

adoption tax credit so that families could better afford to provide a loving home for a child in need of adoption. In 1997, this Republican Congress provided for a \$500-per-child tax credit which would benefit 3 million children in Illinois. \$1.5 billion in higher take-home pay will stay in Illinois to meet the needs of local Illinois families rather than coming here to Washington. We believe that those Illinois families can better spend their hard-earned dollars better at home than we can here in Washington.

Mr. Speaker, this year let us help the American family again by eliminating the marriage tax penalty. Let us allow those 21 million married couples who are currently paying on average \$1,400 more, just because they are married, under our Tax Code to keep that money to meet their own needs. Let us eliminate the marriage tax penalty and let us pass the Marriage Tax Elimination Act and let us do it now.

H.R. 2400, SURFACE TRANSPORTATION FUNDING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 21, 1997, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure will finish its consideration of H.R. 2400, which authorizes surface transportation funding for the next 6 years, better known as BESTEA. This is the most important domestic bill of this Congress and, indeed, well into the next century. It provides for rails, roads and pathways that bind our Nation's cities and regions into one country.

In 1991, ISTEA, the groundbreaking legislation, promoted efficient use of scarce resources by encouraging balanced transportation systems and long-range planning. As a supporter of ISTEA's principles, I have been pleased with the progress of BESTEA through Congress. I want to thank our chairman and ranking members for their terrific work. Thanks to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER), the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR), the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. PETRI) and the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL), H.R. 2400 is proof that in the spirit of bipartisanship, building on sound policy, everyone can win.

BESTEA continues the ISTEA tradition of encouraging real transportation solutions. Our citizens know from experience that an unbalanced, unplanned transportation system can waste millions of their dollars while eliminating their choices and even destroying their communities. ISTEA contained a mix of incentives, instructions and opportunities for citizen participation that helped guarantee that Federal dollars will be spent wisely.

Mr. Speaker, this is a comprehensive bill. Its greatest achievement is in promoting the two pillars of sound transportation: balance and local decision-making. A balanced transportation system is more efficient, cost effective, and it gives people choices about how they get to where they need to go to live, work, and play.

Mr. Speaker, I am particularly pleased that in BESTEA all modes of transportation are supported. BESTEA does great things for bicycling with strong support of the Congressional Bicycle Caucus and a national campaign to promote bikes. It requires increased consideration of safety for cyclists. It adds important provisions to require that bike and pedestrian facilities be considered when new roads are planned, and it increases overall funding for the Enhancements and CMAQ programs, which have been the key to over \$1 billion in cycling facilities.

BESTEA does great things for transit and transit does great things for our communities, returning \$4 in benefits in the environment, social and infrastructure for every dollar that we invest. Millions of us, whether we use transit or not, have reasons to be grateful for the record funding level of \$36 billion over the next 6 years.

BESTEA does great things for rail, one of the most cost-effective ways to move passengers and freight. Rail helps to relieve pressure on our crowded highways and airports, adding capacity at a fraction of the cost.

BESTEA does great things for drivers. These funds are essential for badly needed maintenance and repair of our roads and bridges and to add capacity where it is truly needed. The best thing for motorists is that balancing the transportation system means giving people alternatives which in turn reduces congestion, pollution and even road rage. Even if we do not use the alternatives, the experience for the motorist is improved.

BESTEA also maintains the local decision-making, one of the most important but underappreciated things the Federal Government has done for communities in the last 25 years.

I have to say that one omission does, in fact, concern me. For in 1991, with the passage of ISTEA, Congress required States and larger communities to develop realistic plans that linked transportation and land use. Transportation plans were intended to avoid wasting scarce resources.

Unfortunately, BESTEA takes a step backward by making this planning optional. This means, as a practical matter, some of the States which have the greatest need are less likely to do the integrating planning for the future.

We have been working on improving the planning language for BESTEA for months and this struggle will continue through final passage. We cannot afford to throw money at transportation solutions that will only cause more problems in the long run. Planning does not mean dictating results; it sim-

ply ensures that communities cannot get away with ignoring problems, or worse, shifting them on to their neighbors. These are unarguably Federal priorities.

