

A most unique statement, to say the least. He has publicly stated an aversion to new medical technology and health care advances, saying:

One of the drivers of low value in health care today is the continuous entrance of new technologies, devices, and drugs that add no value to care.

That is in his eyes. He refers to this as an “excess supply” of health care. And, of course, we have his infamous quote that “the decision is not whether or not we will ration health care. The decision is whether we will ration care with our eyes open.”

It should then come as no surprise that CMS under Dr. Berwick’s leadership has embarked upon a path of increasing government control, centralized decisionmaking, and top-down mandates that treat doctors as nothing more than cooks practicing “cookbook medicine” and patients as nothing more than numbers, despite their individual needs and desires.

One example: attempts by CMS to restrict the number of times seniors with diabetes can test their blood sugar by limiting them to one test strip per day, regardless of what the doctor recommends. Doctors understand that diabetes care is an exceedingly complex and personalized enterprise. My question that I could not ask yesterday: Why is CMS replacing the judgment of a doctor on how many times their patient should test their blood sugar with a CMS-knows-best approach?

An even more egregious example of the government getting in between patients and doctors is Dr. Berwick’s recent investigation into Medicare coverage of the life-extending prostate cancer therapy Provenge. Provenge is a therapeutic vaccine approved by the Food and Drug Administration to treat late-stage prostate cancer through an innovative process that removes immune system cells from patients and exposes them to cancer cells and an immune system stimulator and then injects them back into the patient. Provenge has been shown to increase life expectancy by an average of 4 months but sometimes longer, with one patient living an additional 7 years. In addition, Provenge is special because of its lack of side effects as compared to the traditional chemotherapy methods. So not only can patients live longer, but their quality of life will be better.

Medicare coverage for FDA-approved drugs is usually automatic. My next question to Dr. Berwick would have been, had I had the opportunity in the committee yesterday but was denied because of scheduling: Why did you initiate a coverage investigation so soon after Provenge was approved? Why is CMS seeking to substitute its judgment for not only patients and doctors but for the FDA, the gold standard for drug approval worldwide? Are you questioning the FDA’s decision? When drug companies and research folks produce after many years of research and effort and cost, are they going to have to go through two hurdles—first,

the FDA, which can take years, and then CMS—as to whether Medicare will approve it? It seems that is where we are headed.

I know or I think I know the answer as to why Dr. Berwick decided to conduct this investigation.

It is cost—\$93,000 for a complete cycle of Provenge was the driving factor behind this investigation.

The good news is that yesterday an advisory committee recommended that CMS cover Provenge. But I am very concerned about the precedent this sets not only for other cancer regimens such as the promising breast cancer drug Avastin but for all new medical innovations.

Some may say that an extra 4 months of life is not enough to justify this high price tag. It is a high price tag. First, the government should not be in the business of placing dollar values on life, period. That is what Great Britain is trying to move away from. That is why David Cameron made the unique statement that maybe we ought to have a system that puts the choice between doctors and patients. What a novel idea.

Secondly, the traditional chemo and all of its associated side effects costs Medicare upwards of \$110,000 per patient per year. So Provenge is actually a cost saver when viewed in that context.

Third, this is exactly the type of innovative approach we need to win the fight against cancer. Medical advances don’t come in giant leaps; they more often occur at the margins. We should not deny patients and doctors treatment options simply because they don’t offer a complete cure. That is shortsighted, not to mention cruel.

Finally, if we want companies and investors to continue to pour their dollars and efforts into developing a cure for cancer, this is the wrong approach. The investment into researching and developing Provenge approached \$1 billion over 15 years, 15 clinical trials. Refusing to allow a return on this huge investment will send a chilling effect across the health research industry, resulting in less investment, less innovation, and worse care for patients. Maybe less innovation is actually the goal of this administration and of Dr. Berwick, who has targeted the “entrance of new technologies, drugs, and devices” as “one of the drivers of low value in health care today.” Value is a subjective concept.

Another question I have for Dr. Berwick: I prefer that the value of health care be determined by the patient and doctor, not the government. Would you agree?

Finally, from yesterday’s news, I have been shocked by the number of ObamaCare waivers coming out of the Department of Health and Human Services. According to the New York Times today, 111 waivers have been granted to employers to allow them to avoid the new health care mandates. The only thing more shocking than the

number of waivers is who is getting them. Would you believe that they are some of the most ardent supporters of health care reform? Unions such as the Service Employees International Union, the United Federation of Teachers, and the Transport Workers Union have all applied for and been granted waivers from the rules. They don’t have to follow the rules. They don’t have to follow the mandates. Guess who are the strongest supporters of health care. The fact is, ObamaCare is bad for business, bad for workers, bad for seniors, bad for taxpayers.

