

leadership council of the Sisters of St. Joseph of Orange. In that position, she will be one of five Sisters who are responsible for giving direction to this health care community.

Since she joined St. Mary Medical Center in 1993, Sister Sharon's vision and leadership has helped make the hospital one of the most highly-regarded in the High Desert and recognized throughout San Bernardino County for its quality of care. Her dedication to serving the poor and disadvantaged has made St. Mary's a leader in services to the needy in the area. She has been forceful in convincing other community leaders to also ensure that a safety net remains in place for the truly needy.

While in Apple Valley, Sister Sharon developed a program for at-risk pregnant women that is now a full-fledged outreach center. She opened a High Desert office for Catholic Charities, making its disaster relief and services to the poor available for the first time. She established a Food Resource Center that provides a range of counseling services for families receiving government food assistance. She started an annual "Share the Warmth" drive to acquire shoes and coats for needy children. And she started an annual Thanksgiving food drive for needy families. She was one of the original members of the San Bernardino County Children and Families Commission.

As a member of the leadership council, Sister Sharon will help direct the ministries of the Sisters of St. Joseph of Orange. Through the St. Joseph Health Care System, the council oversees the operation of 15 acute health care facilities, as well as an array of clinics, home-health-care services and hospices in California, Texas and Arizona. The sisters have been ministering to the sick since 1912 in California, and their hospitals served 143,000 inpatients and 2.3 million outpatients in 2000.

Mr. Speaker, the patients who receive top-notch care at St. Mary's Medical Center will enthusiastically endorse Sister Sharon as a good choice to help run the ministries health care system. We will miss her direct leadership in the High Desert, but have no doubt that she will ensure that the entire system improves over her five-year term. Please join me in congratulating her and wishing her well in this important new role.

#### INTRODUCING THE RENTERS RELIEF ACT

#### HON. ELIOT L. ENGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 27, 2001

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce legislation that addressing a crisis in our country. My bill, the Renters Relief Act, provides a refundable tax credit of up to \$2,500 for people paying more than 30 percent of their income toward housing costs.

Throughout our nation, millions of working families are struggling to make ends meet. Housing costs are often the greatest drain on a family's economic resources.

I would like to call to my colleagues' attention some disturbing facts from around the country: In Atlanta, Georgia there are 11,907 families waiting for housing assistance from HUD; In the Los Angeles Metro region more than 400,000 renters have incomes less than 50 percent of the area median income, and

pay over half of their income for rent or are living in severely substandard housing, the "worst" case scenario; In Boston, the average monthly fair market rent for a two-bedroom apartment in the metro area is \$874, that means a family must earn at least \$35,000 or else they will be spending more than 30 percent of their income on housing.

We have heard the statistics over and over. The fact is we are not producing enough housing that is guaranteed for low and moderate-income people. We are not building nearly enough public housing to accommodate our needs. Incomes are not keeping up with housing costs. I have been frustrated at not being able to help more of my constituents.

In fact, three years ago Secretary Cuomo said that "Not even families working full-time at minimum wage can afford decent quality housing in the private rental market. This is not just a big city problem but affects America's growing suburbs as well."

HUD's own research indicates that a wide variety of market forces have contributed to this crisis of housing affordability through the 1990s. Among these are "continued suburbanization of population and employment, regulatory barriers to development of multifamily housing, underinvestment in affordable housing by local communities, continuing discriminatory barriers, and the simple economics of supply and demand in which rising incomes for higher income families drive up rents faster than the poorest families can afford. Also, the growth in the crisis during the 1990s can also be attributed to the elimination of Federal appropriations for additional rental vouchers between 1995 and 1998."

I urge my colleagues to turn the tide. Join me in moving the Renters Relief Act forward!

#### HONORING DR. BOBBY JONES OF NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE FOR TWENTY-FIVE YEARS OF SERVICE TO THE GOSPEL MUSIC INDUSTRY

#### HON. BOB CLEMENT

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 27, 2001

Mr. CLEMENT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Dr. Bobby Jones of Nashville, Tennessee. For more than twenty-five years, he has promoted and performed gospel music during his "Bobby Jones Gospel" shows worldwide. In fact, I have known him for a number of years and consider him to be a personal friend.

Bobby Jones is truly a pioneer in taking gospel music to a wider audience via television programming beginning with his local television show on WSMV-Channel 4 in Nashville, and over the past twenty years as a personality on Black Entertainment Television (BET). His programs have inspired, informed, and entertained a generation of Americans. In fact, "Bobby Jones Gospel" is credited with being the first and only nationally syndicated black gospel television show.

