

honored with a Superior Performance Award in 1980, a Commander Award for Civilian Service in 1988 and 1999, a Special Act of Service Award in 1991, the Superior Civilian Service Award in 1992, and a Meritorious Civilian Service Award in 1996.

Madam Speaker, Robert Woody is a valuable member of his community and his leadership will be greatly missed. Mr. Woody plans to travel with his companion, continuing farming, teaching Fire Science and Safety with Missouri's Division of Fire Safety, and spending time with his two sons, Andy and Adam. As he begins the next phase of his life, I know the Members of the House will join me in thanking Robert Woody for his service to the Fort Leonard Wood Fire Department and wish him well as he begins his retirement.

STEM CELL RESEARCH
ENHANCEMENT ACT OF 2007

SPEECH OF

HON. ROSA L. DeLAURO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 11, 2007

Ms. DeLAURO. Madam Speaker, no single action this Congress could take would have a more profound, more life-affirming impact than allocating federal funds for biomedical scientists to conduct research with human embryonic stem cells. Alzheimer's, Parkinson's, brain and spinal cord disorders, diabetes, cancer—at least 58 diseases could potentially be cured through stem cell research. Diseases that touch every family here in America and throughout the world.

And Mr. Speaker, I stand here as someone who understands the promise of biomedical research all too well. Having been diagnosed with ovarian cancer by chance on an unrelated doctor's visit two decades ago, I know first-hand how this research can change lives—it saved mine. It can quite literally mean the difference between life and death. Between hope and despair.

To be clear, I think it is safe to say that every Member of this body is excited about the recent news regarding the scientific potential in amniotic stem cells. One can only imagine the medical breakthroughs this research has in store for us.

But scientists tell us it is no replacement for embryonic research—just as the limited number of stem cell lines President Bush made available in 2001 were not a replacement for full federal funding of this research. Indeed, this finding simply reminds us how critical it is that we pursue any and every kind of research that can contribute to our understanding of these diseases—so long as we can ensure it is performed with the utmost dignity and ethical responsibility. That is what “expanding stem cell research” is all about.

And for sure, this legislation does just that—permitting peer-reviewed federal funds to only be used with public oversight and by only allowing research on embryos that were originally created for fertility treatment purposes and that are in excess of clinical need and will otherwise be destroyed.

I believe the real moral issue here is whether the United States Congress is going to stand in the way of science and preclude the scientists from doing lifesaving, ethical re-

search. We do not live in the Dark Ages—and nor should our public policy. With this vote, this Congress has an opportunity to show the world we are a country that believes science has the power to advance life.

Mr. Speaker, I believe we are such a country. The world has always looked to America as a beacon of hope precisely because of our capacity to use our abundant resources to promote the best ideas in the world. Let's continue that tradition. Let's lead the way—let's support this bill.

HONORING TONY GWYNN'S ELEC-
TION TO BASEBALL HALL OF
FAME

HON. JULIA CARSON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 12, 2007

Ms. CARSON. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize my good friend Tony Gwynn and congratulate him on his election to the Baseball Hall of Fame. This high honor caps a career of great accomplishment, respect for the game, the fans and his team the San Diego Padres.

Tony is an all around athlete having been drafted by both the Padres and Clippers before focusing on his baseball career. He is a member of the exclusive 3,000 hit club, a five-time gold glove winner at right field and an eight-time National League Batting Champion. These numbers are amazing enough but adding to that the Roberto Clemente award for dedication to community and 15 trips to the All-Star Game at the request of baseball fans worldwide shows the love and respect fans of baseball showed to him as well.

Congratulations on your election today to the Baseball Hall of Fame. I am proud of you Tony, you deserve it and the best of luck in retirement.

TRIBUTE TO ARMY PFC PAUL
BALINT, JR.

HON. KAY GRANGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 12, 2007

Ms. GRANGER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the courage of a young hero from my district. On December 15, 2006, Army Private First Class Paul Balint, Jr. (B Company, 1st Battalion, 26th Infantry Regiment, 1st Infantry Division) died in Al Ramadi, Iraq, in support of Operation Iraqi Freedom. Private Balint had served in the Army for over a year and in Iraq for three months, before sustaining fatal injuries during an attack on his battalion.

Balint was known as a loyal friend and soldier. His parents remember him as a compassionate man and a mediator, always thinking about others and wanting to make sure everyone was having a good time. He also had a love for hip-hop music and was going to add music to the home videos he filmed while in Iraq.

His parents had no doubts about what their son wanted to do with his life. He was going to be a soldier. Balint used to recite the “The Soldiers Creed” at the kitchen table while his

mother cooked. When his father asked him what he wanted to do, he said he “wanted to be in the infantry.” When his father then asked him about the issue of Iraq, Balint responded that he wanted to go “fight that stuff.”

Balint enlisted in the armed forces in Willow Park, Texas, with his brother, mother and father at his side.

After completing basic training, Balint had the Soldiers Creed branded into memory, and into his heart.

Madam Speaker, in honor of Private Balint, I would like to read aloud the Soldiers Creed.

