

But one of the other areas that I thought needed special attention is the issue dealing with the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. This area is a very important area. Obviously in trying to achieve a balanced budget, a fiscal budget, we also need to maintain an environmental balance.

I think what has been lost in the enthusiasm and the controversy that surrounds many of the policies with the environment has really been a lack of understanding and a recognition of what the consequence of many of these actions are.

It is as if, Mr. Speaker, that we have moved back to the 19th century era of the robber barons and we are trying to put into place policies that maybe were right, and I do not even think they were right in the 19th century, in the latter part of the 20th century.

The Arctic Plain, the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, really represents an area that is a window on the Ice Age. Since the retreat of the great Ice Age, this area has been the home of the caribou calving ground of 160,000 herd caribou, the porcupine caribou herd today.

What is being proposed here is to take it out of that protected status that it has enjoyed, to permit it to be open to oil and gas exploration.

In order to understand the impact of this, this is not just any piece of land. It really is an arctic desert. It is an area that has very little water on it. The vegetative mat is about as deep as the podium that I am standing in front of today speaking and it has taken 20,000 years of accumulated growth for that organic mat to form over the polar ice area.

Of course, while the oil development and gas development may not occupy much of the surface, it would in essence, of course, have a profound impact on this 1.5 million-acre area. Incidentally, it is the only part of the arctic plain on the Beaufort Sea that is in fact not open to development today, and that is the irony, because there are so many areas of Alaska, so many areas of that plain that are already open to oil development. And so just feeding this, or letting the speculators bid on it, would not deliver us a great change in terms of our deficit but it would I think destroy forever a pristine area and create an environmental deficit.

As my colleagues tonight are noting, the Republican budget reconciliation bill decimates programs for people such as Medicaid and Medicare and replaces them with a new type of welfare—aid to dependent industries and special interests. This is especially evident where environment issues are concerned. Over and over again, the interests of the mining, timber, oil, and gas industries take precedence over public health and the rights of future generations to inherit a healthy planet are adversely affected by the provisions of the Republican reconciliation measure especially as it impacts the environment.

I'll make just a few points to illustrate my point. First, the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge is destroyed.

The bill permits oil and gas exploration supposedly to secure \$1.3 billion in Federal revenue and in my view the Treasury will never receive that much because the economic assumptions are faulty and the bill assumes a 50–50 split between the Federal Government and Alaska, even though Alaska can and probably will sue for 90 percent under the Alaska Statehood Act.

The best the Nation would get is enough oil to fuel the America's energy needs for 200 days—That's the most optimistic forecast. But most importantly the unique and fragile Arctic ecosystem would be destroyed. ANWR is home to more than 200 species of conspicuous and many more inconspicuous species of fauna and flora. The porcupine caribou herd uses the northern coastal plain for calving and post-calving activities. It is the biological heart of this arctic wilderness. The Native American Gwich'in people who rely on the caribou for subsistence would of course be adversely affected. Public opinion opposes oil drilling in ANWR in fact 70 percent favor the preservation of this area. Furthermore, this new policy of using asset sales for deficit reduction sets a bad precedent. The loss of resources offsets potential gains in terms of dollars.

Second the mining provisions of this measure enshrine the rights of speculators in law at the expense of the U.S. taxpayer. The mining law of 1872 permits mining companies to acquire public land and mineral rights for a fraction of their value, this so-called reform remains blind to the mineral value of the land. The mining industry now buys mineral rich land for as little as \$5 per acre. And we should not be blackmailed in the reform process to give away the minerals to the mining interests. Within the past week, the Secretary of the Interior was forced to turn over 3 billion dollars' worth of copper and silver for under \$2,000 because of the 1872 Mining law.

Meaningful reform of this budget-busting 19th century mining law is needed today. The Republican budget fails to provide real reform. Federal mineral rights will be sold at their market value, which means the value of the surface land, not the minerals underneath. This would be like selling Fort Knox for the price of the parking lot and building. The American taxpayers are getting ripped off again under the Rubric of reform—some reform; Republican reform.

Third, other provisions in the Republican budget continue the special interest benefit under a mantra of budget balancing such as Park concessions change that gives incumbent concessionaires huge advantages over the competition. Grazing provisions that further reduce the already scandalously low fees paid by ranchers. Continuation of below cost timber sales—as the taxpayer pays the cost and loses in American legacy and congressional mandates the transfer of a Ward Valley, CA site for a low level radioactive waste dump with no public or scientific safeguards.

In conclusion, this budget bill regards land and conservation policy will revive the era of the great robber barons, who exploited and degraded America's natural resources during the nineteenth century and into the 20th century. Isn't it time to correct such policy for the 21st century. This Republican budget bill would destroy natural monuments like ANWR and in essence build new monuments to greed and the special interests. This budget bill fails in terms of politics and public opinion, science, economics, and morality.

