

to tell you about a church that has been part of its community for an entire century. Memorial Baptist, and many other small churches like it, have been quietly going about their work of teaching and strengthening families and communities so long that we hardly realize, until we stop and think about it, to what great extent they form the backbone of our country. A 100-year anniversary gives us this opportunity.

Memorial Baptist Church has been a source of strength to its members and neighbors through many hard times. The church has provided spiritual support through two World Wars, the Great Depression, two more wars, times of social upheaval that tore many communities apart across our country, and the family struggles that come with many years of high unemployment. Dilltown is a very small, close-knit rural community located in southwestern Pennsylvania, a region hard-hit economically by the downsizing of the steel industry some years ago. Were it not for the good works of the small community churches like Memorial Baptist, many families might have been torn apart—many people might have lost their faith and their hope.

But the Memorial Baptist Church has continued on, continued to be there to serve the people of Dilltown, and for that, we should all be humbly grateful.

So again, I congratulate the pastor and members of Memorial Baptist Church on its 100th anniversary of service to God and community. Keep up the good work, and may you be there for 1,000 more years.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JOHN N. HOSTETTLER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 1, 1997

Mr. HOSTETTLER. Mr. Speaker, I inadvertently missed rollcall vote No. 458 on September 26, 1997. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes" on the Bartlett amendment to strike funding for payments for U.N. international organization arrearages and U.N. international peacekeeping arrearages.

TRIBUTE TO THEODORE W. CHERRY

HON. MICHAEL PAPPAS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 1, 1997

Mr. PAPPAS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a man whose years of service to South Brunswick, NJ, has made him an icon of the community. Ted Cherry, a former mayor and committeeman of South Brunswick Township was recently honored during a regular meeting of the township committee.

State representatives and members of the committee joined together in honoring Mr. Cherry, South Brunswick's first African-American mayor. Mr. Cherry, the town's mayor in 1979, 1980, and 1982, received a standing ovation while being honored with a resolution passed by both houses of the New Jersey State Legislature. The State honored Mr. Cherry for exemplifying the "true meaning of selfless public service."

Mr. Speaker, Ted Cherry's years of unselfish, dedication to the people of South Brunswick is an example of strong, objective leadership in public service.

"We are here tonight to say we admire you and we feel indebted to you," said State Senator Peter Inverso. This was only one of many kind words that were said about Mr. Cherry. Ted Cherry is an inspiration to us all by the fair and personable way he conducted himself during his tenure as a public official.

As a former local official, I am well aware of the countless hours of hard work that all local officials endure for their fellow residents. I am pleased to join with my fellow elected officials in New Jersey in recognizing the efforts of Ted Cherry.

EQUITY FOR IMMIGRANTS ACT

HON. ELIZABETH FURSE

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 1, 1997

Ms. FURSE. Mr. Speaker, the legislation I am introducing today, the Equity for Immigrants Act, will pay to restore benefits to legal immigrants by cutting corporate subsidies the Federal Government provides to arms merchants for sale of weapons systems to other countries. I am very pleased that 15 other Members are joining me as original cosponsors.

When the welfare reform bill was passed in the summer of last year, I pledged to restore benefits that were denied to legal immigrants. Before then, legal immigrants were eligible for a wide variety of public assistance. I am a legal immigrant and I felt it was extremely unfair to place nearly half the burden of welfare reform squarely on the backs of taxpaying legal immigrants.

Federal spending is all about choices. Earlier this year, this House easily added \$27 billion for B-2 bombers that no one wanted. We can provide benefits for legal immigrants who play by the rules, pay taxes, and carry the same responsibilities as citizens.

The Balanced Budget Act that became law in August restored over half of the benefits that had been denied to legal immigrants. My legislation, the Equity for Immigrants Act, restores the remainder of those benefits at a cost of \$9.5 billion over 5 years and pays for them by eliminating \$9.5 billion in wasteful subsidies provided to U.S. defense contractors.***HD***welfare reform bills

Last year's welfare reform bill established comprehensive new restrictions on the eligibility of legal immigrants for means-tested public assistance. The savings derived from denying benefits to legal immigrants were estimated at \$21 billion over 5 years, accounting for nearly half the savings in the entire welfare reform bill.

The welfare reform bill denied Supplemental Security Income [SSI] and food stamps to most legal immigrants. In addition, it gave States the option of providing Temporary Assistance for Needy Families [TANF] and Medicaid to legal immigrants. It also barred most legal immigrants arriving after August 22 of last year from receiving Federal means-tested public benefits—TANF, food stamps, Medicaid, and SSI—for 5 years after arrival.***HD***balanced budget act

The Balanced Budget Act was signed into law August 5, 1997. It restored SSI and Medicaid benefits for legal immigrants who were here before August 22, 1996. It allowed SSI for those who were here on that date who later become disabled. The Balanced Budget Act also extends the exemption from SSI and Medicaid restrictions for refugees from 5 years to 7 years after entry.

The Balanced Budget Act provided \$11.5 billion in restored benefits for legal immigrants for the period 1998–2002.

