Drug Administration for approving lower cost generic versions. So you will see, when you go to a drugstore, many drugs which now are off patent. They have provided good profits for the developer, the drug company, but they are now off patent. So there could be generic competition in many of the drugs we use. That has worked to keep the price down and to bring competition to the industry. But no such process for biologics exists, no allowance of a generic substitute to compete with the biologic.

As it stands, biologic manufacturers are in the envious position of having a permanent monopoly. No one can compete with them. Even after their patent has expired, FDA, under law, cannot legally approve competing products because of a gap in FDA law. At this point the only thing that stands in the way of establishing a generic approval process for biologics is the political muscle of the biologics industry. Here is what the industry tells us. They don't want any kind of approval process for generic biologics. They don't want competition. They want to continue to charge $14,000 if you have Crohn's disease, $19,000 if you have MS, and $30,000 per round of treatment for the 75,000 Americans who have lymphoma.

If we do establish such a process, they want to render it useless by granting biologics the equivalent of a permanent patent extension. Maybe you

give them 12 years. After 12 years, you allow a generic, unless they slightly change a molecule or a process and you get another 12 years and another 12 years and another 12 years. So in addition to 20 years worth of patent protection, they want 12 years of market exclusivity which has the exact same effect as patent protection. When FDA grants a drug market exclusivity, it means that FDA will not approve any generic version of that drug, period.

After the first 12 years of market exclusivity is over, the biologics industry wants to slightly modify their product, and they get another 12 years of market exclusivity. And if they slightly modify the product again, they want another 12 years and another. In other words, they want no generic competition.

We have generic competition in all kinds of drugs that are very well known, but there is no provision for any kind of generic competition for these biologics. The Federal Trade Commission, the government agency with no skin in the game, with no belief that one product is better than another, with no ties to the drug industry, with no ties to anybody, issued a report asserting that the biologics industry gets plenty of marketplace protection through patents and they should not be afforded even 1 day of market exclusivity, much less 12 or 24 or 36 years.

AARP recently reported that the top 10 biologics recoup their R&D investment after 2 years of sales. The industry claims they need decades sometimes to recoup their investment. But the AARP doesn't make this stuff up. Biologics manufacturers, even though AARP said they only need 2 years of sales to recoup their investment, are given more time than that so they can make a healthy profit. Yet biologics manufacturers are asking for 20 years of patent protection, coupled with 12 more years of market exclusivity; again, renewed over and over. That is the way they like it. The biologics industry wants us to go home and tell constituents with arthritis or respiratory illness, hemophilia, cancer, or multiple sclerosis, numerous other conditions now treated by biologics, if they are lucky, in 24 or 36 years they will have access to treatments that are more affordable.

If we care about patients and fiscal responsibility, we will not allow the biologics industry to bully us into giving them more marketplace protection than any other industry. But it will take the personal will of Members from both sides of the aisle to overcome the biologic industry's clout.

Some Members of this body have already taken a stand. I was proud to join Senator SCHUMER, Senator COLLINS, Senator VITTER, and Senator BINGAMAN—Democrats and Republicans—to introduce legislation that would close the gap on FDA law that prevents generic versions of biologics from being approved. This legislation is a compromise. It would provide 5 years of market exclusivity—remember, they already have patent protection—the same as that provided to other prescription drugs. Then they would be eligible for an additional 3 years of market exclusivity for beneficial changes to their products and even more exclusivity if they conduct pediatric tests on their product. This tiered approach, which I hope to include as part of the health care reform bill moving through the HELP Committee, would provide needed competition, long-term savings, and an opportunity for consumers to have safe, effective, and affordable medical treatments.

I credit the manufacturers and the scientists and thank them, the medical researchers, for this. They provide great promise and hope to those suffering from devastating diseases and chronic illness. But absent price competition, countless Americans will be unable to benefit from these medicines because they are too expensive. We are talking about tens of thousands of dollars a year just for this drug treatment, this biologic treatment, let alone all the other doctors' bills and medicine they would need.

I hope when my colleagues are lobbied by the biologics industry—and they are spending millions of dollars on this because it means hundreds of millions of dollars in more profits for them—I hope when my colleagues are lobbied by the biologics industry, they will remember 12 plus 12 plus 12. It simply does not work for us. The American patients, American businesses, and American taxpayers cannot afford to wait 12 or 24 or 36 years for affordable biologics. Frankly, we should not make them wait.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. KAUFMAN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business for up to 10 minutes.

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

IN HONOR OF JOE CONNAUGHTON

Mr. KAUFMAN. Madam President, I have spoken here a few times already about Federal employees and the great work they perform. I am honored to be in a position to come here and do it again. I enjoy sharing stories in this Chamber about excellent public servants.

These stories are only but a few pieces in the vivid mosaic of our Federal workforce. The stories are exemplary, not exceptional. These are regular people doing a great job.

The real story of our Federal employees—that of their dedication, their talents, and their important contributions—needs to be told.

Service in government is characterized by sacrifice. Many of our Federal employees wear a uniform and sacrifice on the battlefield. Others work in civilian jobs but still make great sacrifices by working long hours and foregoing opportunities in the private sector, such as substantially better pay and bonuses. Their bonus, as I have said before, is the satisfaction of having served their country.

Today I wish to speak about a man who risked his life during wartime and then spent nearly three decades working as a civilian engineer for the U.S. Army Missile Command.

Joe Connaughton, a native of Tuscaloosa, AL, had already distinguished himself during the Second World War. He served as a navigator and bombardier on 47 missions in both the European and Pacific theaters. Joe was decorated with three air medals and four battle stars, and his unit received the Croix de Guerre for support provided to the French Expeditionary Force during the Allied offensive in Italy.

After returning home, Joe took advantage of the GI bill to pursue a bachelor of science degree in chemical engineering from the University of Alabama. He began working for the U.S. Army Missile Command near Huntsville in the late 1950s.

For 27 years, Joe worked for the Army Missile Command's Research, Development, and Engineering Division at Redstone Arsenal. He and his engineering team helped develop and perfect weapons systems critical to maintaining our military edge during the Cold War. This included the Lance, Hellfire, and THAAD missile propulsion systems.

When Joe and his colleagues were working on the Hellfire missile, which is carried primarily by the Apache attack helicopter, there was a problem when the TV-based guidance system encountered difficulties in smoke and bad weather. A missile whose own propulsion method gives off a smoke plume cannot be accurately directed if the smoke hinders its guidance system. The engineering team on which Joe worked developed a smokeless propellant, which greatly enhanced the missile's accuracy.

For this achievement, Joe and his team earned the Army Missile Command's Scientific and Engineering Award in 1980.

When the Hellfire entered service in 1984, it was intended for use against Soviet tanks in a future Cold War conflict. But with the collapse of communism in Europe just a few years later, some began to doubt whether its development—and that of similar systems—was worth the cost.

However, with the laser guidance and missile propulsion system developed by the civilian engineers at Redstone Arsenal, the Hellfire proved its worth during Operation Desert Storm in 1991.

In that conflict, the Army and Marine Corps used the Hellfire to disable the Iraqi air defenses in its initial strike, quickly gaining air supremacy. Apache helicopters launched Hellfire missiles against a myriad of targets,