

did when Japan had agreements with other countries that permitted those countries and the citizens from those countries to sue.

So what we have now is a situation that even after the status of their case and their ability to sue had changed, our State Department became the biggest block to having these heroes from the Bataan Death March exercise their right, because our State Department would intercede in their court cases and undermine their right to sue in court.

What this bill does and why it is necessary to put it on this appropriations bill is, it prevents the State Department from using its resources or its people to interfere with the rights of those American POWs and interfere with their right to take their case to court.

That is why it was important for us to get it on this bill. This was the vehicle. It was written in a way that was ruled in order, so the provision was ruled in order by the Parliamentarian.

This gives us an opportunity to bring justice to these men. They are dying every day. Every day there is another survivor of the Bataan Death March who passes away. All of us have family members who were in World War II, and we are seeing them pass away, at great pain to us. We need to make sure that when they die, they know their country has done right by them.

That is what this is all about. Every day that we postpone this, another number of these men pass into eternity. Let us let them go knowing their country backed them up and appreciated what they did.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. OTTER). Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to instruct.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRBACHER).

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO BRITISH-AMERICAN INTER-PARLIAMENTARY GROUP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, pursuant to 22 United States Code 2761 and clause 10 of rule I, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Members of the House to the British-American Interparliamentary Group in addition to Mr. PETRI of Wisconsin, chairman, and Mr. GALLEGLY of California, vice-chairman, appointed on May 1, 2001:

Mr. BEREUTER of Nebraska;
Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina;
Mr. HORN of California;
Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin;
Mr. BROWN of South Carolina;
Mr. SPRATT of South Carolina;
Mr. PRICE of North Carolina;
Mr. POMEROY of North Dakota;
Mr. CLYBURN of South Carolina; and
Mr. ALLEN of Maine.
There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BROWN of Ohio addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. COLLINS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. KAPTUR addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. NORTON addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

□ 1445

MEDICAL EDUCATION FOR NATIONAL DEFENSE ACT IN THE 21ST CENTURY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. OTTER). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUYER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, today, I have introduced the Medical Education for National Defense Act in the 21st Century, H.R. 3254. I would like to thank the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS), the gentleman from New York (Mr. MCHUGH), the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. SNYDER), and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS). These are Members of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs,

Committee on Armed Services and Committee on Energy and Commerce, with whom we have coordinated on this bill.

This legislation would authorize funds to establish partnership between the Department of Veterans' Affairs, the VA, and the Department of Defense, we call DOD, to develop education and training programs on medical responses to the consequences of terrorist activities.

We are fighting a war on terror on two fronts, domestically and overseas. Unfortunately, as a Nation, we are not prepared for the new face of terror that we have been exposed to in the aftermath of the September 11 attacks. What has become all too clear is that our health care providers are not armed with the proper tools to diagnose and treat casualties in the face of nuclear, biological, and chemical weapons.

The events of September 11 have forced the American people to reexamine many facets as to how we live our lives. We have been forced as a Nation to become more aware of our surroundings and more vigilant in the defense of our freedoms.

Most recently, we have come under attack through our own mail systems by terrorists who have used its efficiency to spread the deadly disease of anthrax. The difficulty experienced by government officials and our health care community, in responding to this attack, use infectious diseases rarely seen by medical personnel that should serve as wake-up call for us all.

A Washington Post article on November 1, 2001 by Susan Okie is a perfect illustration of the urgency of our medical community's lack of preparedness to deal with biological, chemical, and nuclear attacks. Ms. Okie reports the accounts of two of the heroic physicians who treated victims of the anthrax attacks: Dr. Susan Matcha, a Washington, D.C. area physician, and Dr. Carlos Omenaca, of Miami, Florida.

Dr. Matcha was quoted as saying, "We're really in uncharted territory here. As much as we want to have literature to look at, we really have nothing to guide us." According to the article, Dr. Omenaca, who encountered a rare form of inhalation anthrax in the case of Ernesto Blanco, found the description of the symptom that Mr. Blaco displayed in a 1901 textbook.

Just think, a doctor in the United States of America, home of the best medical system of the world, this doctor had to use a medical textbook from the first half of the last century to acquire information that he sought on the diagnosis and prognosis of the anthrax. I find that not only unbelievable but unacceptable.

As disturbed as this makes me, we are not here to try to place blame on this predicament to any group or organization. The reason why so many of our medical personnel feel uncomfortable about their ability to respond to these situations is because very few of

them were taught how to diagnose and give a prognosis for these types of rare diseases in medical school.

In fact, out of all of the medical schools in our country, only one, the Department of Defense Uniform Services University of Health Science, USUHS, has in its core curriculum a program to teach its medical students how to diagnose and treat casualties that have been exposed to chemical, biological, or radiological agents.

That, Mr. Speaker, is why I have introduced legislation to create a partnership between the Department of Defense and the Department of Veterans' Affairs that tasks these two agencies to develop and disseminate a program to both our current medical professionals and current medical students in the Nation's medical schools. We already have a nexus in place between our medical universities, where there is a VA hospital in close proximity. That nexus is already in place and that is what we plan to tap into.

