

and I anticipate it will be an annual event. At the same time, we can hope that current research foreshadows a day when it will no longer be necessary to raise awareness of Ataxia.

SCIENCE SPENDING

HON. SHERWOOD L. BOEHLERT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 5, 2000

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Speaker, I insert in the record an op-ed piece that appeared in yesterday's Washington Post—an op-ed that I am also distributing as a Dear Colleague letter.

The column is by Dr. Harold Varmus, a distinguished Nobel Laureate and former director of the National Institutes of Health (NIH) who is now president of the Memorial Sloan-Kettering Cancer Center in New York City.

Dr. Varmus' point is that Congress needs to be investing adequately in science spending across the board, not just at NIH. Improvements in medicine rest on advancements in a wide variety of fields; we can't improve health in this country by focusing exclusively on NIH.

This is advice we would be wise to heed. The federal research portfolio has become too skewed toward medical research. We need to address that imbalance not by reducing funding for NIH but by increasing funding for the other federal research agencies. That would be a wise investment in this time of surplus.

I'm pleased to say that Congress is beginning to take steps in that direction. I know, for example, that the appropriations bill my good friend and neighbor Congressman JIM WALSH has put together includes a substantial increase for the National Science Foundation (NSF).

But we need to make a comprehensive, consistent commitment to funding the entire federal science portfolio more generously. I look forward to working with my colleagues to accomplish just that.

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 4, 2000]

SQUEEZE ON SCIENCE

(By Harold Varmus)

In recent weeks both presidential campaigns have voiced their support of efforts to double the budget of the National Institutes of Health. This is an encouraging sign that the current bipartisan enthusiasm for medical research will continue in the next administration. But it also offers an opportunity to make an important point about the kinds of science required to achieve breakthroughs against disease.

The NIH does a magnificent job, but it does not hold all the keys to success. The work of several science agencies is required for advances in medical sciences, and the health of some of those agencies is suffering.

For the coming fiscal year, Congress has again—magnanimously and appropriately—slated the NIH for a major increase, its third consecutive 15 percent increase. By these actions, Congress has shown that it is determined to combat the scourges of our time, including heart disease, cancer, diabetes, AIDS and Alzheimer's disease.

But Congress is not addressing with sufficient vigor the compelling needs of the other science agencies, especially the National

Science Foundation and the Office of Science at the Department of Energy. This disparity in treatment undermines the balance of the sciences that is essential to progress in all spheres, including medicine.

I first observed the interdependence of the sciences as a boy when my father—a general practitioner with an office connected to our house—showed me an X-ray. I marveled at a technology that could reveal the bones of his patients or the guts of our pets. And I learned that it was something that doctors, no matter how expert with a stethoscope or suture, wouldn't have been likely to develop on their own.

Of course, the X-ray is routine now. Medical science can visualize the inner workings of the body at far higher resolution with techniques that sound dazzlingly sophisticated: ultrasound, positron-emission tomography and computer-assisted tomography. These techniques are the workhorses of medical diagnostics. And not a single one of them could have been developed without the contributions of scientists, such as mathematicians, physicists and chemists supported by the agencies currently at risk.

Effective medicines are among the most prominent products of medical research, and drug development also relies heavily on contributions from a variety of sciences. The traditional method of random prospecting for a few promising chemicals has been supplemented and even superseded by more rational methods based on molecular structures, computer-based images and chemical theory. Synthesis of promising compounds is guided by new chemical methods that can generate either pure preparations of a single molecule or collections of literally millions of subtle variants. To exploit these new possibilities fully, we need strength in many disciplines, not just pharmacology.

Medical advances may seem like wizardry. But pull back the curtain, and sitting at the lever is a high-energy physicist, a combinational chemist or an engineer. Magnetic resonance imaging is an excellent example. Perhaps the last century's greatest advance in diagnosis. MRI is the product of atomic, nuclear and high-energy physics, quantum chemistry, computer science, cryogenics, solid state physics and applied medicine.

In other words, the various sciences together constitute the vanguard of medical research. And it's time for Congress to treat them that way. Sens. Christopher Bond (R-Mo.) and Barbara Mikulski (D-Md.) have just proposed to double the budget of the National Science Foundation over five years. This admirable effort should be vigorously supported and extended to include the Department of Energy's Office of Science, which fund half of all research in the physical sciences and maintains the national laboratories that are central to biomedicine.

