

# Stem Cell Research Enhancement Act of 2007 / Act should be passed

---

< Stem Cell Research Enhancement Act of 2007

The printable version is no longer supported and may have rendering errors. Please update your browser bookmarks and please use the default browser print function instead.

## Position: Act should be passed

*This position addresses the topic Stem Cell Research Enhancement Act of 2007.*

For this position

“ By means of bald assertion, the White House seeks to enshrine in law what is essentially a religious belief: That all stages of human life are sacred. Hands off. As Abraham Lincoln pointed out, it's fine to do that in this country if you can sell all the people on it, but Bush can't, hasn't tried (he knows he would fail), and is instead establishing by fiat a policy favored mainly by people who share this religious view.” ”

From States must lead, by The Philadelphia Inquirer editorial board (*The Philadelphia Inquirer*, June 25, 2007) (view)

“ Both the Senate and the House, which passed the embryonic stem cell bill by comfortable but not veto-proof margins, need to summon the strength to override Mr. Bush's veto, so that important research into possible cures for Parkinson's, diabetes and other serious ailments can move ahead.” ”

From Mr. Bush's Stem Cell Diversion, by The New York Times editorial board (*The New York Times*, June 21, 2007) (view)

“ Since President Bush's first veto last July, thousands of people who have been diagnosed with diseases could benefit from this potentially life-saving research. President Bush can do the right thing by signing this bill into law -- opening his mind to the promise of this research giving millions of patients and their families hope.” ”

From Another Opportunity for President Bush To Do The Right Thing, by Diana DeGette (*The Huffington Post*, June 12, 2007) (view)

“ "From my standpoint, it is clear today that American science will be better served, and the nation will be better served, if we let our scientists have access to more stem-cell lines," Dr. Elias A. Zerhouni, director of the National Institutes of Health, told the Senate health appropriations subcommittee. He said that the funding limits imposed by Bush have stalled efforts to advance research that could help sick and injured people.” ”

From Stem-cell bills on Senate track, by The Denver Post editorial board (*The Denver Post*,

April 8, 2007) (view)

“ “For basic research in an area as innovative as embryonic stem cells, generous government funding is crucial, because the eventual payoff is still too speculative to attract the needed investment from the private sector. Several states, including California, have created special funds to subsidize embryonic stem cell research without the Bush restrictions, but the field would advance quickly and with less duplication if scientists had access to the \$30 billion that the NIH annually dispenses.” ”

From Sign the stem cell bill, by The Boston Globe editorial board (*The Boston Globe*, April 15, 2007) (view)

“ “The restrictions on federal financing have led to absurdly complicated and costly maneuvers... In a shocking example cited during Senate debate, a California researcher who had been cultivating stem cells in a makeshift privately financed lab suffered a power failure but was unable to transfer her lines into industrial-strength freezers in another lab because they were federally financed. Two years of work melted away because of this inanity.” ”

From Loosening the Stem Cell Binds, by The New York Times editorial board (*The New York Times*, April 13, 2007) (view)

“ “Mr. Casey's and Mr. Bush's opposition to embryonic stem-cell research and the position they have taken is apparently faith-based. It is difficult to see, however, how faith-based compassion does not include supporting a critical quest for medical solutions to severe, fatal diseases.” ”

From Cell mates: Casey casts a Santorum vote against research, by Pittsburgh Post-Gazette editorial board (*Pittsburgh Post-Gazette*, April 13, 2007) (view)

“ “It failed to get the two-thirds majority in either chamber of Congress that it would need to overcome President Bush's expected veto. That alone was disappointing. But also frustrating was much of the debate in the Senate, which was colored by presumptuous readings of early scientific data and policymaking by anecdote.” ”

From Science, Not Speculation, by The Washington Post editorial board (*The Washington Post*, April 13, 2007) (view)

“ “Although they dress up their arguments in the language of science, opponents of research using embryonic cells are basically fighting a religious battle. Central to it is the dubious premise that early-stage embryos fertilized in vitro are the moral equivalent of fully formed human beings. Even if that belief were valid, it is already being violated by in vitro fertilization, a mainstream medical practice that produces thousands of excess embryos a year.” ”

From The stem cell do-over, by Los Angeles Times editorial board (*Los Angeles Times*, April 12, 2007) (view)

## Against this position

---

*No results*

Mixed on this position

---

*No results*

---

Retrieved from

"[https://discoursedb.org/w/index.php?title=Stem\\_Cell\\_Research\\_Enhancement\\_Act\\_of\\_2007/\\_Act\\_should\\_be\\_pa  
ssed&oldid=5286](https://discoursedb.org/w/index.php?title=Stem_Cell_Research_Enhancement_Act_of_2007/_Act_should_be_passed&oldid=5286)"

---

**This page was last edited on April 13, 2007, at 13:56.**

All text is available under the terms of the GNU Free Documentation License.