I think the text that best captures the spirit of the ISTEA reauthorization is to be found in the 58th chapter, 12th verse of Isaiah:

Those from among you.

Shall build the waste places;

You shall rise up the foundations of many generations;

And you shall be called the Repairer of the Breach,

The Restorer of Streets to Dwell In.

I think ISTEA makes progress towards this timeless goal and I, along with the prophet Isaiah, am pleased to support it.

HONESTY IS AN ABSOLUTE PRE- REQUISITE FOR PUBLIC SERVICE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HEFLEY). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 21, 1997, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. LEWIS) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

□ 1245

Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I would like to read a piece from the Washington Times that caught my attention. It reads: "Still amazingly relevant today, New York Gov. Theodore Roosevelt observed on May 12, 1900:

We can afford to differ on the currency, the tariff, and foreign policy; but we cannot afford to differ on the question of honesty if we expect our republic permanently to endure.

Honesty is it not so much a credit as an absolute prerequisite to efficient service to the public. Unless a man is honest, we have no right to keep him in public life. It matters not how brilliant his capacity.

The weakling and the coward cannot be saved by honesty alone. But without honesty, the brave and able man is merely a civic wild beast who should be hunted down by every lover of righteousness.

No man who is corrupt, no man what condones corruption in others can possibly do his duty by the community.

'Liar' is just as ugly a word as 'thief' because it implies the presence of just as ugly a sin in one case as in the other. If a man lies under oath or procures a lie of another under oath, if he perjures himself or suborns perjury, he is guilty under the statute law.

Under the higher law, under the great law of morality and righteousness, he is precisely as guilty if, instead of lying in court, he lies in a newspaper or on the stump; and in all probability, the evil effects of his conduct are more widespread and more pernicious.

MORAL DECLINE IN AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HEFLEY). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 21, 1997, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. TIAHRT) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, I am increasingly concerned about the moral decline we are facing in America. As a society, it seems to be sinking to an

all-time low. Sunday mornings are often reserved for a time for us to exercise our faith, but now it has become the Nation's pastime to defend the undefendable.

Men and women who have proclaimed to care about justice for women in the workplace now defend sexual advances and now defend inappropriate behavior. Most parents want to protect their children. I know I do. I have a 17-year-old daughter and two younger sons, and I want to be able to protect them from any unlawful pressure or from bad behavior that is the lowest and worst in our society.

I am particularly concerned about my daughter, because she will be the first to go out on her own. When she attends a college, I do not want a professor or the president of the college or university groping her to pressure her for sex for performance, for grades. And when she gets her first job, I do not want the CEO or president of the corporation or any of her fellow workers making sexual advances in exchange for promotions.

And for my sons, it is a great compromise to the virtues and values that built this great Nation for us to just let them watch a weeknight evening of television. The language, the violence, the lack of morals, the attacks on the institution of marriage all go against what civil people do when they want to live peaceably together.

Only a few programs, very few programs, restore our faith in hard work, honesty, integrity, respect for each other. But most of television leaves us wanting, wanting for heroes that will bring us to our highest and best.

Yes, our economy is strong. The New York Stock Exchange presses new records almost weekly. Unemployment is low. The welfare rolls are down. More and more people are working and earning more and more money. Our bank accounts seem full, but our hearts and souls are empty.

Well, my colleagues have heard, "You can't legislate morality, so you can't change our society." Well, first of all, that is a false statement. When a 14-year-old boy breaks into a liquor store to rob the store and kills an attendant, that is against the law. It is also against God's law, the Ten Commandments.

But we can do our best as a government to prevent that 14-year-old from making that decision through good education, through encouraging strong families and communities, trying to steer them from a decision that would destruct them for the rest of their lives and harm society. But we as a government cannot change that young boy's heart. And that is really what needs to happen.

