Today, more than 1,000 laboratories worldwide are engaged in the study of angiogenesis. A million patients worldwide are now receiving anti-angiogenesis therapy for cancer and macular degeneration, and there are more than 50 angiogenic inhibitors in clinical trials.

But Judah envisioned a day when people would have an annual blood test to screen for biomarkers of malignant diseases and if evidence of early stage, yet undetectable disease was found, they would be given nontoxic, angiogenic inhibitors to prevent disease from occurring. He said that location wouldn't matter. It would be just like heart disease, where statins are given for control of biologic markers of future disease like cholesterol.

What a vision, Judah.

I thought you'd be here to see it.

Judah was honored by societies and foundations all over the world. The walls of his conference room on Karp 12 are lined with them. His awards were incredible in depth and breadth, including one he was particularly proud of—the Helen Keller award for his work in the prevention and treatment of blindness.

He was a member of nearly every medical society, yet he was particularly proud of the fact that he was inducted as an honorary member of the Academic Society of Black Surgeons.

He wrote more than 400 original publications and over 100 book chapters himself, but it was with such great joy that he brought over to my office a couple of months ago a book he didn't author or edit. It was the first clinical textbook teaching clinicians about how to treat cancer with angiogenic inhibitors.

As I look around this room, I see, however, what will be his most lasting legacy. It is a living testament to one of his greatest gifts—his unique ability to recognize and cultivate talent and brilliance in others.

He grew the program for vascular biology from the surgical research program at Children's, starting with one-half of a floor of the Enders Research Building. He expanded and nurtured it with devotion, commitment, and love. He was always in my office, lobbying hard for more space and ended up with two entire floors in the Karp Family Research Building.

But more importantly, he had this gift of mentoring his staff in a way that is unequaled by anyone I have ever known. His work will continue in the hands of the incredible talent in vascular biology in the program he built.

It consoles me to some extent that the work Judah started with a singular, seminal glimmer of an idea more than 40 years ago will continue to thrive, grow, and succeed in their hands.

Judah's lasting legacy will continue to extend far beyond our walls, improving the lives of millions of people around the world.

Farewell, our friend, and thank you.

REGARDING TWO AMICUS BRIEFS FILED WITH THE SUPREME COURT IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA V. HELLER

HON. MARK UDALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 2008

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Madam Speaker, I have reviewed two amicus briefs filed for consideration by the U.S. Supreme Court in connection with the case of District of Columbia v. Heller.

One brief has been signed by a majority of our colleagues in Congress. The other was filed on behalf of the Bush administration by the Solicitor General, Paul D. Clement. I want to explain why I have decided not to join in signing the first one.

First of all, I want to make clear I am aware of the importance of this case as regards the interpretation of the constitutional reach of the Second Amendment. As I said when the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia decided Parker v. District of Columbia last year, I am convinced that the Constitution's Second Amendment protects the rights of individuals to keep and bear arms. I believe the Court of Appeals' decision striking down several gun laws passed by the D.C. City Council in that case was rightly decided and persuasively reasoned with regard to that fundamental point. As one who reveres the Bill of Rights and as a strong proponent of individual liberty in other contexts, like privacy and freedom of expression, I am very comfortable asserting that the Second Amendment ought to be recognized as protecting individual rights and not just a collective right to form militias.

The decision in Parker has been appealed to the Supreme Court in District of Columbia v. Heller, and I had an opportunity to read the amicus brief in support of upholding the decision of the Court of Appeals that Members of Congress were urged to sign. After carefully reviewing the brief, I found that I agreed with the arguments in 29 of its 31 pages, which support my view about the nature of the individual right guaranteed by the Second Amendment.

If the brief stopped there, I would support it without hesitation. However, it does not stop there. Page 30 of the amicus brief includes declarations that "the District's handgun ban is unreasonable on its face" and further, that "The lower court's categorical approach in holding a prohibition on handguns to be unconstitutional per se was correct."

Those assertions directly contradict statements in the Solicitor General's brief warning that while the Second Amendment does protect an individual right, the lower court's categorical approach to reviewing the D.C. laws in question "could cast doubt on the constitutionality of existing federal legislation" including restrictions on possession of firearms by convicted criminals, fugitives from justice, illegal immigrants, and people suffering from mental disorders.

Some may ask why the many Members of Congress who signed the first brief did not similarly hesitate to so flatly contradict the arguments of the Solicitor General. It is possible that my colleagues read the brief as only trying to make clear that the lower court rightly ruled about the nature of the right protected by the Second Amendment and rightly rejected the absurd argument advanced by the District of Columbia that if any individual right attached to the Second Amendment it should only apply to weapons (not handguns) known at the time the founders drafted the Constitution. But if that was the intention, the amicus brief is drafted in an ambiguous way that is regrettable.

I can speak only for myself, but as a nonlawyer who thinks Mr. Clement is highly qualified to serve as Solicitor General, I find it difficult to reject his concerns outright. And it is for this reason I cannot unequivocally endorse the amicus filed by my colleagues. It seems to me that the Supreme Court will need to take the Solicitor General's views into account when the Court considers the right standard for reviewing the decision of the lower court.

HONORING JANEL'S INDUSTRIES, INC.

HON. FRED UPTON

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 2008

Mr. UPTON. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Janel's Industries, Inc. of Cassopolis, Michigan, as the recipient of the Defense Logistics Agency's, DLA, Business Alliance Award for Outstanding Readiness Support in the Service Disabled, Veteran-Owned Small Business Category.

Janel's Industries, Inc. specializes in cable assemblies and wiring harnesses, which have been used to support the mission of our brave soldiers here in the United States as well as those actively serving in Iraq. Janel's Industries, Inc., has supported the DLA mission as well as our national interests by satisfying the military's increased demand for supplies in an expedited manner. In addition, these products were shipped to the military ahead of schedule, at no additional cost to the U.S. Government or the American taxpayer.

Once again, I would like to personally recognize Janel's Industries, Inc. and its employees for going above and beyond to provide such an invaluable service to our military. The United States is truly a better place because of their contributions.

A TRIBUTE IN HONOR OF NATIONAL PEACE CORPS WEEK

HON. MIKE McINTYRE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 2008

Mr. McINTYRE. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to join the 110th Congress in celebrating National Peace Corps Week from February 25 to March 3, 2008, as well as the upcoming 47th anniversary of the Peace Corps. As of September 30, 2007, over 8,000 Peace Corps volunteers are currently at 68 posts serving 74 countries, representing the largest number of Americans serving in the Peace Corps since 1970.

Eleven Peace Corps volunteers from my district in southeastern North Carolina are currently serving in 11 nations. These North Carolinians continue to help countless individuals who want to build a better life for themselves, their children, and their communities through their work as Peace Corps volunteers. I am impressed with their passion and dedication as promoters of humanitarianism throughout the world. These individuals truly represent the kind and compassionate spirit of my district. Each Peace Corps volunteer sent out into the field represents an opportunity not only to make a significant and lasting difference but to foster a better understanding of Americans throughout the world.