

BLAIR SCOLDS BRITISH "WORKLESS CLASS" IN OUTLINE OF WELFARE PLAN

**HON. JAMES A. LEACH**

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 26, 1997

Mr. LEACH. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to read excerpts from the attached article from the June 3, 1997, edition of the New York Times. The article recounts a recent speech given by British Prime Minister Tony Blair regarding what he describes as a culture of dependency on government. In the speech, given outside a notoriously neglected housing project in South London, Prime Minister Blair called for an "ethic of mutual responsibility," where government institutions are re-fashioned.

During the House's consideration of H.R. 2, the Housing Opportunity and Responsibility Act of 1997, I urged my colleagues from the other side of the aisle to abandon the policies of extreme liberalism and consider the recent electoral success of the new, pragmatic Labor Party in Britain. Many of the concepts expressed by Prime Minister Blair in his speech are surprisingly similar to the ideals contained in the House's public housing reform bill. Much like Prime Minister Blair's "New Labor" philosophies, H.R. 2 creates a mutuality of obligation between public housing residents and the Federal Government. The approach contained in the House bill is intended to help end the cycle of property, where generation follows generation in an environment devoid of hope and opportunity, and instead encourage self-sufficiency and the process of moving people from welfare to work.

In anticipation of House consideration of the conference report on the House and Senate housing bills later this year, I commend the attached article to Members' attention.

[From the New York Times, June 3, 1997]

BLAIR SCOLDS BRITISH "WORKLESS CLASS" IN OUTLINE OF WELFARE PLAN

(By Sarah Lyall)

LONDON.—Appearing at a notoriously neglected housing project in South London, Prime Minister Tony Blair today denounced the culture of dependency on government that he said had created a "workless class" of people who live off the state and have no motivation to find jobs.

Mr. Blair, who has resolutely moved his party away from its old working-class roots and remodeled it as a centrist movement that he calls "New Labor," said one of the cornerstones of his Government would be getting people off welfare and putting them back to work.

In doing so, he called for a "radical shift in our values and attitudes" and said that the welfare state, long associated with the old Labor Party, had to change along with the times.

"Earlier this century, leaders faced the challenge of creating a welfare state that could provide security for the new working class," he said. "Today the greatest challenge for any democratic government is to refashion our institutions to bring this new workless class back into society and into useful work."

\*\*\* The Prime Minister's speech came as his Labor Government, which swept into power with an overwhelming majority a month ago, prepares a major overhaul of the country's welfare system. In its review, Mr.

Blair said, the Government would ask a simple question about all of Britain's benefits: "Do they give people a chance to work? Or do they trap them on benefits for the most productive years of their lives?"

\*\*\* But Mr. Blair warned that young people would have responsibilities of their own. "There will be and should be no option of an inactive life on benefit," he said. "Where opportunities are given, for example, to young people, for real jobs and skills, there should be a reciprocal duty to take them up."

Mr. Blair called for an "ethic of mutual responsibility" in Britain. "It is something for something," he said. "A society where we play by the rules. You only take out if you put in. That's the bargain."

\*\*\* Mr. Blair said: "In the 1960's, people thought Government was always the solution. In the 1980's people said Government was the problem. In the 1990's, we know that we cannot solve the problems of the workless class without Government, but that Government itself must change if it is to be part of the solution."

CHINA-RELATED CHALLENGES

**HON. TILLIE K. FOWLER**

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 26, 1997

Mrs. FOWLER. Mr. Speaker, although China policy is in the news right now, most Americans remain unaware of one of the most serious China-related challenges our nation faces—the Clinton administration's dramatic loosening of export controls on sensitive militarily-related technology. Much of that technology is going to the People's Republic of China, which could spell trouble for our national security and interests abroad.

