

We want both the House and the Senate on record as favoring this simple, first-amendment friendly, parent-friendly, child-friendly solution to this ongoing problem.

You will hear arguments from some that this technological way of dealing with the problem of TV violence is akin to "Big Brother." It's exactly the opposite. It's more like "Big Mother" and "Big Father." Parents take control.

And we know this technology works. In this country, the Electronics Industries Association has already developed standards for it. In Canada, a test in homes in Edmonton proved that it works and works well.

This is not a panacea. It will take some time for enough new sets to be purchased to have an impact on the Nielsen ratings and, therefore, an impact on advertisers. But its introduction in the cable world through set-top boxes is likely to be much more rapid. The cable industry has said that it is prepared to move forward with a V-chip approach as long as broadcasters move forward as well.

And the Electronic Industries Association has already agreed to introduce the technology into sets that would allow up to four levels of violence or sexual material to be rated.

Only the broadcasters have remained adamant in their opposition. They are opposed because the V-chip will work so well, not because it won't work. It will take only a small number of parents in key demographic groups using the V-chip to test the willingness of advertisers to support violent programming.

Parents will have the capacity to customize their own sets—to create their own private safe harbor—to protect their own children as they see fit.

I urge my colleagues to support this important initiative.

ELIMINATION OF THE INDIAN ARTS AND CRAFTS BOARD

HON. TIM JOHNSON

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 13, 1995

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the elimination of funds for the Indian Arts and Crafts Board at the Bureau of Indian Affairs. The Board is the primary Federal advocate for American Indian and Alaska Native art and its interconnected economic, cultural, social, and spiritual purposes. I feel strongly that the activities of the Board are in large part responsible for the explosion of interest in contemporary Native American arts and crafts in recent years, laying the ground work for long-term economic benefits to Indian tribes.

The Board is the only Federal program concerned with increasing the economic benefits of American Indian creative work. According to a 1985 Congressionally-mandated Commerce Department study, annual sales of Indian handicrafts and other artwork are over \$1 billion. Many producers reside on their own reservations, however American Indians and tribes control only a small portion of this market. The Board engages in a variety of promotional efforts to change that. For example, the Board's source directory publication is the primary means of establishing direct contact between consumers and Indian producers at

an annualized cost of \$50,000—this publication will end with the termination of the Board.

Federal expenditures for social programs continue to exceed investments for economic growth in Indian country. I feel strongly that the role of the Federal Government must be to encourage tribal self-sufficiency at every opportunity and to prioritize programs which enhance economic growth for tribal communities. Without the Board, the Federal Government will no longer have the capacity to provide economic development assistance for Indian art to the 554 federally-recognized tribes and their thousands of artists and crafts people.

Additionally, the Board has been charged by the Congress with developing regulations and administering, on an ongoing basis, the Indian Arts and Crafts Act of 1990 (Public Law 101-6440), which provides specific legal protection for Indian art producers. This congressional charge of responsibility reflects the unique expertise of the Board relative to marketing Indian arts and crafts. Abolishing the Board will deprive the Secretary of the Interior of the expertise necessary to fulfill this congressional mandate.

The Board maintains outstanding collections of contemporary and historic American Indian and Alaska Native art (23,000 objects), which are a multi-million dollar promotional asset and include over 50 percent of the artwork managed by the Department of the Interior nationwide. The Board's collection's will require continued management and protection and should not be hastily dispersed, as they include objects that some tribes consider sacred, as well as objects of cultural patrimony under the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (Public Law 101-601). Although the board's collections are well cared for, management of museum property in general is currently identified as one of the most critical department material weaknesses under the Federal Financial Manager's Integrity Act. Abolishing the Board will add to, not diminish, this departmental material weakness.

Mr. Speaker, two thirds of these collections are located at the three Indian museums operated by the Board in reservation areas in Montana, Oklahoma, and my State of South Dakota. They are major economic, cultural and educational attractions in their regions. In Browning, MT, annual attendance at the Museum of the Plains Indians averages over 78,000. Annual attendance at the Southern Plains Indian Museum in Anadarko, OK, and the Sioux Indian Museum in Rapid City, SD, averages over 41,000. For \$600,000 per year, the Board maintains its collections and operates these three museums with contemporary exhibitions and sales of the work of emerging Indian artists. These museums, and the museum sales shops operated by local Indian organizations, will close their doors if funding for the Indian Arts and Crafts board is eliminated.

Closing the Sioux Indian Museum in South Dakota will have an especially adverse effect, as the city of Rapid City has just voted \$11,000,000 of local tax funds to build an innovative new museum facility which will include the Board's Sioux Indian Museum collection at no additional cost to the Federal Government. It would have a projected operating deficit of \$169,000 without the Board's continued financial participation in maintaining the Board's own collection. That level of operating deficit will undermine Rapid City's plans to raise \$1.6 million in additional capital from

private foundations required to complete the project, which is expected to attract at least 182,000 annual visitors and to generate a direct spending impact of \$3.6 million annually on the regional economy.

There are nine federally recognized tribes in South Dakota, whose members collectively make up one of the largest native American populations in any State. At the same time, South Dakota has 3 of the 10 poorest counties in the Nation, all of which are within reservation boundaries. While the elimination of the Board would be a direct blow to the encouragement and development of native American arts and crafts in South Dakota as a sound source for economic growth, I believe the repercussions of the board's termination will be felt nationwide.

THE B-2: A PERFECT WEAPON FOR THE POST-COLD WAR WORLD

HON. JANE HARMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 13, 1995

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues an article by Charles Krauthammer that appeared in today's edition of the Washington Post.

I believe that Mr. Krauthammer presents cogent and powerful arguments for continued production of B-2 bombers. He points out that only the B-2, with its long range, can deploy from secure U.S. bases on short notice and is invulnerable to enemy counterattack. It is the kind of weapon the United States needs for the post-cold war world.

I recommend Mr. Krauthammer's article to my colleagues:

[From the Washington Post, July 13, 1995]

THE B-2 AND THE "CHEAP HAWKS"

(By Charles Krauthammer)

We hear endless blather about how new and complicated the post-Cold War world is. Hence the endless confusion about what weapons to build, forces to deploy, contingency to anticipate. But there are three simple, glaringly obvious facts about this new era:

(1) America is coming home. The day of the overseas base is over. In 1960, the United States had 90 major Air Force bases overseas. Today, we have 17. Decolonization is one reason. Newly emerging countries like the Philippines do not want the kind of Big Brother domination that comes with facilities like Clark Air Base and Subic Bay. The other reason has to do with us: With the Soviets gone, we do not want the huge expense of maintaining a far-flung, global military establishment.

(2) America cannot endure casualties. It is inconceivable that the United States, or any other Western country, could ever again fight a war of attrition like Korea or Vietnam. One reason is the CNN effect. TV brings home the reality of battle with a graphic immediacy unprecedented in human history. The other reason, as strategist Edward Luttwak has pointed out, is demographic: Advanced industrial countries have very small families, and small families are less willing than the large families of the past to risk their only children in combat.

(3) America's next war will be a surprise. Nothing new here. Our last one was too. Who expected Saddam to invade Kuwait? And even after he did, who really expected the

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 counter-attack 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 Cas-

tro'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.