



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 107th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 147

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, MAY 15, 2001

No. 66

House of Representatives

The House met at 12:30 p.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. DUNCAN).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
May 15, 2001.

I hereby appoint the Honorable JOHN J. DUNCAN, Jr., to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Monahan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 802. An act to authorize the Public Safety Officer Medal of Valor, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed bills of the following titles in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 39. An act to provide a national medal for public safety officers who act with extraordinary valor above and beyond the call of duty, and for other purposes.

S. 166. An act to limit access to body armor by violent felons and to facilitate the donation of Federal surplus body armor to State and local law enforcement agencies.

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 106-554, the Chair, on behalf of the President pro tempore, and upon the recommendation of the Majority Leader, appoints the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. HAGEL) to the Board of Directors of the Vietnam Education Foundation.

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 100-696, the Chair, on behalf of the Democratic Leader, announces the appointment of

the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) as a member of the United States Capitol Preservation Commission, vice the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN).

MORNING HOUR DEBATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 3, 2001, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning hour debates. The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 30 minutes, and each Member, except the majority leader, the minority leader, or the majority whip limited to 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) for 5 minutes.

LINDA SHENWICK

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, having some concern by the recent UN votes that denied the United States a seat on both the Human Rights Commission and the Narcotics Trafficking Commission, many of my colleagues are again questioning how the U.S. should approach its participation in the United Nations.

In reality, while there is sufficient reason to assess blame on certain functions within the UN, we should also look to our own government. In 1999, during the State Department authorization debate, I brought to the attention of my colleagues the treatment of a dedicated State Department employee, Ms. Linda Shenwick.

Ms. Shenwick is an exemplary public servant, having served in the United States mission to the United Nations handling personnel and budget issues. She quickly carved out a reputation for diligence and hard work.

She earned three consecutive outstanding ratings and a promotion to

the Senior Executive Service. Ms. Shenwick's reputation earned the respect of other UN member states resulting in her election to serve on the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions in 1991 and again then in 1993.

In her position she repeatedly found evidence of deliberate waste, fraud and mismanagement at the UN. Her reports, however, were largely ignored by the previous administration.

Without recourse to address these incidents on her own, Ms. Shenwick began notifying key Members of Congress regarding her discoveries. As a result of her work, Congress forced the UN to create an Office of Inspector General to end such fraud and mismanagement.

So how was one of the most valuable civil servants rewarded? Certain government officials and department employees embarked on a campaign to sabotage her career.

Ms. Shenwick has endured false accusations, unsubstantiated poor performance reviews, and the ultimate and, I believe, illegal removal from government service.

I would like to point out, Mr. Speaker, to my colleagues that when former Secretary Madeline Albright refused to renominate Ms. Shenwick to the UN Budget Committee, negating 5 years of experience with the Byzantine UN budgetary bureaucracy, the U.S. ended up losing its seat on the Budget Committee for the next 4 years.

In all honesty, I do not think we would be seeing current problems at the U.S. mission if we had more employees like Linda Shenwick. Ms. Shenwick is a person that believes in the United Nations and wants to serve to bolster the influence of the United States and to strengthen the organization as a whole.

The problems of waste, fraud and mismanagement have been highlighted by most of my colleagues here on the House floor over the years.

This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H2149

Why, then, do we not insist that the Department of State staff the U.S. mission with those individuals who know where to look for these problems and have the courage and have the dedication to serve and to report them to Congress?

Ms. Shenwick should be reinstated to her former position, reimbursed for her personal expenses, and we should have her personnel files expunged of any unsatisfactory reviews or other false evidence to justify those reviews.

I will be sending a letter to President Bush requesting reinstatement of Ms. Shenwick so the United States can again benefit from her expertise, her diligence, and highly exemplary service.

Mr. Speaker, I am also introducing a concurrent resolution to the same effect. I hope my colleagues will join with me in signing this letter to the President and also cosponsor my legislation.

ENERGY CONSERVATION SHOULD BE FOUNDATION OF OUR NATIONAL POLICY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, my goal in Congress is for the Federal Government to be a better partner with individual citizens, their State and local governments; our communities more livable, our families safe, healthy and economically secure.

Having a dependable supply of energy and using it wisely is critical for a livable community. The current controversy surrounding energy is an excellent opportunity for this administration and this Congress to give thoughtful consideration to the impact that energy decisions can have on the livability of our communities and to develop a more rational approach to energy utilization.