BENEFITS RESTORATION TITLE

Title I of my bill restores legal immigrants' eligibility for benefits by repealing title IV of the welfare reform bill. Title IV was the part of last year's welfare bill which eliminated legal immigrants' eligibility for benefits.

The cost over 5 years of restoring those benefits that were not included in the Balanced Budget Act is \$9.5 billion.

Repealing the remainder of title IV as my bill does would accomplish the following:

Food stamp benefits would be restored for legal immigrants who were here August 22, 1996 as well as for future immigrants.

SSI and Medicaid would be provided to all future immigrants regardless of date of entry.

Repealing title IV would also eliminate the State option for providing TANF and Medicaid to legal immigrants. This has a potential magnet effect with differing benefits among States.

Repealing title IV would also eliminate the 5-year bar on assistance for new arrivals before they can receive Federal means-tested public benefits.

WELFARE FOR WEAPONS DEALERS

Title II of my bill reduces arms export subsidies to fund the cost of providing these remaining benefits to legal immigrants. Taxpayers spend billions of dollars annually for Federal subsidies devoted to helping major defense companies market their wares around the world—plying everything from ammunition to high-technology fighter jets, all at a time when the United States is already the world's leading arms exporter.

Uncle Sam is the world's largest arms dealer, employing nearly 6,500 full-time personnel to promote foreign arms sales by U.S. companies. For the sixth consecutive year, the United States led the world in arms deliveries in 1996.

We are militarizing foreign aid. In 1995, subsidies for arms exports accounted for over 50 percent of U.S. bilateral aid.

Major weapons manufacturing firms buy influence by contributing to congressional candidates—\$14.8 million between 1990 and 1994. These firms include Lockheed-Martin, Northrup Grumman, and others.

We are backing losers. The U.S. Government ranks first in the world in subsidizing arms exports. Meanwhile we spend only \$150 million a year to help U.S. firms get a foothold in the expanding international market for environmental technologies. That market is expected to reach \$190 to \$240 billion by the end of this decade. This is at a time that by DOD's own reckoning, the international arms market will likely continue to shrink from its current level of \$32 billion.

There is a boomerang effect to our arms sales. Subsidized arms sales have caused more security problems than they have solved. The last five times the United States has sent troops into conflict situations—in Panama,

Iraq, Somalia, Haiti, and Bosnia—they faced forces on the other side that had gained access to U.S. weaponry, training, or military technology in the period leading up to the conflict.

"Surplus" weapons giveaways have emerged as a major military assistance program. While other, more visible forms of military aid have been cut since the end of the cold war, shipments of surplus arms through a variety of programs have increased dramatically. The United States transferred military equipment worth \$7 billion 1990 through 1995, including 4,000 tanks, 125 attack helicopters, 500 bombers, and 200,000 pistols and rifles. In the majority of cases, the equipment was provided for free.

The Pentagon appears to be giving away still useful equipment in order to justify the procurement of new weapons. Congress never debates or votes on surplus arms grants, as it does with other forms of military aid and these transfers are generally omitted from statistics on the overall value of U.S. arms exports.

HDelements of funding title

Section 201 of my bill eliminates the Leased Defense Articles Program, which transfers U.S. equipment to other nations for minimal or no rent. Its cost over 5 years is \$3.25 billion.

The United States leases weapons systems that we might want back in the future, rather than selling or giving them away. We also lease equipment when the recipient cannot afford to purchase the weapons outright. The recipient pays rent on the equipment equal to the depreciation of the articles while leased. Weapons systems are loaned for free for cooperative military research and development projects and for joint training exercises.

Section 202 also eliminates the Excess Defense Articles Program, which gives away surplus weapons worth \$2 billion over 5 years.

Every year, the Pentagon transfers thousands of militarily-useful items it no longer wants to other countries. These items range from boots and uniforms on up to tanks and fighter aircraft. These transfers offer a way to keep potential customers acclimated to U.S.-made equipment. These giveaways of surplus military hardware help hook foreign armies on U.S. equipment, paving the way for future sales.

Section 203 mandates recoupment fees on weapons sales to foreign purchasers. These fees recover some portion of the taxpayer-financed research and development costs of the weapons system.

All weaponry exported by U.S. firms benefits from billions of dollars of taxpayer investments in research and development and plant and equipment. In order to pay back a part of this taxpayer investment in these weapons systems, for more than 25 years it was U.S. Government policy to assess recoupment fees on foreign sales of U.S. military equipment. The fees are determined by dividing total R&D and other one-time costs by the total number of units that are expected to be produced. These fees are no longer required.

The General Accounting Office estimates that if the fees are imposed on all government and commercial arms sales, revenues recouped by the Treasury would average \$500 million per year.

Section 204 of this title eliminates Foreign Military Financing [FMF] funding for Greece, Turkey, Cambodia, Caribbean and South Asian countries, and Partnership for Peace-eli-

gible countries in Central and Eastern Europe and the Former Soviet Union. FMF provides grants and subsidized loans to buy U.S. military equipment. We will spend \$1 billion on this funding over the next 5 years.

