Weekly Compilation of

# Presidential Documents

Monday, October 25, 1993
Volume 29—Number 42
Pages 2089–2154

## Contents


**Addresses and Remarks**

Business for Social Responsibility conference—2126
Democratic National Committee fundraiser—2138
Executive Leadership Council dinner—2136
National Breast Cancer Coalition—2092
North American Free Trade Agreement Jobs and Products Day Trade Fair—2111
Meetings with Members of Congress—2107, 2143
Radio address—2089
Technology reinvestment project—2145
White House Conference on Climate Change—2108

**Appointments and Nominations**

American Red Cross, Board of Governors, members—2123
Commerce Department, Assistant Secretary—2106
Energy Department, Assistant Secretary—2111
Intergovernmental Relations Advisory Commission, members—2106
Superior Court of the District of Columbia, Associate Judge—2106
United Nations Human Rights Commission, U.S. Representative—2151
U.S. District Court, Judges—2151
White House Conference on Aging, Executive Director—2151

**Bill Signings**

Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1994, statement—2142

**Bill Signings—**Continued

Continuing appropriations resolution, statement—2143
Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1994, statement—2143

**Communications to Congress**

Bosnia conflict, letter—2123
Determination not to prohibit fish imports from Panama, message—2089
Federal Prevailing Rate Advisory Committee report, message transmitting—2110
Haiti
Letter—2125
Message—2104
Israel-U.S. tax convention protocol, message transmitting—2110
Poland-U.S. fishery agreement, message transmitting—2136
Slovak Republic-U.S. tax convention, message transmitting—2142
Transportation Department reports, message transmitting—2110
Use of U.S. Armed Forces in international operations, letter—2104

**Executive Orders**

Blocking Property of Persons Obstructing Democratization in Haiti—2103
Establishing an Emergency Board To Investigate a Dispute Between the Long Island Rail Road and Certain of Its Employees Represented by the United Transportation Union—2122
Federal Acquisition, Recycling, and Waste Prevention—2115


(Continued on the inside of the back cover.)


WEEKLY COMPILATION OF

PRESIDENTIAL DOCUMENTS

Published every Monday by the Office of the Federal Register, National Archives and Records Administration, Washington, DC 20408, the *Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents* contains statements, messages, and other Presidential materials released by the White House during the preceding week.

The *Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents* is published pursuant to the authority contained in the Federal Register Act (49 Stat. 500, as amended; 44 U.S.C. Ch. 15), under regulations prescribed by the Administrative Committee of the Federal Register, approved by the President (37 FR 23607; 1 CFR Part 10).

Distribution is made only by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402. The *Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents* will be furnished by mail to domestic subscribers for $80.00 per year ($137.00 for mailing first class) and to foreign subscribers for $93.75 per year, payable to the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402. The charge for a single copy is $3.00 ($3.75 for foreign mailing).


There are no restrictions on the republication of material appearing in the *Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents.*

Contents—Continued

**Interviews With the News Media**

Exchanges with reporters
Cabinet Room—2107, 2143
Grand Hyatt Washington Hotel—2135
Interviews
Radio reporters—2096
Television reporters in San Diego, CA
KFMB—2150
KGTV—2147
KNSD—2148

**Proclamations**

National Biomedical Research Day—2124
National Consumers Week—2135
National Forest Products Week—2092
National Mammography Day—2095
World Food Day—2091

**Statements by the President**

*See also* Appointments and Nominations; Bill Signings
Congressional action on the Commerce Department appropriations—2110
Federal acquisition, recycling, and waste prevention—2115
German ratification of the Maastricht Treaty—2102

**Statements Other Than Presidential**

Haiti—2105

**Supplementary Materials**

Acts approved by the President—2154
Checklist of White House press releases—2153
Digest of other White House announcements—2152
Nominations submitted to the Senate—2152

# Week Ending Friday, October 22, 1993

## Message to the Congress on the Determination Not To Prohibit Fish Imports From Panama

*October 15, 1993*

*To the Congress of the United States:*

Pursuant to section 8(b) of the Fishermen's Protective Act of 1967, as amended (22 U.S.C. 1978(b)), generally known as the Pelly Amendment, I am notifying you that on August 18, 1993, in accordance with section 101(a) of the Marine Mammal Protection Act (MMPA), the Secretary of Commerce certified to me that a ban on the importation of yellowfin tuna and yellowfin tuna products from Panama has been in effect since December 22, 1992. This ban is the result of a finding by the Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, that Panama's marine mammal program was not comparable to that of the United States, as required by the MMPA.

By the terms of the MMPA, such certification is deemed to be a certification for the purposes of the Pelly Amendment, which requires that I consider and, at my discretion, order the prohibition of imports into the United States of any products from the certified country to the extent that such prohibition is sanctioned by the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. The Pelly Amendment also requires that I report to the Congress any actions taken under this subsection and, if no import prohibitions have been ordered, the reasons for this action.

After thorough review, I have determined that additional sanctions against Panama will not be imposed at this time. The Government of Panama is currently engaged in developing a marine mammal program that is comparable to that of the United States. The results of these efforts should be evident in an anticipated annual report and request for a finding of comparability for 1994 from Panama.

**William J. Clinton**

The White House,
October 15, 1993.

NOTE: This item was not received in time for publication in the appropriate issue.

## The President's Radio Address

*October 16, 1993*

Good morning. I want to talk with you today about our prosperity and our strength now and in the years to come. From the beginning of our administration I promised bold action with a plan for economic growth. We moved to put our fiscal house in order, to bring the deficit down, to spur business investment, and start investing in our own people again. Our plan passed the Congress, and now good things are beginning to happen.

We still have a long way to go, but there's clearly been real progress. Long-term interest rates are at historic lows. That means more businesses investing in jobs and economic growth. Home mortgages are at a 25-year low. That's put more money in the pockets of millions of Americans who are now buying or refinancing their homes.

During the first 8 months of this administration our American economy has created 1.1 million private sector jobs, more than had been generated in the previous 4 years. Our people have been waiting for a long time for a strong recovery. We've made progress, but we know there are other things we've got to do if we're going to put America at full strength for the long term. For one thing, we've got to have someone to buy our products and our services. To do that, we've got to look beyond our borders, to jolt our export markets so they will grow and create jobs here at home.

All wealthy nations are finding today that they can't create jobs without expanding trade. It's not just the United States, the same thing is true in Germany and the rest of Europe and in Japan. I know we can do it because, just as with the rest of the progress we've made so far, we've got a plan to increase exports. Already we've lowered cold war trade barriers, $37 billion worth of high-tech equipment which we can now sell in the export markets. We're working with Japan and with the entire international trading system to open up new markets for our manufactured products. And we've got a very important part of that plan right here in our area, called the North American Free Trade Agreement. Perhaps you've heard it called NAFTA. The bottom line is this: NAFTA will help create export relationships that will produce jobs, 200,000 of them by 1995, and will continue to create jobs in the future. It will help our economy to grow.

Everywhere on Earth, more exports mean more jobs. And these jobs on average pay better, 17 percent better than jobs that don't have anything to do with exports. Critics may say what they will, but they can't dispute the facts. We are competing in an era of almost unimaginable economic change, where investment and information can cross the globe in the flicker of a computer screen. It's a new world. But on the trade front, America has too often been playing by old rules.

Our chief rivals in the global marketplace have been adapting. Europe has been developing its own trading bloc. Japan has cornered much of Asia. And now with NAFTA, we can adapt by using our friends and neighbors, first in Canada and Mexico and eventually in the rest of Latin America.

With NAFTA, our products will have easier access to Canada and the second fastest growing market in the entire world, Latin America. Without NAFTA, one of our best markets, Mexico, could turn to Japan and Europe to make a sweetheart deal for trade. With NAFTA, we'll be creating the biggest trading bloc in the world right at our doorstep and led by the United States. Without NAFTA, Mexico could well become an export platform allowing more products from Japan and Europe into America.

Why would we want that to happen? It's no accident that NAFTA is supported by every living former President, almost every serving Governor, and leaders of both parties. And yet, I know many Americans are worried about the agreement. They've been told that companies will head South once the ink is dry because wages are lower and environmental investments are cheaper in Mexico. But all the wishing in the world won't stop those companies from leaving today. Today companies can go to Mexico and produce for the American market with low tariffs if they want to. But NAFTA will require Mexico to enforce its own environmental laws and labor standards, to raise the cost of production in Mexico by raising wages and raising environmental investments. That will make it less likely, not more likely, that a company will cross the Rio Grande River to take advantage of lower wages or lax pollution laws.

I say again, under NAFTA more jobs will stay at home here in America and more American exports will head to Mexico. NAFTA means exports, and exports mean jobs. I believe with all my heart the fear stirred up over NAFTA flows from the pounding the middle class took over the past decade and a half, not from NAFTA itself. But I have to tell you, as your President, I could not be for this trade agreement unless I believed strongly that we needed to ensure the economic security of our hard-working middle class families.

That's why I'm fighting in Congress to pass NAFTA when it votes on it next month. I hope you'll tell your Representatives that you want it to pass, too. If you want to create more American jobs, if you want to lower the differences in cost of production in America and Mexico, if you want to take down barriers in Mexico to exports, then you should want NAFTA.

And let me say again, America right now has a trade surplus with Mexico. Mexicans, even though their incomes are lower than Americans, are the second largest purchaser of American products per person, second only to Canada. This means greater opportunities for our people and more jobs. I hope that you will support it.

Before I close, I want to say a word about our brave helicopter pilot who was held and then released in Somalia. Tonight Michael Durant is on his way home. We are thankful beyond words that Chief Warrant Officer Durant will be reunited with his family and that he will recover from his wounds. At the same time, our hearts and the hearts of all Americans go out to the 18 families who are grieving tonight for their loved ones who were lost in Somalia and to nearly 100 others who were wounded. They and their comrades are in our prayers.

God bless you all, and thanks for listening.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:06 a.m. from the Oval Office at the White House.

## Proclamation 6613—World Food Day, 1993 and 1994

*October 16, 1993*

*By the President of the United States of America*

### *A Proclamation*

Arising from poverty, homelessness, civil strife or famine, hunger burdens the lives of nearly 800 million people throughout the world. Women and children suffer the most. Studies suggest that in developing countries, some 36 percent of children under 6 years of age are moderately or severely undernourished.

On this World Food Day, let us commit ourselves to bringing change to the lives of those who suffer from hunger and to preserving the resources we will need in the years ahead.

Failure to protect our environment now and in the future will clearly affect the ability of countries to produce food and fiber for growing populations. The United Nations has indicated that the world may not be able to feed itself by sometime early in the next century if we continue to abuse productive soil. If world food production is to be maintained and enhanced, we must learn to safeguard the biological diversity that underpins our agricultural system. Today, the biological foundation is imperiled. Traditional crop varieties and animal breeds are becoming endangered. Many are already extinct. When we lose a traditional wheat or rice variety, we lose its unique characteristics and its potential pest and disease resistance, drought tolerance, or nutritional benefits. Nature's diversity is a precious inheritance. We cannot live on this earth without it. Through sound agricultural practices and intelligent shepherding of our natural resources, we can nourish and protect our land, forests, rivers, and streams.

The almost constant threat of famine in Africa and the continuing food problems in Asia should remind us all of our global vulnerability, especially as the population continues to grow. Raising the global community's awareness of the hunger that afflicts the young, the infirm, the poor, and the elderly—and considering the needs of others each day—can bring change and help ensure our food supply for the future.

The Congress, by House Joint Resolution 218, has designated October 16, 1993, and October 16, 1994, as "World Food Day" and has authorized and requested the President to issue a proclamation in observance of these days.

**Now, Therefore, I, William J. Clinton,** President of the United States of America, do hereby proclaim October 16, 1993, and October 16, 1994, as World Food Day. I call on all Americans to observe these days with appropriate programs and activities.

**In Witness Whereof,** I have hereunto set my hand this sixteenth day of October, in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred and ninety-three, and of the Independence of the United States of America the two hundred and eighteenth.

**William J. Clinton**

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 2:59 p.m., October 18, 1993]

NOTE: This proclamation was published in the *Federal Register* on October 20.

## Proclamation 6614—National Forest Products Week, 1993

*October 16, 1993*

*By the President of the United States of America*

***A Proclamation***

Our National Forests are a priceless heritage, a gift that we hold in trust for future generations. As stewards of this inheritance, we have the obligation of preserving the capacity of these lands to sustain, not only themselves, but also the species that depend on them. Even as we strive to fulfill this obligation, the American people are asking fundamental questions about how our National Forests are managed and about how best to ensure a healthy and productive land.

Much has already been done to protect our forests. Of the 191 million acres of National Forest, 34 million have been set aside as part of the wilderness preservation system, a system that safeguards wilderness for future use and enjoyment. National Forests include more than 4,300 miles of designated segments of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers Systems. These rivers are maintained in a free-flowing condition for the enjoyment of this and future generations.

Much more remains to be done, and we are only beginning to fathom, however incompletely, the complexities of the ecosystems of which our National Forests are composed. We know that over 250 threatened and endangered species of fish, animals, and plants inhabit National Forests and are dependent on them for survival. We also know that the key to protecting these and other species is to maintain healthy ecosystems through effective management of National Forests. In addition, we now understand that our forests are only one part of a global mosaic of forest ecosystems and that, if we are to be a world leader in environmental conservation, our stewardship must set standards for the world to emulate.

Our National Forests are also vital to our physical and spiritual well-being. National Forests are the single largest provider of outdoor recreation in the United States, providing 288 million visitor days at Forest Service campgrounds, picnic areas, and other recreation attractions in the past year. Products generated from National Forests support jobs for hundreds of thousands of workers, most located in rural America. People whose livelihoods are dependent on forest products industries must be considered as we reexamine the role of National Forests in promoting the welfare of all Americans.

Clearly, we are moving toward a new era in the stewardship of public lands. This new era is one in which we must blend environmental values with the needs of people in such a way that the National Forests represent diverse, healthy, productive, and sustainable ecosystems. Ecosystem management must be grounded on sound science and on compliance with existing law.

In recognition of the central role our forests play in enhancing the welfare of our Nation, the Congress, by Public Law 86–753 (36 U.S.C. 163), has designated the week beginning on the third Sunday in October of each year as ''National Forest Products Week'' and requested the President to issue a proclamation in observance of this week.

**Now, Therefore, I, William J. Clinton,** President of the United States of America, do hereby proclaim the week beginning October 17, 1993, as National Forest Products Week and call upon all Americans to observe that week with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

**In Witness Whereof,** I have hereunto set my hand this sixteenth day of October, in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred and ninety-three, and of the Independence of the United States of America the two hundred and eighteenth.

**William J. Clinton**

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 2:58 p.m., October 18, 1993]

NOTE: This proclamation was published in the *Federal Register* on October 20.

## Remarks to the National Breast Cancer Coalition

*October 18, 1993*

Thank you very much. Secretary Shalala and Fran, Dr. Love, distinguished Members

of Congress, Mrs. Cuomo, Mrs. Florio, and all of you distinguished guests. It's wonderful for me to be here today.

I was sitting here thinking that I more or less feel like the fifth wheel now. Just about everything that needs to be said has been said. But we sort of felt one man ought to talk on this program. And I won the lottery. [*Laughter*]

In the 3 minutes that will elapse at the beginning of this talk, another American woman will be diagnosed with breast cancer. If I speak for 12 minutes, another woman will die of it during the course of the remarks. And yet we know that one in every three American women does not receive the basic services, like mammographies, which can help to detect breast cancers and that the cost of not dealing with this amounts to about $6 billion a year to this country over and above all the human heartbreak involved.

Now that means that this is another one of those terrible American problems that is not only tearing the heart out of so many families but also has left us again with no excuse for why we would spend so much money picking up the pieces of broken lives when we could spend a little bit of money trying to save them.

We know all the stories; many of you here are the stories. I appreciate the reference to my brave mother, who struggles on with her breast cancer condition and who has resumed her remarkable life, but who also knows how much more we need to do. I'm glad to see Sherry Kohlenberg's husband and son here. When she came to see us in the Oval Office—Sherry was one of our 50 faces of hope, and we kind of keep up with all those folks that, to us, symbolize what we wanted this administration to be about. And when Sherry came to see us last June with Larry and with Sammy, she said, ''Don't ever forget what this does to the people who are left behind.'' And I'm glad to see them here today, and I'm glad they had the courage to come to remind us of that.

Since we know that there are a lot of things we don't know, it's important that we focus on research as well as treatment, that we focus on detection early as well as care. In my first budget submission, I recommended the creation of the office of research on women's health and the largest increase in funding for breast cancer research in the history of the National Institutes of Health. When you add that up to the increased funding for detection and preventive services at the Center for Disease Control, the Food and Drug Administration, and the Department of Defense, together the combined expenditures approved by this Congress, thanks in no small measure to these women who are here, amounts to about $600 million this year alone.

I also want to emphasize that in the health security plan that I have proposed to the Congress we provide for increases, not decreases in medical research and a means to fund those increases in medical research. We cannot provide basic security to all Americans and forget about the research that needs to be done on the things we don't know how to cure yet.

To help to coordinate our research and delivery efforts, in mid-December Secretary Shalala will bring together a broad range of health professionals, Government agencies, and groups like yours to develop a national action plan for the prevention, the diagnosis, and the treatment of breast cancer. A national strategy is what these petitions are all about. And while I am trying to reduce the volume of paperwork in Washington—[*laughter*]—frankly, I'm glad to see these here. We will do better, and you will help us. And we will have this national action plan.

I also want to point out that the health security plan that Hillary and I are fighting so hard for, along with the other members of our administration, will also fundamentally change the dimension of the fight against breast cancer. It is a plan that clearly shows the sign of several strong women at work, including two on this platform, based on the notion that when it comes to health care research and delivery, women can no longer be treated as second-class citizens.

We began to manifest that commitment, frankly, in this budget which was just passed, in which virtually everything was cut or frozen but which increased services for early

childhood and for little children. We also believe that we have to further increase our investments in these things, in prenatal, in maternal and child health care and nutrition, and in detecting and preventing diseases.

We believe that we need a health security plan that guarantees to every American a comprehensive package of benefits that not only can never be taken away but that includes preventive services to try to keep people well as well as help them when they're sick. We believe that some of these preventive services are so important that they should indeed entail no out-of-pocket costs at all to American citizens when the considered medical judgment is that everybody should get them on a regular basis. That includes routine clinician visits and not only appropriate breast exams but also important procedures like immunizations and Pap smears.

We also know that we can reduce deaths by making mammography widely available and by encouraging its use. And this plan covers these mammograms at no additional cost to patients for all women over 50 and provides mammograms where important in the judgment of the physician and the woman in every case where there is a health care plan. So if this plan passes, for the first time everybody who's got a health insurance policy, which will be everybody in America, will have mammograms in the policy. That is a very important thing.