My question to Dr. Berwick: When will the American people get a waiver from ObamaCare? Of course, that decision would be under the purview of the Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services, Kathleen Sebelius, whom I know as a personal friend.

Kathleen, Kathleen, Kathleen, you are granting all these waivers to people in regard to the mandate on health care. When will the American people get a waiver from some of the things they choose not to take part in? This is, indeed, shocking news.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. BOND. Madam President, I understand I have 15 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct.

Mr. BOND. Will the Chair advise me when 10 minutes has been used.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Yes.

#### BIOTECHNOLOGY: HOPE FOR THE FUTURE

Mr. BOND. Madam President, as I will be leaving the Senate in a few weeks, I ask my colleagues to indulge me as I speak for a few minutes on a subject I believe is very important, and that is continuing the policies and funding that help drive scientific advancement in new areas, particularly agricultural biotechnology.

It goes without saying that we are living in a time of breathtaking scientific discovery, whether the field is aerospace, information systems, or biotechnology.

In the last hundred years, science has taken us from the Wright Brothers first flight to manned space flight. Science has taken us from Henry Ford’s first car to today’s vehicles hosting full-fledged entertainment systems and global positioning systems. Science has taken us from typewriters to supercomputer and from candles to electricity.

Science is moving even faster now. Advances in technology will continue to reach far into every sector of our economy.

Future job and economic growth in the areas of health care, life sciences, industry, defense, agriculture and transportation is directly related to scientific advancement. And America’s

future wealth and economic pre-eminence is tied to technological advancement.

Technological advancement will continue to drive our economy, job growth and our quality of life.

While most of the work is being done by our scientists, engineers, entrepreneurs and educators, government can play a role in helping create the conditions for them to succeed: through research funding, through tax policy, and through free trade agreements. This is especially true when it comes too agbiotechnology.

Looking back about 15 years ago, I received a strong push for a new idea—mapping the corn genome, one of the first real biotech projects for commercial agriculture. This push came not from leaders in education, science or the corporate world—and we have many—but from corn growers and soybean producers in Missouri.

Our producers convinced me that biotechnology was not only key to improving farm incomes and the rural economy, but in revolutionizing the world in the same way the steam engine revolutionized industry, and the computer revolutionized the sharing of information.

At that time, it was tough to get anyone interested in the project—Congress, the media, even my own staff. Imagine running for reelection and telling your staff: hey, great idea, I'm going to campaign on the corn genome.

As Mark Twain said:

A crank is someone with a new idea—until it catches on. Back then, those of us peddling biotechnology sounded like cranks.

The first time I asked the Agriculture Appropriations Committee to fund biotech projects, I didn't get a single dime.

But we persisted, anyway. I teamed up with my colleague and good friend, Senator BARBARA MIKULSKI, on a bipartisan initiative to fund biotech research through the National Science Foundation.

Through the years we have provided nearly a billion dollars to NSF.

With the help of Missouri's own Chancellor Bill Danforth and Roger Beachy as well as others, Senator TOM HARKIN and I sponsored legislation creating the National Institute of Food and Agriculture to support the competitive research at the Federal level needed to advance agriculture science.

Fifteen years later, we now have the proof that this idea really is changing the world, as promised.

Already, hundreds of millions of people have been helped by biotechnology drugs and vaccines that can cure diseases and eliminate the need for surgery. And there are many more drugs and vaccines being tested which will eventually help us treat other diseases.

Agricultural biotechnology is bringing hope to those in the developing world by providing crops that are more pest and disease-resistant and more nutritious.

It helps our farmers by consistently increasing crop yields, especially as our global population continues to increase while available farmland decreases.

From an environmental perspective, the use of transgenic seeds has reduced pesticide application on our fields by tens of millions of pounds annually in the United States alone.

And—especially important now during the tough recession we are in—agriculture biotech creates good, high-paying jobs and helps revitalize rural economies.

The sky is the limit for the future of biotech. Advances here will continue to impact the entire world.

Madam President, 2005 marked the year that the billionth acre of transgenic crops was planted worldwide, a notable achievement in a field of science that was at the time only a decade old.

In 2008, the second billionth acre of a biotech crop was planted only 3 years after the first.

All this while a handful of professional antitechnology activists are still, unsuccessfully in search of their first stomach ache. Their persistent Luddite-type hatred of ag biotech, though without any scientific support, has fueled fear of genetically modified, GMO, foods, even in less developed countries, where near-term starvation is a real prospect without a ag biotech.

The growth of biotech will continue to explode in future years. Developing countries using ag biotech out number industrial countries by a ratio of three to two.

In fact, resourceful farmers in some countries are approving biotechnology before their lagging governments do.