Jones has also introduced a wealth of new musical talent to the world through his television shows. Artists such as Yolanda Adams, Kirk Franklin, and Hezekiah Walker first came to the attention of the public after being showcased on "Bobby Jones Gospel." Additionally,

his video program on BET, is the only national black gospel video program to date. He also hosts a weekly syndicated gospel countdown show heard on radio stations across the nation.

Bobby Jones has always aspired to great things. The Henry County, Tennessee, native dreamed of a musical career at an early age, which drove him to graduate from high school at the age of 15 and to earn a bachelor's degree from Tennessee State University (TSU) at the age of 19. An education major, he went on to earn a master's degree from TSU, and doctorate from Vanderbilt University. Upon graduation, Jones successfully taught in both the Tennessee and Missouri school systems.

He is also credited with forming the now familiar "Black Expo,"—fair like events, which take place across then nation and celebrate the many contributions of African Americans to the community in which they take place.

Bobby Jones has been honored numerous times by his peers. In 1980, he received The Gabriel Award and an International Film Festival Award for writing and performing Make A Joyful Noise. In 1982, he was nominated for a Grammy Award, along with his group, New Life. The Gospel Music Association (GMA) honored him in 1984, with a Dove Award for Black Contemporary Album of the Year. That same year he picked up a Grammy Award for "Best Vocal Duo for a Soul/Gospel Performance" for the single he recorded with Barbara Mandrell, "I'm So Glad I'm Standing Here Today." He also won an NAACP Image Award in 1984. The GMA honored him with the "Commonwealth Award for Outstanding Contribution to Gospel Music" in 1990. In 1994, Jones was nominated for a Cable ACE Award.

His autobiography, "My 25 Years in Gospel Music: Make a Joyful Noise" was recently released by Double Day Books. Another recent venture is his new television program "Bobby Jones Presents . . ." for the Word Network. This show contains classic performances from "Bobby Jones Gospel."

Jones is to be commended and honored for twenty-five years of outstanding service to the gospel music industry. He is a beloved figure who no doubt will continue to enlighten audiences for many years to come.

#### TWENTY-FIVE YEARS OF THE HELSINKI COMMISSION

#### HON. STENY H. HOYER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 27, 2001

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, twenty-five years ago this month, on June 3, 1976, a law was enacted creating the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe. We know it as "the Helsinki Commission." One of the smallest and most unique bodies in the U.S. Government, it perhaps ranks among the most effective for its size. I have been proud to be a member of the Commission for the past 16 years.

When President Gerald Ford signed, in Helsinki in 1975, the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, he said that "history will judge this Conference not by what we say here today, but by what we do tomorrow—not only by the promises we make, but by the promises we keep." That

piece of rhetoric has not only been repeated in various forms by every United States President since; it has continually served as a basis for U.S. policy toward Europe.

Credit for this fact, and for the Commission's establishment, first goes to our late colleague here in the House, Millicent Fenwick, and the late-Senator Clifford Case, both of New Jersey. Observing the foundation of human rights groups in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe to monitor and, it was hoped, to encourage their governments to keep the promises made in Helsinki, she and other Members of Congress felt it would be good to give them some signs of support. Keep in mind, Mr. Speaker, that this was in the midst of detente with Moscow, a polite dance of otherwise antagonistic great powers. It was a time when the nuclear warhead was thought to be more powerful than the human spirit, and the pursuit of human rights in the communist world was not considered sufficiently realistic, except perhaps as a propaganda tool with which to woo a divided European continent and polarized world.

The philosophy of the Commission was otherwise. Respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms is, as the Helsinki Final Act indicates, a prerequisite for true peace and true security. As such, it is also a principle guiding relations between states, a legitimate matter for discussion among them. This philosophy, broadened today to include democratic norms such as free and fair elections and respect for the rule of law, remains the basis for the Commission's work.