The unique structure of this plan, with some preventive benefits absolutely free to Americans in the highest risk categories, was based upon the best available scientific evidence expressed in the findings of the United States Preventive Services Task Force and supported by forthcoming guidelines, for example on mammograms, from the National Cancer Institute. They were based on the best available scientific evidence, I will say again. And I very much appreciate the fact that just before we came up here today, Hillary whipped out an article that had Dr. Love quoted, and she said, ''Have we done it like you said we should?'' and Dr. Love said, ''Yes.'' I felt like I had gotten an A in class. [*Laughter*]

I also want to emphasize that none of this can ever be fixed in stone. You hear a whole lot of discussion as we get into the debate on the health care plan about how this or that or the other problem is not fixed. Well, my fellow Americans, this is a very dynamic thing, health care. And even the countries that have the best system, if you define ''best'' as high quality results, universal coverage, preventive services at lower costs, even they have continuing problems. You have to work on this forever. This is the beginning of what we should have done a long time ago, not the end of it. And one of the things that we need to make a commitment to do now is to update all these preventive approaches as new and better studies become available, based on recommendations like those we'll soon receive from the President's Special Commission on Breast Cancer. They've worked hard for 2 years, and I'm looking forward to that report.

Finally, let me say that—and this is an important thing to women who live in inner cities or remote rural areas—the best health care coverage in a policy is no good unless you can access it. We can have great policies and coverage, but we also have to have access. So we had a whole group of people who work all across America on these problems. And I myself spent a whole 4-hour period listening to this because I've worried about it for years, coming as I do from a small rural State, to be able to say to you that if this plan passes as we propose it, we'll be able to have the latest technologies given to doctors and nurses who can practice in the smallest rural communities and the most isolated parts of our large inner cities, to allow health professionals to contribute their best to all the people of this country who need these preventive services.

As you know from your efforts to gather all these signatures, change requires that people work together. But when they work together and make their voices heard, change can come. I'll never forget the meeting I had with breast cancer advocates at a hospital during the election, and I told Hillary after it was over that if we had the energy of the women who were there at that meeting concentrated on about four major things we could turn this country around in 3½ weeks.

And so I say to you in closing, we need that energy. And we will give you a vehicle,

beginning with Secretary Shalala's meeting in December, to develop a national action plan on breast cancer. But it is important that that plan be fit into a larger commitment to the health care of Americans: to put women's health concerns, from research to the delivery of health care, on an equal footing with men's; to say that it is better to focus on keeping people well than just treating them when they're sick, and when you focus on that you will find them when they're just a little sick and be able to get them well a whole lot quicker; and finally, to say that none of this will ever come to pass until we finally join the ranks of every other advanced country in this world and give every citizen of this country health care that is always there, that can never be taken away from them.

Every American can bring some weapon to this struggle, and your weapons are unique. They are not the dollars and deal-making talents of lobbyists or the stethoscopes or syringes of doctors and nurses. But they are the power of the pen and the petition and, most important of all, the power of the personal story. For in the end, America ought to be shaped by the lives of Americans, not just by the interests of Americans but by the values of Americans, not just by what we want when everything is going well but by what we need in our direst and most difficult moments.

I urge you to continue to fight in the months ahead. We can win this battle. As a part of the national drive for early breast cancer detection, tomorrow thousands of doctors and hospitals and medical centers across the country will offer discounted mammograms, thanks in no small measure to all of you.

I'm going to sign this proclamation when I finish my remarks which declares tomorrow National Mammography Day. I want to thank all the Members of Congress who pushed this through and two who are not here, Senator Biden and Congresswoman Marilyn Lloyd, who were sponsors of this legislation. And I want to remind you that you've got to continue to bring this level of intensity, of energy, of passion to this battle. You have the most powerful thing of all, personal stories. When American politics works best, it's when it reflects the lives of the American people. You can make sure on these issues we do that. And I hope you will.

Thank you, and God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:33 a.m. in the East Room at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Frances Visco, president, National Breast Cancer Coalition (NBCC); Dr. Susan Love, founder of the NBCC and director of the Breast Center at the University of California, Los Angeles; Matilda Cuomo, first lady of New York; and Lucinda Florio, first lady of New Jersey. Following his remarks, the President signed Proclamation 6615, National Mammography Day, 1993.

## Proclamation 6615—National Mammography Day, 1993

*October 18, 1993*

*By the President of the United States of America*

### *A Proclamation*

Breast cancer is an insidious disease that takes the lives of far too many women. This year alone, 182,000 American women are expected to develop breast cancer, and 46,000 will die of this disease. The risk of death from breast cancer is significantly reduced when the cancer is found in the earlier, more treatable stages of development. If women follow early detection guidelines, we should see a 30-percent drop in the breast cancer death rate. We all must work to ensure that every woman is informed about the serious risk of breast cancer and about the importance of regular breast exams and screening mammography. Most important, these health care procedures must be within the reach of all women.

The high survival rates of women who are diagnosed as having early stage breast cancer have motivated health professionals and other concerned citizens to focus their educational efforts on the importance of early detection. Women can take an active role in the fight against breast cancer through clinical breast exams, breast self-examination, and mammography. In many cases, cancers can be seen on a mammogram up to 2 years before they could be detected by a woman or her physician. The key to that advantage, however, is access to such screening.

I am pleased that third-party reimbursement for mammography is increasing, allowing more women to benefit from this life-saving procedure. Through Medicare, the Department of Health and Human Services covers much of the cost of screening mammography for women 65 and older. Most states and the District of Columbia now have laws requiring private insurers to offer coverage for this procedure. I urge every State government, insurance company, medical facility, and business to develop policies that ensure all women access to appropriate and affordable mammography. Of course, women must take responsibility for availing themselves of screening when it is available.

Likewise, health care professionals must make sure that their patients receive regular breast cancer screening. Businesses must offer screening to their employees in the form of insurance coverage or services offered. Community organizations and individuals not only must spread the word about the importance of early detection, but also must motivate women to get regular screenings.

I am heartened that we have the technology to discover breast cancer in its earliest stages, the means to motivate women to get regular mammograms, and the capability to treat early breast cancer successfully in most cases. These resources can save the lives of countless women. For the sake of American women and their loved ones, we all must strive to see that every woman is educated about early breast cancer detection and that she has access to all needed health care.

In recognition of the crucial role of mammography in the battle against breast cancer, the Congress, by House Joint Resolution 265, has designated October 19, 1993, as "National Mammography Day" and has authorized and requested the President to issue a proclamation in observance of this day.

**Now, Therefore, I, William J. Clinton,** President of the United States of America, do hereby proclaim October 19, 1993, as "National Mammography Day." I invite the Governors of the 50 States and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Mayor of the District of Columbia, and the appropriate officials of all other jurisdictions under the American flag to issue similar proclamations. I also ask health care professionals, private industry, advocacy groups, community associations, insurance companies, and all other interested organizations and individuals to observe this day by publicly reaffirming our Nation's continuing commitment to the control of breast cancer.

**In Witness Whereof,** I have hereunto set my hand this eighteenth day of October, in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred and ninety-three, and of the Independence of the United States of America the two hundred and eighteenth.

**William J. Clinton**

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 9:57 a.m., October 19, 1993]

NOTE: This proclamation was published in the *Federal Register* on October 20.

## Interview With Radio Reporters

*October 18, 1993*

***The President.*** First of all, I want to thank all of you for coming today and for offering all of us this opportunity to have a conversation with the radio listeners around the country and beyond.

I thought I would open just by saying that I have sent a letter this afternoon to Senator Mitchell in the Senate about some potential amendments to the defense appropriation bill and one actual amendment dealing with Bosnia, Haiti, and the whole command and control apparatus of our military as it relates to cooperation with other countries in peacekeeping and other endeavors. That amendment has actually been introduced.

The letter essentially says that I oppose the amendment that affects the way our military people do their business, working with NATO and other military allies. I think it unduly gets into the details of the command and control operations of the military, which I think is an error, and that I would oppose any amendments with regard to Haiti and Bosnia that were of questionable constitutionality and unduly restricted the ability of the President to make foreign policy, and outlines some of my concerns.

In Haiti, my concerns are that there should be no restrictions that would undermine the

ability of the President to protect the Americans on Haiti, that would aggravate the likelihood of another mass exodus of Haitians, or that would send a green light to the people who think they've got the best of both worlds: they got the sanctions lifted, and then they broke their word on the Governors Island Agreement.

With regard to Bosnia, the amendment simply points out that the United States has very strong NATO allies and that there were strict conditions that I have put on any kind of cooperation in Bosnia with NATO to enforce a peace agreement and that I think most Members of Congress agree with those conditions, but I don't think we should have an amendment which would tie the President's hands and make us unable to fulfill our NATO commitments, thus raising all kinds of questions about the long-term relationship of the United States to Europe.

So that's what the letter says. There is only one amendment so far that has been offered, and we are discussing with various Members of Congress other proposed amendments. We'll just have to see what happens. But I thought I ought to say clearly today that I would strenuously oppose such attempts to encroach on the President's foreign policy powers.

Now we can go to the questions. Mark [Mark Knoller, CBS News].

### *Haiti*

***Q.*** Thank you, Mr. President. Your opening statement raises the question of whether the United States would be willing to use military force for the purpose of removing the military leadership from Haiti and reinstalling President Jean-Bertrand Aristide in power.

***The President.*** Let me tell you what I have done today on Haiti, first of all. I just signed the Executive order freezing the assets of any people who are supporting the military and police leaders who have continued to fight the resumption of democracy and who are responsible for the bad things that have happened down there in the last few days. I have also, with the authorization of the Haitian government, directed our ships in the area to move closer to the shore so they will be in plain sight. And that has been done today.

I think we should continue to work with President Aristide and with Prime Minister Malval. They want to go back to the sanctions. Remember, once the sanctions were tough, and they included oil, they produced the Governors Island Agreement. And what happened is that people who have an economic stranglehold on Haiti got what they wanted with Aristide's request, that is, lifting the sanctions. They got the amnesty that Aristide promised, they thought he would never give. And then, when time came for them to deliver what they agreed to do, they didn't do it.

So I think the appropriate position for us to take at this time is to go back to those sanctions and make them as tough as possible and enforce them as completely as possible. And that is what the Prime Minister wants us to do and what President Aristide has asked us to do. I think it would be an error for me to discuss what further steps might or might not be taken. After all, we do have—I'll say again, we have 1,000 Americans there, and we have another 9,000 people with dual citizenship, and we'd have no way of knowing what will or won't happen.

But what the Haitians want is for the conditions of legitimacy to be maintained and restored. That is, the Haitian people have expressed their desires; two-thirds of them voted for President Aristide. And in terms of the questions that have been raised again in recent days about whether he could or could not govern the country, that's why he worked so hard with our support to get Mr. Malval, who plainly can run the government, as one of the ablest people in the nation to be the Prime Minister so they'd have the kind of partnership that would work. So I feel comfortable that they are capable of working with their friends and allies in the area to bring about a more democratic and a more prosperous Haiti if given the chance.

### *Health Care Reform*

***Q.*** Mr. President, economists are expressing some concern of late about your health care reform plan and about whether it might grow considerably larger than you envision. What assurances can you give the American

public that it either will not grow out of control or that the need for universal health care is worth it ballooning to the size of, say, Medicare and Medicaid, which are 10 times larger than originally predicted?

***The President.*** First of all, let me say that it's not a Government program. The Government will only insure the unemployed uninsured. Two-thirds of the funding for this program will come from employers and the employees who don't presently contribute anything to the American health care system.

Secondly, where have these economists been for the last 15 years? I mean, the American health care system is already 40 percent more expensive than any other one in the world and the only advanced health care system in the world that can't seem to figure out how to provide coverage to everybody while spending 40 percent more than anybody else spends.

The budget we just passed in this Government has Medicare and Medicaid going up at 3 times the rate of inflation. We proposed to reduce that in our bill. We have also ceilings on how much health care expenditures can increase in any given year if the competition doesn't cut the costs.

Now, if you look around the country at the places which have tried serious efforts at managed competition, including bringing the Medicaid program into a competitive arena, there's every indication that the rate of increase will slow down and that it will work. But the economists, they seem to want it all ways. They criticize me on the one hand for having a ceiling on how much costs could increase in any given year and then saying we don't have any guarantees, if you take it off they won't increase more. And it is difficult to imagine how we could design a system that would have costs more out of control than the one we have. I mean, the reason we have so much support here from employers in heavy industry, for example, who already cover their employees is that they're being killed by the cost increases.

The system we have is irresponsible and out of control financially, and doesn't provide health care security to Americans. So we think there are plenty of protections built in to slow the rate of increase in costs. In fact, if anything, I think we've been certainly realistic and then some, in estimating how fast we can slow costs down. That is, even under our plan, it is estimated that the percent of our income going to health care will go from about 14.5 to about 18 by the end of the decade, and that if we just stay with the system we've got, which is the alternative—in all these things, you've got to ask what's the alternative—we'll go from 14.5 to 19 to 20 by the end of the decade. We have allowed and budgeted for significant increased expenses in health care.

### *Republican Criticism*

***Q.*** Mr. President, in the past week or so you and your foreign policy team have come in for some pretty blistering criticism, especially from a group of prominent Republicans. Richard Lugar, Dick Cheney, Dan Quayle, James Baker, and Robert Dole have all been very, very critical of your foreign policy. And some members of your administration have suggested that's politically motivated, these people might be running for President. What do you make of it, and how do you react to those criticisms?

***The President.*** I think you can monitor their travel schedules and statements as well as I can. I don't have anything to say about that. I'm going to do my job as best I can. I'm going to try to support a bipartisan approach to foreign policy. I'm going to try to involve Republicans and Democrats in the process of consultation and getting as good advice as I can all the way along. And I think that you have to expect that when things go very well, as they did with Russia and the Middle East, people will say you're doing fine, and if difficulties arise, then some will say that you didn't do fine. So I just don't want to get into the politics of it.

If you want to talk about any specific policy in any specific country, I'll do my best to answer that. But I think it serves no useful purpose for me to engage any of them in this sort of debate. Whatever the political motivations are, I have a contract that runs for a specific amount of time. I'm going to do the very best I can during that time, and then when the time is up the American people can make their own judgments. I haven't even been President a year. I don't have any interest in starting a political debate now.

### *Administration Goals*

***Q.*** Even though it's been less than a year, Mr. President, it's been a very ambitious Presidency with a lot of projects you've taken on yourself, health care reform, reinventing Government, national service, things you inherited like Somalia, Haiti in a way, NAFTA. Is there ever coming a point, is there now a point that you just have to say, enough is enough for now, the plate is too full, we have to resolve some of these things before we get on with other things?

***The President.*** Oh, sure. And we have taken that position. I mean, first of all, if you go back to the budget, we kept the budget front and center until that was resolved. And it plainly has worked rather well. Long-term interest rates are still below 6 percent. The budget did some remarkable things. It dramatically broadened the availability of college loans to students, and it has the most significant piece of tax reform for working families in 20 years by increasing the earned-income tax credit, so that all working families on modest incomes with children will know they'll be lifted above the Federal poverty lines. That's a lot to accomplish in a year right there.

The national service bill passed, and very well, and of course, a number of other pieces of legislation have. And now, what we're going to focus on between now and the end of the year is making as much headway as we can on the first round of reinventing Government cuts, on the crime bill, on the political reform initiatives that some of which have passed the Senate already, the campaign finance reform and lobby reform bill, and on getting the health care bill heard and setting schedules there so we'll know that it will be reviewed along with all other ideas in a prompt and timely fashion, and we'll be able to see as we wind up here a process which unfolds next year and brings us to a date-certain vote.

But we do have a lot going. We probably had more done this year than in any given first year in a long time, and there's still a lot more to do. For example, we started our welfare reform task force hearings around the country, but I don't intend to offer any legislation on that until next year. And there will be a lot of other things that will come up as we go along next year. We want, for example, to change the whole unemployment system, as you know, to a reemployment system. We don't think that will be offered until next year, to give the American people a system of lifetime education and training.

I do hope that we can pass as many bills as possible this year. I was heartened by the fact that the House passed our education reform bill, the Goals 2000 bill, with such a big bipartisan majority last week, which made me think we could probably pass that bill completely before the Congress goes home the end of the year.

### *Russia*

***Q.*** Mr. President, it's coming up on 2 years since the end of the Soviet Union and the declaration by the remaining states to call themselves democracies or create democracies. Secretary Christopher is headed over there. Can you tell us what the objective of his trip is? Will he be looking to set up a summit meeting?

***The President.*** Well, there is a possibility, of course, that President Yeltsin and I will meet again early next year; I have to go to Europe to the NATO summit. But primarily, what he wants to do is to convey the continuing support of the United States for democracy and reform in Russia, to urge the Yeltsin administration on in their efforts to complete the timetable to get a new constitution and to have legislative elections and to restore completely the conditions of democracy in Russia, and to review the progress on the Russian aid package, both the ones, the two passed by the United States Congress here with strong bipartisan support and the international package that came out of the G–7 summit. And so he'll be doing all those things. And I'm sure they'll review some of the difficulties in that part of the world, too. President Yeltsin also has his share of foreign policy problems that he can't fully solve. But we'll talk about that. We're interested very much in some of those things. Especially we'd like to see the last Russian troops withdrawn from Latvia and Estonia, as they have been from Lithuania.

### *Haiti*

***Q.*** Mr. President, if we could return to the Haiti issue for just a moment. Senator Dole said he didn't think it was worth any American lives to restore President Aristide. You indicated you didn't want to go too far into options. But are there conditions beyond, say, a direct physical threat to the U.S. Embassy compound in Port-au-Prince under which you would consider committing U.S. troops to Haiti? For example, attacks or killings of foreigners, a flow of refugees, or maybe just threats against foreigners? Are there any conditions for sending U.S. troops?

***The President.*** I just think at this time it's better for me not to rule in or out options. Keep in mind, the Haitian Government, as we speak, has not asked for that and does not want that. And keep in mind that the sanctions did work once before to get this agreement, which was not honored perhaps because we raised the sanctions, we lifted the sanctions.

But let me remind you that the circumstances of this need to be focused on. Haiti is very much in our backyard. The people wanted democracy. There is the continuing issue of whether there would be another exodus of Haitians trying to come to the United States, something which I think is not in their interest or ours but is something that the present conditions could make more likely. And we do have those Americans there.

So what I want to do today is to encourage Prime Minister Malval and the brave people who are in his government and the good people of Haiti who plainly want democracy and are being pushed around by the only guys in town with guns, which I regret very much. But we are trying to preserve the legitimacy of democracy there.