President Clinton was right to veto this budget reconciliation ("wreckonciliation") bill—we owe it to future generations to protect their rightful legacy and uphold this veto and more importantly balance the budget without creating a massive environmental deficit or a human deficit.

IN MEMORY OF GENERAL MAX THURMAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYWORTH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I rise this afternoon to remember the life and the contributions of a great American. Gen. Max Thurman had his final battle with leukemia end 1 week ago. His remains were laid to rest earlier today at Arlington National Cemetery.

During almost four decades of military service, Max Thurman found his duty offered him diverse challenges, from Vietnam, the U.S. Army Recruiting Command, ultimately to commander of our forces during Operation Just Cause in Panama, an operation for which he delayed his retirement from military service.

His devotion to duty was so intense that he earned several nicknames during the course of his military career. Indeed, one of those nicknames, I suppose, speaks volumes to those who served under his command, for they came to call him Maxatollah. But that devotion to duty, that intensity, that ability that Max Thurman brought to the U.S. Army served that fighting force well in a massive transition from a conscripted army to a volunteer force.

Max Thurman faced a challenge not only on the field of battle but among those who would make their livings trying to influence Americans on Madison Avenue, for it was Max Thurman who worked just as tirelessly in his recruiting command to fashion a message to young Americans, to reshape and rethink and rearticulate a call to duty. It was Max Thurman who worked with those from the civilian world to encapsulate a phrase that spoke not only to the promise of youth, not only to the promise of this great country, but to the promise of service in the U.S. Army, for it was Max Thurman who helped to coin the phrase "Be all that you can be."

Indeed, his reputation won him a certain celebrity. The story goes that once upon a time, in the airport, I believe, in Chicago, a lady approached him and simply said, "General, are you the 'Be all you can be' man?"

And Max said, yes, he was that man.

But he was far more. Those privileged to serve with him, both on the field of battle and in other commands, talk of his reputation, of his intensity, of his dedication to service, of that commanding voice but, yes, also that distinctive walk that would reverberate in the Marshall Corridor in the Pentagon, as if this were a man born to command.

My personal recollections are different, for I did not know the Maxatollah, not in that sense. My father grew up with Max in the southern town of High Point, NC, and Max Thurman preceded me to North Carolina State University where he earned his degree in chemical engineering.

The Max Thurman I knew was a kind, decent and yes, dare I say gentle man, one always willing to stop and answer questions in a kindly fashion.

Yes, we heard his command voice in Panama, in Operation Just Cause, and yes, we mourn his passing and pass along our condolences to his brother, Lt. Gen. Roy Thurman, now retired, and to all those who served with him.

But it is safe to say that Max Thurman lived up to the slogan "Be all that you can be" because he was all he possibly could have been.

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY SPENDING PRACTICES QUESTIONED

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

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Speaker, I think that you are well aware that I have come to the well on a number of occasions to address the House regarding my concerns about Government waste in general and how to root it out and eliminate it. But in particular I have focused attention on the Department of Energy and the extravagant travel practices of certain members of the Department, and the relationship of that travel to the transfer of money from certain accounts into other accounts as it relates to the overall mission of the Department of Energy.

In that context, I had occasion to get a telephone call from the Secretary of Energy some 3 or 4 weeks ago, asking to meet with me and to explain certain things, which I did. It was my impression, both from that conversation as well as from other developments that had occurred in the press, that perhaps a new leaf had been turned over in the Department of Energy, that the kind of profligate waste and abuse of travel moneys and of traveling and just a general sort of complete uncaring attitude toward the taxpayers' money had been overcome, and that really we had done some good work perhaps just by bringing attention to it in this House.

But it is my very sad duty today to report to you and to this House that I have had come across my desk a cable that was addressed to the State Department from U.S. Ambassador John B. Ritch. He is the U.S. Chief of Mission to the United Nations in Vienna. It criticizes in very stark terms the ongoing waste of taxpayer dollars on travel by the Department of Energy, specifically the U.S. delegation to the International Atomic Energy Agency conference in Vienna this past September.

□ 1615

I want to read to you from the cable. It says, "Subject: Nonproliferation of delegates as well as weapons."

The size of the United States delegation to this year's IAEA general conference exceeded thermonuclear critical mass and threatened to vaporize our message of fiscal austerity to the United Nations. At least 38 Washington visitors, of whom only 19 were accredited to the conference, came to Vienna to participate in the 39th general conference in September. At a rate of \$188 per day for 8 days, per diem alone approached \$60,000. With an average air fare of \$900, air fare for the delegation came to \$35,000, bringing the total close to \$100,000. This figure does not include the visitors' salaries, nor does it cover the full cost of the United States delegation, which also included most of the already in-place staff. Counting the U.N. Vienna, our delegation came to about 50.