Unfortunately, the President, his chief spokesperson, and most recently the Vice President, are setting up a false policy conflict for Americans. They would like us to somehow believe that being more thoughtful about use of energy and the Federal Government's role in promoting a better approach is somehow an assault on the American way of life. Nothing could be further from the truth.

Mr. Speaker, America works best when we give people choices so they can determine what works best for them. A country that disregards the value of conservation, that ignores fuel efficiency for all automobiles, that seeks to maximize production of energy at the expense of environmental quality is not protecting the American way of life, nor is it doing American families or businesses any favors.

Energy conservation is not just a matter of personal virtue, but if it

were, there is nothing wrong with formulating energy policy that recognizes the importance of this virtue.

Energy conservation should be, with all due respect to the Vice President, the foundation of our national policy. It is the only way we will provide significant amounts of energy in the near term. Furthermore, it is an approach that has already proven effective and has received bipartisan support.

All the hotly debated talk about drilling in the Alaskan National Wildlife Refuge and building a new power plant a week is not going to alleviate the problems facing consumers now. Instead of cutting the budget for environmental conservation, we need to set policies that actually encourage it.

There are simple conservation measures we could be taking today. Number one, extending fuel efficiency standards to all vehicles, including SUVs, light trucks and minivans. An increase of 3 miles per gallon in the fuel efficiency of SUVs will save more oil than drilling in the Arctic would ever produce, and we will get the benefits long before we ever get any Arctic oil.

Two, encouraging higher building standards that are more energy efficient, such as colored roofs, which reflect heat rays and lower home temperatures by as much as 5 degrees.

Three, we should be promoting new technologies and alternate fuels. We should not force people who want a 70-mile-per-gallon vehicle to have to buy one from overseas. By providing incentives and Federal support for developing and deploying energy-efficient technologies here in the United States, we can provide new and lucrative markets for American businesses.

Four, we ought to restore the higher standards for energy guzzling appliances. The Bush administration should allow the saving standards issued by the Clinton administration to stand, not be rolling them back.

Businesses are already realizing these benefits. A DuPont plant in New Jersey, for instance, which refused energy use per pound of product by one-third, cut global warming pollution per pound of product by nearly one-half, and as production rose 9 percent, the total energy bill fell by \$17 million a year.

But we need to get help to the people who perhaps cannot afford it.

Five, helping low-income people with today's skyrocketing energy bills and helping them install energy savings appliances seems to make sense. If we can afford, as some suggest, up to \$2 trillion in tax cuts, there is no reason that Congress cannot put some money on the table now that will help reduce the demand for energy production and help low- and moderate-income people save money over time.

We should have policies that reduce the extra costs for low-income people who may not have the money to replace appliances that in the long term will pay for themselves many times over. The long-term benefits accrue not

just to those low-income households. The community and the utilities will benefit huge savings by not building unnecessary power plants.

Yesterday's poll in USA Today showed that the American public understands this problem and an overwhelming percentage favor conservation over production.

We should invest in alternative energy, retrofit existing buildings with new technology, help lower-income people cope today and conserve for tomorrow, and all of us should embrace conservation.

These principles should be the basis of a national energy policy, an approach that will unite us in Washington, D.C., because it is what the people want and it is the quickest path to building more livable communities.

PARENTS' ROLE IN TEEN PREGNANCY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. JOHNSON) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be joined on the floor of the House today by the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON), who is my very dear friend and colleague. The gentlewoman and myself and the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE) and the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) have been very active on the issue of teen pregnancy, and work closely with the campaign to end teen pregnancy to bring attention to the issue throughout the Nation.

The newest data shows a very interesting fact: Teens listen to their parents. Often parents think their teenagers only listen to their teenage friends, and sometimes parents give up talking to their teenagers about difficult subjects like sex and sexuality and sexual activity amongst teens.

But when your child is in their teen years, that is a time when you need to talk with your child. You need to listen to your son or your daughter. You need to hear what pressures they feel and face, because it is only through that conversation that you can help your teenager understand their own growth.

Of course, they are growing in sexual awareness, but they are also growing emotionally towards independence and intellectually towards a level of personal power necessary for them to fulfill their dreams.

When we talk to our kids about sexuality, we rarely talk to them about the terrible danger teen pregnancy poses to their growth and development, their ability to parent, their ability to provide for their child in the way they would want to. We rarely talk to them about the sheer lunacy of teen sex because of the devastating impact it can have on their lives. For young girls,