To change a young man's heart, we have to go beyond just the laws of the land, and each of us has to take on a responsibility, a responsibility to first live our lives as we would like others to live theirs; second, to build strong families, then strong communities. Be-

cause what happens when that 14-year-old boy makes a decision is, he goes against all those things that built this country as a great Nation: hard work, integrity, virtue, faith in God.

Those are the values and virtues that each of us must turn back to in order to save our society from this downward spiral, in order to inspire us to rise beyond our daily circumstance to our highest and best, not only as individuals, but as a great Nation.

HUMAN CLONING LEGISLATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 21, 1997, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address the subject of cloning.

Last year Ian Wilmut, a scientist in Scotland, announced the cloning of a sheep named Dolly; and at that time I came to the floor and expressed my concern about the possibility of applying that technique to cloning humans. I was certainly in tune with the American people, because it turned out over 90 percent of them object to cloning of human beings, for various reasons.

I am in the unusual situation of being one of the few scientists in the Congress, and as a scientist I understand the vital role that science plays in enhancing the welfare of individuals in society, and I am extremely reluctant to place any limits on scientific research. However, while the possibilities of scientific experiments may seem limitless, there are times when society, through its governmental process, can and should place limits on scientific experimentation.

There are many things which science can do. Most of them should be done. Some should not. And it is up to us to decide which should not.

There are a number of scientific reasons at this point for banning human cloning. It took 277 tries to produce Dolly, and it would take considerably more than a thousand, I believe, to produce a human clone. The dangers associated with that are immense. And in particular, we have to worry about the rights of all those failures which resulted in discards. If we are cloning sheep and things go bad, no one regrets discarding the defective sheep. But if it is a human, we have an entirely different situation.

There are also social and psychological reasons for banning human cloning and, above all, there are moral and ethical reasons for a ban. However, in spite of the national consensus on banning human cloning that I mentioned, the bill that I introduced to do this has come under attack, primarily from those who would benefit in various ways, from allowing the process to go forward. The Biotechnology Industry Organization and the Association for Reproductive Medicine clearly have a vested interest in this.

Let me point out some of the scare tactics that have been used. The following was distributed in a letter to all Members of the House of Representatives, from the Biotechnology Industry Organization, better known as BIO. They state, just to select one phrase, "We urge you to use caution before deciding to cosponsor or support hastily drafted legislation which would not only ban human cloning, but would inadvertently shut down biomedical research by outlawing basic laboratory techniques used for decades."

There are several things wrong with that statement. First of all, they say the legislation is hastily drafted. That seems to be a phrase people always use when they do not like legislation. The bill under discussion in the Committee on Commerce has survived several hearings over several months in the Committee on Science. It has been deliberated and modified by the Committee on Science and is certainly not hastily drafted. I think it is a good bill.

Secondly, they say it will inadvertently shut down biomedical research. That is absurd, absolutely absurd. The bill that I have introduced would not shut down biomedical research. The letter says it would do that by outlawing basic laboratory techniques used for decades. I would like the industry to show me one such technique used for decades which my bill would shut down.

It is time for the facts to get out. It is time for the Members of the House to get the facts and to pay attention to it and not be guided by alarmist information distributed by organizations that have a vested financial interest in preventing my bill from passing.

If we look at the bill that came out of the Committee on Science, which is now before the Committee on Commerce, and a companion bill which will be modified similar to this, we were very careful. We do not ban human cloning, first of all, because "cloning" is not a precise term. We defined it in terms of prohibiting human somatic cell nuclear transfer. Now, that is a very technical definition, but very narrow and very precise.

Secondly, we specifically outline what is permitted, because I did not just want to ban human cloning and leave things up in the air; I wanted to be very specific about what was permitted. And this bill makes it clear that somatic cell nuclear transfer or other cloning technologies can be used to clone molecules, to clone DNA, clone cells other than human embryo cells or tissues, to clone animals; and I plan to expand that to include cloning plants as well.

We are working very hard to come up with a good bill that is fair and equitable and that will allow legitimate research to go forward but will ban the cloning of human beings in any form and at any stage of life. I would appreciate the support of my colleagues.