Ironically, the United States delegation spent much of the week fighting a proposal that would have increased our annual contribution to the technical assistance fund by \$125,000, roughly the same amount that it took to bring our visitors to Vienna. Predictably, most of the work to defend the United States position actually ended up being done by a few experts from Washington and U.N. VIE.

Let me remind you again, Mr. Speaker, this is written by our U.S. ambassador to the U.N. delegation in Vienna. This is an ambassador who is an appointee of President Clinton.

In the context of today's budget climate and Administration efforts to reinvent a more cost-effective government, this year's delegation represented a profligate cost. But, as indicated above, it was also an embarrassment. Several of our G-77 and other counterparts wondered aloud how our professed budgetary austerity squared with extravagant United States Government travel habits. By way of comparison, most other delegations, even from larger countries, included only one or two visitors from capitals. It is also true that a traveling Cabinet officer needs some accompanying support. But these points do not serve to justify more than three dozen visitors from Washington, particularly since the general conference is, in certain respects, one of the least substantive events on the IAEA calendar. We want to be clear on this point: U.N. VIE encourages substantive visits, but for substance, Washington officials should glean far more from a well-scheduled one-to-two-day visit during the normal IAEA work cycle.

The Ambassador said the size of the U.S. delegation to IAEA conference this past September threatened to vaporize our message of fiscal austerity for the United Nations.

Now, what brings me to the floor, besides wanting to bring to your attention, Mr. Speaker, this, I think, important piece of information, what really brings me to the floor is that lost in all of the liberal rhetoric that we hear around here about massive budget cuts, about heartless and cold treatment, about callousness, is the fact that the Federal Government continues to waste billions and billions of dollars annually. It is precisely this type of waste and abuse that Americans want stopped.

This disclosure that comes on the heels of President Clinton's veto of the very first balanced budget to cross his

desk ever, and the first balanced budget to come across any President's desk in 26 years, raises questions certainly about this administration's commitment to controlling Federal spending. The President is talking about reinventing Government. If this is the kind of Government that he has reinvented, if this is what he wants in terms of reinvention, then, doggone it, Mr. Speaker, we are getting nowhere on this.

I will wrap up by saying this: The President's veto of the budget package while he has this kind of profligate spending going on in his own agencies clearly shows the lie of what is going on at the political levels in this government.

Mr. Speaker, I am including for the RECORD the message just referenced, as follows:

IMMEDIATE—UNCLASSIFIED—DSSCS
MESSAGE—11758 CHARACTERS
VZCZCMSS4272
ACTION=DOE
CMS(-),EIA(-),NN42(-),PO(-) OIN
IDD(-)
INFO=
DATEZYUW RUEHVEN3288 3191559-
EEEE=RHEBDOE.
ZNY EEEEE ZZH
EZ02:
O J51559Z NOV 95
FM USMISSION USVIENNA
TO RUEHC/SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 1929
RUEHMT/AMCONSUL MONTREAL 0020
RUEHRO/AMEMBASSY ROME 1147
RUEHFR/AMEMBASSY PARIS 2122
RUEHGV/USMISSION GENEVA 3037
RUCNDT/USMISSION USUN NEW YORK 1126
RUEHBS/USEU BRUSSELS
BT
UNCLAS E F T O SECTION 01 OF 02
USVIENNA 003288
**** SECTION BREAK ****
SECTION 01 OF 02
DEPT FOR PM—AMBASSADOR
SIEVERING;
FROM USMISSION UNVIE
SENSITIVE
NOFORN
E.O. 12958: N/A
TAGS: IAEA, AORC, AFIN, US
SUBJECT: NON-PROLIFERATION OF DELEGATES AS WELL AS WEAPONS
EZ05:
REF: USVIENNA 2856

1. This is an action request, see para 8.

SUMMARY

2. The size of the U.S. delegation to this year's IAEA general conference (REFTEL) exceeded thermonuclear critical mass and threatened to vaporize our message of fiscal austerity to the UN. Against the twin backdrops of UN reform and reinventing government, UNVIE recommends that the Department issue strict guidance to limit the size of U.S. delegations to international conferences. As to the severity of the problem and how it might best be rectified, we are interested in the observations of other relevant U.S. missions. Ambassador would welcome a clear-cut instruction to administer the country clearance authority against a new and stricter standard. End summary.

COUNTING THE BEANS

3. At least 38 Washington visitors (of whom only 19 were accredited to the conference) came to Vienna to participate in the 39th IAEA general conference in September. At a