THE SOLDIERS CREED

I am an American Soldier.

I am a Warrior and a member of a team.

I serve the people of the United States and live the Army Values.

I will always place the mission first.

I will never accept defeat.

I will never quit.

I will never leave a fallen comrade.

I am disciplined, physically and mentally tough, trained and proficient in my warrior tasks and drills.

I always maintain my arms, my equipment and myself.

I am an expert and I am a professional.

I stand ready to deploy, engage, and destroy the enemies of the United States of America in close combat.

I am a guardian of freedom and the American way of life.

I am an American Soldier.

Private Balint is gone, but he will never be forgotten. God Speed to his family and to the United States of America.

STEM CELL RESEARCH
ENHANCEMENT ACT OF 2007

SPEECH OF

HON. JAMES L. OBERSTAR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 11, 2007

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, the issue of embryonic stem cell research places humanity on the frontier of medical science and at the outer edge of moral theology.

On the side of science there is much hope, even expectation that extraordinarily effective therapies will be developed to treat—and possibly cure—a wide range of maladies such as diabetes, Parkinson's, spinal cord injury and a host of others. Progress has been achieved in the laboratory in animal studies and in human application. Much has yet to be learned, however, about adverse outcomes, which is why scientists proceed cautiously without over promising and with respect for the moral considerations of their research.

The latter gives me the greatest pause. An editorial in America Magazine said it well: “The debate over embryonic stem cell research cannot be fully resolved because it is ignited by irreconcilable views of what reverence for life requires.”

Let us recall Louise Brown, the first test tube baby. Her life began in vitro, as a fertilized egg. There are many potential Louise Browns, potential human beings conceived in the laboratory but leftover as cryogenic embryos. Are they to be discarded, or, can they ethically be used for stem cell research? That is the moral theology issue that we must resolve.

The reality is that human life is established in creating an embryo, whether in vitro or in

uterus. Each of us has to decide the morality of this core element of the embryonic stem cell research issue. It is extraordinary research on the farthest frontier of science, experimenting with the very origins of human life. It is research which raises profound questions, anchored in moral theology, about the intrinsic nature of human life—when it begins, when it is infused with an immortal soul, and when it ends.

The answers to those questions are not crystal clear; they are not subject merely to scientific formulation; the answers may simply lie in conscience between each of us and our God.

For myself, I resolve the uncertainties of this moral dilemma in favor of the most vulnerable: unborn human life, which compels me to vote no on the Stem Cell Research Enhancement Act (H.R. 3).

STEM CELL RESEARCH ENHANCEMENT ACT OF 2007

SPEECH OF

HON. WALLY HERGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 11, 2007

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Speaker, while I support promoting ethical stem cell research to advance the progress of medicine and cure diseases, I rise in opposition to H.R. 3, the "Stem Cell Research Enhancement Act."

In 2004, my State of California approved a \$3 billion bond measure to fund embryonic stem cell research. The referendum was sold to voters as an investment in cures for debilitating diseases, like spinal cord injuries and Alzheimer's. Yet a December 3, 2006, article in the Los Angeles Times, entitled "Reality Check for Stem Cell Optimism," notes that these promises were vastly overstated. In fact, the research institution's draft plan now says it is "unlikely" that any stem cell therapies will be developed for clinical use during the project's 10-year lifespan.

As my good friend the gentleman from Florida, Dr. WELDON, has explained, the latest science demonstrates the enormous potential of non-embryonic stem cells. I urge my colleagues to vote against a bill that authorizes further spending of taxpayer dollars on speculative research about which many Americans have deep moral concerns.

[From the Los Angeles Times, Dec. 3, 2006]

REALITY CHECK FOR STEM CELL OPTIMISM
(By Mary Engel)

The meeting was almost over when Roman Reed steered his wheelchair to the microphone.

On the table before him sat a 149-page book of budget charts and timetables, the first concrete outline of what California's voter-approved stem cell institute plans to accomplish in its 10-year lifespan.

"I want to thank you from the bottom of my heart," Reed said to the institute's staff and 29-member oversight board in October. "I promised my son that one day I would be able to walk, stand next to him and go hold my wife's hand. And seeing this road map to cures, I know that this will come true."

The room at Los Angeles' Luxe Hotel thundered with applause for the Fremont resident, who broke his neck while playing college football in 1994.

Despite the enthusiasm of Reed and his audience, the book offered no promise of a cure for his paralysis.

Two years after California voters authorized \$3 billion in bonds to fund stem cell re-

search, the institute created to oversee the enterprise has just begun what experts see as a long and slow scientific journey. Even with the \$150-million state loan approved recently to kick-start work stalled by legal challenges, there are no breakthroughs in sight. Gone are the allusions to healing such afflictions as spinal cord injuries and Parkinson's and Alzheimer's diseases that dominated the 2004 campaign for Proposition 71. In fact, scientists say, there is no guarantee of cures—certainly not any time soon—from the measure that was optimistically titled the California Stem Cell Research and Cures Act.