Of course, the Commission was not meant to be a place for mere debate on approaches to foreign policy; it had actually to insert itself into the policy-making process. The Commission Chairman for the first decade, the late Dante Fascell of Florida, fought hard to do just that. It was, I would say, a bipartisan fight, with several different Congresses taking on several different Administrations. Moreover, it was not just a fight for influence in policy-making; it was a much tougher fight for better policies. The Commission staff, led during those early years by R. Spencer Oliver, was superb in this respect. It knew the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe. It worked with non-governmental organizations to increase public diplomacy and, subsequently, public support for human rights advocacy. The staff developed the ability to insert principle into policy at the negotiating table. Over time, as State Department and other Executive-branch officials would come and go, the Commission staff developed the institutional memory to recall what works and what doesn't, allowing human right as an element of East-West relations consistently to strengthen. With the Commission staff represented on U.S. delegations to follow-up and experts meetings which emerged from the Final Act—collectively called the Helsinki process—our country addressed issues at the heart of Cold War, forthrightly confronting the Soviets and their allies in the presence of our European allies, neutral and non-aligned states and the more reluctant Warsaw Pact members. The Commission was viewed as unique in the role it played to “co-determine” with the Executive branch U.S. human rights policy toward the Soviet Union and East-Central Europe.

In 15 years at the East-West divide, the Commission also championed policies, like the Jackson-Vanik amendment, linking human

rights to trade and other aspects of U.S. bilateral relationships. The concept of linkage has often been chastised by the foreign policy establishment, but it comes from the passion of our own country's democratic heritage and nature. With persistence and care, it ultimately proved successful for the United States and the countries concerned.

The Helsinki Commission also became the champion of engagement. Commission members did not simply speak out on human rights abuses; they also traveled to the Soviet Union and the communist countries of East-Central Europe, meeting dissidents and “refuseniks” and seeking to gain access to those in the prisons and prison camps. At first, the Commission was viewed as such a threat to the communist system that its existence would not be officially acknowledged, but Commissioners went anyway, in other congressional capacities until such time that barriers to the Commission were broken down. The Commission focus was on helping those who had first inspired the Commission's creation, namely the Helsinki and human rights monitors, who had soon been severely persecuted for assuming in the mid-1970s that they could act upon their rights. Ethnic rights, religious rights, movement, association and expression rights, all were under attack, and the Commission refused to give up its dedication to their defense.

Eventually, the hard work paid off, and the beginning of my tenure with the Commission coincided with the first signs under Gorbachev that East-West divisions were finally coming to an end. Sharing the chairmanship with my Senate counterparts—first Alfonso D'Amato of New York and then Dennis DeConcini of Arizona—the Commission argued against easing the pressure at the time it was beginning to produce results. We argued for the human rights counterpart of President Reagan's “zero option” for arms control, in which not only the thousands of dissenters and prospective emigrants saw benefits. They were joined by millions of everyday people—workers, farmers, students—suddenly feeling more openness, real freedom, and an opportunity with democracy. Dissidents on whose behalf the Commission fought—while so many others were labeling them insignificant fringe elements in society—were now being released and becoming government leaders, people like Polish Foreign Minister Bronislaw Geremek and Czech President Vaclav Havel. The independence of the Baltic States, whose forced incorporation into the USSR was never officially recognized by the United States, was actually reestablished, followed by others wishing to act upon the Helsinki right to self-determination. The Commission was among the first to suggest not as rhetoric but as a real possibility the holding of free and fair elections, tearing down the Berlin Wall, and beginning a new world order in Europe.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, those of us on the Commission knew that the fall of communism would give rise to new problems, namely the extreme nationalism which communism swept under the rug of repression rather than neutralized with democratic antiseptic. Still, none of us fully anticipated what was to come in the 1990s. It was a decade of democratic achievement, but it nevertheless witnessed the worst violations of Helsinki principles and provisions, including genocide in Bosnia-Herzegovina and brutal conflicts elsewhere in the Balkans as

well as in Chechnya, the Caucuses and Central Asia, with hundreds of thousands innocent civilians killed and millions displaced. Again, it was the Commission which helped keep these tragedies on the U.S. foreign policy agenda, holding hearings, visiting war zones and advocating an appropriately active and decisive U.S. response. In the face of such serious matters, too many sought to blame history and even democracy, equated victim with aggressor and fecklessly abandoned the principles upon which Helsinki was based. Again the Commission, on a bipartisan basis in dialogue with different Administrations, took strong issue with such an approach. Moreover, with our distinguished colleague, CHRISTOPHER SMITH of New Jersey, taking his turn as Chairman during these tragic times, the Commission took on a new emphasis in seeking justice for victims, providing much needed humanitarian relief and supporting democratic movements in places like Serbia for the sake of long-term stability and the future of the people living there.

