

EuroBio's Innovative

Choose how you use it

□ HOW IT MAKES
A DIFFERENCE

➤ HOUSE OF COMMONS DEBATES

Derived from the rough and tumble of British politics, the House of Commons Session fires the opening salvo in the EuroBio spirit of debate. In two hours of rapid fire, interactive exchanges and discussion, the session will explore important topics.

□ WHEN?

□ TUESDAY, 7TH OCTOBER - 14.00-16.00

□ WHAT
TO EXPECT?

This is debate as you have never seen it before, a series of free-form and fun discussions where your own views may be turned against you by cunning opponents. Where you stand on any given issue may depend on where you sit.

□ MOVING
FORWARD

Tell us which debates you are interested in. With a voting system that is more reliable than Florida's, you get to vote electronically on the topics you want to discuss. Or suggest your own topics for future editions of EuroBio.

House of Commons Debates

 **TUESDAY**
7TH OCTOBER
14.00 - 16.00
SALLE MAILLOT

**It is better to debate a question
 without settling it than to settle
 a question without debating it.**

Joseph Joubert

**A man never tells you anything
 unless you contradict him.**

George Bernard Shaw



**The Young European
 Biotech Network**



The House of Commons Session opens the debating part of EuroBio 2008. Bringing together all three streams of attendees from red, white and green biotech for two hours of rapid fire, interactive exchanges and discussion. The aim of the session is to get inside a number of important debate topics and to get attendees fired up and used to the idea of participating actively in the conferences.

Format: The House of Commons session has two parts. In the first 30 minutes, six debate themes will be proposed by six different people each giving an elevator pitch on why their topic is the most important. The audience votes to select the debate. The debate chair (Roderik van Grieken of the Netherlands Debating Institute) may eliminate uncontroversial topics, deeming those motions "carried" or "defeated". The three remaining debate topics would each go forward to a 30 minute debate during the next phase of the session.

For each debate, the auditorium is divided arbitrarily into three equal parts: "For", "Against", and "Jury"-*The Rising Generation*. The chair asks the delegates to debate the motion according to the part of the room they are in, regardless of their own personal opinion. Thus some people who would in reality be "For" a motion may find themselves in the "Against" camp, and vice versa. This frees delegates to state their views strongly rather than allowing peer-pressure to attenuate or politicise their comments. It also allows them to have fun.

Each debate will be started by two opening elevator statements, one for and one against the motion (playing the role of "Prime Minister" and "Leader of the Opposition"). The opening statements will be given by the same six lead debaters who initially proposed the debate topics. The floor is then open for addi-

tional comments in support of or against. In addition, the "jury" group-*The Rising Generation*- asks questions which members of the opponents and proponents (preferably not just the lead debaters) can pick up on. At the end of the debate, the shift in the voting of the jury group determines which side has won.

At the end of debate 1, the roles are switched so that the Government for Debate 1 becomes the Opposition, and the former Opposition is elected as the new Government. Any similarities to flip-flopping in proportionally represented democracies are entirely coincidental.

Lead Debaters

- Diane Romza-Kutz, Attorney-at-Law, Neal, Gerber & Eisenberg LLP
- Bruce W. Jenett, Partner, Co-Chair, Global Life Sciences Sector, DLA Piper US LLP
- Alastair Kent, President of European Genetic Alliances' Network (EGAN); Director, Genetic Interest Group
- Eric Meslin, Director, Indiana University, Center for Bioethics and Associate Dean; Professor of Medicine, Medical and Molecular Genetics, and Philosophy; Former Executive Director, National Bioethics Advisory Commission (NBAC)
- Mike Ward, BioCentury
- Johan Vanhemelrijck
Former Secretary General, EuropaBio

Topics that were put to a vote

TOPIC	EXPLANATION
1• Axe the CAP and spend €50 billion a year instead on R&D	The Common Agricultural Policy gets a €100 present each year from each European citizen. FP7 gets €14
2• Only the weakness of the dollar prevents US entities owning European biotechnology	US biotechnology is supported from research to the market
3• Industry self-regulation leads inevitably to nepotism	Industry association rules create pseudo-regulatory clubs which argue for self-interest rather than public interest
4• Nationalism is the greatest enemy of biotechnology in Europe	EU measures help biotechnology but they are obstructed, not enacted, or not enforced by Member States
5• Less than 10% of pharma industry spending on R&D is actually innovative	Most of the R&D spend is devoted to clinical trial box-ticking
6• Biofuels are a green window-dressing	Do biofuels really address climate change, reducing consumption, or increasing energy efficiency?
7• The European ideal gets in the way of life science progress	The strength of the European life sciences endeavour is unimportant compared with objectives such as peace, integration, democracy and monetary union
8• National research programmes truly promote European Research ideals	Local science priorities reflect global needs and not historical funding patterns
9• Celebrity endorsement is vital for biotechnology and its products	Film and soap stars can raise the profile of biotech, but are all the associations going to be positive?
10• Opponents of stem cell research should not be allowed stem cell treatments	Choices should combine current values and future needs
11• Scientist always see the world exactly as it is	Which is more real: a detailed understanding of a narrow field, or a broad context with no depth?
12• Engineers are the key to Europe's real biotechnology revolution	Biology is interesting but Europe needs engineers to construct the new industries