Growth brings with it many opportunities for scientists from the "developed world" to collaborate on biotechnology projects with scientists in the developing world.

But how do we ensure that all people, especially those who need it, are not left behind?

We must do it. There is a humanitarian imperative. People who are well fed have many problems, a people who are hungry have only one problem.

As Norman Borlaug put it:

Without food, man can live at most but a few weeks; without it, all other components of social justice are meaningless.

We simply cannot afford not to tap into the promise of biotechnology. By 2050, developing countries will be home to 90 percent of the expected population of 9 billion.

However, while the world is expected to increase its population by more than 30 percent the area of productive agricultural lands in the world remains relatively unchanged. Traditional agriculture cannot keep up.

Increasing crop yields—and income—is especially important in a world where according to the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization, FAO, 925 million children go to bed

hungry every day and several million of them die from nutrition-related illnesses every year.

For these individuals, a crop failure can mean the difference between surviving and starving.

We are not without challenges.

Although diminishing, a vocal and aggressive group of advocacy organizations continue to market fear rather than sound science, especially in Europe.

When public policy decisions are based on fear, rather than sound science, we are in trouble.

My good friend Dr. Martina McGloughlin has argued that some multinational corporations operating as NGOs shamelessly hype fear of biotech GMO and use fear to solicit funds for their salaries—these are the modern-day Luddites who know how to profit from their self-generated hysteria.

The result: the science cannot get to the marketplace and improve people's lives.

Fortunately the European Union is perhaps beginning to see they are missing out. They have begun to soften their opposition—however slightly—on genetically modified imports.

The stakes, of course, are higher in developing nations than in Europe, where most are well fed.

The late Dr. Norman Borlaug, the unassuming humanitarian credited with feeding a billion people and saving the lives of hundreds of millions, warned us about the biotech naysayers.

He worried that "fear-mongering" by environmental extremists against pesticides, fertilizers and genetically-improved foods would put millions at risk of starvation while damaging the biodiversity those extremists claim to protect.

So we must do a better job, as policy makers, educators, business leaders, and scientists to communicate the value of biotechnology to those around us.

As my colleagues know, we are struggling to find our way out of this recession and create new jobs.

Some of the millions of jobs lost during the last 2 years are never coming back.

Biotech shows the promise of replacing some of those jobs. And biotech will provide the jobs of the future. Whether in the research lab, the incubator, in a small company or a large corporation, biotech is creating good, high-paying jobs. It is extremely important for producing enhanced revenues and jobs.

That is why ongoing workforce development and job training in new fields like biotechnology is so important.

And it is good to see some of our educational institutions getting involved.

Missouri Western University in St. Joseph, MO, has built a biotech incubator to encourage new businesses in the area and to help train workers.

Not long ago, I visited a St. Louis Community College program that is

training young people to work in biotech labs. They are getting on-the-job training at an incubator known as BioBench.

That's a win-win. It's a win for young people trying to find jobs in the new economy, and it is a win for the companies who need the skills of these workers.

Efforts like these keep high-paying, cutting-edge jobs right here in the United States.

One key to making sure the benefits of biotech continue to grow is making sure the American public and press, beyond farmers, researchers, a few company leaders and policy makers understand the value of biotech. Those who understand biotech must make a conscious effort to educate their peers and leadership across the country.

We need to develop advanced science and technology curriculum that prepares our students for the high-tech jobs of the future. A growing industry needs a pipeline of future talented workers. We need to continue to expand hands-on training opportunities to prepare and transition our current workforce into these new high-tech jobs.

So there is good news on many fronts when it comes to the future of the biotech movement. But we need a continued, strong, public-private partnership going forward.

As I mentioned earlier, in the last 12 or 13 years, Congress has provided nearly a billion dollars to the National Science Foundation to conduct plant biotech research, building on the initiative Senator MIKULSKI and I introduced in the VA-HUD-Independent Agencies Appropriations Subcommittee.

The need for continued investment in basic research is crucial to the growth of biotechnology and I hope Congress will continue to fund research in this area.

While I won't be around to beat the drum next year from the inside, I have worked with my colleagues Senator JOHANNES and Senator KLOBUCHAR to create a new Biotech Caucus. I hope those of you who understand the challenge and promise of ag biotech will choose to join the ranks and communicate the benefits of ag biotech to our peers.

While we have much to be proud of when it comes to developments and advancements in biotechnology—we cannot rest on our laurels. We must continue to support basic research in our Nation's labs. We must continue our investment in the buildings and equipment that make it possible. We must continue to create policies that allow biotech businesses to flourish—bringing critical research from the lab shelves to the marketplace and the benefits to our citizens. We must support job training for new workers and help transition the current workforce into these high-tech jobs of the future. And, maybe most important, we need to continue to educate those who do

not understand the full magnitude and benefit of biotech.