Now, the truth is, as you know, there are people in this country, in the press, and in the Congress and elsewhere, who, notwithstanding the vote of the Haitian people, basically have never felt very strongly about returning Aristide anyway and have questioned his fitness to be President. You can do that with the winner of any election. But all I can tell you is that I would just like to observe just a couple of things. Number one is, unlike his adversaries, President Aristide has done everything he said he would do under the Governors Island Agreement, including giving them amnesty. And secondly, recognizing his lack of experience in politics and business, he reached out to a man like Malval, who's plainly one of the ablest people in the country and clearly a very stable and reassuring figure, asking him to run the government. So I feel that we should support the democratic movement in Haiti. And I think that the steps we're taking now are the appropriate ones.

### *Assistant Attorney General Nominee*

***Q.*** Mr. President, have you decided on a nominee for the position of Assistant Attorney General for Civil Rights?

***The President.*** I don't want to give you an evasive answer, but let me tell you what happened. We had, weeks ago, a nominee who declined the position for personal reasons. And the Justice Department was asked, the Attorney General specifically was asked, to make another recommendation. I believe that she has a recommendation for me which I have not yet formally received. But I am not positive of that, but I believe so.

### *Gun Control Legislation*

***Q.*** Mr. President, I'd like to ask you about a subject that you've brought up in a number of your remarks lately. You've been discussing the issue of gun control, firearms violence, the extremely high cost of health care related to firearm injuries. Senator Chafee of Rhode Island has once again introduced legislation which is pending in the Judiciary Committee now which would ban the sale, manufacture, possession, importation, or exportation of all handguns with exceptions for law enforcement, military, and licensed target clubs. You've talked about your support for the Brady bill and for a ban on assault weapons. How would you feel about Senator Chafee's bill, which I understand Dr. Sullivan, former HHS Secretary, is testifying on tomorrow?

***The President.*** Well, I have to read it, but I think it might go a little far if it bans all handguns, just because I think that there is a lot of evidence that Americans have used handguns responsibly for sporting purposes, that they're not all used as weapons for committing crimes or killing people. I do believe,

however—and let me say first—secondly, as a practical matter, I have not yet been able to get Congress to vote on the crime bill, including the Brady bill and the vote to ban a comprehensive list of assault weapons.

I also know that I heard that Senator Kohl has an amendment, which I would encourage, which would make national the ban on ownership or possession of handguns by minors unless with their parents or another supervising adult in an appropriate setting, which might be the way to go on the issue that Senator Chafee is concerned about. Nonetheless, I hold him in the highest regard. He's, I think, an extremely responsible person, and I welcome the hearings on his legislation. But I would have a little problem with a total ban on handguns. I would have a problem with that based on what my understanding of the situation is.

Again, we ought to focus on the Brady bill, the assault weapons ban, and banning possession by minors right now. Since I have been working on this in the last several months, one of the multitude of statistics that's made the biggest impression on me is the one that we were told a couple of weeks ago, that now someone shot in a criminal encounter is 3 times more likely to die from a gunshot wound because they're likely to have nearly three bullets in them, as opposed to only 15 years ago. That is a huge statistical change. And of course, as I pointed out, these wounds and the homicides put an enormous financial burden on this country, on the medical system, on the criminal justice system.

But mostly, it's an incredible human problem. We've got 90,000 people in the last 4 years murdered in America, most of them by gunshots. That's more in any single year than were ever lost in a single year in the war in Vietnam. I think the time has come to do something about this. And I'm hopeful that both Houses of Congress will act on the crime bill and on the assault weapons bill before the end of the year. I hate to keep coming back to this, but right now I don't know that we have the votes to pass the assault weapons ban in the Congress. And I hope we can get the votes to do that and to pass the limitation on minors and possession or ownership of handguns. I think if we push those now in the Brady bill, then the Congress could really make a dent on the exposure of Americans to lethal violence.

### *War Powers Resolution*

***Q.*** Mr. President, could I go back to your comments about the use of American military force and your discussions with Congress? Would you oppose, would you veto legislation which contained an amendment requiring you to ask and get the consent of Congress before you use troops in Haiti or Bosnia? And how far do you think the congressional role in the war powers area goes?

***The President.*** Well, let me say, my letter says that I want to resist and that I urge the Senate not to vote for things which unduly infringe on the President's power, and certainly not things that are of questionable constitutionality. Before I express an opinion about a veto, I need to see a specific piece of legislation. And there are still discussions going on about the questions of Haiti and Bosnia. The whole issue of the War Powers Resolution and the role of Congress and the role of the President obviously has been the subject of virtually nonstop debate in America for the last several years, for all kinds of obvious reasons. Sometimes Congress has acted or attempted to act to restrict the President's authority under Presidents Reagan and Bush, and sometimes they have.

All I can tell you is that I think I have a big responsibility to try to appropriately consult with Members of Congress in both parties—whenever we are in the process of making a decision which might lead to the use of force. I believe that. But I think that, clearly, the Constitution leaves the President, for good and sufficient reasons, the ultimate decisionmaking authority. And I think to cut off that authority in advance of it being made without all the circumstances and facts there before us is an error and could really lead to weakening our relationships with a lot of our allies and encouraging the very kind of conduct we want to discourage in the world.

I understand what's going on here, and it's all perfectly predictable, given any reading of American history and perfectly understandable, given the aversion that Americans have always had to seeing any of our young people die when the existence of our country

was not immediately at stake. And the President should be very circumspect and very careful in committing the welfare and the lives of even our All-Volunteer Army. We need to have a clear American interest there, and there needs to be clearly-defined conditions of involvement, and the burden is on the President to provide those. But still the President must make the ultimate decision, and I think it's a mistake to cut those decisions off in advance.

### *Advice From Previous Administrations*

***Q.*** Final question. Thank you, Mr. President. In the past week or so, President Bush himself and, as we've already discussed here today, some members of his foreign policy team have criticized your foreign policy team. I'm curious about the promise that has been reported that President Bush made to you. And it's also been reported in at least one commentary, that there was an implied promise from your side to go easy on any revelations about the so-called Iraqgate scandal. What can you tell us about your discussions with Mr. Bush on this?

***The President***. Well, first of all, with regard to the Iraqgate issue, there was no promise expressed or implied. There was no discussion about that between me and President Bush. I believe he said publicly that he would not have anything negative to say about the administration for a year at least, that he thought we were entitled to that.

And again, I just don't want to get into this. This is a free country, people have free speech, they can say whatever they want to say. I think you will agree. And maybe I've been wrong to do it, but I have been pretty careful about focusing on the problems we have in the future and not trying to spend a lot of time establishing partisan blame for the past. I said that in my State of the Union speech. I said it in the health care speech. I said it repeatedly. What's past is past. I'm doing the best I can with the issues that I faced when I came here. If the time comes in the future when I have to engage in a debate with any of those folks about who-did-what-when, I'll do my best to have that kind of a debate. But I just don't think—it doesn't get us very far. And I would hope that if they have a constructive suggestion to make about what America should do, I would be more than happy to take it. I'm not ashamed to ask for advice from anybody, Republicans or Democrats. I've called every living former President, I've called former Secretaries of State, I've called those that agreed and disagreed. As you know, Secretary Shultz thought that the previous administration should have done more in Bosnia, thought that we should. I mean, there are people who have—Secretary Kissinger thought just the reverse. I mean, this is a new and difficult and uncertain time. But if they have anything to say about what they think we ought to do, I'll be glad to listen, and I'd just ask that it be constructive when they do it.

***Q.*** I'm told by your aides that we're out of time. On behalf of the radio networks, we thank you, and we hope we can make this a regular thing.

***The President.*** I would like to do it on a regular basis. I'm a big radio listener, you know. Except if we did it enough, we could even have Top 10 countdowns in the middle and stuff. [*Laughter*]

***Q.*** We accept the challenge.

***The President.*** Thank you.

NOTE: The interview began at 3:40 p.m. in the Roosevelt Room at the White House.

## Statement on German Ratification of the Maastricht Treaty

*October 18, 1993*

With the completion of Germany's ratification process last week, the way has been cleared for the entry into force of the Maastricht Treaty. The Maastricht Treaty marks a milestone in the progress of the European Community toward political and economic union, a goal which the United States strongly supports and encourages.

On behalf of the American people, I offer congratulations to the Community on this occasion and reiterate our commitment to a strong and vibrant transatlantic partnership.

## Executive Order 12872—Blocking Property of Persons Obstructing Democratization in Haiti

*October 18, 1993*

By the authority vested in me as President by the Constitution and the laws of the United States of America, including the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 *et seq.*), the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1601 *et seq.*), and section 301 of title 3, United States Code, and in order to take additional steps with respect to the grave events that have occurred in the Republic of Haiti to disrupt the legitimate exercise of power by the democratically elected government of that country and with respect to the national emergency described and declared in Executive Order No. 12775,

**I, William J. Clinton,** President of the United States of America, hereby order:

***Section 1.*** Except to the extent provided in regulations, orders, directives, or licenses, which may hereafter be issued pursuant to this order, and notwithstanding the existence of any rights or obligations conferred or imposed by any international agreement or any contract entered into or any license or permit granted before the effective date of this order, all property and interests in property of persons:

(a) Who have contributed to the obstruction of the implementation of the United Nations Security Council Resolutions 841 and 873, the Governors Island Agreement of July 3, 1993, or the activities of the United Nations Mission in Haiti;

(b) Who have perpetuated or contributed to the violence in Haiti; or

(c) Who have materially or financially supported any of the foregoing, that are in the United States, that hereafter come within the United States, or that are or hereafter come within the possession or control of United States persons, including their overseas branches, are blocked.

***Sec. 2.*** Any transaction subject to U.S. jurisdiction that evades or avoids, or has the purpose of evading or avoiding, or attempts to violate, any of the prohibitions set forth in this order, or in Executive Orders Nos. 12775, 12779, or 12853, is prohibited, notwithstanding the existence of any rights or obligations conferred or imposed by any international agreement or any contract entered into or any license or permit granted before the effective date of this order, except to the extent provided in regulations, orders, directives, or licenses issued pursuant to the relevant Executive order and in effect on the effective date of this order.

***Sec. 3.*** The Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the Secretary of State, is hereby authorized to take such actions, including the promulgation of rules and regulations, and to employ all powers granted to me by the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, as may be necessary to carry out the purpose of this order. The Secretary of the Treasury may redelegate any of these functions to other officers and agencies of the United States Government, all agencies of which are hereby directed to take all appropriate measures within their authority to carry out the provisions of this order, including suspension or termination of licenses or other authorizations in effect as of the date of this order.

***Sec. 4.*** Nothing contained in this order shall create any right or benefit, substantive or procedural, enforceable by any party against the United States, its agencies or instrumentalities, its officers or employees, or any other person.

***Sec. 5.*** (a) This order shall take effect at 11:59 p.m., eastern daylight time on October 18, 1993.

(b) This order shall be transmitted to the Congress and published in the *Federal Register*.

**William J. Clinton**

The White House,
October 18, 1993.

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 4:26 p.m., October 18, 1993]

NOTE: This Executive order was published in the *Federal Register* on October 20.

## Message to the Congress on Blocking Property of Persons Obstructing Democratization in Haiti

*October 18, 1993*

*To the Congress of the United States:*

Pursuant to section 204(b) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. section 1703(b), and section 301 of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. section 1631, I hereby report that I have again exercised my statutory authority to issue an Executive order with respect to Haiti that, effective 11:59 p.m., e.d.t., Monday, October 18, 1993, that:

(a) Blocks all property in the United States or within the possession or control of United States persons, including their overseas branches, of persons:

(1) who have contributed to the obstruction of the implementation of United Nations Security Council Resolutions 841 and 873, the Governor's Island Agreement of July 3, 1993, or the activities of the United Nations Mission in Haiti;

(2) who have perpetuated or contributed to the violence in Haiti; or

(3) who have materially or financially supported any of the foregoing; and

(b) Prohibits any transaction subject to U.S. jurisdiction that evades or avoids, or has the purpose of evading or avoiding, or attempts to violate, the prohibitions in the new order, or in Executive Orders Nos. 12775, 12779, or 12853, except to the extent now authorized pursuant to the relevant Executive order.

I am enclosing a copy of the Executive order that I have issued.

The new Executive order is necessary to further the implementation of the Governors Island Agreement by reaching persons who are supporting the groups fomenting violence and opposing the restoration of constitutional government in Haiti. The new Executive order is to be implemented by the Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the Secretary of State.

**William J. Clinton**

The White House,
October 18, 1993.

## Letter to Senate Leaders on the Use of United States Armed Forces in International Operations

*October 18, 1993*

*Dear Mr. Leader:*

I am writing to express grave concern about a number of amendments that may be offered to H.R. 3116, the Defense Appropriations bill for FY 94, regarding Haiti, Bosnia and the use of United States armed forces in international operations.

I am fundamentally opposed to amendments which improperly limit my ability to perform my constitutional duties as Commander-in-Chief, which may well have unconstitutional provisions, and which if adopted, could weaken the confidence of our allies in the United States. Such amendments would provide encouragement to aggressors and repressive rulers around the world who seek to operate without fear of reprisal.

America's adversaries and allies must know with certainty that the United States can respond decisively to protect the lives of Americans and to address crises that challenge American interests. Successive administrations have found it critical in world affairs to be able to state that no option has been ruled out.

I respect and acknowledge the importance of cooperation between the executive and legislative branches. There will inevitably be give and take between the executive branch and Congress as we work to redefine our role in the post Cold War world. But it is wrong and even dangerous to allow the questions of the moment to undercut the strength of our national security policies and to produce a fundamental shift in the proper relationship between our two branches of government.

The amendment regarding command and control of U.S. forces, which already has been introduced, would insert Congress into the detailed execution of military contingency planning in an unprecedented manner. The amendment would make it unreasonably difficult for me or any President to operate militarily with other nations when it is in our

interest to do so—and as we have done effectively for half a century through NATO. It could lead to an all-or-nothing approach that causes the United States to shoulder the entire burden of a conflict even when a multinational approach would be most effective from the standpoint of military planning, burden sharing and other American national interests.

With regard to potential amendments on Haiti, let me caution against action that could aggravate that nation's violent conflict and undermine American interests. The situation on the ground in Haiti is highly unstable. Limiting my ability to act—or even creating the perception of such a limitation—could signal a green light to Haiti's military and police authorities in their brutal efforts to resist a return of democracy, could limit my ability to protect the more than 1,000 Americans currently in Haiti, and could trigger another mass exodus of Haitians, at great risk to their lives and great potential cost and disruption to our nation and others.

With regard to potential Bosnia amendments, our nation has worked with NATO to prepare to help implement a fair and enforceable peace settlement. This amendment thus could undermine our relationship with our NATO allies and frustrate the negotiation of an end to the aggression and ethnic cleansing in the former Yugoslavia. As you know, I have placed strict conditions on any U.S. involvement in Bosnia with which I believe most members of Congress would agree.

I am committed to full consultation with Congress on our foreign policy. As I have clearly stated for the record, I welcomed congressional authorization for U.S. operations in Somalia and would welcome similar action regarding U.S. efforts in Bosnia, should that become necessary. Further, as this Administration has done and is continuing to do, we will consult with and keep Congress fully informed on these and other issues that affect American national security.

I would welcome an opportunity to engage you and others in the bi-partisan leadership in a full and constructive dialogue about the processes of executive-legislative relations regarding America's engagement in a changed world. But amendments such as these are not the right way for the American government to decide how we act in the world, and I urge the Senate to reject them.

**Bill Clinton**

NOTE: Identical letters were sent to George Mitchell, majority leader of the Senate, and Bob Dole, minority leader of the Senate.

## Statement by the Press Secretary on Haiti

*October 18, 1993*

The President remains gravely concerned by the persistent refusal of the Haitian military authorities to fulfill their commitments under the Governors Island Agreement and at the repression which they continue to carry out against the Haitian people.

The President stated on October 15 that there are important American interests at stake in Haiti. We must protect American lives. We want to avoid a mass exodus of Haitians fleeing political persecution at great risk to themselves and at great potential cost and disruption to the United States and other nations. We want to help restore democracy in Haiti and thereby promote democracy throughout this hemisphere.

Therefore, the United States is taking several measures which will go into effect at 11:59 p.m. tonight to ensure strict implementation of the U.N. oil and arms embargo against Haiti. These measures will also sanction those individuals who are defying the U.N. measures, acting to disrupt the Governors Island Agreement, and preventing the restoration of democracy and return of President Aristide to Haiti.

The President is today signing an Executive order that will freeze the assets under U.S. jurisdiction of individuals ("Specially Designated Nationals") who have obstructed the Governors Island Agreement or the activities of the U.N. Mission in Haiti and who are perpetrating or contributing to the violence. It will also cover individuals who are financing or providing material support to those taking such actions. These groups include senior military and police officers and the civilian attachés and their financial patrons. Furthermore, we will deny visas to and

prohibit the entry into the United States of such individuals.

The United States has deployed six Navy vessels to help enforce the U.N. embargo. Argentina, Canada, and France also will contribute ships, and other countries are actively considering participation.

The military and police authorities must understand that they have no future in continuing their brutal resistance to the return of democracy and President Aristide. The United States is determined to work with the U.N., the OAS, and others to oppose this repression of the democratic will of the Haitian people.

## Appointment of Members of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations

*October 18, 1993*

The President announced his intention to appoint 10 members to the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations (ACIR) today. Among them is former Mississippi Governor William Winter, who will serve as ACIR's Chair.

The Commission was created during the 1970's to foster better relations between all levels of government. Its primary functions are to provide an intergovernmental problem-solving forum, policy recommendations for intergovernmental cooperation, identification of emerging issues, information dissemination, and technical and international assistance.

"As a former Governor and State attorney general, I am committed to improving cooperation between governments at all levels," said the President. "When people want something done by the government, they don't care whether it gets done by the county, by the State, or by the Federal Government, they just want the job done. The talented, experienced, and diverse group of people that I am appointing to this commission, with Governor Winter taking the lead, will work to find ways to help public servants at all levels achieve that goal."

The commissioners being appointed are:

William F. Winter, former Governor of Mississippi;
Carol Browner, EPA Administrator;
Howard Dean, Governor of Vermont;
Marcia L. Hale, White House Director of Intergovernmental Affairs;
Arthur Hamilton, minority leader, Arizona House of Representatives;
Michael Leavitt, Governor of Utah;
Bob Miller, Governor of Nevada;
Gloria Molina, member, Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors;
Richard Riley, Secretary of Education;
John Stroger, commissioner of Cook County, IL, and immediate past president of the National Association of Counties.

NOTE: Biographies of the appointees were made available by the Office of the Press Secretary.

## Nomination for an Assistant Secretary of Commerce

*October 18, 1993*

The President announced today that he intends to nominate GTE executive Graham R. Mitchell to be Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Technology Policy.