In this new decade, Mr. Speaker, the Commission has remained actively engaged on the issues of the time. Corruption and organized crime, trafficking of women and children into sexual slavery, new attacks on religious liberty and discrimination in society, particularly against Romani populations in Europe, present new challenges. Senator BEN NIGHTHORSE CAMPBELL of Colorado, the latest Commission Chairman, has kept the Commission current and relevant. In addition, there continue to be serious problem areas or widespread or systemic violations of OSCE standards in countries of the Balkans, Central Asia and the Caucuses, or reversals of the democratization process as in Belarus. The Commission was born in the Cold War, but its true mission—the struggle for human rights, democratic government and the rule of law—remains as important now as it was then. It remains an essential element for true security and stability in the world, as well as, to paraphrase Helsinki, for the free and full development of the individual person, from whose inherent dignity human rights ultimately derive.

To conclude, Mr. Speaker, I wish to erase any illusion I have given in my praise for the Helsinki Commission on its first quarter of a century that it had single-handedly vanquished the Soviet empire or stopped the genocidal policies of Slobodan Milosevic. No, this did not occur, and our own efforts pale in comparison to the courage and risk-taking of human rights activists in the countries concerned. But I would assert, Mr. Speaker, that the wheels of progress turn through the interaction of numerous cogs, and the Commission has been one of those cogs, maybe with some extra grease. The Commission certainly was the vehicle through which the United States Government was able to bring the will of the American people for morality and human rights into European diplomacy.

To those who were in the Soviet gulag, or in Ceausescu's Romania as a recent acquaintance there relayed to me with much emotion, the fact that some Americans and others were out there, speaking on their behalf, gave them the will to survive those dark days, and to continue the struggle for freedom. Many of those voices were emanating in the non-governmental community, groups like Amnesty International, Freedom House and Human Rights Watch. Through the Helsinki Commission, the

voice of the United States Congress was heard as well, and I know that all of my colleagues who have been on the Commission or worked with it are enormously proud of that fact.

IN MEMORY OF MR. JAMES V.  
PSENICKA

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 27, 2001*

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory of a very fine man, Mr. James V. Psenicka, for his dedicated years of service and countless contributions to the community.

Mr. Psenicka was born in Maple Heights to Czech immigrants who met and married in the United States. The family then moved to Streetsboro to purchase land. Mr. Psenicka graduated from Kent State High School in 1950 and immediately joined the staff of "The Neighborhood News" where he served as a reporter and advertising salesman. He soon earned his bachelors degree in journalism from Kent State University in 1955.

Mr. Psenicka assumed the role of owner and publisher of "The Neighborhood News" in 1961 after serving in the U.S. Navy Air force in Guam. As publisher, Mr. Psenicka campaigned for cleaner air and strict anti-pollution regulation. He fought for countless causes to make life better for hard-working Czech and Polish-American readers. Under his leadership, the newspaper was named Best Weekly Newspaper by the Neighborhood and Community Press Association of Greater Cleveland in 1999.

Although his commitment to "The Neighborhood News" earned the newspaper countless awards and honors, Mr. Psenicka kept family and friends first. He enjoyed traveling with his wife and three sons to Canada, Greece, Europe, and many other places. He relished boating and gardening. You would often see Mr. Psenicka off the coast of Lake Erie fishing.

Mr. Psenicka also had an incredible dedication to his local community. He served as a member of Karlin Hall on Fleet Avenue and the Small Business Advisory Council to the U.S. Congress. In addition, Mr. Psenicka served as a dedicated member to the Kiwanis Club of South East Cleveland, the world's largest service organization.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in honoring the memory of Mr. James V. Psenicka, a man that has touched the Cleveland and world community in many ways. His love, dedication, and honor will be greatly missed.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR  
AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT OF 2002

SPEECH OF

HON. WES WATKINS

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 21, 2001*

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2217) making ap-

propriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, and for other purposes:

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2217, the Interior Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2002. Among the components of that act is funding for the Department of Energy's Office of Fossil Energy and its program of oil and natural gas research and development. Few among us understand what an important role oil and natural gas research and development plays in our nation's ability to produce critical quantities of those resources for our domestic consumption.

I would like to introduce into the RECORD today one of the recommendations contained in a report of the Interstate Oil and Gas Compact Commission (IOGCC) entitled A Dependent Nation: How Federal Oil and Natural Gas Policy is Eroding America's Economic Independence. This report contains the IOGCC governors' own set of recommendations for a national oil and natural gas policy. It is my hope that this information will help explain why federally funded oil and natural gas research and development is so vitally important to this country.

