United States to send a half-million man expeditionary force to roll him back? Then again, who predicted Pearl Harbor, the invasion of South Korea, the Falklands War?

What kind of weapon, then, is needed by a country that is losing its foreign bases, is allergic to casualties and will have little time to mobilize for tomorrow's unexpected provocation?

Answer: A weapon that can be deployed at very long distances from secure American bases, is invulnerable to enemy counterattack and is deployable instantly. You would want, in other words, the B–2 stealth bomber.

We have it. Yet, amazingly, Congress may be on the verge of killing it. After more than $20 billion in development costs—costs irrecoverable whether we build another B–2 or not—the B–2 is facing a series of crucial votes in Congress that could dismantle its assembly lines once and for all.

The B–2 is not a partisan project. Its development was begun under Jimmy Carter. And, as an urgent letter to President Clinton makes clear, it is today supported by seven secretaries of defense representing every administration going back to 1969.

They support it because it is the perfect weapon for the post-Cold War world. It has a range of about 7,000 miles. It can be launched instantly—no need to beg foreign dictators for base rights; no need for weeks of advance warning, mobilization and forward deployment of troops. And because it is invisible to enemy detection, its two pilots are virtually invulnerable.

This is especially important in view of the B–2's very high cost, perhaps three-quarters to a billion dollars a copy. The cost is, of course, what has turned swing Republican votes—the so-called ''cheap hawks''—against the B–2.

But the dollar cost of a weapon is too narrow a calculation of its utility. The more important calculation is cost in American lives. The reasons are not sentimental but practical. Weapons cheap in dollars but costly in lives are, in the current and coming environment, literally useless: We will not use them. A country that so values the life of every Capt. O'Grady is a country that cannot keep blindly relying on non-stealthy aircraft over enemy territory.

Stealth planes are not just invulnerable themselves. Because they do not need escort, they spare the lives of the pilots and the fighters and radar suppression planes that ordinarily accompany bombers. Moreover, if the B–2 is killed, we are stuck with our fleet of B–52s of 1950's origin. According to the undersecretary of defense for acquisition, the Clinton administration assumes the United States will rely on B–52s until the year 2030—when they will be 65 years old!

In the Persian Gulf War, the stealthy F–117 fighter flew only 2 percent of the missions but hit 40 percent of the targets. It was, in effect, about 30 times as productive as non-stealthy planes. The F–117, however, has a short range and thus must be deployed from forward bases. The B–2 can take off from home. Moreover, the B–2 carries about eight times the payload of the F–117. Which means that one B–2 can strike, without escort and with impunity, as many targets as vast fleets of conventional aircraft. Factor in these costs, and the B–2 becomes cost-effective even in dollar terms.

The final truth of the post-Cold War world is that someday someone is going to attack some safe haven we feel compelled to defend, or invade a country whose security is important to us, or build an underground nuclear bomb factory that threatens to kill millions of Americans. We are going to want a way to attack instantly, massively and invisibly. We have the weapon to do it, a weapon that no one else has and that no one can stop. Except a ''cheap hawk,'' shortsighted Republican Congress.

HONORING BON VIEW ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

HON. JAY KIM

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 13, 1995

Mr. KIM. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to rise today and pay tribute to a wonderful accomplishment that occurred on Saturday July 8, 1995—the grand reopening of Bon View Elementary School in Ontario, CA.

Several years ago, parents, school staff members, and concerned neighbors alerted me to problems surrounding the existing Bon View Elementary School. The school was in a neighborhood that had gone from a rural neighborhood to one in an urbanized setting. The changing environment encroached on the campus with low-flying planes, industrial traffic, city yards and the inherent problems of being completely surrounded by industrial facilities. This was not a good environment for our students to learn in.

The need for a new or relocated school was apparent. Working together with a design team of two teachers, parents, classified staff, maintenance staff, the board of trustees for the Ontario-Montclair School District, the school superintendent, school principal and the architect, a school was put together that truly meets the needs of quality education. This $7.5 million facility was designed for a team approach to both curriculum and management, with the year-round schedule in mind. With funding from Asset Management, $1.5 million from the FAA and Department of Airports, State matching funds, and a generous $2.1 million gift from the city of Ontario, the dream of a new, state of the art school was realized.

The new Bon View Elementary School is truly a school for the entire community, and it is indeed a day for celebration.

A TRIBUTE TO THE VICTIMS OF ''13TH OF MARCH'' TUGBOAT

HON. ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 13, 1995

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, today marks the first anniversary of the indiscriminate murder by the Castro regime, of over 40 Cuban citizens, mostly women and children, while they were attempting to escape the island aboard the *13th of March* tugboat. We do not forget the love of freedom which these Cuban nationals represented nor the risks they took to obtain that freedom.

Today, hundreds of Cuban exiles sail toward those same waters where the massacre occurred in order to pay tribute in a solemn ceremony to those who perished on that day and to the thousands of Cubans who struggle daily against Castro's repressive apparatus.

On this tragic anniversary, the White House and the State Department have acted as Castro's spokesman and have warned the flotilla participants that if attacked by Castro authorities, expect no help from their own national government. So it is that the saga continues in the Clinton administration's drive to coddle up to dictator's from Cuba to Vietnam while setting aside the aspirations of freedom of millions of citizens from around the world.

On this day, let us remember that while in the United States we are blessed with countless freedoms, only 90 miles from our shores, in Cuba, life is marked by repression, persecution, and misery. Let us remember those who have perished and continue to suffer under the hand of Cuba's tyrant.

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

SPEECH OF

HON. WILLIAM P. LUTHER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 11, 1995

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1905) making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes:

Mr. LUTHER. Mr. Chairman, I wish to express my concerns regarding the future status of funding for the National Ignition Facility [NIF] included in the fiscal year 1996 House Energy and Water Appropriations measure.

I applaud the Appropriations Committee's decision to defer money for construction on this project. However, I am concerned that the full Appropriations Committee added $10 million to the bipartisan subcommittee funding proposal for the NIF.

My major concern with the NIF is the stark reality of budgetary demands in future years, particularly with respect to the construction funds necessary of completion of the NIF. Current estimates of completion of the NIF, after design and construction, place the cost at more than $1 billion and perhaps as much as $1.5 billion.

At a time when Federal budget realities require hard, difficult choices, the NIF project will require an obligation of an ever-increasing amount of funds from an invariably shrinking funding source.

Therefore, in order to protect higher priorities, particularly basic science research projects, serious questions need to be raised in the coming months about future plans involving future funding for NIF design and construction.

There are some who argue that we need the NIF in order to keep our stockpile of nuclear weapons safe. The NIF is, in fact, the most expensive of many components that make-up DOE's stockpile stewardship program. Yet, according to most experts, the NIF's contribution to stockpile safety is nominal.

Given our current budget situation, and the recommended levels of funding for energy research in the recently passed budget conference report, we cannot afford to fully construct the NIF.

While I understand the compromise position of the full Appropriations Committee, Mr.