"I have called on the Commerce Department to take the lead in giving our country the technological capability to win in a competitive world marketplace," said the President. "With his years of high-tech management experience, Graham Mitchell has the know-how that effort requires."

NOTE: A biography of the nominee was made available by the Office of the Press Secretary.

## Nomination for an Associate Judge of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia

*October 18, 1993*

The President announced today that he will nominate Rafael Diaz to be an associate judge of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia. The President is empowered by statute to choose DC Superior Court judges from a list submitted by a local nominating commission.

"Rafael Diaz has proven himself with a decade's service to the District of Columbia,"

said the President. ''His solid record and his reputation for competence have been widely noted, and he has been strongly recommended by a wide range of people. I expect him to be an outstanding judge.''

NOTE: A biography of the nominee was made available by the Office of the Press Secretary.

## Remarks and an Exchange With Reporters Prior to a Meeting With Members of Congress

*October 19, 1993*

### *NAFTA*

***The President.*** Let me say, first of all, I'm glad to have this bipartisan House delegation here, the latest in a round of several meetings on NAFTA. I want to begin by expressing my encouragement of today's housing numbers as well as the reports of increased business investment, which indicate that the economy is picking up. And I'm encouraged by that. And I know that all of us hope that that will work and that the lower interest rates and the declining deficit will help to support continued economic renewal.

But if America wants to grow more jobs, we're going to have to increase our exports. And therefore it is critical that we continue pushing and pass this trade agreement before the Congress goes home. And I'm here to—hopeful we pick up a few more votes for the NAFTA agreement today and to discuss some of the outstanding issues on it with the Members here. It's imperative: We can have an economic recovery, but if we're going to create jobs, we're going to have to increase exports. That's what wealthy countries have to do. And I hope we can do that here and pass NAFTA.

### *Somalia*

***Q.*** Mr. President, does the withdrawal of the Rangers from Somalia, sir, mean that you've given up on the search for Aideed?

***The President.*** No, it means that we have 3,600 marines coming in, many of whom have similar capacities, who will be there. And it means that right now we are engaging in a political process to see how we can resolve our mission in Somalia and to do all the things the United Nations ordered to do, including working out a political solution and having a process by which the people who were responsible for killing the Pakistani soldiers—that's what started all this—that that investigation can proceed and appropriate action can be taken. There may be another way to do that. So right now we're in a standdown position. It does mean that a final decision's been made.

***Q.*** Mr. President, you have set a deadline of March 31st to get the troops out of Somalia. Do you have any contingency plans for Somalia at all?

***The President.*** Well, we're doing what we agreed to do. We're pursuing negotiations to try to get a political solution. And I'm happy to say that, if anything, as you probably noted in the paper today, we're able to fulfill our mission better now than we have been for the last few months. We're delivering the safety of the—and our mission is going along as planned.

### *NAFTA*

***Q.*** Mr. President, this is your sixth meeting with the Members of Congress on NAFTA. So far only three Members have emerged saying that they've shifted their position—these meetings. Are you making the progress you need in order to ratify it and——

***The President.*** I think we are. A lot of people have said things to me privately that they haven't said yet in public. And I think the Congress is still waiting to see how we're going to work out some of these other issues, including the training programs—a lot of the Democrats want to know—and they're going to have a chance to vote on that. And we still have to work through the whole issue of how we deal with the fact that if we pass NAFTA, we have to reduce tariffs. And that's a $2.5 billion tax on American consumers today, the tariffs are, that we will reduce. And under our budget laws, that has to be replacing—so we have to work through that. There are still some practical things to work out.

I believe that a majority of the Congress today believes it's the right thing to do. So our question is whether we can persuade a majority to vote, do what they think is right. I think by the end of November we'll be able to do that.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:45 a.m. in the Cabinet Room at the White House. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

## Remarks at the White House Conference on Climate Change

*October 19, 1993*

Ladies and gentlemen, first let me thank you all for being here and thank the Vice President, the Cabinet, our Science Adviser, Katie McGinty, and others who worked so hard on this policy. If I might begin by just observing, I was looking at the clouds hoping we didn't have too much of a climate change this morning before the event could unfold.

This is an issue which has been of great concern to me for a long time. When I decided to seek this office back in 1991, I did it after having spent more than a decade as a Governor deeply frustrated by what seemed to me too often to be inevitable, persistent, aggravating conflicts between the impulse to promote economic opportunity for the people that I represented and the clear obligation, the moral obligation, on all of us to try to preserve this planet that we all share. And anyone with eyes to see could look down the road and recognize that, even with imperfect scientific knowledge, at some point the impulse to give people something to do would have to be reconciled with the obligation to preserve the planet we all share and that if there were ways through the use of technology and partnerships and ingenuity to actually enhance economic opportunities while preserving the planet, how much better off we would all be.

That is what we have sought to do in this administration. The Vice President outlined the number of things that we have tried to do to move the environmental agenda forward and at the same time move our economy forward. I remember so well the sort of shocking but bracing and reinforcing feeling I had the first time I began to go to New Hampshire, which is what you have to do in this country if you want to ultimately become President, to find that people just living their own lives in what was in a very economically depressed State also believed that we could find a way and that we had to find a way to pursue our economic objectives and fulfill our moral responsibilities to have an aggressive and responsible program about the environment.

That cannot be done unless we change our attitude about what we put into our atmosphere and how we respect the air we breathe. That requires us to meet head-on the serious threat of global warming. I made a commitment to do that on Earth Day this year, to make a commitment to an approach that would draw on the most innovative people we could find in this country, whether they were in business, labor, government, or the environmental movement, to turn this challenge into an opportunity. And that's what this report seeks to do. It seeks to give the American people the ability to compete and win in the global economy while meeting our most deep and profound environmental challenges.

We have begun the task of linking our economy to the environment today in what I believe is a truly extraordinary fashion. And I think if all of you read the plan in its exquisite and sometimes mind-bending detail, you will see that it is a very aggressive and very specific first step; I would argue, the most aggressive and the most specific first step that any nation on this planet has taken in the face of perhaps the biggest environmental threat to this planet.

The task is accomplished primarily by harnessing private market forces, by leveraging modest Government expenditures to create a much larger set of private sector investments, and by establishing new public-private partnerships to bring out our best research and our best technologies. This plan takes the environmental debate where it should have been years ago, beyond a confrontation over ideology to a conversation about ideas, beyond polemics to real progress.

On Earth Day I made a commitment to reduce our emissions of greenhouse gases to 1990 levels by the year 2000. And I asked for a blueprint on how to achieve this goal. In concert with all other nations, we simply must halt global warming. It is a threat to our health, to our ecology, and to our economy. I know that the precise magnitude and patterns of climate change cannot be fully

predicted. But global warming clearly is a growing, long-term threat with profound consequences. And make no mistake about it, it will take decades to reverse. But the first step is before us today. And because most of our recommendations do not require legislation, something which will doubtless please the Congress with all the burdens they have already on their plate, we can take action on our plan beginning today.

This plan is the result, as the Vice President has said, of genuine collaboration based on solid scientific and economic analysis, including funding to back up each and every proposal it contains. Like the announcement of our clean car initiative last month, this approach to global warming encourages public-private cooperation across a spectrum of economic, technological, and environmental questions. There are 50 separate initiatives in this plan, touching every sector of our economy because the problem, frankly, affects every sector of the economy. There are measures to improve energy efficiencies in commercial buildings and to make better household appliances. There are new agreements with public utilities to reduce greenhouse gases and new public-private ventures to increase the efficiency of industrial motors.

The plan will make it possible for all Americans to purchase appliances unlike any we own today. When your furnace dies or your washer breaks, you'll be able to go to a local store and buy a new appliance much more efficient than any you can buy today, and one that will save money in its operation. The energy savings we achieve will lower the cost of doing business in America and make us more competitive on the world market and more prosperous here at home. And the investments generated by this plan will create jobs in the sectors that make, install, and use energy efficient and pollution-cutting technologies.

Finally, to meet the challenge of global warming, as I have said with regard to cutting the deficit and reforming health care and in so many other areas, we frankly must all take some more personal responsibility. We will all benefit environmental and economically from the actions we are proposing today, and it will take all of us to make this plan work. So I say to all the American people: If your utility offers you help in conserving energy in your own home, seize it. If you own a business and the EPA offers you a chance to join the Green Lights program, do it. If you run a factory and the Department of Energy offers you a plan to help install an efficient motor system, use it. You will save money, and you will help your country and your fellow citizens.

This plan isn't designed for an archive. It's designed for action, for rapid implementation, constant monitoring, and for adjustments as necessary to meet our goals. It's part of a long-range strategy that includes the establishment of a team here in the White House to identify and implement those policies which will continue the trend of reduced emissions.

The action plan reestablishes the United States as a world leader in protecting the global climate. I urge other industrial countries to move rapidly to produce plans as detailed, as realistic, and as achievable as ours. This initiative gives us a chance, a very, very good chance to reduce greenhouse gases, grow our economy, and create a new high-skill, high-wage job base in America.

We take pride here in this country in the love we have for our land, in our leadership among nations, in our ability to set new goals and solve new challenges. Today we have given life to those values again. And through them, we will help to build a healthier environment and a stronger economy for decades to come. We also will help to meet our moral obligation to ourselves, our neighbors around the world, and most important, to our children.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 12:27 p.m. on the South Lawn at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to John H. Gibbons, Assistant to the President for Science and Technology.

## Message to the Senate Transmitting the Israel-United States Tax Convention Protocol

*October 19, 1993*

*To the Senate of the United States:*

I transmit herewith for the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification the Second Protocol Amending the Convention Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the State of Israel with Respect to Taxes on Income, signed at Washington on November 20, 1975, as amended by the Protocol signed May 30, 1980. The Second Protocol was signed at Jerusalem on January 26, 1993. Also transmitted for the information of the Senate is an exchange of notes and the report of the Department of State with respect to the Protocol.

The Second Protocol further amends the 1975 Convention, as amended by the 1980 Protocol, in large measure to accommodate certain post-1980 provisions of U.S. tax law and treaty policy. The new Protocol also reflects changes in Israeli law and makes certain technical corrections to the Convention that are necessary because of the passage of time. It will modernize tax relations between the two countries and will facilitate greater private sector U.S. investment in Israel.

I recommend that the Senate give early and favorable consideration to the Protocol and give its advice and consent to ratification.

**William J. Clinton**

The White House,
October 19, 1993.

## Message to the Congress Transmitting Reports of the Department of Transportation

*October 19, 1993*

*To the Congress of the United States:*

I transmit herewith the 1992 calendar year reports as prepared by the Department of Transportation on activities under the Highway Safety Act and the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1966, as amended (23 U.S.C. 401 note and 15 U.S.C. 1408).

**William J. Clinton**

The White House,
October 19, 1993.

## Message to the Congress Transmitting the Report of the Federal Prevailing Rate Advisory Committee

*October 19, 1993*

*To the Congress of the United States:*

In accordance with section 5347(e) of title 5 of the United States Code, I transmit herewith the 1992 annual report of the Federal Prevailing Rate Advisory Committee.

**William J. Clinton**

The White House,
October 19, 1993.

## Statement on Congressional Action on Department of Commerce Appropriations

*October 19, 1993*

The House/Senate conference decision to bolster the Department of Commerce FY94 budget to $3.56 billion, a 12.6 percent increase over FY93 levels of $3.16 billion, represents a vote of confidence in this administration's investment priorities and in the Department of Commerce. The budget increases reflect the increased responsibilities of the Commerce Department under the leadership of Secretary Ron Brown.

Congress' decision hits a home run for this administration's civilian technology and defense conversion policies. It demonstrates the importance of our efforts to promote economic growth through civilian technology and address the aftermath of economic dislocation resulting from the end of the cold war. Their decision affirms our goal of building a stronger, more competitive private sector able to maintain U.S. leadership in critical world markets.

Highlights of the Commerce appropriations include:

- $80 million for defense conversion. These funds will provide a much needed boost to the Economic Development Administration's programs to assist communities that have been impacted by the end of the cold war.
- $520.2 million for the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST). NIST will be able to bolster its technology outreach programs, the advanced technology program, and the manufacturing extension partnership.
- $70.9 million for the National Telecommunication and Information Administration. The NTIA appropriation will set a speedy pace for this agency's lead role in fulfilling this administration's goal of an information superhighway, as outlined by the "National Information Infrastructure: Agenda for Action."

I commend the congressional leadership, Senator Ernest Hollings, Senator Pete Domenici, Congressman Neal Smith, and Congressman Harold Rogers, for their foresight and support in revitalizing this country through these programs. It is a dramatic step forward for the United States toward a solid economic future.

## Nomination for an Assistant Secretary of Energy

*October 19, 1993*

The President announced his intention to nominate Christine Ervin, currently director of the Oregon department of energy, to be Assistant Secretary of Energy for Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy.

"We must expand our efforts to use energy more efficiently and to develop new, renewable sources of energy," said the President. "Having an Assistant Secretary of Energy with Christine Ervin's wide range of experience will help us to move that process forward."

NOTE: A biography of the nominee was made available by the Office of the Press Secretary.

## Remarks at the NAFTA Jobs and Products Day Trade Fair

*October 20, 1993*

Thank you very much. I want to thank Harold and Bob and, of course, Lee Iacocca, who has been such an eloquent spokesperson for NAFTA. It's nice to see him on television in an ad where he's—I enjoy watching him sell Chryslers, but I like seeing him sell NAFTA even more in the television ads.

I want to thank the many Members of the United States Congress who are here today. They hold the fate of this trade agreement and in many ways the fate of America's trade future in their hands. I want to thank the members of the Cabinet who are here today: the Treasury Secretary, Lloyd Bentsen; our United States Trade Ambassador, Mickey Kantor, who negotiated the agreements on the environment, on labor standards, and some other things which make this a truly unique trade agreement in the history of world trade; the Labor Secretary, the Education Secretary, the Commerce Secretary, Bob Reich, Dick Riley, and Ron Brown. I've seen all of them. There may be other members of the Cabinet here today showing our unified support for this agreement. I also want to thank all the companies and the workers who came here today. They really showed what this trade agreement is all about. It's about the jobs of American workers and the future of American working families, people who are determined to compete and win.

Today the demonstrations in these two tents should show our country and show our Congress why we need NAFTA. In the next month before the vote, we've got to vigorously make this case to the American people. I was talking with Bob and the other steelworkers over at their exhibit over here, and I said, "You know, we figure that an enormous number of America's unions will actually pick up jobs if this agreement passes."

The NAFTA fight is an interesting one to me. Lee Iacocca has already said it pretty well, but I have to restate it for you in personal terms. Before I became President, I was a Governor of my State for a dozen years during the 1980's. When I took office in

1983, our unemployment rate was 3 percentage points above the national average. I know all about losing jobs to trade, to not being able to compete. There are a lot of companies here that have plants in my State, and I believe that every one I saw here, I have personally been in the plant. I saw companies shut down and move to Mexico in the 1980's. And when it happened, because I live in a small State, I knew who they were. I'm proud to say we brought one of them back, too, before I left office. I would not ever do anything knowingly that would cost jobs to the American economy and take opportunities from American working people. This won't do that; it will do the reverse.

The people who are fighting this are bringing to this fight the resentments that they have over what happened in the 1980's. You heard Lee talk about it: How many decent people lost their jobs? How many times did we see people shut down and move to other countries solely because of lower labor costs or higher other production costs in America? That's what happened before. But in the last 12 or 13 years we have seen productivity growth in the production sector in the United States go up at 4 percent or more a year.

You heard Lee say that you can now produce an automobile for anywhere in this part of the world cheaper in the United States than anyplace else. We've had two European companies put plants in North America. They could have gone to Mexico. Where did they go? One went to South Carolina. One is now going to Alabama. Why? Because it's cheaper. Because the labor is highly productive, even though more expensive, and that is a relatively small part of a big, complex operation, making an automobile and putting it into a showroom.

And I tell you, friends, if we can get folks in this country to focus on what this trade agreement does, it will alleviate the anxieties that so many people had in the 1980's. It raises the cost of production in Mexico by requiring greater investments in labor and in the environment. It lowers the trade barriers. On automobiles alone, the domestic content requirement will be lowered, and we'll be able to go from selling one to 50,000 American cars in one year alone. It will give us access to a Mexican market on preferential terms as compared with our Japanese and our European competitors, something that we have seen on the reverse side not only in Europe but especially in Asia. And it will create good jobs. We'll not only get more jobs out of this, but the jobs we get related to exports pay on average about 17 percent more than nonexport-related jobs in this country.

And look at the Mexicans. You know, frankly, I'm getting a little weary of hearing people criticize Mexico as not perfect. You think everybody else we trade with in the world is perfect? Look at the progress they have made. It's hard to show a country that's made a stronger commitment to open markets and a free enterprise system, coming from a long way back.

In most of my lifetime, if you wanted to be a popular politician in Mexico, the way to be popular was to badmouth the United States, blame all of the problems of the people on the United States. The last two Presidents of Mexico have started to turn that around. This President said, ''We're going to compete in the global economy, and we're going to try to have open relationships. And we're going to start with the United States.'' And unilaterally, they have lowered a lot of their tariffs, even though they're still 2.5 times as high as ours. And now we've got the trade surplus that Lee Iacocca talked about.

We can do so much better if we adopt this agreement and we give ourselves a chance to compete in a friendly way with a country that now likes the United States, wants to be tied to the United States, full of 80 million people who spend 70 percent of the money they spend on foreign products in the United States of America. It is a pretty good deal, and it's time we started to take it.

We believe that this agreement will create 200,000 new jobs by 1995 alone. Keep in mind, as has already been said, the Mexican economy today is only about one-twentieth the size of the American economy; it's about the size of the economy of California from Los Angeles County to the Mexican border. And already these folks are accounting for a $6 billion trade surplus.

Imagine what would happen to the American economy as the Mexican economy grows, as the people there have their incomes go up, as they have more money to spend, and as they have a special trade relationship with the United States. Imagine, those of you who are involved in manufacturing, all the other things that are going to happen if we have this special relationship. One of our American toy manufacturers has already announced that they will change their plant location from China to Mexico and therefore will buy what is 85 percent of the value of the toy, the plastic parts, from an American company instead of a Japanese company. There are absolutely unforeseeable consequences of this.

Let me just tell you about a couple of the companies that we just saw. The Harris Corporation is the number one United States supplier of radio and TV broadcast equipment. Twenty-nine percent of its $3 billion in annual sales come from exports. And in the last couple of years, sales to Mexico have gone from $12 million to $40 million a year, despite 20 percent tariffs. Imagine what will happen when the tariffs drop: More people will be hired.