Scientists can wage an effective war on disease only if we—as a nation and as a scientific community—harness the energies of many disciplines, not just biology and medicine. The allies must include mathematicians, physicists, engineers and computer and behavioral scientists. I made this case repeatedly during my tenure as director of NIH, and the NIH has made significant efforts to boost its support of these areas. But in the long run, it is essential to provide adequate budgets for the agencies that traditionally fund such work and train its practitioners. Moreover, this will encourage the interagency collaboration that fuels interdisciplinary science. Only in this way will medical research be optimally poised to continue its dazzling progress.

H.R. 4292: THE BORN-ALIVE INFANTS PROTECTION ACT OF 2000

HON. JACK QUINN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 5, 2000

Mr. QUINN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend my colleagues in the House of Representatives for demonstrating their overwhelming support for H.R. 4292 last week. The Born-Alive Infants Protection Act of 2000, which is designed to ensure that all infants who are born alive are treated as persons for purposes of federal law, passed the House with 385 votes.

It has long been accepted legal principle that infants who are born alive are persons and are entitled to the full protection of the law. In fact, many states have statutes that, with some variations, explicitly enshrine this principle as a matter of state law, and some federal courts have recognized the principle in interpreting federal laws. But recent changes in the legal and cultural landscape appear to have brought this well-settled principle into question.

Babies whose lungs are insufficiently developed to permit sustained survival are often spontaneously delivered alive, and they may live for hours or days. Others are born alive following deliveries induced for medical reasons, or following attempted abortions. Enactment of H.R. 4292 is necessary to ensure that all infants who are born alive are treated as legal persons for purposes of federal law.

H.R. 4292 is proposed to codify (for federal law purposes only) the traditional definition of "born alive" that is already found in the laws of most states: complete expulsion from the mother, accompanied by heartbeat, respiratory, and/or voluntary movements.

Although I was unable to vote on this legislation, I wholeheartedly support it and urge its enactment into law.

H.R. 4365: CHILDREN'S HEALTH ACT OF 2000

HON. SUE WILKINS MYRICK

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 5, 2000

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, a woman who becomes pregnant in less than ideal circumstances has a difficult road ahead no matter what action she takes. She faces serious questions about what will happen to her future: Will the father help? How will I afford the costs? What will my family think and will they support my decision? How am I going to get through this? It is an incredibly scary time and the ultimate question is whether her life will ever be the same.

My biggest concern for a woman in this situation is that she may see abortion as the easiest solution—when there is no easy choice. Too often, I hear stories about women who are frantic for a solution and rush to an abortion clinic without learning about the long-term emotional and physical consequences. As a mother and a grandmother, I can tell you that

pregnancy changes a woman's life forever—even if the pregnancy is not carried to term.

The law states that women have the right to choose between carrying the baby and aborting it. Before she makes the decision, I pray that she is given the information and the support to truly be able to choose what is best for her and the tiny baby.

This bill strengthens a woman's choices in two ways. First, it increases access to information about adoption in the health clinics where it is needed most. Women facing unplanned pregnancies deserve to hear about their options from a well-trained counselor who can provide accurate, up-to-date information and refer them to a reputable placement agency.

This bill also authorizes a new grant program for research and additional services (such as mobile health clinics to provide comprehensive health services, including ultrasound screenings), to enhance access to health care for pregnant women and infants, including grants to increase access to prenatal care, ultrasound services, and prenatal surgery.

Prenatal surgery is now a very realistic option. Look at this picture that was taken by Max Aguilera-Hellwag—this baby underwent prenatal surgery to correct spina bifida. Sarah Marie Switzer was born on August 22, 1999.

Mr. Speaker, there are many exciting programs contained in this bill, and I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of H.R. 4365.

IN RECOGNITION OF BENNIE L.
THAYER

HON. NYDIA M. VELÁZQUEZ

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 5, 2000

Ms. VALÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay a sad farewell to Bennie Thayer, the long-time President and Chief Executive of the National Association for the Self-Employed, who died October 2.

As a retailer and manufacturer himself, Mr. Thayer knew small business issues from the inside out. On the first day that I became the Democratic leader of the House Small Business Committee, he came to my office to advocate the need to accelerate the 100 percent deduction of health insurance for the self-employed.

He was a regular fixture in the Halls of Congress, where he frequently testified about the importance of simplifying government regulations for small businesses, clarifying the home-office deduction and promoting tax fairness.

When Mr. Thayer talked, I listened, because I knew he spoke straight from the heart of the small business community.

He has such an impressive history of accomplishments on behalf of small businesses that it is impossible to list them all adequately. He chaired and served on the boards of numerous local and national business associations concerned with economic development, credit development, small business enhancement and general business growth. In this capacity, he advised three Presidents on small business issues.

He authored a book that examined health care issues from the standpoint of small business owners. It was called, "We, the People: An American Solution to Health Care Reform."

