

cut, 70 percent of which will go to the rich. Well, their philosophy is take from the poor and give it to the rich. That is what they are proposing to do.

We should reject this welfare reform proposal and reject this reverse Robin Hood approach that the Republicans are advocating.

#### REPUBLICAN WELFARE REFORM ENCOURAGES RESPONSIBILITIES

(Mr. NORWOOD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. NORWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Personal Responsibility Act, because the current welfare system has been an utter and complete failure. The welfare system encourages people toward three extremely harmful actions. First: Don't get a job. Second: Don't get married. Third: Have children out of wedlock—repeatedly. The current system subsidizes each of these behaviors with a check from the Federal Government. Only the Federal Government could have designed such a destructive system.

Mr. Speaker, this bill will make real change in the system. It will change the incentives to encourage people to get a job, get married, and be responsible in having children. All the while, we will hear the cries from Democrats who are so wrapped up in defending the morally bankrupt welfare system that they fail to see its destructive nature.

□ 1445

#### DEMOCRATS SEEK WELFARE REFORM THAT MOVES PEOPLE INTO THE WORKFORCE

(Mr. FORD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I want to respond to my Republican colleagues by saying that there is nothing in this welfare reform package of a Personal Responsibility Act that says that we are going to send people to work. What the Democrats have said all along in our debate in the subcommittee and full committee is that we want to link welfare to work. We want people to be able to work, and we want to have a program that will assist them and move them into the workforce. I say to my colleagues, "You punish children, and you are just plain mean to children in this country, just for one purpose, and that is to say to the wealthiest of this Nation that we're going to pass you on a tax cut." It is wrong in the Personal Responsibility Act, for the Republicans to bring it to this floor, to be so cruel and to penalize children in this Nation at a time that we ought to be trying to protect our children because they will be the next generation that will carry this Nation forward.

#### REPUBLICAN WELFARE BILL PROMOTES FREEDOM AND REWARDS DETERMINATION

(Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, as my colleagues know, that is exactly what is wrong here, the Federal Government in control. They want to control our lives and every aspect of it. As my colleagues know, George Washington over there did not want welfare, he did not want taxes.

This week another historic debate is going to begin; another 40-year-old broken welfare program will end. Today the Republicans are going to bring forward a welfare bill that promotes freedom, rewards determination, and establishes self-esteem. Today mean-spirited Democrats, uncaring Democrats, will try to stop reform, cruel Democrats now defending a system that promoted dependency, rewarded complacency, and established self-defeat. They are the ones defending big government.

Mr. Speaker, that is why we believe in our Constitution. We believe that States, not the Federal Government, should be given the flexibility to design a program that will fix the problems that are unique to their communities.

Mr. Speaker, let us not just talk about ending welfare as we know it. Let us do it. Vote "yes" for America. Vote "yes" for welfare reform.

#### WELFARE SLOWLY DESTROYS THE WILL TO PERSEVERE

(Mr. HEFLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Speaker, the welfare system has been called a waste, it has been called inefficient, it has been called a destroyer of families, and it has even been compared with slavery. I would argue that these criticisms are largely accurate.

To those who would defend the current welfare system, I challenge them to go outside the Capitol Building and walk around the streets of the District of Columbia or almost any major city in America. Here one can see the results of the welfare culture. Crime, corruption, teenage pregnancy, children without fathers, poverty, unemployment, and on and on it goes. In other words, an almost complete breakdown of community.

The problems that the District and other communities face are not because too little money is being spent on welfare. They exist because welfare creates a perverse set of incentives that suffocate the dignity of work and slowly destroy the will to persevere.

Mr. Speaker, Republicans have promised to not only reform welfare, but to replace welfare. We are committed to the belief that people are more important than government and that strong

children are better than strong bureaucracies.

#### FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Hallen, one of its Clerks, announced that the Senate had passed with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 889. An act making emergency supplemental appropriations and rescissions to preserve and enhance the military readiness of the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1995, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 889) "An Act making emergency supplemental appropriations and rescissions to preserve and enhance the military readiness of the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1995, and for other purposes," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes to the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. HATFIELD, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. GRAMM, Mr. DOMENICI, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. GORTON, Mr. SPECTER, Mr. BOND, Mr. BURNS, Mr. BYRD, Mr. INOUE, Mr. JOHNSTON, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Ms. MIKULSKI, and Mr. REID to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

#### COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DOOLITTLE) laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
OFFICE OF THE CLERK,  
Washington, DC, March 21, 1995.

Hon. NEWT GINGRICH,  
*The Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 5 of Rule III of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, I have the honor to transmit a sealed envelop received from the White House on Friday, March 17, 1995 at 4:35 p.m. and said to contain a message from the President whereby he notifies the Congress of his intention to designate the West Bank and Gaza Strip as a beneficiary for the purposes of the Generalized System of Preferences.

With great respect, I am  
Sincerely yours,

ROBIN H. CARLE,  
*Clerk, U.S. House of Representatives.*

#### EXTENSION OF GENERALIZED SYSTEM OF PREFERENCES' BENEFITS TO THE WEST BANK AND GAZA STRIP—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 104-47)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without

objection, referred to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

I am writing to inform you of my intent to designate the West Bank and Gaza Strip as a beneficiary of the Generalized System of Preferences (GSP). The GSP program, which offers duty-free access to the U.S. market, was originally authorized by the Trade Act of 1974.