There's a small business from Covington, Kentucky, represented back here, the Monarch Tool and Manufacturing Company, which began to export coin slots to Mexico over the last 3 years. The company was foundering in the mid-eighties. Now almost 70 percent of its sales come from exports.

There's a company here from California, of which I am a satisfied customer, Golden Bear Sportswear. During the 1980's, this company, which makes among other things leather bomber jackets, moved its factory from San Francisco to Korea. And after 4 years they moved back. The lady that runs the company wrote me one of the most moving letters I've ever received, saying that she was absolutely determined to keep jobs in America and in California, to work with the people who helped to build the company and buy its products. Now the business is flourishing, and the owners are proud to put "Made in the U.S.A." on the jackets. The family-owned business with 100 employees makes 100,000 jackets a year, most marketed through retailers like Brooks Brothers, the Gap, L.L. Bean, and Lands' End. They have annual sales of $16 million. Instead of moving a plant to Korea, they'd like to move some of those jackets to Mexico. I think we ought to give them a chance to do it. That's what America is all about.

The beacon of our country's technological genius, Hewlett-Packard of Palo Alto, California, has computers which now face a 20 percent tariff in Mexico, which will drop to zero. Three years ago, Mexicans bought 120,000 personal computers. Last year they bought 390,000 personal computers. Imagine how many personal computers 80 million people could buy if there were not a 20 percent duty on those products.

Let me just say two other things about this. One person that I talked to on the line, and I wish I could remember where he was, said, "You know, Mr. President, as important as NAFTA is for Mexico and American trade, it may be actually more important for other things. It will say to the world whether we're a good trading partner. It will say to the world whether the United States Government has a constant policy of supporting expanded trade and whether the President and the trade apparatus of the country can be trusted to make deals that America adheres to." Yes, you said that. [*Laughter*] And I thank you for that. And I can tell you this, it will also say to the world and especially to the rest of Latin America whether the United States wants to be a good neighbor again, whether we want to reestablish the kind of feeling that existed 30 years ago and 60 years ago.

I tell you, my friends, democracy and the fever for a market economy is sweeping across Latin America. I dream of the day when we'll have over 700 million people in this trading bloc united in believing that we can help one another grow and flourish. But all the other countries of the world are looking at us, and all the other countries of Latin America want to know: Are we going to do this or not?

Colombia, not a very big country, has a President struggling to liberate its country from the scourge of the dominance of drugs, struggling to develop a diversified free market economy. In the last 2 years, that little

country's increased their purchases of American products by 69 and 64 percent on their own. The President of Colombia says, ''I want to be a part of NAFTA.''

Chile, for so long a military dictatorship, is now a democratic free market economy endorsing NAFTA. They don't benefit from it. They just want it to be a symbol of something they can be a part of. Look at Argentina, once the eighth wealthiest country in the entire world, finally on the way back again. We have opportunities we cannot dream of. I don't know how long it will take us to put all that back together if we turn away from this.

The last thing I want to say is this: I have really tried to avoid talking about all the bad things that will happen if it doesn't pass because I want us to be optimistic and upbeat. And I don't want us to adopt this out of fear. There's been too much fearmongering on the other side, and all kinds of ridiculous statements made. But it is simply a fact that Mexico needs access to sophisticated goods and products, that Mexico needs access to investors who can make secure investments.

What would we do in America if we turn away from this and they make this sort of arrangement with Japan or with Europe, and they make the investments there, and then we have to deal with their products coming through the back door from Mexico? What will happen to our job base? I'm telling you, everything people worried about in the 1980's will get worse if this thing is voted down and will get better if it's voted up.

My friends in California worried about the large influx of illegal immigrants—California, a State built by immigrants but burdened by illegal immigration in volume too great for a State with a very high unemployment rate today to handle. And people are afraid there. What's going to happen if it passes, or if it doesn't pass? If NAFTA passes, you won't have what you have now, which is everybody runs up to the *maquiladora* line, gets a job in a factory, and then runs across the line to get a better job. Instead there will be more uniform growth in investment across the country, and people will be able to work at home with their families. And over the period of the next few years, we will dramatically reduce pressures on illegal immigration from Mexico to the United States.

But if you beat this, will it reduce the pressure for people looking for illegal immigration? No. It will increase the pressure on people coming here. So if you want to have the immigration problem eased, you must vote for NAFTA, not against it. We can go through issue after issue after issue, and it's the same.

So I say to you again what we started this with. I know this has been a tough time for most Americans. There's all this bewildering change in the world, and it's making people's jobs less secure. And at the same time, we've got a lot of problems here at home with violence, with the availability and cost of health care, with all the other things that are bothering our people. But we are trying to address those in this administration. We're trying to give Americans greater security in their family lives, in their education lives, with their health care, and on their streets. But we cannot create security out of an unwillingness to change.

This vote really is going to say a lot about what kind of people we expect to be. Are we going to hunker down and turn away and say, ''My goodness, we're going to be overcome by a trade agreement with Mexico''? Or are we going to take this as the first step toward reaching out to the rest of the world, saying Americans can compete and win again?

We've got all the evidence we need. We know that it's not just the United States. No wealthy country in the world today can create new jobs without expanding trade. It cannot be done. Nobody is doing it. Nobody is doing it. And if you look at Europe, the most protectionist countries have higher unemployment rates. The most open market in Europe, Germany, is the only country with an unemployment rate as low as ours. I'm telling you, this is going to define what kind of people we're going to be and whether we want to really compete and win in the global economy. I think Americans are winners. And I think when it comes down to it, the Congress will vote for us to win.

I want to say this one thing on behalf of the Members of the Congress. They have to make this vote. I'm working with them to

make sure that we can get the training we need for people who will be dislocated. We need to do that for people anyway, all across America. And we will have a strategy to help those areas of the country that are already in trouble that have nothing to do with this. But the Congress tells me over and over again, they hear from the people who are against NAFTA because they're afraid and they're whipped up. They don't hear from the people who are for it, who are going to win.

So we brought you here today not only to send a message to them but so that I could ask you and companies like you and employees like your employees all across America to call or write the Members of the Congress in every State, without regard to party, to talk about this. They need to hear from people who will get jobs, who will have increased incomes, who will have increased opportunities.

I agree with Mr. Iacocca. We have no one to blame but ourselves if this thing goes down. We've got the facts on our side; they've got the fear on their side. We need to get the facts to the Congress in the faces of the people who will win from this agreement. And we have to do that.

Every time you have to face a big change in your life, you can make one of two decisions: You can hunker down and hope it'll go away, or you can sort of face it and make it turn out all right. You can make change your friend. If you hunker down and hope it goes away, that works about one time in 100. The other 99 percent of the time, you better figure out a way to make change your friend, because it's coming at you anyway. The world economy is coming at us anyway. We have already paid the price for our inadequacies. We are now competitive, and we can win. And it is time we use NAFTA to prove it to ourselves, as well as to the rest of the world.

Thank you, and God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:31 a.m. on the South Lawn at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Harold Sumpter, senior vice president, H&H Industries, and steelworker Bob Scheydt.

## Statement on Signing the Executive Order on Federal Acquisition, Recycling, and Waste Prevention

*October 20, 1993*

Families, businesses, and communities all across America know that recycling makes sense. It saves money and it protects the environment. It's time for the Government to set an example and provide real leadership that will help create jobs and protect the environment, encouraging new markets for recycled products and new technologies.

NOTE: The President's statement was included in a White House announcement on the President's signing of Executive Order 12873.

## Executive Order 12873—Federal Acquisition, Recycling, and Waste Prevention

*October 20, 1993*

**Whereas,** the Nation's interest is served when the Federal Government can make more efficient use of natural resources by maximizing recycling and preventing waste wherever possible;

**Whereas,** this Administration is determined to strengthen the role of the Federal Government as an enlightened, environmentally conscious and concerned consumer;

**Whereas,** the Federal Government should—through cost-effective waste prevention and recycling activities—work to conserve disposal capacity, and serve as a model in this regard for private and other public institutions; and

**Whereas,** the use of recycled and environmentally preferable products and services by the Federal Government can spur private sector development of new technologies and use of such products, thereby creating business and employment opportunities and enhancing regional and local economies and the national economy;

**Now, Therefore, I, William J. Clinton,** by the authority vested in me as President by the Constitution and the laws of the United States of America, including the Solid Waste Disposal Act, Public Law 89–272, 79

Stat. 997, as amended by the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (''RCRA''), Public Law 94–580, 90 Stat. 2795 as amended (42 U.S.C. 6901–6907), and section 301 of title 3, United States Code, hereby order as follows:

PART 1—PREAMBLE

***Section 101.*** Consistent with the demands of efficiency and cost effectiveness, the head of each Executive agency shall incorporate waste prevention and recycling in the agency's daily operations and work to increase and expand markets for recovered materials through greater Federal Government preference and demand for such products.

***Sec. 102.*** Consistent with policies established by Office of Federal Procurement Policy (''OFPP'') Policy Letter 92–4, agencies shall comply with executive branch policies for the acquisition and use of environmentally preferable products and services and implement cost-effective procurement preference programs favoring the purchase of these products and services.

***Sec. 103.*** This order creates a Federal Environmental Executive and establishes high-level Environmental Executive positions within each agency to be responsible for expediting the implementation of this order and statutes that pertain to this order.

PART 2—DEFINITIONS

For purposes of this order:

***Sec. 201.*** ''Environmentally preferable'' means products or services that have a lesser or reduced effect on human health and the environment when compared with competing products or services that serve the same purpose. This comparison may consider raw materials acquisition, production, manufacturing, packaging, distribution, reuse, operation, maintenance, or disposal of the product or service.

***Sec. 202.*** ''Executive agency'' or ''agency'' means an Executive agency as defined in 5 U.S.C. 105. For the purpose of this order, military departments, as defined in 5 U.S.C. 102, are covered under the auspices of the Department of Defense.

***Sec. 203.*** ''Postconsumer material'' means a material or finished product that has served its intended use and has been discarded for disposal or recovery, having completed its life as a consumer item. ''Postconsumer material'' is a part of the broader category of ''recovered material''.

***Sec. 204.*** ''Acquisition'' means the acquiring by contract with appropriated funds for supplies or services (including construction) by and for the use of the Federal Government through purchase or lease, whether the supplies or services are already in existence or must be created, developed, demonstrated and evaluated. Acquisition begins at the point when agency needs are established and includes the description of requirements to satisfy agency needs, solicitation and selection of sources, award of contracts, contract financing, contract performance, contract administration and those technical and management functions directly related to the process of fulfilling agency needs by contract.

***Sec. 205.*** ''Recovered materials'' means waste materials and by-products which have been recovered or diverted from solid waste, but such term does not include those materials and by-products generated from, and commonly reused within, an original manufacturing process (42 U.S.C. 6903 (19)).

***Sec. 206.*** ''Recyclability'' means the ability of a product or material to be recovered from, or otherwise diverted from, the solid waste stream for the purpose of recycling.

***Sec. 207.*** ''Recycling'' means the series of activities, including collection, separation, and processing, by which products or other materials are recovered from the solid waste stream for use in the form of raw materials in the manufacture of new products other than fuel for producing heat or power by combustion.

***Sec. 208.*** ''Waste prevention,'' also known as ''source reduction,'' means any change in the design, manufacturing, purchase or use of materials or products (including packaging) to reduce their amount or toxicity before they become municipal solid waste. Waste prevention also refers to the reuse of products or materials.

***Sec. 209.*** ''Waste reduction'' means preventing or decreasing the amount of waste being generated through waste prevention, recycling, or purchasing recycled and environmentally preferable products.

***Sec. 210.*** "Life Cycle Cost" means the amortized annual cost of a product, including capital costs, installation costs, operating costs, maintenance costs and disposal costs discounted over the lifetime of the product.

***Sec. 211.*** "Life Cycle Analysis" means the comprehensive examination of a product's environmental and economic effects throughout its lifetime including new material extraction, transportation, manufacturing, use, and disposal.

PART 3—THE ROLE OF THE FEDERAL ENVIRONMENTAL EXECUTIVE AND AGENCY ENVIRONMENTAL EXECUTIVES

***Sec. 301.*** *Federal Environmental Executive.* (a) A Federal Environmental Executive shall be designated by the President and shall be located within the Environmental Protection Agency ("EPA"). The Federal Environmental Executive shall take all actions necessary to ensure that the agencies comply with the requirements of this order and shall generate an annual report to the Office of Management and Budget ("OMB"), at the time of agency budget submissions, on the actions taken by the agencies to comply with the requirements of this order. In carrying out his or her functions, the Federal Environmental Executive shall consult with the Director of the White House Office on Environmental Policy.

(b) *Staffing.* A minimum of four (4) full time staff persons are to be provided by the agencies listed below to assist the Federal Environmental Executive, one of whom shall have experience in specification review and program requirements, one of whom shall have experience in procurement practices, and one of whom shall have experience in solid waste prevention and recycling. These four staff persons shall be appointed and replaced as follows:

(1) a representative from the Department of Defense shall be detailed for not less than one year and no more than two years;

(2) a representative from the General Services Administration ("GSA") shall be detailed for not less than one year and no more than two years;

(3) a representative from EPA shall be detailed for not less than one year and no more than two years; and

(4) a representative from one other agency determined by the Federal Environmental Executive shall be detailed on a rotational basis for not more than one year.

(c) *Administration.* Agencies are requested to make their services, personnel and facilities available to the Federal Environmental Executive to the maximum extent practicable for the performance of functions under this order.

(d) *Committees and Work Groups.* The Federal Environmental Executive shall establish committees and work groups to identify, assess, and recommend actions to be taken to fulfill the goals, responsibilities, and initiatives of the Federal Environmental Executive. As these committees and work groups are created, agencies are requested to designate appropriate personnel in the areas of procurement and acquisition, standards and specifications, electronic commerce, facilities management, waste prevention, and recycling, and others as needed to staff and work on the initiatives of the Executive.

(e) *Duties.* The Federal Environmental Executive, in consultation with the Agency Environmental Executives, shall:

(1) identify and recommend initiatives for government-wide implementation that will promote the purposes of this order, including:

(A) the development of a federal plan for agency implementation of this order and appropriate incentives to encourage the acquisition of recycled and environmentally preferable products by the Federal Government;

(B) the development of a federal implementation plan and guidance for instituting economically efficient federal waste prevention, energy and water efficiency programs, and recycling programs within each agency; and

(C) the development of a plan for making maximum use of available funding assistance programs;

(2) collect and disseminate information electronically concerning methods to reduce waste, materials that can be recycled, costs and savings associated with waste prevention and recycling, and current market sources of products that are environmentally preferable or produced with recovered materials;

(3) provide guidance and assistance to the agencies in setting up and reporting on agency programs and monitoring their effectiveness; and

(4) coordinate appropriate government-wide education and training programs for agencies.

***Sec. 302.*** *Agency Environmental Executives.* Within 90 days after the effective date of this order, the head of each Executive department and major procuring agency shall designate an Agency Environmental Executive from among his or her staff, who serves at a level no lower than at the Deputy Assistant Secretary level or equivalent. The Agency Environmental Executive will be responsible for:

(a) coordinating all environmental programs in the areas of procurement and acquisition, standards and specification review, facilities management, waste prevention and recycling, and logistics;

(b) participating in the interagency development of a Federal plan to:

(1) create an awareness and outreach program for the private sector to facilitate markets for environmentally preferable and recycled products and services, promote new technologies, improve awareness about federal efforts in this area, and expedite agency efforts to procure new products identified under this order;

(2) establish incentives, provide guidance and coordinate appropriate educational programs for agency employees; and

(3) coordinate the development of standard agency reports required by this order;

(c) reviewing agency programs and acquisitions to ensure compliance with this order.

PART 4—ACQUISITION PLANNING AND AFFIRMATIVE PROCUREMENT PROGRAMS

***Sec. 401.*** *Acquisition Planning.* In developing plans, drawings, work statements, specifications, or other product descriptions, agencies shall consider the following factors: elimination of virgin material requirements; use of recovered materials; reuse of product; life cycle cost; recyclability; use of environmentally preferable products; waste prevention (including toxicity reduction or elimination); and ultimate disposal, as appropriate. These factors should be considered in acquisition planning for all procurements and in the evaluation and award of contracts, as appropriate. Program and acquisition managers should take an active role in these activities.

***Sec. 402.*** *Affirmative Procurement Programs.* The head of each Executive agency shall develop and implement affirmative procurement programs in accordance with RCRA section 6002 (42 U.S.C. 6962) and this order. Agencies shall ensure that responsibilities for preparation, implementation and monitoring of affirmative procurement programs are shared between the program personnel and procurement personnel. For the purposes of all purchases made pursuant to this order, EPA, in consultation with such other Federal agencies as appropriate, shall endeavor to maximize environmental benefits, consistent with price, performance and availability considerations, and shall adjust bid solicitation guidelines as necessary in order to accomplish this goal.

(a) Agencies shall establish affirmative procurement programs for all designated EPA guideline items purchased by their agency. For newly designated items, agencies shall revise their internal programs within one year from the date EPA designated the new items.

(b) For the currently designated EPA guideline items, which are: (i) concrete and cement containing fly ash; (ii) recycled paper products; (iii) re-refined lubricating oil; (iv) retread tires; and (v) insulation containing recovered materials; and for all future guideline items, agencies shall ensure that their affirmative procurement programs require that 100 percent of their purchases of products meet or exceed the EPA guideline standards unless written justification is provided that a product is not available competitively within a reasonable time frame, does not meet appropriate performance standards, or is only available at an unreasonable price.

(c) The Agency Environmental Executives will track agencies' purchases of designated EPA guideline items and report agencies' purchases of such guideline items to the Federal Environmental Executive. Agency Environmental Executives will be required to justify to the Federal Environmental Executive as to why the item(s) have not been purchased or submit a plan for how the agencies

intend to increase their purchases of the designated item(s).

(d) Agency affirmative procurement programs, to the maximum extent practicable, shall encourage that:

(1) documents be transferred electronically,

(2) all government documents printed internally be printed double-sided, and

(3) contracts, grants, and cooperative agreements issued after the effective date of this order include provisions that require documents to be printed double-sided on recycled paper meeting or exceeding the standards established in this order or in future EPA guidelines.

***Sec. 403.*** *Procurement of Existing Guideline Items.* Within 90 days after the effective date of this order, the head of each Executive agency that has not implemented an affirmative procurement program shall ensure that the affirmative procurement program has been established and is being implemented to the maximum extent practicable.

***Sec. 404.*** *Electronic Acquisition System.* To reduce waste by eliminating unnecessary paper transactions in the acquisition process and to foster accurate data collection and reporting of agencies' purchases of recycled content and environmentally preferred products, the executive branch will implement an electronic commerce system consistent with the recommendations adopted as a result of the National Performance Review.