But his accomplishments don't stop there. He served as the State Chair of the Maryland delegation to the 1995 White House Conference on Small Business and as the Regional Implementation Chairman. He was also on the Microsoft Small Business Technology Board to promote computer and information technology to small businesses nationwide. And he served as the Co-Chairman of the Maryland Delegation to the 1986 White House Conference on Small Business.

He was a renowned public speaker, appearing on various radio and television shows to increase awareness of the opportunities and challenges of the self-employed.

I will remember Bennie Thayer as a passionate champion of small businesses, a man of principle and someone who cared deeply about his community.

While the nation's small businesses have lost a great advocate, Mr. Thayer's legacy will live on in Congress and in the hearts of the self-employed.

I salute Bennie Thayer and extend my sympathies to his family.

A LETTER FROM THE HUNGARIAN
AMBASSADOR

HON. ERNEST J. ISTOOK, JR.

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 5, 2000

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following letter from the Hungarian Ambassador into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

THE AMBASSADOR OF HUNGARY.

October 4, 2000.

HON. ERNEST J. ISTOOK, JR.,
U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ISTOOK: I am deeply moved when I express my heartfelt gratitude to you and your distinguished Colleagues in the House of Representatives on the adoption of H. Con. Res. 400 congratulating my country, Hungary, on the 100th anniversary of its statehood. I am particularly indebted to Congressman Frank Pallone, who initiated the resolution, and your 29 Colleagues, who joined you as co-sponsors.

The eloquence and historical depth of the resolution will surely impress all my compatriots, as well as hundreds of thousands of Americans of Hungarian descent. Being a historian myself and as someone who lived through a greater part of the 20th century, which brought so much misfortune to my people, I also very much appreciate the words used by you and your colleagues in approving the resolution. On this occasion let me share a few ideas with you on the links that bind your great nation of America with Hungary.

The people of Hungary have been admirers of the United States for well over two centuries. We, too, have fought for our freedom and independence several times during these centuries. We felt your nation's sympathy in many difficult periods, particularly in 1848/49 and 1956. In 1978 the United States returned the Holy Crown of St. Stephen, kept in safety at Fort Knox since 1945, to the Hungarian people, boosting our morale and pride in our

history, thus contributing to the process which led to the peaceful transformation of the political system of Hungary in 1989/90.

I am pleased to say that we, Hungarians, are not alone in celebrating the establishment of the State. Like the United States, Hungary is also a nation of immigrants. When our ancestors moved into the Carpathian Basin they soon absorbed its sparse Slavic and Turkic population. Later on we welcomed many individuals and whole national groups in search of a better life and more freedom. Thus credit for the achievements of our thousand year old history goes not only to our Founding Fathers, but to all those who joined our nation through the centuries, embraced our culture and language and enriched us immensely with their industry, knowledge, culture and traditions. Among our neighbors, the Slovaks shared a common state with the Hungarians for over 1000 years, and the Croats a union for 800 years. But all the peoples of Central and Eastern Europe joined the Hungarians at one time or other struggling against common enemies, sometimes even under common Sovereigns. Hungary was also open for refugees escaping war and oppression and it became a truly multinational country, showing both good and bad examples how to get on with many languages and cultures. The resolution appropriately points out the outstanding contributions in science, arts, culture and economy that Jewish Hungarians provided to our nation. Later on many of our citizens left the homeland, in order to seek knowledge, freedom or opportunity. That is how we established so many links to Western Europe and the Americans. Thus, the Hungarian Millennium is a common Central European celebration, and also a Trans-Atlantic one.

The bust of Louis Kossuth, Governor of revolutionary Hungary in 1849, and later a refugee most warmly received in the United States in 1851/52, stands in one of the hallways of the Capitol. The dream of Kossuth and so many other Hungarians has come true: our two nations have become allies. We are working together to turn South-Eastern Europe, a region of conflicts, into a stable and prosperous one. We are fighting jointly against international crime and terrorism, and the rights of people oppressed. We count on your support in our efforts to seek the safeguarding of the rights of close to three million Hungarians residing in the states bordering on Hungary.

A historian of ancient Rome, Sallustius, stated: "Truly not armies nor treasurers are the safeguards of a kingdom, but friends." We, Hungarians, have a modest army and small wealth, but a great friend in the United States. We are grateful for your friendship and for the resolution which is such a beautiful testimony of that.

Sincerely yours,

GEZA JESENSZKY.

REPUBLIC OF CHINA NATIONAL
DAY

HON. COLLIN C. PETERSON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 6, 2000

Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, our long time ally and close friend, the Republic of China on Taiwan, will be celebrating its 89th anniversary on October 10th.