I have carefully considered the criteria identified in sections 501 and 502 of the Trade Act of 1974. In light of these criteria, I have determined that it is appropriate to extend GSP benefits to the West Bank and Gaza Strip.

This notice is submitted in accordance with section 502(a)(1) of the Trade Act of 1974.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON,

THE WHITE HOUSE, March 17, 1995.

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION FOR FISCAL YEAR 1993—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Science:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

In accordance with section 3(f) of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1862(f)), I am pleased to transmit to you the Annual Report of the National Science Foundation for Fiscal Year 1993.

The Foundation supports research and education in every State of the Union. Its programs provide an international science and technology link to sustain cooperation and advance this Nation's leadership role.

This report shows how the Foundation puts science and technology to work for a sustainable future—for our economic, environmental, and national security.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON,

THE WHITE HOUSE, March 21, 1995.

REPORT ON DEVELOPMENTS RELATING TO THE INTERNATIONAL EMERGENCY ECONOMIC POWERS ACT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 104-48)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on International Relations and ordered to be printed:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

1. On August 19, 1994, in Executive Order No. 12924, I declared a national emergency under the International

Emergency Economic Powers Act (IEEPA) (50 U.S.C. 1701 *et seq.*) to deal with the threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States caused by the lapse of the Export Administration Act of 1979, as amended (50 U.S.C. App. 2401 *et seq.*) and the system of controls maintained under that Act. In that order, I continued in effect, to the extent permitted by law, the provisions of the Export Administration Act of 1979, as amended, the Export Administration Regulations (15 C.F.R. 768 *et seq.*), and the delegations of authority set forth in Executive Order No. 12002 of July 7, 1977 (as amended by Executive Order No. 12755 of March 12, 1991), Executive Order No. 12214 of May 2, 1980, Executive Order No. 12735 of November 16, 1990 (subsequently revoked by Executive Order No. 12938 of November 14, 1994), and Executive Order No. 12851 of June 11, 1993.

2. I issued Executive Order No. 12924 pursuant to the authority vested in me as President by the Constitution and laws of the United States, including, but not limited to, IEEPA. At that time, I also submitted a report to the Congress pursuant to section 204(b) of IEEPA (50 U.S.C. 1703(b)). Section 204 of IEEPA requires follow-up reports, with respect to actions or changes, to be submitted every 6 months. Additionally, section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act (NEA) (50 U.S.C. 1601 *et seq.*) requires that the President, within 90 days after the end of each 6-month period following a declaration of a national emergency, report to the Congress on the total expenditures directly attributable to that declaration. This report, covering the 6-month period from August 19, 1994, to February 19, 1995, is submitted in compliance with these requirements.

3. Since the issuance of Executive Order No. 12924, the Department of Commerce has continued to administer and enforce the system of export controls, including antiboycott provisions, contained in the Export Administration Regulations. In administering these controls, the Department has acted under a policy of conforming actions under Executive Order No. 12924 to those required under the Export Administration Act, insofar as appropriate.

4. Since my last report to the Congress, there have been several significant developments in the area of export controls:

BILATERAL COOPERATION/TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

—As part of the Administration's continuing effort to encourage other countries to implement effective export controls to stem the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, as well as certain sensitive technologies, the Department of Commerce and other agencies conducted a range of discussions with a number of foreign countries, including governments in the Baltics, Central and Eastern

Europe, the Newly Independent States (NIS) of the former Soviet Union, the Pacific Rim, and China. Licensing requirements were liberalized for exports to Argentina, South Korea, and Taiwan, responding in part to their adoption of improved export control procedures.

AUSTRALIA GROUP

—The Department of Commerce issued regulations to remove controls on certain chemical weapon stabilizers that are not controlled by the Australia Group, a multilateral regime dedicated to stemming the proliferation of chemical and biological weapons. This change became effective October 19, 1994. In that same regulatory action, the Department also published a regulatory revision that reflects an Australia Group decision to adopt a multi-tiered approach to control of certain mixtures containing chemical precursors. The new regulations extend General License G-DEST treatment to certain categories of such mixtures.

NUCLEAR SUPPLIERS GROUP (NSG)

—NSG members are examining the present dual-use nuclear control list to both remove controls no longer warranted and to rewrite control language to better reflect nuclear proliferation concerns. A major item for revision involves machine tools, as the current language was accepted on an interim basis until agreement on more specific language could be reached.

—The Department of Commerce has implemented license denials for NSG-controlled items as part of the "no-undercut" provision. Under this provision, denial notifications received from NSG member countries obligate other member nations not to approve similar transactions until they have consulted with the notifying party, thus reducing the possibilities for undercutting such denials.

MISSILE TECHNOLOGY CONTROL REGIME (MTCR)

—Effective September 30, 1994, the Department of Commerce revised the control language for MTCR items on the Commerce Control List, based on the results of the last MTCR plenary. The revisions reflect advances in technology and clarifications agreed to multilaterally.

—On October 4, 1994, negotiations to resolve the 1993 sanctions imposed on China for MTCR violations involving missile-related trade with Pakistan were successfully concluded. The United States lifted the Category II sanctions effective November 1, in exchange for a Chinese commitment not to export ground-to-ground Category I missiles to any destination.

—At the October 1994 Stockholm plenary, the MTCR made public the fact of its "no-undercut" policy on