PART 5—STANDARDS, SPECIFICATIONS AND DESIGNATION OF ITEMS

***Sec. 501.*** *Specifications, Product Descriptions and Standards.* Where applicable, Executive agencies shall review and revise federal and military specifications, product descriptions and standards to enhance Federal procurement of products made from recovered materials or that are environmentally preferable. When converting to a Commercial Item Description (CID), agencies shall ensure that environmental factors have been considered and that the CID meets or exceeds the environmentally preferable criteria of the government specification or product description. Agencies shall report annually on their compliance with this section to the Federal Environmental Executive for incorporation into the annual report to OMB referred to in section 301 of this order.

(a) If an inconsistency with RCRA Section 6002 or this order is identified in a specification, standard, or product description, the Federal Environmental Executive shall request that the Environmental Executive of the pertinent agency advise the Federal Environmental Executive as to why the specification cannot be revised or submit a plan for revising it within 60 days.

(b) If an agency is able to revise an inconsistent specification but cannot do so within 60 days, it is the responsibility of that agency's Environmental Executive to monitor and implement the plan for revising it.

***Sec. 502.*** *Designation of Items that Contain Recovered Materials.* In order to expedite the process of designating items that are or can be made with recovered materials, EPA shall institute a new process for designating these items in accordance with RCRA section 6002(e) as follows. (a) EPA shall issue a Comprehensive Procurement Guideline containing designated items that are or can be made with recovered materials.

(1) The proposed guideline shall be published for public comment in the *Federal Register* within 180 days after the effective date of this order and shall be updated annually after publication for comment to include additional items.

(2) Once items containing recovered materials have been designated by EPA through the new process established pursuant to this section and in compliance with RCRA section 6002, agencies shall modify their affirmative procurement programs to require that, to the maximum extent practicable, their purchases of products meet or exceed the EPA guideline standards unless written justification is provided that a product is not available competitively, not available within a reasonable time frame, does not meet appropriate performance standards, or is only available at an unreasonable price.

(b) Concurrent with the issuance of the Comprehensive Procurement Guideline required by section 502(a) of this order, EPA shall publish for public comment in the *Federal Register* Recovered Material Advisory Notice(s) that present the range of recovered

material content levels within which the designated recycled items are currently available. These levels shall be updated periodically after publication for comment to reflect changes in market conditions.

***Sec. 503.*** *Guidance for Environmentally Preferable Products.* In accordance with this order, EPA shall issue guidance that recommends principles that Executive agencies should use in making determinations for the preference and purchase of environmentally preferable products.

(a) Proposed guidance shall be published for public comment in the *Federal Register* within 180 days after the effective date of this order, and may be updated after public comment, as necessary, thereafter. To the extent necessary, EPA may issue additional guidance for public comment on how the principles can be applied to specific product categories.

(b) Once final guidance for environmentally preferable products has been issued by EPA, Executive agencies shall use these principles, to the maximum extent practicable, in identifying and purchasing environmentally preferable products and shall modify their procurement programs by reviewing and revising specifications, solicitation procedures, and policies as appropriate.

***Sec. 504.*** *Minimum Content Standard for Printing and Writing Paper.* Executive agency heads shall ensure that agencies shall meet or exceed the following minimum materials content standards when purchasing or causing the purchase of printing and writing paper:

(a) For high speed copier paper, offset paper, forms bond, computer printout paper, carbonless paper, file folders, and white woven envelopes, the minimum content standard shall be no less than 20 percent postconsumer materials beginning December 31, 1994. This minimum content standard shall be increased to 30 percent beginning on December 31, 1998.

(b) For other uncoated printing and writing paper, such as writing and office paper, book paper, cotton fiber paper, and cover stock, the minimum content standard shall be 50 percent recovered materials, including 20 percent postconsumer materials beginning on December 31, 1994. This standard shall be increased to 30 percent beginning on December 31, 1998.

(c) As an alternative to meeting the standards in sections 504(a) and (b), for all printing and writing papers, the minimum content standard shall be no less than 50 percent recovered materials that are a waste material byproduct of a finished product other than a paper or textile product which would otherwise be disposed of in a landfill, as determined by the State in which the facility is located.

(1) The decision not to procure recycled content printing and writing paper meeting the standards specified in this section shall be based solely on a determination by the contracting officer that a satisfactory level of competition does not exist, that the items are not available within a reasonable time period, or that the available items fail to meet reasonable performance standards established by the agency or are only available at an unreasonable price.

(2) Each agency should implement waste prevention techniques, as specified in section 402(d) of this order, so that total annual expenditures for recycled content printing and writing paper do not exceed current annual budgets for paper products as measured by average annual expenditures, adjusted for inflation based on the Consumer Price Index or other suitable indices. In determining a target budget for printing and writing paper, agencies may take into account such factors as employee increases or decreases, new agency or statutory initiatives, and episodic or unique requirements (e.g., census).

(3) Effective immediately, all agencies making solicitations for the purchase of printing and writing paper shall seek bids for paper with postconsumer material or recovered waste material as described in section 504(c).

***Sec. 505.*** *Revision of Brightness Specifications and Standards.* The General Services Administration and other Federal agencies are directed to identify, evaluate and revise or eliminate any standards or specifications unrelated to performance that present barriers to the purchase of paper or paper products made by production processes that minimize emissions of harmful byproducts. This

evaluation shall include a review of unnecessary brightness and stock clause provisions, such as lignin content and chemical pulp requirements. The GSA shall complete the review and revision of such specifications within six months after the effective date of this order, and shall consult closely with the Joint Committee on Printing during such process. The GSA shall also compile any information or market studies that may be necessary to accomplish the objectives of this provision.

***Sec. 506.*** *Procurement of Re-refined Lubricating Oil and Retread Tires.* Within 180 days after the effective date of this order, agencies shall implement the EPA procurement guidelines for re-refined lubricating oil and retread tires.

(a) Commodity managers shall finalize revisions to specifications for re-refined oil and retread tires, and develop and issue specifications for tire retreading services, as commodity managers shall take affirmative steps to procure these items in accordance with RCRA section 6002.

(b) Once these items become available, fleet managers shall take affirmative steps to procure these items in accordance with RCRA section 6002.

***Sec. 507.*** *Product Testing.* The Secretary of Commerce, through the National Institute of Standards and Technology ("NIST"), shall establish a program for testing the performance of products containing recovered materials or deemed to be environmentally preferable. NIST shall work with EPA, GSA and other public and private sector organizations that conduct appropriate life cycle analyses to gather information that will assist agencies in making selections of products and services that are environmentally preferable.

(a) NIST shall publish appropriate reports describing testing programs, their results, and recommendations for testing methods and related specifications for use by Executive agencies and other interested parties.

(b) NIST shall coordinate with other Executive and State agencies to avoid duplication with existing testing programs.

PART 6—AGENCY GOALS AND REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

***Sec. 601.*** *Goals for Waste Reduction.* Each agency shall establish a goal for solid waste prevention and a goal for recycling to be achieved by the year 1995. These goals shall be submitted to the Federal Environmental Executive within 180 days after the effective date of this order. Progress on attaining these goals shall be reported by the agencies to the Federal Environmental Executive for the annual report specified in section 301 of this order.

***Sec. 602.*** *Goal for Increasing the Procurement of Recycled and Other Environmentally Preferable Products.* Agencies shall strive to increase the procurement of products that are environmentally preferable or that are made with recovered materials and set annual goals to maximize the number of recycled products purchased, relative to non-recycled alternatives.

***Sec. 603.*** *Review of Implementation.* The President's Council on Integrity and Efficiency ("PCI") will request that the Inspectors General periodically review agencies' affirmative procurement programs and reporting procedures to ensure their compliance with this order.

PART 7—APPLICABILITY AND OTHER REQUIREMENTS

***Sec. 701.*** *Contractor Operated Facilities.* Contracts that provide for contractor operation of a government-owned or leased facility, awarded after the effective date of this order, shall include provisions that obligate the contractor to comply with the requirements of this order within the scope of its operations. In addition, to the extent permitted by law and where economically feasible, existing contracts should be modified.

***Sec. 702.*** *Real Property Acquisition and Management.* Within 90 days after the effective date of this order, and to the extent permitted by law and where economically feasible, Executive agencies shall ensure compliance with the provisions of this order in the acquisition and management of federally owned and leased space. GSA and other Executive agencies shall also include environmental and recycling provisions in the acquisition of all leased space and in the construction of new federal buildings.

***Sec. 703.*** *Retention of Funds.* Within 90 days after the effective date of this order,

the Administrator of GSA shall develop a legislative proposal providing authority for Executive agencies to retain a share of the proceeds from the sale of materials recovered through recycling or waste prevention programs and specifying the eligibility requirements for the materials being recycled.

***Sec. 704.*** *Model Facility Programs.* Each Executive department and major procuring agency shall establish model facility demonstration programs that include comprehensive waste prevention and recycling programs and emphasize the procurement of recycled and environmentally preferable products and services using an electronic data interchange (EDI) system.

***Sec. 705.*** *Recycling Programs.* Each Executive agency that has not already done so shall initiate a program to promote cost effective waste prevention and recycling of reusable materials in all of its facilities. The recycling programs implemented pursuant to this section must be compatible with applicable State and local recycling requirements. Federal agencies shall also consider cooperative ventures with State and local governments to promote recycling and waste reduction in the community.

PART 8—AWARENESS

***Sec. 801.*** *Agency Awards Program.* A government-wide award will be presented annually by the White House to the best, most innovative program implementing the objectives of this order to give greater visibility to these efforts so that they can be incorporated government-wide.

***Sec. 802.*** *Internal Agency Awards Programs.* Each agency shall develop an internal agency-wide awards program, as appropriate, to reward its most innovative environmental programs. Winners of agency-wide awards will be eligible for the White House award program.

PART 9—REVOCATION, LIMITATION AND IMPLEMENTATION

***Sec. 901.*** Executive Order No. 12780, dated October 31, 1991, is hereby revoked.

***Sec. 902.*** This order is intended only to improve the internal management of the executive branch and is not intended to create any right or benefit, substantive or procedural, enforceable at law by a party against the United States, its agencies, its officers, or any other person.

***Sec. 903.*** The policies expressed in this order, including the requirements and elements for effective agency affirmative procurement programs, shall be implemented and incorporated in the Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) within 180 days after the effective date of this order. The implementation language shall consist of providing specific direction and guidance on agency programs for preference, promotion, estimation, certification, reviewing and monitoring.

***Sec. 904.*** This order shall be effective immediately.

**William J. Clinton**

The White House,
October 20, 1993.

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 11:24 a.m., October 21, 1993]

NOTE: This Executive order was published in the *Federal Register* on October 22.

## Executive Order 12874—Establishing an Emergency Board To Investigate a Dispute Between the Long Island Rail Road and Certain of Its Employees Represented by the United Transportation Union

*October 20, 1993*

A dispute exists between The Long Island Rail Road and certain of its employees represented by the United Transportation Union.

The dispute has not heretofore been adjusted under the provisions of the Railway Labor Act, as amended (the"Act").

A party empowered by the Act has requested that the President establish an emergency board pursuant to section 9A of the Act (45 U.S.C. 159a).

Section 9A(c) of the Act provides that the President, upon such request, shall appoint an emergency board to investigate and report on the dispute.

**Now, Therefore,** by the authority vested in me by section 9A of the Act, it is hereby ordered as follows:

***Section 1.*** *Establishment of Board.* There is established, effective October 20, 1993, a board of three members to be appointed by the President to investigate this dispute. No member shall be pecuniarily or otherwise interested in any organization of railroad employees or any carrier. The board shall perform its functions subject to the availability of funds.

***Sec. 2.*** *Report.* The Board shall report its findings to the President with respect to the dispute within 30 days after the date of its creation.

***Sec. 3.*** *Maintaining Conditions.* As provided by section 9A(c) of the Act, from the date of the creation of the board and for 120 days thereafter, no change, except by agreement of the parties, shall be made by the carrier or the employees in the conditions out of which the dispute arose.

***Sec. 4.*** *Expiration.* The board shall terminate upon the submission of the report provided for in Section 2 of this order.

**William J. Clinton**

The White House,
October 20, 1993.

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 11:22 a.m., October 21, 1993]

NOTE: The Executive order was published in the *Federal Register* on October 22.

## Letter to Senate Leaders on the Conflict in Bosnia

*October 20, 1993*

*Dear Mr. Leader:*

The violent conflict in the former Yugoslavia continues to be a source of deep concern. As you know, my Administration is committed to help stop the bloodshed and implement a fair and enforceable peace agreement, if the parties to the conflict can reach one. I have stated that such enforcement potentially could include American military personnel as part of a NATO operation. I have also specified a number of conditions that would need to be met before our troops would participate in such an operation.

I also have made clear that it would be helpful to have a strong expression of support from the United States Congress prior to the participation of U.S. forces in implementation of a Bosnian peace accord. For that reason, I would welcome and encourage congressional authorization of any military involvement in Bosnia.

The conflict in Bosnia ultimately is a matter for the parties to resolve, but the nations of Europe and the United States have significant interests at stake. For that reason, I am committed to keep our nation engaged in the search for a fair and workable resolution to this tragic conflict.

I want to express my lasting gratitude for the leadership you have shown in recent days as we have worked through difficult issues affecting our national security. With your help we have built a broad coalition that should provide the basis for proceeding constructively in the months ahead. Once again you have earned our respect and appreciation.

Sincerely,

**Bill Clinton**

NOTE: Identical letters were sent to George Mitchell, majority leader of the Senate, and Bob Dole, minority leader of the Senate.

## Appointment of Members of the Board of Governors of the American Red Cross

*October 20, 1993*

The President announced today that he intends to appoint seven administration officials to be Government members of the Board of Governors of the American Red Cross. The seven are:

Secretary of Defense Les Aspin;
Export-Import Bank Chairman Kenneth Brody;
Secretary of State Warren Christopher;
Secretary of Education Richard Riley;
Secretary of Health and Human Services Donna Shalala;
Federal Emergency Management Agency Director James Lee Witt; and
General John M. Shalikashvili, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

"I have long admired and sought to support the ongoing work of the American Red Cross to bring aid to those in need both around the world and here in our own communities," said the President. "As I recently saw firsthand during the Midwest flooding this summer, their workers and volunteers are true lifesavers. I am appointing this senior group of officials to serve on their board because I want to be sure that my administration does everything that we can to support the Red Cross' important work."

## Proclamation 6616—National Biomedical Research Day, 1993

*October 20, 1993*

*By the President of the United States of America*

### *A Proclamation*

The Congress has designated October 21, 1993, as "National Biomedical Research Day." On this day, we celebrate the central role played by biomedical research in improving human health and longevity, and we acknowledge the promise this wide-ranging endeavor holds for securing the future physical and mental well-being of people around the world. Biomedical research not only yields the requisite information that scientists and physicians need to prevent and treat diseases but also reveals the fundamental nature of life in humans, other animals, and plants.

There is an intriguing quality to biomedical research: A discovery does not always predict its future uses. As a consequence, it is essential that the Nation continue to champion broad-based studies of both the normal and the disease processes. These studies will yield a fundamental understanding of biological systems and will provide us with the foundation of knowledge needed to ensure successful responses to current and future health problems.

An event that took place 40 years ago illustrates how vital such fundamental knowledge is. In 1953, Nobel laureates Drs. James D. Watson and Francis H.C. Crick described the structure of DNA, the genetic material of all living things. Today, as a direct outcome of their basic research, gene therapy has been devised for children with severe combined immune deficiency; accurate diagnostic tests are available for many life-threatening diseases and conditions; and the genetic mechanisms underlying disorders like cystic fibrosis and Huntington's disease have been identified.

The discovery of the structure of DNA also set the stage for the development of recombinant DNA technology, out of which has blossomed the biotechnology industry. In just the past 10 years, some 1,300 biotechnology companies have been formed. Through biotechnology, chemists and biologists are able to design and produce novel medicines and vaccines for clinical use. Scientists have learned how to commandeer the cellular machinery of living organisms, so that these organisms produce needed proteins and other biological molecules. Researchers have also genetically "engineered" crop plants to make them hardier and resistant to pests. The success of the biotechnology industry has also enhanced the economic competitiveness of the United States in the world marketplace. There is no doubt that the future fruits of biotechnology, both medical and economic, will be even greater.

The continuing preeminence of the United States in biomedical research reflects the contributions of many groups of dedicated professionals at work in Federal agencies such as the National Institutes of Health and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and in government-supported laboratories at universities, hospitals, and private research facilities. Teachers at all levels—from those who encourage our kindergartners to those who train biomedical specialists—are also helping to ensure the future success of biomedical research, an enterprise that cannot go forward without both strong practitioners and a supportive public.

Unraveling the mysteries of living organisms remains a daunting task. But, through biomedical research, the ceaseless whooping coughs of children have been silenced; smallpox no longer exacts a human toll anywhere on the Earth; and vaccines, treatments, and cures are at hand for many diseases. As the struggles continue against AIDS, cancer, heart and lung diseases, arthritis, diabetes,

Alzheimer's disease, epilepsy, multiple sclerosis, and a host of other afflictions, we look to the successes of the biomedical community for our inspiration.

We look to the future with our eyes open and with unflagging support for continued biomedical research that is broad enough and deep enough to establish a firm foundation of knowledge from which effective cures and therapies will emerge.

**Now, Therefore, I, William J. Clinton,** President of the United States of America, do hereby proclaim October 21, 1993, as National Biomedical Research Day. I invite the Governors of the 50 States and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and the appropriate officials of all other jurisdictions under the American flag, to issue similar proclamations. I ask every beneficiary of biomedical research; that is, every citizen of this country, to acknowledge the true worth of biomedical research. I ask biomedical researchers, health care professionals, schools and universities, community organizations, and businesses to join in efforts to celebrate the successes of biomedical research and to promote this enterprise.

**In Witness Whereof,** I have hereunto set my hand this twentieth day of October, in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred and ninety-three, and of the Independence of the United States of America the two hundred and eighteenth.

**William J. Clinton**

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 11:23 a.m., October 21, 1993]

NOTE: This proclamation was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on October 21, and it was published in the *Federal Register* on October 22.

## Letter to Congressional Leaders on Haiti

*October 20, 1993*

*Dear Mr. Speaker: (Dear Mr. President:)*

I have directed the deployment of U.S. Naval Forces to participate in the implementation of the petroleum and arms embargo of Haiti. At 11:59 p.m. E.S.T., October 18, units under the command of the Commander in Chief, U.S. Atlantic Command, began enforcement operations in the waters around Haiti, including the territorial sea of that country, pursuant to my direction and consistent with United Nations Security Council Resolutions 841, 873, and 875. I am providing this report, consistent with the War Powers Resolution, to ensure that the Congress is kept fully informed about this important U.S. action to support multilateral efforts to restore democracy in Haiti and thereby promote democracy throughout the hemisphere.

