

In addition, Mr. Speaker, I am proud to announce that Mindy's name and contributions will be honored forever. Her name will join the names of other men and women who made the ultimate sacrifice while on duty as firefighters at the National Fallen Firefighters' Memorial's Roll of Honor. The memorial, located in Emmitsburg, Md., was designated by Congress as the official, national memorial to fallen firefighters, and it will be further sanctified by the addition of Mindy's name.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing and mourning the loss of Melinda Ohler for her sacrifice and contributions to the people of San Francisco. She will be sorely missed on the Peninsula, in her birthplace of Valparaiso, Ind., and in the hearts of many across this nation who had the privilege of knowing her. To know her was to admire her; her legacy will be one of compassion, selflessness, and a commitment to being all she could be.

COMMEMORATING INDIA'S  
REPUBLIC DAY

**HON. JOHN LINDER**

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, January 29, 2003*

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge an important national holiday in India, namely a celebration of the Indian people's long and protracted struggle for self-governance and freedom: Republic Day.

On January 26, 1950, India's constitution was ratified. The adoption of this constitution, which was greatly influenced by our Founding Fathers, makes India a model for nations across Asia and throughout the developing world.

As one of the world's most populated democracies, India is also a natural ally for our War on Terrorism. With its strategic location, India is a vital resource and a valued partner of the United States.

In a region too often afflicted with non-democratic governments, and wracked by intolerance across religious or ethnic lines, India truly stands out for its democracy and stability.

The Indian-American community within the United States has played a critical role in building this bridge between our two great nations, and I applaud their efforts.

HONORING THE HEROISM OF  
MICHAEL ONUSKO

**HON. MICHAEL N. CASTLE**

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, January 29, 2003*

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I rise today to pay tribute to and honor the heroism of Mr. Michael Onusko of Lincoln, Delaware. His concern and care for the fellow citizens in his community resulted in a life being saved.

Mr. Onusko, a mail carrier with the United States Postal Service, deserves a hero's recognition for his actions that saved 81-year-old Houston, Delaware resident Margaret Phillips. While on his delivery route, Mr. Onusko noticed that Mrs. Phillips had not picked up her

mail from the previous day. Concerned for a friend for whom he had been carrying mail for 13 years, he walked toward the residence to check on Mrs. Phillips. Upon hearing Mrs. Phillips calling for help from the garage, he quickly alerted the police. Mrs. Phillips had fallen off a ladder in her garage and was suffering from hypothermia after lying incapacitated on the floor for almost an entire day. Had Mr. Onusko not checked on Mrs. Phillips, help might not have arrived in time.

Mr. Onusko displayed a quality that all Delawareans should look for in a role model—a deep sense of community and concern for fellow citizens. We should all hope to emulate Mr. Onusko's actions and reach out when we can to those in need. It is people like Mr. Onusko who inspire others to do great things, and to realize that each of us is a part of a community, and a nation that can only succeed if we look out for one another. America needs everyday heroes who display true concern and goodwill when called upon to help their fellow citizens. I am proud to say that Mr. Onusko exemplified these qualities with his actions, and his recognition, Mr. Speaker, is duly deserved.

Ordinary people who perform extraordinary acts of public service, like Michael Onusko from my great State of Delaware, are the true heroes in today's world, and are the true role models for the next generation of leaders, both inside and outside of Delaware's borders.

FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS,  
FISCAL YEAR 2003

SPEECH OF

**HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, January 28, 2003*

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Obey Motion to Instruct.

We are four months into fiscal year 2003, yet 11 of the appropriations bills have yet to be enacted.

I am happy to see that we are close to wrapping up this appropriations process. But now is not the time to skip on the people's priorities. In our rush to finish, we must ensure that Homeland Security and our first responders are at the top of our list.

I urge the conferees to incorporate into the final conference report the language included in the omnibus bill by the other body.

In particular, I support the \$90 million to continue the health monitoring at Mount Sinai Hospital for the men and women who were on the front lines of defense on September 11th and the days that followed.

The other body included specific instructions to FEMA on this \$90 million.

Yesterday, several firefighters and rescue workers who worked the pile at Ground Zero were here in Washington to call attention to this very important issue. These brave heroes entered a battle zone of a new kind of war, and are really the first victims of the war. And we need to ensure they receive the medical care they deserve.

The need for this money was underscored in a report released this week by Mount Sinai Hospital showing that a majority of ground zero workers and volunteers screened for health problems have serious persistent illnesses from the disaster.

