

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 JOHANNS 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

1987. Throughout her career, Julie played a role in the passage of major pieces of legislation including: The Federal Highway Reauthorization Bills of 1992, 1998 and 2005; the 1987 Farm Credit Act; the 1991 Clean Air Act Amendments; the 1992 Family Medical Leave Act; and the 2002 Help America Vote Act. In 2005, after retiring from the U.S. Senate, Julie joined Ogilvy Government Relations as a Senior Vice President, where she continued her work on various transportation and appropriations issues. Throughout her life, Julie was an accomplished athlete, including playing on the University of Minnesota basketball team. Her lifelong love of sports continued into her adult life as an avid golfer and a formidable soccer player. She was a long-time fan of all Minnesota sports, especially the Vikings and the Minnesota Twins, having attended multiple games during the 1987 World Series. Julie's focus on family and work was only equaled by the intensity with which she followed her Minnesota teams, remembering every play from every game. The passion with which Julie lived her life will be sadly missed by all who knew and loved her. The family will receive guests on Friday, November 19, 2010 from 10 a.m. until the time of service at 10:30 a.m. at the Immanuel Lutheran Church, 1801 Russell Road, Alexandria, VA with a private interment to follow. The family requests that in lieu of flowers, gifts will be received for the "Julie Dammann Family Education Trust". Donations may be sent to: Redmon, Peyton & Braswell, L.L.P., 510 King Street, Suite 301, Alexandria, VA 22314.

Mr. BOND. Madam President, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BROWN of Massachusetts. Madam 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.

EMPOWERING STATES TO INNOVATE ACT

Mr. BROWN of Massachusetts. Madam President, I rise today and join my colleague, Senator WYDEN, to speak about legislation we have introduced that will protect not only his State but my State of Massachusetts and other States by allowing them to waive out of specific requirements of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

As my colleagues know, my single priority is and always has been to ensure that what we do in Washington does not harm my State of Massachusetts or the rest of the country, and that we are responsible stewards with every tax dollar that flows from the States into the Federal Government.

This has been true when it comes to voting against raising taxes on families and businesses. It has been true when it comes to fighting for commonsense, pro-growth policies that will create jobs in Massachusetts. It has been true in my efforts to be sure that the Federal health care reform bill does not diminish or harm the health care innovations that have occurred in Massachusetts.

It is my belief that Congress needs to be held responsible for its actions, for the policies it advocates, and the legislation that ultimately passes through these Halls to become law. When Congress passes legislation that is harmful—in this case the Federal health care reform legislation, which I did not support—or there is an unintended consequence—which I think is the case when it deals with Massachusetts and the innovations we have had for years, where we have 98 percent of our people already insured—Members need to be bold enough to stand up and fix it regardless of party affiliation and regardless of whether it is popular.

I commend the Senator who is about to speak after me for his leadership on this matter. Senator WYDEN has been working very diligently on addressing the concerns for his State. Today I get a chance to do the same. Today we get an opportunity to make a correction to the Federal health care reform bill to be sure we are doing the right thing, not just for Massachusetts but for other States that seek to waive out of certain requirements of the Federal health care reform law.

In many ways, Massachusetts has been on the forefront of implementing health care reform: expanding access—as I mentioned, 98 percent of our people are already insured—designing systems to increase market participation—from the Cadillac plan, all the way to the fully subsidized Commonwealth Care Program—and increasing transparency for consumers and providers. We continue to learn, however, lessons every day in Massachusetts about what works and what does not work, and we are continuing to work on those very issues to make sure we can do it better.

This is an important point because it speaks directly to the purpose of this piece of legislation that I have introduced in a bipartisan manner with Senator WYDEN from Oregon.

As you know, the health care reform efforts of Massachusetts are our own. We were one of the first States in the country to take this upon ourselves to address the very serious problem we had in providing funds to hospitals that were providing care for people who were making a good wage but who were not paying the bills. As a result, the citizens had to subsidize the hospitals to the tune of over \$1 billion. So we believed it was imperative for us to get something done.

As difficult as it is to admit this, not every State wants to be like Massachusetts. I understand that. They may not want to be like Oregon either. Massachusetts is a great State, with, I believe, the best hospitals, physicians, doctors, nurses, treatment facilities, research facilities in the country and around the world. There is a reason why people come to Massachusetts for the care and coverage they need so badly.

But I recognize that my colleague from Oregon is interested in protecting reform efforts in Oregon as well. He

does not want to be like Massachusetts because Oregon is different from Massachusetts. Oregon's insurance market is different. Its provider network is different. Its beneficiaries and population are different than in Massachusetts.

Oregon might want to implement reforms or create a coverage mechanism that I do not like or that I would not want to work in the State of Massachusetts, but that is OK. That is what this bill is about. It allows the individual States to have the right to do what they believe is imperative and important for their particular State, which is why the legislation we have introduced—the Empowering States to Innovate Act—is so important.

Right now, as provided under section 1332—the Waivers for State Innovation—of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, States can waive out of provisions of the Federal reform law. That is the good news. We are allowing States to participate in the process and allowing them not to have duplicate processes or maybe potentially have lesser care and coverage if the Federal health care bill is implemented. So it allows us to continue to provide the care and services we want to provide to our citizens in Massachusetts. The bad news is, this waiver authority is not scheduled to take effect until 2017. So what are we doing until then—a full 3 years after the PPACA is scheduled to be fully implemented?

For me and my dear friend from Oregon it does not make any sense. When I see something that does not make any sense in Washington, I do my best, regardless of party affiliation, to fix it.

The first thing our bill does is to allow States to waive out of specific parts of the PPACA in 2014 rather than 2017. This makes sense not only from an operational standpoint, because the PPACA takes effect in 2014, but also from an economic and fiscal standpoint. Why should Massachusetts be delayed in obtaining a waiver from the Federal reform bill when it may already have met or exceeded, in many cases, the provisions of the act? So holding Massachusetts back by limiting my State's ability to continue to innovate and remain flexible and responsive to the health care market costs money, and it costs the taxpayers money at a point right now where we don't have a whole heck of a lot of money to go around.

The second piece our bill does is to provide States with certainty with the waiver process. Not every State will be eligible. Let me repeat that: Not every State will be eligible for a waiver and not every waiver will be granted. But our bill provides some certainty for States that apply for a waiver by requiring the Secretary of Health and Human Services to begin reviewing applications within 6 months of the enactment of this bill. I hope this bill is enacted quickly. The earlier a State knows whether it has received a waiver, the earlier it can begin implementing its specific plans and proposals. It makes fiscal sense.