During the past week, the world has witnessed lawless, brutal actions by Haiti's military and police authorities to thwart the Haitian people's manifest desire for democracy to be returned to their country. With our full support, the United Nations Security Council has responded resolutely to these events. On October 16, the Security Council, acting under Chapters VII and VIII of the United Nations Charter, adopted Resolution 875. This resolution calls upon Member States, "acting nationally or through regional agencies or arrangements, cooperating with the legitimate Government of Haiti, to use such measures commensurate with the specific circumstances as may be necessary" to ensure strict implementation of sanctions imposed by Resolutions 841 and 873. The maritime interception operations I have directed are conducted under U.S. command and control. In concert with allied navies, U.S. Naval Forces will ensure that merchant vessels proceeding to Haiti are in compliance with the embargo provisions set forth in the Security Council resolutions.

The initial deployment includes six U.S. Navy ships and supporting elements under the command of the U.S. Atlantic Command. These U.S. forces and others as may be necessary, combined with those forces that other Member States have committed to this operation, will conduct intercept operations to ensure that merchant ships proceeding to Haiti are in compliance with United Nations Security Council sanctions. On the first day of the operation, one of our ships, with U.S. Navy and Coast Guard personnel aboard, carried out an interception of a Belize-flag

vessel and allowed it to proceed to its destination after determining that it was in compliance with the embargo. In addition, the forces of the U.S. Atlantic Command will remain prepared to protect U.S. citizens in Haiti and, acting in cooperation with U.S. Coast Guard, to support the Haitian Alien Migrant Interdiction Operations (AMIO) of the United States, as may be necessary.

The United States strongly supports the Governor's Island Agreement and restoration of democracy in Haiti. The measures I have taken to deploy U.S. Armed Forces in "Operation Restore Democracy" are consistent with United States goals and interests and constitute crucial support for the world community's strategy to overcome the persistent refusal of Haitian military and police authorities to fulfill their commitments under the Governor's Island Agreement. I have ordered the deployment of U.S. Armed Forces for these purposes pursuant to my constitutional authority to conduct foreign relations and as Commander in Chief and Chief Executive.

Close cooperation between the President and the Congress is imperative for effective U.S. foreign policy and especially when the United States commits our Armed Forces abroad. I remain committed to consulting closely with Congress on our foreign policy, and I will continue to keep Congress fully informed about significant deployments of our Nation's Armed Forces.

Sincerely,

**Bill Clinton**

NOTE: Identical letters were sent to Thomas S. Foley, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and Robert C. Byrd, President pro tempore of the Senate. This letter was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on October 21.

## Remarks to the Conference of Business for Social Responsibility

*October 21, 1993*

Thank you very much, Helen and Arnold. The crowd would have clapped even more for you if they'd known what you were going to say before you said it. They were terrific, I thought. I have a great deal of admiration for them and for their companies and for this organization. I want to point out before I get into my remarks that I have two people here I'd like to acknowledge first: the Director of the Small Business Administration and one of the strongest supporters of our health care reform program, Mr. Erskine Bowles from North Carolina, who is here. And I believe a former board member of yours and the current Director of the Women's Bureau at Labor, Karen Nussbaum, is here.

I believe the purpose of politics is to help the American people live up to the fullest of their God-given potential and to help them to live together in strength and harmony and to fulfill their responsibilities as well as their dreams. That obligation can be met in different ways in different times. But plainly, there are some times in the history of a nation in which that obligation can only be met by the willingness to undertake the rigors of profound change. And I believe this is such a time.

The problem is that in any democracy you can only build a consensus for profound change when things have gotten pretty well off track. And by the time things have gotten pretty well off track, there are an awful lot of people who are unhappy and insecure and uncertain. And if you look around this audience at the companies here represented who have believed you could actually make money and be socially responsible, that you could actually be more productive by taking care of the people with whom you work and the people who are your customers, you see the intense dilemma we face, because people are most able to change when they are most secure. And yet, at large, it becomes possible for society to make these big changes often only when things have gotten so far off track that people are insecure. That, in a nutshell, is the larger dilemma that I face as your President today, but more importantly, that we face as a people.

If you look at the conditions that so many millions of our country men and women face, many are insecure in their jobs. Many are insecure in their ability to get new jobs, in their education levels, in their skill levels. Many, many millions are insecure in their health care. Many are insecure as children in the way they are growing up. And lamentably, at the end of the cold war, the wars

that are being waged on so many streets in America have made millions of people insecure in their daily lives and movements.

And yet, we have no alternative. We have to change. We have to make economic policy changes. We have to make all kinds of real, significant different directions. And yet we live at a time of such insecurity that people distrust their institutions, their elected leaders, and even their own impulses sometimes when it comes to make these changes.

I saw that in trying to pass a budget which did some remarkable things: It reduced the deficit dramatically. It's given us the lowest long-term interest rates in 30 years. It had the most significant reform in the tax structure for working people in 20 years by saying to people with children who spend 40 hours in the work force, you won't be in poverty. No matter how low your job wage is, the tax system will lift you out of poverty, not put you into poverty. It opened the doors of college education to all Americans by expanding eligibility for college loans and lowering interest rates and making the repayment terms easier and tied to the incomes of young people when they get out of college—much of which the American people never even knew while it was going on because it was so easy to whip people up into a white heat about the word "taxes" and because people couldn't believe anyone would really do anything seriously to deal with this issue of the deficit and these other matters.

I see it now as I try to pass the North American Free Trade Agreement through the Congress. And that agreement has become the repository and the symbol of all the accumulated resentments of our people for the 1980's, of all the people who lost their jobs and all the plants that moved overseas and all the times that all the workers in this country saw that their executives were getting pay raises 4 times in percentage terms what they were, 3 times what the profits were going up; that they could lose their health care in an instant; that they could have to start over in a moment; and that no one cared about them anymore. So they associate that with expanded global trade.

So we know rationally that the only way a rich country ever grows richer is to expand its trade. And we know that wealthy countries all over the world, in Europe, in Japan, not just in the United States, are having great difficulty creating new jobs. And the only way to do that is to make more markets beyond the borders of the nation. And yet still, emotionally there is this enormous undertow rooted in the insecurities, the pain, the sense of loss, the disorientation, the feeling that nobody really looks out for me and my family.

And so we are in so many ways, on so many fronts, my fellow Americans, waging a war between hope and fear: on the streets of our cities, in our factories and workplaces, in our homes, indeed, in the hearts of perhaps a majority of our fellow country men and women. And each of us in our own way, we have a little scale inside ourselves. When I don't get enough sleep, I'm more pessimistic than I am when I get more sleep, right? You're probably like that. And I'm more optimistic. And the scales are always going up and down, even in our own lives, aren't they, inside, about how we look at the world and how we see reality.

This is a time when we must be bold, when we must be confident, in which we must have the kind of enthusiasm you exhibited when we came into this room, with a sense of possibility. We need more young people like the young man from the hotel who met me outside, who said, "Keep breaking those paradigms, Mr. President." [*Laughter*] I loved it.

But I say to you, one of the reasons that I'm so happy to see this organization growing and large and vibrant and vigorous is that you have found a way to make people feel more secure by changing by changing. You have found a way to live by the rhetoric of my last campaign, Putting People First. Putting people first.

I believe that one of the biggest problems that this country always has is trying to close the gap between what we say and what we do. I am ecstatic and honored to be here. But I want to take a few moments today to talk to you about that, how to right that balance inside every American so that hope wins out over fear; how to pursue an agenda of security so that we can pursue our agenda of change; and how, in so many profound ways, health care is right at the core of that. Because I am convinced that you have

proved that the future of the American private sector, the real triumph of free enterprise, will be in proving that we can actually do right by our employees, do right by our customers, and do right by our bottom lines if we are enlightened and we do the right things.

I believe that we have set ourselves up over the last 20 years with a whole series of false choices that may work in the short run, but in the end ultimately disappoint everyone. If we have to erode the fabric of family life in America by not giving our workers health care and not providing family leave and not providing adequate child care, ultimately you wind up with less productive workers. If we can't find a way to create new jobs even as we increase productivity, then for the first time in all of human history we will have given up on technology as a job creator and given in to the age-old fears that it is a job destroyer. To be sure, it's always transferred jobs. We used to have half the people working on the farm; now only 3 percent do. But it can be either, or.

All these are questions we are dealing with. So is every other nation in the world now. We are going through a period of change. We can't see the ultimate end of it. No one knows what all these economic trends in the global economy will ultimately lead to, but we know what works. You know what works; you do it. And I came in here today as a friend and an ally to ask you to engage in this health care debate and tell the American people that this is something we have to do not because it is morally right—but it is morally right—but because it's also economically right.

The most expensive alternative of all, looking toward the future, is doing nothing. It's the most expensive financially, and it's the most expensive in human terms, and ultimately it will be the biggest drag on American productivity. It also is, as Helen said in her remarks, guaranteed to provoke the largest amount of resentment because of the uneven impact of the health care system on employees and employers and American citizens today, depending on whether you have coverage, what kind of coverage you have, and how much you're paying for somebody else's health care because we have so much uncompensated care in this system.

Now, I have watched as I have seen the Congress come to grips with many things and try to overcome even their own disbelief. When I took office, most people had been told that the country couldn't afford the family leave bill. But we did it, and the wheel hasn't run off. And I have seen the impact of that. A lot of you have heard me tell this story, but I had a family in the White House the other day with a dying child on one of these Make-A-Wish programs, that the child wanted to see the White House and the President. And the father told me that his daughter was probably not going to make it and that the time he'd spent with her was the most important time he'd ever spent, and if it hadn't been for the family leave law he would have had to choose between losing his job to be with his daughter and therefore doing wrong by his wife and his other two children, or keeping his job and letting someone else spend that precious time with his child. Now, I don't know about you, but I think that fellow is going to be a much better worker for that company than he would have been had that not been the law of the land.

So we now, I think, have a chance to keep going with this engine of change. And we've got a lot of things we need to do on the security front and the change front. We've got a world of economic changes we need to make, but we're going to have to have—if there's no more job security in this America because most people when they lose their jobs don't get it back anymore, totally the reverse of unemployment patterns of the last 60 years, we have to give employment security to Americans. If there's no job security there has to be employment security. Therefore, we have to have a whole different system of lifetime education and training. And we have to undertake that. We'll begin to do that next year. A big part of welfare reform will be doing that, making sure people really have the capacity to move from welfare to work.

We have to provide more security for families. That's what the family leave bill was all about. That's what the earned-income tax credit in the budget bill was all about, lifting the working poor out of poverty so there will

never be an incentive to be on welfare and there will always be an incentive to be both a good parent and a good worker.

We have to find more security for people on their streets and in their homes and in their schools. That's why I so desperately want to do something to reduce the number of automatic weapons that are in the hands of teenagers on the streets of the city, assault weapons.

But we also have to do something about health security. You know, Hillary and I got 700,000 letters before I made my health care speech to Congress and she began to testify. And we're getting them in now at about 10,000 letters a week, more. Story after story after story: the small business that had the premium go up 40 percent a year with no claims; the business person who has to cut his or her employees back to a policy with a $2,500 or $3,000 deductible even though the employee average salary is $22,000, $23,000 a year; the person who is physically disabled but who has a fine mind who can't get a job because the only available employers are small businesses and they don't have any kind of community rating, so this person will drive the premiums out of sight; a person with the HIV virus who may have another 10 years of productive life, strong, productive life and contributions to be made, who is either not employed now and therefore won't be employed, or can't ever change jobs because of the job lock provisions of the present system; the hospitals that are out there, struggling to do a good job on modest profits, or not-for-profit hospitals who can't meet their uncompensated care burden or those that do by raising everybody else's hospital costs in ways that undermine confidence of those that pay those bills in the integrity of the system; the doctors who talk to me about how, yes, their fees have gone up a lot in the 1980's, but 10 years ago they took 75 percent of what they earned home, and now it's down to 52 percent, and all the rest of it has vanished in the sea of paperwork because they have to hassle 300 insurance companies with thousands of different policies to make sure they've crossed every "t" and dotted every "i" to get the payment they're entitled to anyway; the stories, over and over again, mounting up in every part of our country.

As you know, we spend more on health care than anybody in the world, and yet we do less with it. Now, how would you feel if you were running your business, competing with people all across the country and perhaps all across the world for jobs and incomes, if you had to spend 14 percent of your revenues covering only 86 percent of your market and all your competitors spent 8 or 9 percent of their revenues and covered 100 percent of their market? You don't have to be as bright as a tree full of owls to figure out that eventually there would be some adverse consequence to that. But we go on blithely as if that's the way it has to be. And when I propose a change, some people say, "Oh my God, we can't afford that. Look at this wonderful thing we've got going."

Now, we have in many ways the best health care system in the world. But we have in other ways the worst financed and organized health care system in the world for a country as rich as we. Otherwise, how can you explain the fact that we are plainly the capital of pharmaceuticals in the world in terms of developing new drugs and manufacturing them right here in America and we have the third worst immunization rate in this hemisphere, behind Haiti and Bolivia—I mean, ahead of them, but only ahead of them. You tell me why that happened. If we're so great, how have we permitted ourselves to go on year-in and year-out not closing that gap?

Do we have the best health care in the world, the doctors and nurses, the hospitals, the medical research, the technology? You bet we do. For people who access it, it is good. And do those people resent the burdens that are imposed on them by this crazy-quilt system? You bet they do. Some of the strongest advocates for change we've had are from doctors who are sick and tired of having to hire one more person every year because of the clerical administrative burdens of this system.

People say, "Aw, this system the President's proposed is so complex." I get tickled; it's complex compared to what? It's complex compared to zero. It's simple compared to

what we have now. What is the proper standard by which you evaluate this?

If we do nothing to change the current course on which we have embarked, we'll be spending 19 percent of our income on health care by the year 2000. We will have a smaller percentage of our population covered with health insurance than we have today, because we have about 100,000 Americans a month permanently losing health insurance, 2 million every month losing it but 100,000 permanently losing it. And by the year 2000, instead of the gap being 4.5 percent to 5.5 percent between our major competitors, of our income, it'll be about 7 percent. Today, we spend 14.5 percent of our income on health care. Canada's at 10; Germany and Japan are just under 9. There is no measurable difference in the health outcomes.

Now, to be perfectly fair, there are two elements of our cost system that will always, at least for the foreseeable future, keep us above other countries. One is, we do rely more and we invest more in groundbreaking technologies and pharmaceuticals, and we should continue to do that. And we all want them for ourselves and our family if there's a chance it will prolong our lives.

The second issue is sadder. We are quite simply, as compared with other wealthy countries, more willing to endure a far higher rate of violence. We have far higher rates of AIDS. We have far higher rates of teenaged mothers and out-of-wedlock births and low birth-weight babies, and they're far more likely to cost more. So we have system-related costs that are greater than our competitors. And that's about half the gap between us and them. But the other half is our own fault. And if we don't get about the business of closing it, we're going to have a difficult time competing. And we're going to have an increasingly difficult time explaining why it is we are prepared to put up with a system that no one else on earth tolerates and to pay the human and economic cost of maintaining it.

Today I'd like to focus on two of the issues that have been raised by some people in the business community against our proposal. Some say that we propose to create a new bureaucracy by creating these health alliances, and we shouldn't do that. I say what we propose to do is to have a smaller rate of cost increases through increased competition and greater efficiency and reduce waste by giving small businesses the same bargaining power that big business and Government has today.

If you look at the Federal employees' health insurance program, for example, because of the power we have to bargain and because everybody knows the Federal Government is up to its ears in debt and doesn't have a lot of money, you look at what's happened to the rates on most of the Federal health insurance policies: very modest increases this year. Look at the California public employee system: huge people in that block, a big block of buyers, and everybody knows California is in bad shape financially, so they have a rate increase this year that's right at the rate of inflation.

Small business, however, has seen its rates go up at 2 and 3 times the rate of inflation. Why? No bargaining power. In small groups, one person gets real sick, explodes the rate structure for everybody. So what these alliances do, quite simply, is to say if you're in a firm with fewer than 5,000 employees, we will give you the option, the opportunity, to be in a big buying group. And in the course of that, we will give your employees the option of having more choices than you can probably provide for them now in health care, but none of them will cost you any more than you would otherwise pay as an employer.

This will give smaller businesses and self-employed people access to market economics. Market economics is beginning to work in health care, that and all the Cain I think we've been raising the last year or so. It's beginning to work. The aggregate increases are beginning to slow some. But they're finding, again, as Helen said in the opening remarks, it's very uneven. You might have health care inflation at 7 percent this year or 6 percent, but you'll still have a lot of small businesses with 30 percent premium increases. Why? No market power.

So when you hear all this stuff that these alliances are big bureaucratic nightmares and Government creations, that's not true. The alliances are groups of consumers in each State in groups approved by the State, not

by the Federal Government, that will have buying power presently available to governments and to big business but not to small business and often not even to medium-sized business. I think it will work.

I also believe in order to make it work we have to have insurance companies that compete not on the basis of which company is most adept at excluding people who have problems but on the basis of cost and quality. Now, to be fair to the insurance companies, you can only do that if there is a community rating system, if you don't have all the risk factors calculated into every individual purchaser of insurance. If you do that, you have nailed small business from the get-go, the people that are creating most of the new jobs in this country.

If you have a community rating system, who gets hurt, from the present system, who pays more? Young, single, healthy people will pay more, about anywhere from $6 to $8 a month more for their premiums under our estimate. They will, but it's fair. You know why? Because under our system all the young people without insurance will get insurance and because if they're young and healthy, they'll be middle-aged like me someday, and they'll get the benefit of this system. The society will be stronger. And it will be far better for the big job generators of the country, the small businesses who don't have access to health insurance now.

It also will be fairer because with community rating, you will enable people to effectively move from job to job to job. Then you can say, without breaking a company, that you can't deny someone the right to coverage when they change jobs. Under the present system that would be really tough, to say that you can't deny the coverage to someone who may be the best-qualified person you want to hire, but they have a disability which will raise the premiums of you and all your employees, your other employees, by 20 percent under the present system. That happened. We met a couple in Columbus, Ohio, that had one child with a birth defect. They were insured through the wife's community nonprofit, 20-employee group. And in order to keep that family on the rolls and keep that woman working for that business, they were going to have to raise their premiums, just the employees, every employee by another $200 a year, just the employees; the business by thousands of dollars a year. That wouldn't happen if we have community rating. And you could have free flow of workers from job to job to job, something that's quite important since we live in a time when the average worker will change jobs six or seven times in a lifetime.

