soft money to a national party in an election campaign, and it allows Federal candidates to raise unlimited amounts of soft money for State party ads.

Let us stand up for clean elections, let us stand up for good political discourse in this country, let us stand up for real campaign finance reform.

STEM CELL RESEARCH

(Mrs. MORELLA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to voice my support for stem cell research under the strict NIH guidelines. I want to thank the Members on both sides of the aisle who have joined with me, both pro choice and pro life, in support of this important research.

This is not a political issue, it is not a partisan issue, it is a medical issue and it is a human issue. It is, for some, a life and death issue. It affects our senior citizens and men and women and children. It goes without saying that the children of this country deserve the best medical research that one can find.

I speak of the children with juvenile diabetes, known as the silent killer. More than 1 million Americans have Type 1, which is the juvenile diabetes, a disease that strikes children suddenly, makes them insulin dependent for life, and carries the constant threat of death. It can and does strike adults as well.

In diabetes research, it is hoped that stem cells can be differentiated into insulin-producing islet cells. In essence, we have the potential to grow insulin-producing cells in the lab and then implant them into the body, thus putting an end to the daily insulin injections that people with Type 1 diabetes must take. It is a difficult decision on whether or not to receive the therapy, but I am hopeful that one day we will be able to offer this therapy to those who need it.

Mr. Speaker, I urge President Bush to keep the NIH guidelines in place.

STEM CELL RESEARCH

(Mr. SHIMKUS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, many of us just came out of a meeting with the President, and after the meeting he was asked about this issue. He is committed. It is a difficult decision on stem cell research. He is not polling. I reject any argument that has been done, and I am really disappointed in my colleagues for mentioning this.

One of my colleagues talked about Galileo and that the planets move and science. Science indicates that individual distinct life begins at conception and a distinct DNA, a distinct life entity is there. That is why pro-life supporters, this is an abortion debate.

We could use adult stem cell research to cure these diseases. We should protect the most vulnerable. We should prevent life from conception to natural death.

FEDERAL FARM POLICY

(Mr. SMITH of Michigan asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, today, in a few minutes, we will take up the agricultural bill. In agricultural appropriations we do several things: we have a program in this country that guarantees a farmer a minimum price that they can receive from the program commodity crops that they grow.

The problem we are dealing with in an amendment I will offer today says there should be a limitation on how much money goes to any particular producer. The limitation under current law is $75,000. In the bill that was debated under suspension, unavailable for any amendments 2 weeks ago, we increased that to $150,000.

I think when we consider that the giant farm operations are taking a lot of that price support money and realistically taking away from the small family farmer, we need to decide what Federal farm policy should be. I would ask my colleagues to consider an amendment of $75,000 per producer.

We have producers in this country that are now getting $1.2 million. The average size of farm in this country is 420 acres. We have farms up to 80,000 acres. We should be looking at helping family farmers with Federal farm policy.
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