Set for final approval at UC Irvine this week, the draft plan is clear: "It is unlikely that [the California Institute of Regenerative Medicine] will be able to fully develop stem cell therapy for routine clinical use during the 10 years of the plan."

Instead, the top goal is to establish, in principle, that a therapy developed from human embryonic stem cells can "restore function for at least one disease."

That would be only the first step toward persuading pharmaceutical or biotech companies to fund expanded clinical trials, a process that takes years and millions of dollars. Fewer than 20% of potential therapies that enter trials make it to market.

In addition, the institute hopes to have treatments for two to four more diseases in development within the decade.

"We picked a goal that we thought was realistic, that, with some luck, would be achieved," institute President Zach Hall said. "The field will go on beyond 10 years. We want to have a whole pipeline of things that are in movement."

Jesse Reynolds of the Oakland-based Center for Genetics and Society, a watchdog group that supports stem cell research but advocates better public accountability, called the goals "refreshingly honest."

"The Prop. 71 campaign went beyond the line of responsible political rhetoric," he said. "If there are therapies, they're decades out."

One TV ad, for instance, showed an unidentified young mother beside a child strapped in a wheelchair and breathing through a tube.

"I will vote 'yes' on Prop. 71, definitely," the woman said. "I believe that it's something that can cure spinal cord injuries."

State Senate Health Committee Chairwoman Deborah Ortiz (D-Sacramento), another research backer, was philosophical about the campaign's optimism.

"A campaign requires a message to be driven home," she said. "You can't raise those hopes and then say, 'Oh by the way, it may take us 10 or 15 years.' That's just the nature of campaigns."

California's attempt to cure diseases by referendum is unique. But touting dramatic cures in exchange for research dollars has become "the American way" of doing medical research, said Robert Blendon, professor of health policy and management at the Harvard School of Public Health.

The Nixon-era "war on cancer" suggested that a country that could put a man on the moon—in less than a decade—could surely find a cure within the same time frame. Now, Blendon said, "You can't just talk about investing in research without the equivalent of the trip to the moon."

Such campaigns appeal to an American public that expresses great faith in science but shows little understanding of the plodding nature of most scientific research. Blendon doesn't see downplaying the time frame as dishonest as long as the research truly holds potential.

Proposition 71 came about in response to President Bush's August 2001 mandate restricting federal funding to only a handful of human embryonic stem cell lines, prompted by moral concerns about destruction of embryos during such research. When the meas-

ure passed in November 2004, jubilant supporters had predicted that \$350 million a year from bond sales would start flowing to scientists by May 2005.

The first reality check came in the form of lawsuits by taxpayer and antiabortion groups.

Today, the bonds remain tied up in litigation, though stem cell institute officials are confident that an appellate court will uphold a favorable ruling from a Superior Court judge. To tide over the institute, Gov. Arnold Schwarzenegger in July promised a \$150-million state loan. A state finance committee formally approved the loan Nov. 20, and the institute is gearing up to award its first research grants in January.

Even if researchers hit the ground running, the field is young and progress is likely to be slow. Scientists at the University of Wisconsin derived the first human embryonic stem cells just eight years ago, using donated embryos left over from in vitro fertilization clinics.

Dana Cody, executive director of Life Legal Defense Foundation, which represents two of the groups that sued, said the plan's modest ambitions are a sign that the initiative's promise was overblown.

"I just don't understand the fascination with embryonic stem cell research other than that it's something supported by Hollywood," said Cody, whose organization supports research using adult stem cells. "Even proponents say it's going to be years before any breakthroughs are made, if at all."

Those who support the research—especially those whose lives could depend on it—see the institute's plan through a lens of hope.

The science "is coming along fast, in my opinion," said John Ames, whose son David was diagnosed with amyotrophic lateral sclerosis, or Lou Gehrig's disease, four years ago. "I'm not trying to contradict the position of the strategic plan, but we have hope. We're going to win."

The life expectancy of someone diagnosed with the devastatingly progressive neuromuscular disease is three to five years.

"The thing that drives these individuals and their families is hope," said Christopher Thomas Scott, executive director of the Stanford Program on Stem Cells in Society. "Without that hope, it's very difficult to get yourself going."

Joan Samuelson prefers to call it determination. The Napa Valley attorney founded the Parkinson's Action Network 18 years ago, two years after being diagnosed with early onset Parkinson's disease. She now sits on the institute's oversight board.

"I care deeply about how urgently we pursue the mission of Prop. 71," she said. "I wake up every day with a disorder that gets worse with the passage of time."

To Samuelson, the campaign was about potential. The institute's plan is about day-to-day implementation. They may sound different, she said, but they are steps toward the same goal.

"I read the realism, if you will, as a statement of the fact that this isn't going to be easy," she said. "Nothing great is easy."

What makes embryonic stem cells unique—and so full of potential—is their ability to become any type of cell in the body.

Some researchers envision someday transplanting such cells into patients whose own cells have been damaged by injury or disease, with the hope that the transplanted cells develop into new spinal cord or pancreas cells. But scientists don't yet understand the cues that trigger an undifferentiated embryonic stem cell to become, say, an insulin-secreting pancreas cell.