RECOMMENDATION 2: PROMOTE THE EXPANSION OF RESEARCH TO RECOVER DOMESTIC OIL AND GAS RESOURCES

This far-reaching recommendation encompasses a number of initiatives designed to ensure the nation's reserves are fully developed. First, to make informed decisions regarding the nation's energy future, the public must have definitive information on the actual domestic petroleum resource.

For example, there are vast known reserves of oil in the United States. The IOGCC estimates that 351 billion barrels will remain in the ground after conventional recovery technologies have been applied.

In addition, there are oil and natural gas reserves located on private and public lands and offshore that have not been analyzed or catalogued. Some of these reserves may exist in environmentally sensitive areas or in difficult-to-access locations that would require extraordinary exploration and production measures or advanced research to develop. Therefore, in addition to identifying the entire oil and gas resource base of the country, research should include estimates of the time required to bring these resources into production.

Defining these resources is only a first step. As an advocate for oil and natural gas research, the IOGCC also strongly supports programs that create technology to improve recovery rates and lower finding and production costs. Such research and development (R&D) is an investment in the country's future and its energy security. Technological advance might be the most important factor in ensuring America's nonrenewable resources are fully developed.

As noted by the Task Force on Strategic Energy Research and Development, "There is growing evidence of a brewing 'R&D crisis' in the United States—the result of cutbacks and refocusing in private-sector R&D and reductions in federal R&D. Support for research and development is indeed being simultaneously reduced in the private and public sectors. R&D cannot be turned on and off like a water tap. The acquisition of new knowledge and the embodiment of new knowledge in new products and services for the economy is a cumulative process that requires continuous effort to sustain. The accumulation of cutbacks in public and private R&D could be setting the stage for a major

shortfall and setbacks in R&D in the United States—characterized by the lack of consistent attention to longer-term needs and problems, a shrinking population of scientists and engineers available to perform high-quality R&D, and a loss of incentives and opportunities for new generations of technologists."

A 1997 report commissioned by the IOGCC confirmed the declining trend in oil and gas research and development. "When private R&D is compared to federal expenditures, the outlook is more bleak. Private spending is substantiated . . . but federal spending remains disproportionately small compared to the relative importance of oil and gas to U.S. energy requirements."

Enrollment in petroleum-related majors at America's colleges and universities has shrunk as well. At the University of Texas at Austin, home of one of the largest petroleum engineering programs in the nation, undergraduate enrollment in the Department of Petroleum and Geosystems Engineering has plummeted more than 80 percent from a high of 1,200 in 1982 to 222 in 1999. About 1,300 students currently are enrolled in undergraduate petroleum engineering programs in the U.S., down sharply from more than 11,000 in 1983.

A 1997 study published by the IOGCC expressed alarm at the loss of experienced and entry-level technical personnel, noting "there is a 5- to 7-year gap between decisions to increase exploration budgets and resulting new oil production, even when experienced technical staff are available. However, few have considered the long-term effects of the 1986 petroleum jobs massacre (in which 500,000 jobs were lost) and how the events of 10 years ago will influence future energy policy and supplies . . . Any crisis in oil supply causing increases in domestic activity will be constrained by lack of qualified staff."

The federal government could fulfill a vital leadership role in reversing the trend. The country's network of national laboratories, for example, seems ideally suited for the mission of energy research.

In addition, the IOGCC supports a reallocation of U.S. Department of Energy resources to provide additional research and development funding for oil and natural gas. The DOE's budget request totals \$18.9 billion for fiscal year 2001. For fossil energy research and development, DOE is requesting \$376 million, less than 2 percent of the budget. About \$160 million is requested for oil and natural gas research. This represents slightly more than one-half of one percent of the DOE budget request—for fuels that deliver more than 85 percent of the country's energy.

The DOE's Office of Fossil Energy highlights the importance of R&D. "Looking forward, the domestic oil and gas industry will be challenged to continue extending the frontiers of technology. Ongoing advances in E&P productivity are essential if producers are to keep pace with steadily growing demand for oil and gas, both in the United States and world wide."

The NPC notes "producers are turning to the service sectors to develop new technology for specific applications. Industry consortia have been formed to address critical technology challenges such as deep water development. While many of these changes improve the efficiency with which research and development dollars are spent, concerns have been widely expressed that basic and long-term research are not being adequately addressed."

Meanwhile, solar and renewables technologies, which provide less than 10 percent of U.S. energy, would receive more than \$457 million. The 28 percent increase in funding (\$99 million) for 2001 represents more than the total request for oil and natural gas research.