The Clinton policy has resulted in the transfer to the Chinese of devices and technology ranging from telecommunications equipment that is impervious to eavesdropping, to highly sophisticated machine tools needed to build fighter aircraft, strategic bombers and cruise missiles. The policy has also resulted in the decontrol of high-speed supercomputers, leading to the sale of 46 of them to the PRC over the last 15 months, as revealed in a recent congressional hearing.

The United States should remain engaged with China, which is an emerging superpower. However, we must not forget that it is a Communist country that has undertaken a large-scale defense buildup with the clear intent of increasing its ability to project military power. The U.S. should not be contributing to that goal. As I said yesterday during the debate on MFN, free trade is something to be desired, but commerce at all costs is not—especially when it provides a more level battlefield, which no American wants.

I would like to request that two items be included in the RECORD following my remarks: first, an article detailing the history and details of the current policy of decontrol—and its many flaws—which recently appeared in the independent newspaper Heterodoxy; and second, the text of a resolution passed by the Board of Directors of the Jewish Institute for National Security Affairs [JINSA] regarding the sale or transfer of supercomputers.

[From the Heterodoxy, April/May, 1997]

CLINTON AND THE AMERICAN EXPERIENCE IN CHINA—ARMING THE ENEMY

(By Dr. Stephen Bryen and Michael Ledeen)

At the end of the Cold War, the U.S. towered over the world, the sole surviving superpower, the source of inspiration for a global democratic revolution that had destroyed tyrannies ranging from Spain and Portugal in the '70s, to virtually all of Latin America and then Central and Eastern Europe in the '80s culminating in the fall of the Soviet Empire itself. Washington became the Mecca of a new democratic faith, and the prophets and followers of democracy, from Havel and Walesa to Pope John Paul II and Nelson Mandela, came in a sort of democratic hajj to pay reverent tribute. They all went to Congress and gave thanks to America for having made it all possible, and continued to the White House to pay their respects.

Any other nation in such a position would have extended its dominion over others, and many nations in the rest of the world fully expected us to do just that. They were stunned to learn that America was not interested in greater dominion. Indeed, America was barely interested in them at all. Having won the third world war of the twentieth century, we were about to repeat the same error we had made after the first two: withdraw from the world as quickly as we could, bring the boys home, cut back on military power, and worry about our own problems. Americans are the first people in the history of the world to believe that peace is the normal condition of mankind, and our leaders were eager to return to "normal." And they were encouraged to define this word in a way that included truckling to China and helping it emerge as a major threat to U.S. interests.

Thus was born a policy of criminal irresponsibility, a policy that has not only failed to protect us and our allies against the inevitable rise of new enemies, but actually facilitated, indeed even encouraged, the emergence of new military threats. It began with George Bush, Jim Baker, Brent Scowcroft, and Dick Cheney and continued at a far more rapid rate with Bill Clinton, Warren Christopher, Ron Brown, William Perry, and Anthony Lake. All of them have helped dismantle the philosophy and apparatus created by Ronald Reagan and his team—most notably Defense Secretary Caspar Weinberger—to defeat the Soviet Union by denying it access to advanced technology and thus protect American military superiority for years to come. To understand our current plight with China, it is necessary to understand what we unilaterally dismantled under Bush and Clinton.

It is widely believed that the fall of the Soviet Empire was a great "implosion" produced by the failure of the Soviet economic system and the visionary policies of Mikhail Gorbachev. This is the leftwing view of recent events, a view intended to deny credit to democracy and America in forcing the outcomes. Western policies are rarely credited with a key role in this drama, but in fact they were the crucial ingredients. The Soviet economic system, for example, had failed long ago. In fact, it had failed from the very beginning, as each disastrous "plan" was replaced with another. Russia was the world's greatest grain exporter before World War I, and half a century later had become the world's greatest grain importer. That is not an easy accomplishment, and testifies to the shambles created by the Communist regime.

Things were not much better in the industrial complex, even the vaunted military sector. The Soviets were rarely able to design and manufacture advanced technologies on their own. Without exception, when the Soviets needed to modernize an assembly line,