The initial screening program which ends this July will screen only about 9,000 of the approximately 40,000 rescue workers in need of medical attention. The analysis reveals that over 50 percent of the sample study have pulmonary illnesses, ear, nose and throat ailments, or persistent mental health problems.

The Doctors at Mt. Sinai believe the same statistics will hold for the roughly 3,500 responders they have seen to date. 78 percent of the participants reported at least one World Trade Center-related pulmonary symptom that first developed or worsened as a result of their rescue efforts; 52 percent reported mental health symptoms requiring further evaluation; and only about one-third of the sample participants had received any prior medical care for any of their symptoms and conditions.

In other words, for about one-third of these participants—their trip to Mount Sinai had been their only source of medical care; emphasizing the critical need to fully fund this program now, not later, not months down the road.

I urge my colleagues in the House to read the findings from the Mt. Sinai report—which can be found on my website: <http://www.wtcexams.org/>.

Medical monitoring delayed is proper health care denied. But again we face the challenge of securing the House support and the Administration's support and leadership to make this happen.

Medical monitoring delayed is proper health care denied. I hope that the conferees will include in the final conference report the language included in the omnibus bill by the other body.

The first responders were there for us when we needed them, now the question is will the federal government be there for them.

INTRODUCTION OF RESOLUTION  
URGING REVIEW OF STEEL TARIFF  
CONSEQUENCES FOR STEEL  
CONSUMERS

**HON. JOE KNOLLENBERG**

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, January 29, 2003*

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce a resolution regarding the Steel Safeguard Program that was initiated on March 5, 2002. This resolution asks for little, but could mean everything to steel-consuming manufacturers in this country.

By introducing this resolution I, along with 51 of my colleagues, are merely asking that the President direct the International Trade Commission (ITC) to include in its mid-term review of the Steel Safeguard Program an assessment of the Program's impact on steel consumers. Currently the ITC is under no obligation to report on these effects. By affirmatively accepting our request, the President will have a complete picture of the economic effects of the Program when he considers in September of this year whether or not to extend the tariffs for another eighteen months.

Last March, the Bush Administration imposed tariffs on imported steel, some as high as 30 percent, in an attempt to limit low-price imports in order to give our domestic steel industry time to reorganize and become more competitive. At that time, it was obvious that

steel-consuming manufacturers were going to feel pain, but we didn't know how bad the pain would be. Nobody knew how bad it would be.

Mr. Speaker, the pain is real and it is deep.

Since last year, I have been hearing stories of skyrocketing steel prices, broken contracts, and supply disruptions. Now, we have layoffs. Now, we have companies buying more steel from foreign countries exempt from the tariffs. And, now, more and more manufacturers, both large and small, are being forced to move production overseas. And once those jobs go, they aren't coming back.

Two days ago, I was joined by representatives from six automotive parts supply companies to discuss the effects of the tariffs. Let me give you just a taste of what these companies are doing to cope with the tariffs.

Arvin-Meritor, which is based Troy, Michigan, in my district, bought one million tons of steel globally last year. They recently closed down a Tennessee plant that employed 317 people in part because of higher steel prices and are now exploring options for buying cheaper steel from non-U.S. suppliers who are exempt from the tariffs.

Dura Automotive Systems, Inc., which is based in Rochester Hills, also in my district, cut 60 jobs after the tariffs were imposed and business was lost.

Metaldyne, which is based in Plymouth, Michigan, is expecting to source 30–40 percent of its steel from abroad within the next few years because of rising prices and supply shortages. They currently buy 98 percent of their steel domestically.

Dana Corp., which is based in Toledo, Ohio, is considering not only buying more steel from abroad, but buying components and finished parts from abroad as well because they can be made cheaper in foreign plants that don't have to pay inflated prices for steel.

All of these companies, and others throughout the steel consuming manufacturing industry, are forced to respond to this pain in order to remain globally competitive. Many of these companies will expand their purchases of finished steel products from overseas, because finished products are not covered by the tariffs. Sourcing parts from overseas causes more pain for companies up the manufacturing stream. Companies are being forced to make these decisions because of the steel tariffs.

Let's be clear. Right now, the unintended consequences of the steel tariffs are killing American jobs in steel consuming companies. This clearly was not the intent of the Steel Safeguard Program. This is the collateral damage. But we can't ignore the fact that the tariffs are costing jobs.

And I have to ask this question: what good will the tariffs have achieved if there are no customers left to buy steel from U.S. steel companies?

I am not here to criticize the President. In fact, I don't think the President would've supported these tariffs if he could've seen in a crystal ball the full damage they're causing. These effects have come about more rapidly and more severely than anyone predicted.