The combination of DOD's expertise in the field of treating casualties resulting from an unconventional attack and the VA's infrastructure of 171 medical centers, 800 clinics, satellite broadcast capabilities, and a preexisting affiliation with 80 medical schools will enable the current and future medical professionals in this country to become knowledgeable and medically competent in the treatment of casualties that we all hope will never materialize.

However, Mr. Speaker, we cannot afford to assume that our country will never have to experience a massive biological, chemical, or radiological attack on the American people. We must, as elected Members, sent by our constituents to Washington to represent their interests, act to ensure that if the worst of fears are realized, our medical professionals will be ready and able to deal with these situations.

Mr. Speaker, I will insert the rest of the statement in the RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot impress upon you enough the urgency of making sure this proposal is adopted. Both the American Medical Association and the American Association of Medical Colleges have thrown the full weight of their support behind this plan. These two organizations, made up of the doctors who will be on the front lines of this new war, know how vital it is to receive this educational package that the Uniformed Services University of Health Sciences and the VA are currently developing to disseminate to the Nation's medical community.

It is often said that knowledge is power, and in this instance nothing could be truer. The knowledge resulting from the implementation of this act is critical. Our medical professionals need to be exposed to training methods that would enable them to save lives, and I can think of no greater power than that.

Please, join with me and support this important piece of legislation.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was commu-

nicated to the House by Ms. Wanda Evans, one of his secretaries.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DEFAZIO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

ENVIRONMENTAL REGULATIONS FOR SMALL BUSINESSES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, I had two countervailing experiences today. One was to travel to the botanical gardens here on the Capitol Mall and meet with the extraordinary personnel of the Environmental Protection Agency that are overseeing the decontamination at the Hart Senate Office Building and in the offices of the three Members of Congress who have been affected by anthrax contamination.

I witnessed then, as I have witnessed in days past, extraordinary professionalism and a deep commitment to creating an environment that is safe for us and for our staff. The EPA has earned a special place in my heart in the last week. But then I traveled just moments later, Mr. Speaker, across the street where I chaired the Subcommittee on Regulatory Reform and Oversight where I serve as chairman on the Committee on Small Business.

It was there that we took a hard look at the inadequacy of regulatory analyses that agencies use to support rule-making. And the special emphasis regrettably, Mr. Speaker, was on one agency in particular that was singled out by witness after witness for its poor regulatory analyses, and that agency was the Environmental Protection Agency.

The hearing that we convened today was all about the way that the EPA goes about evaluating the cost and benefit of regulations on small businesses. Small business owners are very familiar with the burdens that Federal regulations place on them. Many studies including those sponsored by the Office of Advocacy of the United States Small Business Administration have shown that small businesses face disproportionately higher costs to comply with Federal regulations, including those issued by the EPA than their larger business counterparts. Thus, accurate estimates of costs, if derived from the experiences of large businesses often, Mr. Speaker, paint a false picture of the impact of regulations or the impact of an EPA regulation on a small business. And if the EPA misjudges the economic impact, it often produces an irrational rule that wages war on the vitality of small business America.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the polestar of the rule-making process is

that regulations should be rational. When Congress passed the Administrative Procedure Act of 1946, it believed that the process of notice, comment, and agency response to the public comment would be sufficient conditions to ensure rational outcome. After the regulatory onslaught in the 1970's which saw the creation of the EPA, and the enactment of many statutes that EPA implements by rule-making, Congress and the executive branch determined that further refinements were necessary.

Congress imposed new analytical requirements to assess the impacts on small business and other entities. Presidents Reagan, Bush, and Clinton produced executive orders all in different ways mandating the analysis of cost and benefits. And even my own predecessor, Congressman David McIntosh, led the charge here on Capitol Hill to create a rational process whereby the regulatory state would analyze the cost of the regulations versus the benefit to the environment or the health and safety of employees.

In 1980 Congress enacted the Regulatory Flexibility Act as well. The RFA represents another tool in the decisional calculus designed to develop rational rules. The Reg Flex Act, as it is affectionately known by many in small business circles, requires Federal agencies to consider whether their proposal for final regulations will have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small businesses.

Despite this legacy since 1946 of demanding a rational foundation for government regulations, Mr. Speaker, sadly, today at our hearing we heard of a very very different tale, indeed. What I heard from one witness after another is that not only the EPA but many Federal and administrative agencies pay very little regard to the difference between the size of businesses when they impose paperwork requirements. And their estimates of the cost of compliance are often far afield of the reality of many small businesses like the one that I started in my basement or like the one my late father ran throughout his lifetime in Columbus, Indiana.

There is a great Biblical tale of the pharisee, Mr. Speaker, who heaps burden upon burden on the traveler but never lifts a finger to help them carry that burden. At our hearing today for the Subcommittee on Regulatory Reform and Oversight of the Committee on Small Business, we heard the need for the EPA and other elements of the administration in the regulatory state to cease adding burdens to travelers but now to begin to think about the size and scope of those enterprises, to lift that burden and let us begin an era of unburdening American small business of Federal and regulatory red tape.