

majority of Americans, who tell pollsters they back expanded funding of embryonic stem cell research.

During the Fourth of July recess, many Senate Republicans struggled with the question of whether the new legislation should be brought to the floor as a substitute for the House-passed bill or as a competing bill—and if both were to come up, then how to vote on each. At least a handful of senators have hinted in recent days that they may transfer their vote to the new bill, Hill sources said—among them Hatch, Johnny Isakson (R-Ga.) and Kay Bailey Hutchison (R-Tex.).

The issue will get its first formal airings at a Senate subcommittee hearing Tuesday and at a Hill media event on Wednesday at which pro-research celebrities Michael J. Fox and Dana Reeve, widow of “Superman” star Christopher Reeve, will call for an immediate loosening of Bush’s policy.

Some supporters of the research say they would be happy if both bills passed. But for some of the more ardent advocates of an immediate expansion of the Bush policy, Bartlett’s alternative legislation is a diversion.

“Don’t stop embryonic stem cell research now, hoping there will be some other way to do it in the future,” Senator Tom Harkin (D-Iowa) said in an interview. “These alternative methods of deriving stem cells—we don’t know whether they’ll work. The one thing we do know how to do is derive embryonic stem cells.”

The new techniques fall into two major categories. In one, a single cell is removed from a days-old embryo created for fertility purposes and coaxed to become a self-replicating colony of stem cells, leaving the remainder of the embryo to develop normally.

The technique shows great promise, according to researchers at Advanced Cell Technology Inc. in Worcester, Mass., who pioneered it. But critics have raised the possibility that individual cells removed from such young embryos may have the biological potential to become embryos themselves, which would mean their destruction or cultivation as colonies could still raise ethical issues.

Bush’s Council on Bioethics also expressed concerns recently that such a technique may subtly harm an embryo, even if it does not kill it.

“You may get a human being, but you may not get the same human being,” said William B. Hurlbut, a Stanford professor and a council member. “You might find that late in life, there are some strange differences between those people and others.”

Hurlbut is the leading proponent of a different approach, which he calls altered nuclear transfer, or ANT. It involves the creation of an embryo—or what Hurlbut says is something akin to an embryo—that lacks a gene necessary for the development of a placenta. Because a placenta is required for an embryo to implant in a woman’s womb, the altered embryo would be genetically incapable of becoming a fetus or a baby. For many, that would obviate ethical concerns about destroying it to get its stem cells.

Researchers have tried the technique in mice with some success, but its usefulness as a source of human stem cells remains hypothetical. Some, such as Weissman, think the difficulties inherent in making such a system work are being overlooked by Hurlbut, who is a physician but not a research scientist.

“I’ve been telling Bill, ‘Why don’t you go work in a lab this summer? Why not see how easy or hard it really is?’” said Weissman. He said he has no problem with the funding of such research as long as it does not interfere with increased funding for existing programs of embryo research.

Practical or not, ANT has gained a quickly widening circle of support. The Roman

Catholic archbishop of San Francisco, William J. Levada, has written a letter to Bush assuring the president of his support.

But other conservative leaders have mixed views on whether it makes sense to pursue the new alternative therapies or to focus single-mindedly on defeating any expansion of the current policy.

“I have significant concerns about all the alternatives,” said David Prentice, senior fellow for life sciences at the Family Research Council, which he said does not yet have a formal position on the science.

Jessica Echard, executive director of the Eagle Forum, the public policy organization founded by Phyllis Schlafly, said her group opposes “middle ground” legislation that pursues alternative methods for producing embryonic stem cells.

“Most scientists will say it’s never enough,” she said. “We will be giving ground to more and more unethical research.”

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. ABERCROMBIE (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of illness.

Mr. CARDIN (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today after 4 p.m. and the balance of the week on account of a family emergency.

Mrs. JONES of Ohio (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and July 11 on account of constituent business in the district.

Mr. OBEY (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of attending the funeral of the late Senator Gaylord Nelson.

Mr. EVERETT (at the request of Mr. DELAY) for July 11 on account of being unable to travel due to Hurricane Dennis.

Mr. BACHUS (at the request of Mr. DELAY) for today from 7 p.m. until July 13 at 6 p.m. on account of attending a funeral.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Ms. KAPTUR) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. HOYER, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. EMANUEL, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MEEHAN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. INSLEE, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. NORTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BLUMENAUER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. EDWARDS, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. POE) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. FLAKE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. NORWOOD, for 5 minutes, today and July 13 and 14.

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, for 5 minutes, July 13.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM, for 5 minutes, July 13.

Mr. HUNTER, for 5 minutes, July 13.

Mr. MCCAUL of Texas, for 5 minutes, July 13.

#### BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Jeff Trandahl, Clerk of the House reports that on July 1, 2005 he presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bills.

H.R. 120. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 30777 Rancho California Road in Temecula, California, as the “Dalip Singh Saund Post Office Building”.

H.R. 289. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 8200 South Vermont Avenue in Los Angeles, California, as the Sergeant First Class John Marshall Post Office Building.

H.R. 324. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 321 Montgomery Road in Altamonte Springs, Florida, as the “Arthur Stacey Mastrapa Post Office Building”.

H.R. 504. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 4960 West Washington Boulevard in Los Angeles, California, as the “Ray Charles Post Office Building”.

H.R. 627. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 40 Putnam Avenue in Hamden, Connecticut, as the “Linda White-Epps Post Office”.

H.R. 1072. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 151 West End Street in Goliad, Texas, as the “Judge Emilio Vargas Post Office Building”.

H.R. 1082. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 120 East Illinois Avenue in Vinita, Oklahoma, as the “Francis C. Goodpaster Post Office Building”.

H.R. 1236. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 750 4th Street in Sparks, Nevada, as the “Mayor Tony Armstrong Memorial Post Office”.

H.R. 1460. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 6200 Rolling Road in Springfield, Virginia, as the “Captain Mark Stubenhofer Post Office Building”.

H.R. 1524. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 12433 Antioch Road in Overland Park, Kansas, as the “Ed Ellert Post Office Building”.

H.R. 1542. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 695 Pleasant Street in New Bedford, Massachusetts, as the “Honorable Judge George N. Leighton Post Office Building”.

H.R. 2326. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 614 West Old County Road in Belhaven, North Carolina, as the “Floyd Lupton Post Office”.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 o’clock and 5 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, July 13, 2005, at 10 a.m.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker’s table and referred as follows: