

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 DEL-
EGATES 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

rate of \$188 per day for 8 days, per diem alone approached \$60,000. With an average airfare (Delta roundtrip Washington-Vienna-Washington) of \$900, airfare 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 U.S. delegation, which also included most of the already-in-place UNVIE staff. Counting UNVIE, our delegation came to about 50.

4. Ironically, the U.S. 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 it took to bring our visitors to Vienna. (Predictably, most of the work to defend the U.S. position ended up being done by a few experts from Washington and UNVIE.)

GO FORTH AND REDUCE

5. 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 USG travel habits. By way of comparison, most other delegations, even from larger countries, included only one or two visitors from capitals. (The only delegation even comparable to ours was the Japanese, which totalled 20, including Vienna-based personnel; Japan was shielded from comment, however, by an impeccable UN payment record.)

6. To be sure, some U.S. delegation members came to do work not directly related to the general conference, taking advantage of the presence of counterparts here—for example, for an NPT depositaries meeting and consultations on nuclear materials. 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 in the IAEA calendar. We want to be clear on this point: UNVIE encourages substantive visits, but for substance, Washington officials would glean far more from a well-scheduled 1-2 day visit during the normal IAEA work cycle.

ACTION REQUEST

UNCLAS E F T O SECTION 02 OF 02
USVIENNA 003288
DEPT FOR PM—AMBASSADOR
SIEVERING;
FROM USMISSION UNVIE
NOFORN SENSITIVE
E.O. 12958: N/A
TAGS: IAEA, AORC, AFIN, US
SUBJECT: NON-PROLIFERATION OF DEL-
EGATES AS WELL AS WEAPONS

7. Ambassador requests that the Department draw up standards or guidelines which IO and relevant missions can use to limit significantly the size of U.S. delegations to international conferences. For its part, UNVIE—having beefed up its IAEA section to reflect U.S. national security priorities—is now positioned not only to cover the daily work of the Agency but also to handle, with very limited augmentation from Washington, the board of governors meetings and general conferences. Buttressed by instructions, we are prepared to use the country clearance process to help manage cost-effective USG participation in Vienna conferences. Ritch

BT
#3288
2482
NNNN.

Amb. JOHN B. RITCH,
Chief of Mission.

THE QUESTION OF THE BALANCED
BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. METCALF). Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. ABERCROMBIE] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, as you know, I have been coming to the floor in past days to discuss this whole question of the balanced budget. The previous speaker mentioned it again. It comes up on this floor with a regulatory that I think lets it amount almost to the point of prayerful incantation, Mr. Speaker. We hear over and over again phrases, like "This is for my children and my grandchildren." "We must have a balanced budget in order to give them an opportunity." "We have to have a balanced budget in 7 years."

Mr. Speaker, I will say yet again, and say for the record, that there is no proposal from the Republican majority to balance the budget in 7 years. There is no such thing as a balanced budget. On the contrary, what is happening is a proposal that is now before the President and the negotiators that is now before the President and the negotiators from the White House from the Republican majority which mortgages the Social Security trust fund to the tune of some \$636 billion, at least as of last January, and the conference report of the Republican majority in the House of Representatives, that does not include the interest.

The facts are, then, that we will be paying somewhere in excess of \$1 trillion. I take that back, Mr. Speaker. I do not know if we will be paying it. We will certainly owe it. But I have not seen any plan whatsoever or language in the budget proposal which indicates how we are going to pay the \$1 trillion back.

For those who maybe have tuned in to our proceedings here and have been kind enough to contact me and ask for a little more detail and for those who may not know, of our colleagues, about this proposition that I am putting forward that there is no balanced budget, may not have heard it, let me reiterate where I get this proposition, Mr. Speaker.

Let me indicate to you that I have in my hand a copy of the concurrent resolution of the budget for fiscal year 1996. This was printed on June 26, 1995, and this comes from your Committee on the Budget. This is, in fact, the official conference report.

On page 3 of the conference report, Mr. Speaker, it lists the deficits, and I am quoting now from the document, "For purposes of enforcement of this resolution, the amounts of the deficits are as follows:" The fiscal years 1996 through 2002 then follow: In the first year, the deficit is \$245,600,000,000. Deficits accrue each succeeding year until you reach the year 2002, the 7th year of this proposed balanced budget, in which the deficit amount is listed as \$108,400,000,000.

If we are talking about reducing deficits, that is one thing. President Clinton's budget did that. We reduced the deficit. We reduced the absolute number of the deficit, and the rate of the deficit has been going down and will have gone down for 3 years, something which I believe the record shows, Mr. Speaker, has not been done since Mr. Truman's administration in the late 1940's.

So I repeat, the budget document itself, so we know the premise that I am operating from, indicates that we will have deficits, deficits starting in the \$245 billion range this year and continuing on through to the year 2002, when supposedly we have a balanced budget.

Let me indicate what the public debt is. The public debt, and these are not my figures, Mr. Speaker, this is what is printed in the record of the conference report of the Republican majority here, the public debt is as follows: The appropriate levels of public debt are for the fiscal year 1996, \$5,210,700,000,000, \$5.2 trillion; in the year 2002, 7 years from now, when we supposedly have balanced the budget, the number has gone to \$6,688,600,000,000, almost \$6.7 trillion from \$5.2 trillion. I do not think it takes any great mathematician to realize that the public debt will have risen during the time we are supposedly balancing the budget by more than \$1 trillion.

Going on, again, quoting from the budget document itself, not figures I made up, section 103, Social Security, "social security revenues." Now I think anybody that is observing our proceedings today or listening in to our proceedings, they know what they mean by a balanced budget. It is how much of the revenues you have, how much money comes in and what your outlay is, how much money comes in and what your outlay is, how much money goes out, and at the end of the year or at the end of a period of years, if you say you are going to balance the budget, that is what we mean by it, how much came in, how much went out.

Well, I have just read to you that there is a deficit. Obviously, we are spending more money than we are taking in. Where are we going to get the money? "Social security revenues, for purposes of this section, the Congressional Budget Act, the amount of revenues of the Federal Old Age and Survivors' Insurance trust fund and disability insurance trust fund are as follows: Social security revenues," Mr. Speaker, "fiscal year 1996, \$374,700,000,000," almost \$375 billion, and again other amounts accruing each year from 1997 on through the 7-year period to the year 2002.

How much do we get in revenues in 2002? \$498,600,000,000. Now, where that money comes from, Mr. Speaker, is from your paycheck and mine and from paychecks all across the country, under the so-called FICA position on your paychecks, FICA. That is your