Only through effective communication can we ensure that sound science—not myths and fear—guide public policy.

In closing, let me say that in 40 years of public life, I have seen a lot of great ideas come and go. I strongly believe ag biotech is here to stay and will grow. We are only just beginning to see the many exciting applications biotechnology can offer. It is truly changing lives, for the better.

In my opinion, a dedicated and collaborative investment by policymakers, researchers, educators, and farmers will result in a vibrant industry that will fuel our economy, improve our environment, and feed our world for years to come.

#### IN MEMORY OF JULIE DAMMANN

Mr. BOND. Madam President, I have a very sad message to bring to the body today. It is with great sadness that I report that we have lost one of our own, Julie Dammann, who lost her brave 11-year battle with cancer.

All of you who knew Julie knew of her superior abilities, high spirit, and unshakably impervious character in the face of adversity. As she was struggling with this disease and going off for weekend treatment on Friday, with a bright smile, she always insisted, when asked, that she was “doing great.” Her life was far too short, but few on Earth live a life as fully as she did.

Julie was a rural kid from Minnesota and graduated from the University of Minnesota. She worked for Rudy Boschwitz before I was fortunate enough to hire her in 1987. Most recently, she went to work as a senior vice president with Ogilvy Government Relations.

But in 1987, after joining my staff as legislative director, she met Rolf Dammann at the National Republican Senatorial Committee, who was apparently interested in more than her highly regarded legislative acumen. Rolf's newfound interest in budget and appropriations issues eventually paid off, and they were married—after the 1988 election, of course.

They both enjoyed politics, history, golf, German beer, and their two lovely daughters Monika and Paula. Throughout her battle with cancer, they were always by her side.

Within any successful enterprise, there is the heart of the operation. In the case of Julie, she was the heart, the legs, the mind, the backbone, and the can-do spirit of my staff. For me, from the first time she walked into my office, she was also my friend.

Remarkably, from that first day through 24 congressional sessions, three reelections, marriage, motherhood, and her bravely defiant fight against cancer, she never stopped. She never rested. F. Scott Fitzgerald once said, “Action is character.” In that case, Julie was character. Now, some

who dealt with her would say “character” is probably an understatement.

Her ability to multitask was legendary. During her time as chief of staff, she could simultaneously talk with me, listen to C-SPAN, BlackBerry instructions to her staff, check out statistics of the previous Vikings game, and evaluate the potential draft picks 9 months in advance—not only for the Vikings, but she learned to do the same for the Kansas City Chiefs and the St. Louis Rams. We tried to keep up, but it was hard.

The fact that she was able to stay in my employ after the Twins-Cardinals World Series of 1987—an epic tragedy for Cardinal fans—speaks volumes to her otherwise high value.

There is seldom enough recognition of the high-caliber people who staff us in the Congress and the government. Julie was exceptional among the exceptional. From 1987 to 2005 while on my staff she was a perfectly reliable source of sound judgment, energy, cheer, and friendship.

She knew the budget, the whip count, the box scores, the news ratings, the third down conversion rate, the poll numbers, the economic report, the schedule, the process, the players, the politicians, as well as every competing argument. But mostly she knew and loved people. She was the ideal public servant.

Our sincere condolences go to Julie's husband Rolf and their daughters Monika and Paula. The girls will carry on with the richest of all inheritances: having their mother's genes and love and guidance to remember. Julie could not have been in more diligent, loving hands than those of her husband Rolf. We thank him for taking such special care of her. We have lost a special friend, but now we are blessed with a special angel.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have a copy of her obituary from the Washington Post printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Julie Ann Dammann, age 51, passed away on November 13, 2010, after a long battle with cancer. She was born in Roseville, MN, on May 23, 1959, to Mrs. Ervina and the late Dr. Paul Hasbargen. After celebrating their wedding anniversary on November 12, Julie is survived by her loving husband of 22 years, Rolf and their daughters, Monika (15) and Paula (13) of Arlington, VA; as well as her sister Linda Bazille, and husband, Brad, of Emerald, WI; mother-in-law, Leslie Morton of Gainesville, VA; and her father-in-law Rolf Dammann Sr. of Nashua, NH. Julie attended Alexander Ramsey High School in Roseville, MN (1977), and then became a proud Golden Gopher and graduate of the University of Minnesota (1980), where she was an Economics and Political Science major. After graduating, Julie commenced a long career in service to the country she loved. Her career in the United States Senate began as a Legislative Assistant to Sen. Rudy Boschwitz (R-MN). Twenty-five years later, she retired from the U.S. Senate as the Chief of Staff to Sen. Christopher S. “Kit” Bond (R-MO), after serving on his staff since