

began his journey of public service in 1956, when he won his first bid as Mayor of the Village of Independence.

Mayor Wisnieski served Independence as mayor for twenty-two years, bringing a sense of fairness, integrity and kindness to the office. During his leadership, the City flourished. He led the effort in commercial growth along Rockside and Pleasant Valley Roads. This vital development provided a sound tax base, which translated into superior city services and low property taxes for all residents.

And years before public officials became environmentally enlightened, Mayor Wisnieski understood the significant and delicate balance between progress and preservation. It was Mayor Wisnieski who led the effort to preserve nearly fifteen acres of green space in the heart of Independence, known for decades as Elmwood Park. Because of his leadership and vision, this beautiful tree-lined park continues to provide recreational enjoyment to thousands of residents, young and old, every year, in the form of swimming, baseball, soccer, fishing, and tennis, strolling, and biking.

Additionally, Mayor Wisnieski's concern for the safety of all residents led to the construction of new fire and police complexes with additional staff to accommodate any medical or safety emergency—twenty-four hours a day, seven days a week.

Mayor Wisnieski has always been a champion of community volunteerism and helping others. He is a founding charter member of the Kiwanis Club of Independence, and founding member of the Independence Historical Society.

Remarkably, throughout all of his exceptional accomplishments, Mayor Wisnieski remains today as he always has been—humble, gentle, and kind—always willing to offer a smile, friendly word, or helping hand. Mayor Wisnieski continues to exude a genuine love and concern for all people, and he extends to everyone the same warmth and respect, regardless of their title or social status.

Mr. Speaker and Colleagues, please join me in honor, gratitude and recognition of "W" Pete Wisnieski, former Mayor of Independence. Mayor Wisnieski's hard work, insight, and dedication to his community have served to uplift and improve every facet of the City of Independence, and set a strong foundation for future ideas, projects and growth. Mayor Wisnieski combined heart with grit while in office, and continues to be the finest example of a citizen, leader, husband, father, grandfather, neighbor and friend. Mayor Wisnieski has earned the admiration and respect of the entire Independence community, as well as the entire Greater Cleveland community and beyond. "Where after all, do universal human rights begin? In small places, close to home."—Eleanor Roosevelt.

THE CUNNINGHAM/MARKEY EFFICIENT ENERGY THROUGH CERTIFIED TECHNOLOGIES ACT OF 2003

HON. RANDY "DUKE" CUNNINGHAM

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 13, 2003

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce the Efficient Energy

Through Certified Technologies, EFFECT, Act of 2003. I am joined in this effort by a substantial and diverse coalition of my colleagues including Mr. MARKEY of Massachusetts, Mr. CRANE of Illinois, Mr. MATSUI of California, as well as Senator SNOWE of Maine and Senator FEINSTEIN of California. This bill is supported by a strong coalition of industries and organizations.

In the 1990s, San Diego alone experienced a 10.2 percent increase in population. This number is expected to rise even further in the next ten years. With such a significant rise in population, comes the need for additional housing. Congressman MARKEY and I have created legislation that would give builders and consumers a reason to construct housing and purchase equipment that not only saves the consumer money in the long run, but also helps save energy. This legislation offers tax incentives to encourage the production and sale of technologically advanced, energy-efficient buildings and equipment.

My constituents in San Diego suffered through the Energy Crisis during the summer of 2001. The aftershocks of the rolling blackouts and outrageously high energy prices are still being felt. While my colleagues from San Diego and I are still seeking ways to prevent this terrible crisis from happening again, I am introducing this bill in an effort to formulate a long-term energy plan.

Buildings account for over \$250 billion of energy use annually, more than half of peak electric demand, and 35 percent of air pollution emissions. Tax incentives for buildings and their major equipment can reduce energy use anywhere from 30 percent to 50 percent, and help to improve air quality. The incentives will reduce peak power demand, which can diffuse the risk of blackouts and high electricity prices. Peak power shortages cost California \$15 billion in 2000 alone.

This legislation is performance based, not cost based. One dollar of federal tax incentives for energy efficiency offered today will not be paid until January-April 2004, but manufacturers will respond to the incentives by investing in production facilities for more efficient products immediately.

The legislation is structured to promote the creation of competitive markets for new technologies and designs that are not widely available today, but have the possibility of being cost effective to the consumer in the future.

Please join me in supporting the EFFECT Act which will provide for a cleaner environment and help reduce energy needs, thus postponing the need for building new power plants as well as helping to save our environment.

THE JAVITS-WAGNER O'DAY PROGRAM WORKS FOR AMERICA

HON. RICHARD BURR

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 13, 2003

Mr. BURR. Mr. Speaker, for the past 64 years the Javits-Wagner-O'Day Program has empowered Americans who are blind or severely disabled by providing them with a diverse set of employment opportunities. Today, 38,000 disabled Americans are realizing their potential by working in their local communities

under this program. These Americans are proud to provide the Federal Government and the U.S. Military with a wide array of SKILCRAFT® brand and other program products and services. The Program prides itself on delivering high-quality products and services at competitive prices in the most convenient way possible.