FMF provides loans and grants to foreign nations for the purchase of U.S. military equipment. The true financial beneficiaries of FMF are not the recipient countries but rather the defense contractors who supply the equipment.

FMF is simply a roundabout way of funneling money from U.S. taxpayers into the coffers of major arms exporting firms; in many cases the funds never leave the United States but are issued to U.S. companies as defense contracts as their work on a given foreign order proceeds. This is a direct export subsidy to the U.S. arms industry.

Section 205 eliminates Economic Support Fund [ESF] moneys for Turkey, Cambodia, Latin America, and the Caribbean. ESF is for strategic considerations rather than development needs. We will spend \$1 billion in ESF for these countries over the next 5 years.

The ESF Program provides cash assistance, commodity imports, and other support for countries of particular security concern to the United States. ESF financing serves as an indirect subsidy to foreign purchasers of U.S. weaponry which provides them with either the cash resources or the financial flexibility to sustain their arms purchases from U.S. companies.

If ESF were truly an economic development program, disbursement of the funds would be based on criteria such as level of need of the recipient nation and the bulk of the funds would not be routinely set aside for major U.S. arms clients as is currently the case.

Finally, section 206 eliminates authority to use Federal dollars for participation in international arms bazaars—overseas promotional events and demonstrations for potential weapons buyers.

In a typical year, the U.S. Government helps promote U.S. weaponry at over half a dozen major international air shows. Costs to U.S. taxpayers include revenues foregone from leasing fees that are no longer charged to U.S. manufacturers to display U.S. Government-owned weaponry. These waived fees alone can cost taxpayers \$5–10 million per show.

These weapons exhibitions are called training missions so the costs of getting U.S. equipment and personnel to them don't have to be reported to Congress. The flight of a B-2 bomber to the Paris Air Show involved at least a 24-hour round-trip at \$14,166 per hour to operate the plane. Pentagon justification for participation in one of these bazaars—in Santiago—stated that it is "consistent" with U.S. goals of "promoting democracy, increasing prosperity and trade ties, and achieving sustainable development" in Latin America.

In addition to Northrup Grumman's B-2, other equipment sent to these shows includes McDonnell-Douglas's F-18 fighter, Lockheed-Martin's F-16 fighter, Sikorsky's Black Hawk utility/assault helicopter, Boeing's Chinook transport helicopter, General Dynamic's Abrams tank, and Raytheon's Patriot missile defense system.

The cost to U.S. taxpayers for these shows in 1995 was \$27 million.

In summary, I urge support for my bill. I will be working hard to accomplish the important

goals outlined here and I look forward to working with my colleagues to bring about fairness for immigrants.

TRIBUTE TO NORMA C. NOTTINGHAM

HON. BOB CLEMENT

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 1, 1997

Mr. CLEMENT. Mr. Speaker, Emerson wrote that "To know that even one life has breathed easier because you have lived. This is to have succeeded."

Today, I rise to honor an outstanding American citizen who far surpassed Emerson's definition. I come to the floor to recognize the retirement of a woman who has touched the lives of thousands of our Nation's youth. Mrs. Norma C. Nottingham has reached into each of our districts—transcending partisan politics—to help shape America's air and space forces through the admissions process at the U.S. Air Force Academy.

Mrs. Nottingham retires this week from a key Pentagon post in the Air Force Academy Activities Group where her contributions have been both monumental and long lasting. I rise to not only recognize this retirement, but to honor the woman whose nearly 44-year career in Government service has been marked by a deep commitment, a high level of caring, and an inspiring sense of humor.

Mrs. Nottingham is a native of the Washington, DC area and has performed brilliantly in a variety of positions throughout her career. She served two U.S. Senators, Ken Keating of New York and Pete Williams of New Jersey, as a staff assistant during the 1970's. Prior to that involvement, she was employed by the Office of the Surgeon General, U.S. Army. Since June 1981, Mrs. Nottingham has been the key point of contact for Congress in the nomination and admissions process for the Air Force Academy.

While serving in her latest position, Mrs. Nottingham's exemplary dedication to the Academy and its mission was a key factor in ensuring the brightest and best young men and women were nominated and appointed to the Academy. Her exhaustive knowledge of Academy policies and programs earned her the respect and trust of virtually every congressional office on Capitol Hill. Additionally, her skills in the political arena were of immeasurable benefit to the Academy and the Air Force on numerous occasions: her experience on Capitol Hill proved invaluable as she assisted in the preparation of legislation, counseled congressional staffers on the Academy's admission procedures, orchestrated staffer visits to the Academy as well as regional instructional workshops for the staffers, and played a key role in the success of hundreds of congressional-sponsored Academy Day events across the Nation.

Mrs. Nottingham personally traveled to my district 9 years ago to assist me with my first Academy Day and has been instrumental in the planning and development of each annual program, providing hands-on service and expert advice to my staff and constituents.

Mrs. Nottingham also contributed significantly to the Foreign Cadet Program through