And let me emphasize that I fully support a healthy domestic steel industry. These are good American companies that employ good Americans.

But companies in my district and across the country are hurting. They are good American companies that employ good Americans. They deserve the consideration along with the steel

industry when the steel tariff regime is reviewed.

This resolution is not anti-steel or pro-steel consumer. It is simply an attempt to ensure that when the President decides whether to extend the Steel Safeguard Program for another 18 months, he has all the information he needs to make the best choice for our nation's economy.

This is a modest request. We are not asking that the tariffs be lifted immediately and we're not attempting to change trade law. I urge all my colleagues to cosponsor this moderate, bipartisan resolution to simply consider the impact the steel tariffs have had on steel consumers.

---

EXTENSION OF TEMPORARY EXTENDED UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION ACT OF 2002

SPEECH OF

**HON. MARK UDALL**

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, January 8, 2003*

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I am voting for this bill because it is urgently needed. Its enactment will prevent the cutoff of some unemployment benefits—a cutoff that otherwise would occur very soon.

In other words, by passing this bill we can save many people who are out of a job from the harm that otherwise would result from the refusal of the Republican leadership of the House to deal with this last year.

That is the right thing to do, even at this late date—and so I will support it.

But while this bill is necessary, it definitely is not sufficient. It does not cover everyone who should be covered. In fact, it will do nothing to help a million or more people who are out of work and who have used up all their federal benefits. The statistics I have seen indicate that at least 17,000 Coloradans fall into that category.

Those people are no less in need of assistance to enable them to pay their bills and feed their families while they look for work. It is not their fault that since the current downturn began more than 1.5 million jobs have been eliminated from the economy—and while the best response to their problems will be to revive the economy so that new jobs will be created, in the meantime we need to make it possible for them to make ends meet until that recovery really gets underway.

In the meantime, this bill does need to be passed. But it should be just the first step—and not the last one—to respond to the economic problems of Colorado and the rest of the country.

---

BACK TO WORK INCENTIVE ACT

**HON. HOWARD P. "BUCK" McKEON**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, January 29, 2003*

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join my colleague, Mr. Porter of Nevada, in support of the Back to Work Incentive Act, which would enact President Bush's plan for Personal Reemployment Accounts (PRAs). This new ben-

efit is an important component of the President's economic growth package, designed to help unemployed workers find a job quickly.

As the President discussed last month, Back to Work accounts will allow the One Stop Career Center system, where the unemployed already seek assistance in obtaining employment, to offer an important new benefit to unemployed workers, in addition to an array of employment services these centers already provide.

States will be able to target this flexible new benefit to unemployed individuals who are most in need of help by offering each individual a re-employment account of up to \$3,000. With these Back to Work accounts, unemployed workers may purchase training, supportive services (such as child care and transportation), and intensive services (such as employment counseling and case management).

Recipients will be able to keep the balance of the account as a cash reemployment bonus if they become reemployed within 13 weeks. Because account recipients can keep the balance of their accounts when they become reemployed quickly and stay employed, PRAs create an incentive to get off unemployment benefits and return to work quickly. The more quickly a job is obtained, the larger the reemployment bonus will be.

Of equal importance, the proposal authorizes \$3.6 billion for states to set up Personal Reemployment Accounts to aid unemployed workers who need the most help getting back to work. This additional support is intended to augment the funding provided under the Workforce Investment Act, which authorizes the federal government's primary programs for helping our nation's workers gain the skills they need to succeed in today's workforce.

These new Back to Work accounts and the job training services administered under the Workforce Investment Act are—both—essential in helping displaced workers and assisting adult workers in areas of the country facing skill shortages that will enhance the 21st century workforce.

As this proposal moves forward, it is my hope that we will meet the President's objectives of getting the economy back on its feet and workers back on the job.

At the same time, I look forward to working to ensure that the system established under the Workforce Investment Act, in particular, the business-led local boards, have an appropriate role in the administration of these accounts.

But make no mistake about it.

Personal Reemployment Accounts represent a new, innovative approach to help unemployed Americans find a job by giving the unemployed more control over their employment search and access to training and services.

In the next few months, the House Education and the Workforce Committee will begin the process of reauthorizing the Workforce Investment Act, where we will focus on improving the system to help achieve the original vision of the law when it was enacted in 1998, which was to create a seamless workforce development system for workers and employers.

Over the past year and a half, the workforce development system funded under the Workforce Investment Act has adequately met the training and employment needs of our nation's employers and employees. States and local areas have created comprehensive services