The Javits-Wagner-O'Day Program includes, among other things, the following product categories: office supply, military-specific, safety, maintenance, repair, medical-surgical, janitorial-sanitation, and customization. The services that are provided to federal and military customers include, but are not limited to, call center and switchboard operation, military base and federal office building supply centers, CD-ROM duplication-replication, data entry, document imaging and grounds care.

I rise today in support of the Javits-Wagner-O'Day Program and the opportunities it provides for an underemployed population of hard-working Americans. Sales of these products and services are enabling more disabled Americans to have the opportunity to become full members of society, including paying into the tax base rather than taking from it. Today in Winston-Salem, North Carolina, 127 blind Americans are employed under the Program, and are producing quality items and services for federal customers.

The Javits-Wagner-O'Day Program is administered by the Committee for Purchase from People Who Are Blind or Severely Disabled (appointed by the President), with much assistance from National Industries for the Blind, NIB, and NISH, which serves people with a wide range of disabilities. More than 650 local nonprofit agencies associated with NIB and NISH employ people who are blind or disabled to produce the products and offer the services authorized for sale to the federal government under the Program.

The Javits-Wagner-O'Day Program is a great illustration of a successful partnership, a partnership that has the ability to grow with the changing procurement environment within the federal government.

EDITORIAL BY LT. COL. CRAIG MAYER

HON. BILL SHUSTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 13, 2003

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring to my colleagues' attention an editorial written by Lieutenant Colonel Craig Mayer (ret.) of Bedford, Pennsylvania. Lt. Col. Mayer is a former U.S. Department of Defense attaché and served as a member of the United States Marines during the Vietnam War. On March 7, 2003 Colonel Mayer wrote an eloquent editorial that describes not only his reflections of war, but also made a compelling case in support of military action against Saddam Hussein. I urge my colleagues to keep the following article in mind as the debate concerning Iraq continues;

When I think of America going to war with Iraq, what comes to mind first is the distinct, sickeningly sweet smell and the fell of dark, sticky blood as I helped drag a horribly wounded young Marine to a medevac helicopter. And the memory of picking up the

young Marine's boot—most of his lower leg still in it—and tossing it into the helicopter. It's the odor of gunpowder and sweat, screams of agony, a green jungle haze, the confusing noise of whirling helicopter blades, Viet Cong machine gun fire, and gasping, wide-eyed men.

I suffer no illusions about the real costs of war and have no impulse to go fight again or send others into the hellish experience I survived in Vietnam.

Why then should we indulge this obscenity again with Iraq? What is at stake? And is it worth the sacrifice?

The debate on the impending war is more, much more, about power and competing worldviews—within America and within the community of nations—than it is or ever was about Saddam's threats and misadventures. The issue is not really about inspections, adequate justification, sham cooperation, or any sincere belief that Saddam Hussein will ever willingly disarm, the debate is about the constraint of American power.

Iraq is the stage for a test of those worldviews.

One view seeks to avoid the use of military power to bring about the rule of law and instead relies on persuasion, negotiation, cooperation, and international institutions. It rationalizes and tolerates threats because its proponents really can't do anything about them. This view is borne of decades of global security and prosperity provided by the United States. It is a view grounded in strategic weakness.

The competing view, the American power view, looks to military power along with the means and willingness to use it as essential for a state of security to create peaceful solutions and the rule of law to govern and grow. It sees international forums and processes as less than reliable. It perceives risks differently and is less willing to tolerate threats because it can do something about them. It is a position grounded in strategic strength.

These opposing views are now colliding. Both views desire the rule of law and peaceful solutions to international problems, but their means are at odds.

Those nations and people of the power adverse view will encounter and confront us simply because we are the only power on the world stage with the means to shape and effect global security. Only by constraining American power can they gain a relative advantage and advance or validate their view. Since the end of World War II, Europe and much of the rest of the world has depended on and has been responsive to American power and our ability to globally project that power—be it in economic or military terms. Our power is now enormous and unprecedented in world history.

Adherents of the power adverse view, most notably France, Germany, and less so Russia, have chosen the Iraq crisis and the forums of the U.N. Security Council and NATO to confront us. We should not be misled by their public assertions or how they or their supporters would like to frame the international debate in the important days ahead. Behind all their coming challenges to intelligence information, appeals for peace, attempts at redefining compliance, pleas for delays, excuses for Iraqi resistance, and bleats about smoking guns is the objective of constraining American power—irrespective of any concerns about Iraq. This is the central and fundamental objective.

There is overwhelming justification for the coerced disarmament of Iraq—the justification threshold was passed years ago.

No greater damage could be done to the maintenance of a stable world order and global security than to succumb to the instincts and wants of those confronting us.

The stakes in this encounter are quite high—perhaps more so than at anytime in the past half century. If the power adverse proponents prevail, it will weaken their security and severely undermine the effectiveness of the U.N. Security Council and NATO—paradoxically, the very institutions they hope to rely on. If they prevail, global security decisions will be thrown into forums and processes that promise little more than delay, equivocation, indecision, and paralysis. Something the world cannot afford in the face of immediate threats and mounting dangers. At the same time, France, Germany, and Russia are not our enemies—they are simply wrong. It is not time for their view to prevail and if history is a teacher that time will probably never come.

The young Marine that I helped drag to a helicopter 34 years ago died a few hours after he was wounded. Our company commander wrote a letter to his parents. The family was presented a purple heart and their son's name was chiseled into the marble monument in Washington.

In the impending war dying is at stake, suffering is at stake, and misery for loved ones left behind is at stake. It is obscene. But the harsh reality is that we live in an anarchic world of walls and the security and defense of a progressive, stable world order depends on military might and this is one of the roles we play. I know that these words provide little solace for the parents of a young Marine we lost years ago. I know that they will not fill the voids in our lives we now feel and that might be created in the days and weeks ahead. I only hope that they might help.

If I thought the impending War with Iraq was a contemporary Vietnam, an ill-conceived and misunderstood venture, I would be one of the first to object. It isn't, and I do not object.

IN REMEMBRANCE OF ZORAN DJINDJIC

HON. CURT WELDON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 13, 2003

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I wish to express my sincere condolences both to the family of Prime Minister Zoran Djindjic and to the nation of Serbia-Montenegro. His assassination cannot be allowed to stop the process of democracy and reform that Mr. Djindjic promised.

The world mourns the loss of a true democrat and lover of freedom; having dedicated his life to these ideals, Mr. Djindjic was willing to risk everything to bring freedom to his homeland. Both during their time in opposition and after the Democratic Party came to power, a rise in which he played a major role, Mr. Djindjic stood not only for democracy in Serbia-Montenegro, but also for justice, as demonstrated by his critical role in bringing Slobodan Milosevic to justice.

Prime Minister Djindjic worked tirelessly to bring Serbia-Montenegro out of the international isolation forced upon it by the regime of Milosevic. Toward this goal, I met with the Prime Minister in January of this year, and I was quite impressed by both his commitment to democracy in Serbia-Montenegro and to making it an integral part of Europe and the world.

In order to ensure democracy and justice, Mr. Djindjic also was a committed opponent of

organized crime, the scourge of so many democratizing states. Without political leaders committed not only to the ideals of democracy, but also to a basic foundation of justice, a free society cannot flourish. Prime Minister Djindjic was a prime example of just such a political leader—one that Serbia-Montenegro, and the world, needs more of.

Yesterday was truly a sad day for democracy, one of its champions fell; but we cannot let the crimes of a few undue the good of lifetime devoted to freedom. Although the world has lost Zoran Djindjic, we must all make sure that his dream lives on.

RECOGNIZING THE LEADERS OF CHURCH OF GOD IN CHRIST FOR THEIR LETTER TO PRESIDENT BUSH REGARDING AFFIRMATIVE ACTION

HON. BARBARA LEE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 13, 2003

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge and commend the leaders of the community-serving Church of God in Christ on their poignant and powerful letter to President Bush regarding Affirmative Action. I encourage my colleagues here in the House and all Americans to read this important letter.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I wish to insert the letter into the RECORD.

CHURCH OF GOD IN CHRIST, INC.,

Memphis, TN, January 23, 2003.

Hon. GEORGE W. BUSH, *President, The White House, Washington, DC.*

DEAR PRESIDENT BUSH: We write to you as the leaders of the community-serving Church Of God In Christ on the matter of Affirmative Action and the recent actions of your Administration toward millions of Blacks in America seeking equal opportunity and participation in the economic, cultural and political life of the nation.

We are deeply disappointed in the actions of your Administration regarding the legal briefs that your Justice Department submitted to the Supreme Court opposing equal opportunity for Blacks in the form of Affirmative Action as practiced by the University of Michigan.

We note that the Republican Party has in recent years failed to speak with a unified voice in favor of redressing the grave effects of the historic wrongs committed against African-Americans in this country, which continue to reduce and constrain the life opportunities of their descendants. Despite the past strong leadership of Republicans such as President Richard M. Nixon, who implemented robust and vigorous measures in employment, minority contracting and university admissions to wipe away the effects of past anti-Black discrimination, we now observe that since the 1980's, your party has rapidly retreated from the historic Republican ideals of equal opportunity and racial justice.

We see that your Secretary of State, General Colin Powell, made a strong statement supporting intensive ongoing implementation of Affirmative Action. This seems to put him at odds with others in your Administration and party, as well as many of your proposed judicial nominees, on the best way to redress the continuing exclusion of Blacks from the economic benefits of American Society. We support Secretary Powell's position and think that other Republicans would