Finally, and again this is a matter of some controversy in this, we believe that if you put everybody in these competitive size groups, then the businesses and the employees will be able to bargain for better prices: and they will go up far less than they've been going up. We also believe there should be some backup cap on how much business could be required to pay in any given years until we get this system up and going, and we know it is, that there ought to be some ultimate budgetary discipline in the system.

Now, a lot of people say, "Well, that's Government regulation of health care." What they really are saying is this is Government regulation of costs that might work, because it will include the public sector and the private sector. We now strictly regulate the price of particular services under Medicare and Medicaid. Do you know how much the last budget increased Medicare and Medicaid? We reduced defense; we've got domestic discretionary spending flat at a time when we ought to be investing more in education and training, in converting from a defense to a domestic economy. But Medicare, will go up 11 percent next year, Medicaid 16 percent. Why? Paying more for the same health care, that's why, more and more and more and more procedures. You have to have aggregate discipline in this system if you're going to slow the rate of increase.

I personally don't think the budgetary ceiling in our bill will ever be reached because if you give everybody the kind of competitive power that big business and Government have today, I think the cost increases will be much lower than we project them to be, and so do most of the business people I know who have worked on this plan and looked at the cost structure from the bottom up. But I don't think it's fair to say that this is some

heavy-handed grab to control the private sector in health care and hurt research in the pharmaceutical industry or anyplace else.

Keep in mind, we have been so conservative or liberal, depending on how you look at it, in our budget estimates. Well, you tell me when I tell you the fact: This plan that we put in estimates that we will go to 17 percent of income spent on health care by the year 2000, as opposed to 19. And it actually will be more than 17, about 17.5 percent. I don't think that's so hot for the economy, either. And I think if we had real competition for quality and service, and if we continue to cover more primary and preventive services, we could do much better than that.

So it's not as if we propose to drive folks into poverty. All these people who are complaining about the ceilings that would be on the rate of increase, the health insurers and others, they're going to get 17.5 percent of our income instead of 14.5 percent by the year 2000. And they think it might not be enough for them to get along on.

I just want to make that clear. You need to understand when you hear all this, about how the Government's regulating this, what we did was put a big old ceiling there in case the costs continue to shoot up even after we give everybody bargaining power. The essence of this is a competitive system for price and quality. And I think it will work.

The second issue is whether or not we have to have universal coverage and whether that's bad for business, to require each business to shoulder some responsibility and each employee not covered now to at least pay some of the income of the employee to get the health care.

Now, here are the options. And here's how we came out with basically taking what we've got. We've got a system in America today that's basically an employer-based system. And when the employers are big enough or they're joined with enough others to have market-based power, the system works pretty well. They're beginning to moderate the rate of cost increases, and there are some very good health care plans out there which provide comprehensive benefits at affordable cost. Sometimes the employees don't pay anything, sometimes they pay something, but basically the systems work pretty well, and most employees are pretty satisfied with it.

The options are the following: If you want universal coverage, you could go to the Canadian system—the problem is that no one I know thinks you could pass that in Congress—which means you basically replace all the health insurance sector of the country with a tax. That's simpler on administrative costs, but since Canada is the second most expensive system, if you put the politicians instead of the people in charge of negotiating for their health care, it may not work out so well. So we rejected that alternative.

Then there are those who say, ''Well, you ought to put the mandate on the employee; let the employee buy it. Make it like car insurance.'' The problem with that is, if you look at what they offer the employees, it's not very good. And it may encourage a total deterioration of the present system we have for those who presently have benefits where the costs are shared by employers and employees.

Then there are those who say, ''Well, what we ought to do is give small businesses the right to get this market power, and the competition will lower the rate of cost, and say that no one can be denied coverage. And when you have more competition the price will go down, and everybody who doesn't have insurance who's got a job will be able to buy it. So we'll just see if it happens.'' The problem with that is that our experience with that is not very good. And what we know is that most employers and employees who have health insurance today are paying too much for it because they're paying for the uncompensated care that others get. And if you want to moderate the rate of increase on individual businesses' and employees' health care, you've got to make sure that everybody who accesses the system pays what they can afford to pay for the privilege of doing that. If you continue to have significant cost shifting here, then there will be continued irresponsibility in the system, which will have real uneven impacts on businesses.

In other words, most everybody in the country today who's got a good health insurance plan is paying too much for it, because they're also paying for the uncompensated care of people who always get care but they

get it when it's too late and too expensive. They show up at the emergency room with appendicitis or whatever, instead of ever going in for basic checkups and basic preventive mechanisms.

So I personally don't think we'll ever get costs under control, nor do I ever think we'll be the society we ought to be, nor do I ever think we'll have the kind of personal security we need until everybody has health insurance. And if you don't have universal coverage, this idea that people are going to be able to move from job to job to job and always have it is just false. And I cannot tell you what it is doing to the families of this country who are worrying about it. It is having a devastating impact on the capacity of millions of people to function well in their jobs.

Mr. Hiatt made a very eloquent statement before I came up. When he came to our economic summit in Little Rock last December, he was then famous at having led the way on child care for his employees, and he made the following statement. He said if you do right by your employees, you, quote, contribute to a workplace that attracts good people and retains them, thereby reducing turnover. Good business.

Then there is one other issue I want to deal with on this universal coverage, and that is, a lot of people say it's not fair to ask employers to make some contribution to their part-time employees, that the taxpayers ought to pay for that. We think if there's a part-time employee that works at least 10 hours a week, a pro rata contribution should be made, a third of the total payment that would otherwise be owed, not a total contribution. And the rest will be made up from the monies we propose to raise.

Now, that can be done. Starbucks Coffee's doing pretty well, and they take care of their part-time workers as well as their full-time workers. And there are others who do that. What we want to do is to make that more economical for everyone who will do it.

Finally, let me say it also makes it affordable. The way we propose to pay for this plan, two-thirds of the money would come from premiums paid by employers and employees. But we know we're going to have to give discounts to small businesses with very low-wage employers, because we don't want to put people out of business. And we know the Government has to cover the unemployed uninsured. How will we get the money for that? Essentially from three sources: one, raising the cigarette tax by 75 cents a pack and asking the large employers who opt out of the system, as they can, to make the contribution they would make if they were in the system to medical research and to the network of public health care clinics that we will have to maintain anyway. That's another thing I want to tell you, that this plan increases the quality of health care. We're going to increase medical research, increase the reach of health clinics. That's the second source of money. The third source of money is in the savings we will achieve in the Medicare and Medicaid programs, by putting Medicaid patients, for example, into the same kind of consumer cooperative buying power that those of you who are small and medium-sized businesses will get by going into the alliance, and by drastically simplifying the paperwork of the system. So that's how it will be paid for.

I want to say again, there are these two elements. The health alliances will contribute to competition and to market-based forces getting into the health care system in a good way. It won't be a big new Government bureaucracy. The requirement of universal coverage will help to stop cost shifting and make health care security a reality and permit workers to know that even if they lose a given job, they'll be able to go on as employees. It will, in other words, give that level of personal security necessary for the American people to think about what our trade policy ought to be, what our investment policy ought to be, what our economic strategy ought to be for the 21st century, and to make the changes necessary to get that done.

And I ask you here to think about the influence that you can have on your Members of Congress, without regard to party. This ought to be an American issue. It ought to be a matter of not only the heart but of hard-headed economics. If we don't, if we don't ask everybody to assume some responsibility—and we're not talking about breaking the bank. For a small firm with an average wage of $10,000, for example, the cost would be

less than $1 a day per employee for the health care plan because of the discount system.

We understand the fragility of the economy in many points. But if we don't face this now, we are not going to get a hold of the health care cost spiral. We are not going to get a hold of the fact that 100,000 Americans are losing their health insurance a month. We are not going to get a hold of the fact that a lot of these costs just involve our paying more for the same health care every year. We get nothing for it. We're spending a dime on the dollar more than any other country on sheer paperwork, 10 cents on the dollar that nobody else in the world pays.

So I would say to you it is time for us to say everybody ought to be responsible and pay something for this health care system, because we all have access to it. And when we really need it, we all get it. And it's just wrong for some people to pay for others who can pay something for themselves.

And we ought to allow the small businesses of this country and the self-employed people of this country and the medium-sized businesses in this country to have the same benefit of market power that only Government and big business have today. It isn't fair. That's what these alliances do. They are not Government entities, they are private sector entities that we're going to put the Medicaid patients in so they can have the benefit of that, too.

Now, that is the kind of thing that we need to do. That is the sort of security that we need to achieve, to build into the fabric of American life the peace of mind and the sense of fairness and justice that enables people to go home at night and look their children in the face and think they're doing a pretty good job by them, and that enables them to have the kind of personal security that will permit people like you to lead this country to make the economic changes that will enable this country to do what it needs to do as we move toward the 21st century, to keep the American dream alive, to keep this country as the foremost country in the world, to enable all of our children to live up to their God-given capacity.

This is just one of those times when we have to decide whether we're going to close the gap between our rhetoric and our reality. Desperately I hope that 30 years from now people will look back on this time just the way we look back on 60 years ago when there was no Social Security. Now we take it for granted. We think it was an easy fight; it actually wasn't. It took them a couple of years and a little blood on the floor in the Congress to get it done. And this may take a while to get done. It doesn't need to take 2 years, I'll tell you that.

You think about it, Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy, Johnson, and Nixon all followed Roosevelt, and all of them tried to get universal coverage. Richard Nixon proposed an employer mandate. Senator Bob Packwood from Oregon, still in the United States Senate, introduced it for him. And we've been fooling around with this now for decades. Meanwhile, we just keep paying more for less. We ought to be paying less for more. That's what you do. That's why most of you are doing very well, because you have provided more for less. Why should you be stuck with a health care system that does the reverse?

I ask you to please, please engage yourself in this debate. Examine this plan. When the book comes out, go over it. If you've got a good idea, give it to us. But don't walk away from the plain obligation to have every American family with the security of health care and the plain need to let the small business people in this country and the self-employed people in this country and the middle-size business in this country have the same bargaining power in this system that big business and Government do.

And most of all, remind the Members of the Congress that there are times when doing the right thing morally and ethically is also good business, that we can make money if we make our workers more secure and whole. When they go home at night and look at their families over the dinner table and they know they've done right by them, then America will be on its way to having the courage and the security to seize the next century and keep the American dream alive.

Thank you, and God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11 a.m. at the Grand Hyatt Washington Hotel. In his remarks, he referred to Helen Mills, CEO of the Mills

Group and Soap Box Trading Co., and Arnold Hiatt, CEO of the Stride-Rite Foundation.

## Exchange With Reporters on Health Care Reform

*October 21, 1993*

***Q.*** Mr. President, why is it taking you so long to draft the health care legislation?

***The President.*** The legislation has been drafted. What we have to do—and let me say we're doing something that no administration, as far as I know, has ever done before. But the reason that we had to delay introducing it is to go back and do two more runs at higher inflation rates, because most people believe that inflation will be a little bit higher because economic growth has come back into the economy.

So we originally ran all the numbers at a 2.7 inflation rate, which was what we were asked to do, what was recommended by the Congressional Budget Office. We now went back, after consulting with our folks, and ran it at a 3.5 percent inflation rate, and then we went back and doublechecked all the numbers with all the actuaries. So unlike a lot of the other bills, we actually have, you will see when the bill comes up, extremely detailed budgetary estimates about which part will cost how much and how it all works.

So essentially, there were no problems in drafting or the policy so much as it was trying to make sure that we had the numbers right. Also, the proposal will increase the reserve fund as a hedge in case, for example, the small business discounts cost more than we thought. We decided to go back to make the Congress and the country feel better about the costs to increase the reserve fund. So just working out the dollars is what has taken all the time, because we wanted to have good numbers ready for them when we came back.

***Q.*** When will it be ready? When will it be ready?

***The President.*** Oh, I think they're going to put it in early next week sometime.

***Q.*** Next week?

***The President.*** Yes.

***Q.*** The 75-cent cigarette tax is final?

***The President.*** That's what will be in the bill.

NOTE: The exchange began at approximately 11:54 a.m. at the Grand Hyatt Washington Hotel. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this exchange.

## Proclamation 6617—National Consumers Week, 1993

*October 21, 1993*

*By the President of the United States of America*

### *A Proclamation*

More than ever, as a Nation and as individual consumers, we need to make every dollar count. Yet, despite the consumer-oriented quality of the U.S. marketplace and the concerted efforts of our law enforcement agencies, marketplace fraud drains at least $100 billion from the economy every year. The loss is not just in dollars, but in consumer confidence—the driving force behind a strong economy.

Fraud has the greatest impact on the most vulnerable consumers. No one, rich or poor, young or old, literate or illiterate, English-speaking or foreign-speaking, able-bodied or disabled, is exempt. What's more, in this electronic global marketplace, fraud has become a "borderless crime" that affects consumers around the world.

Since 1982, the President has designated one week of the year to spotlight consumer education as a vital tool in helping consumers make smart shopping decisions. This year, during "National Consumers Week," the focus is on fraud. Consumers can protect their resources and end the costly drain on the economy by knowing how to spot the signs of fraud and where to turn when they suspect fraud.

If you believe that you have been defrauded, the Better Business Bureau, representatives of Federal, State, and local governments, and even the media can help you. Exposing fraud not only helps you, but it can help prevent others from becoming victims in the future.

**Now, Therefore, I, William J. Clinton,** President of the United States of America, by virtue of the authority vested in me by the Constitution and laws of the United

States, do hereby proclaim the week beginning October 24, 1993, as National Consumers Week. I urge business leaders, educators, professionals, public officials, consumer leaders, and members of the media to observe this week with appropriate activities that emphasize the important role smart consumers play in keeping our markets open, competitive, fair, and honest.

**In Witness Whereof,** I have hereunto set my hand this twenty-first day of October, in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred and ninety-three, and of the Independence of the United States of America the two hundred and eighteenth.

**William J. Clinton**

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 5:01 p.m., October 21, 1993]

NOTE: This proclamation will be published in the *Federal Register* on October 26.

## Message to the Congress Transmitting the Poland-United States Fishery Agreement

*October 21, 1993*

*To the Congress of the United States:*

In accordance with the Magnuson Fishery Conservation and Management Act of 1976 (Public Law 94–265; 16 U.S.C. 1801 *et seq.*), I transmit herewith an Agreement between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of Poland Extending the Agreement of August 1, 1985, Concerning Fisheries off the Coasts of the United States. The agreement, which was effected by an exchange of notes at Washington June 8 and July 29, 1993, extends the 1985 agreement for an additional 2 years, from December 31, 1993, to December 31, 1995. The exchange of notes together with the 1985 agreement constitute a governing international fishery agreement within the requirements of section 201(c) of the Act.

I urge that the Congress give favorable consideration to this agreement at an early date.

**William J. Clinton**

The White House,
October 21, 1993.

## Remarks at a Dinner of the Executive Leadership Council

*October 21, 1993*

Thank you very much, Earl, and thank you, ladies and gentlemen. I actually wanted to hear him talk. I thought I've heard the speech the guy behind him has to make.

I am delighted to be here with the ELC, with Earl Washington and Buddy James and with all the rest of you. I thank you for your achievements in life, and I thank you for the work you have done. The board of this organization met at the White House, I know, last spring, and we have developed a very special relationship.

I was honored to be invited to come by the reception for a moment. I wish I could stay for dinner, but before you asked me to eat I got invited somewhere else, and it's not polite to cancel. At least that's what my mama always taught me.

I want to congratulate your honorees tonight: Suzanne de Passe, and Corning Corporation, and my friend, Dr. Leon Sullivan. And I want to thank all of you for the efforts you're making to make America a better place.

I'd like to also say a special word of appreciation to two very important members of my team who are here tonight, a former board member and officer of this organization and your evening speaker, Hazel O'Leary, the distinguished Energy Secretary—when I saw Hazel tonight I thought nobody would be disappointed that I'm not speaking—and also the Special Assistant to the President for Public Liaison and the highest ranking African-American ever to serve in the White House, Ms. Alexis Herman. I thank her for being here.

Ladies and gentlemen, I ran for President in 1991 and 1992 because I was convinced that our country needed to change its direction and because I thought we were coming apart when we ought to be coming together.

I have always believed that the obligation of a public servant is to try to give every person he or she represents a chance to live up to their God-given capacity and the challenge

to do what is necessary to give others that chance as well. That responsibility takes on different turns and textures, depending on the moment in history when you're fortunate enough to serve. Right now, I think all of you know as well or better than I that in order for every person in this country to have a chance to live up to the fullest of their capacity, all of us have to be committed to making some pretty fundamental changes in the way we operate our economy and the way we work together as a people and the way we relate to the rest of the world.

Whenever people are called upon to change profoundly, we all know that's difficult. I mean, I have a hard time losing 10 pounds. [*Laughter*] Change is not easy. You think about the dimensions of the changes we need to make; we know it is hard. We also know that great democracies normally only make profound changes when it is apparent to all that there is a lot of trouble. The problem with that is, when it's apparent to all that there's a lot of trouble, there are normally a lot of people who are too insecure to want to hear about much change.

If you think about your own life, every one of us has a little balance scale inside, sort of between hope and fear, between being optimistic and averse to today's changes. I know if I get less than 5 hours sleep, I'm less optimistic than I am if I get more than 6, you know. We have that. Every family has it. Every business organization has it. And every nation has it.

I am plagued by the thought of how many Americans are too insecure to feel confident in the future and to grasp the opportunities that are there before us. And so I have this duty to the country, I believe, as President to try to lay down the markers of security that our people need as well as urge them to change. And that's why we're working so hard to provide families more security with things like the Family and Medical Leave Act, to provide people more employment security in a time when you can't have a job security any more—the average person will change jobs seven times in a lifetime—we need a dramatic, radically different way of training and educating our workers; to providing health care security, without which families can't be told if they may have to be willing to change jobs, if they think they're going to have to put their kids in the poor house because they don't have any health insurance; and to try to deal with issues of personal security—ninety thousand people killed in America in the last 4 years alone, in any year more than we ever lost in any given year in the war in Vietnam. This is the only advanced country in the world where teenagers are better armed than police officers. We talk about how terrible it is and refuse to do anything about it.

But just because we are insecure, many of us, doesn't mean we can put off until tomorrow the changes we need to make. You know, whenever you're confronted with a new and challenging set of circumstances that requires you to change, you can do one of two things: You can sort of hunker down and turn away and hope it will go away, or you can face it. Now, hunkering down works about once in 100. Most of the time, it's a real loser. And what I'm trying to do as President is to also tell the American people, ''Look, this Government's on your side. We're trying to lay down these elements of security for families, for safe streets, for health care, for workers. But we have to change.''

The most important fight we're going to have between now and the end of the year on the change front is the fight to ratify the North American Free Trade Agreement. And most of the opposition to the agreement comes from people who have deep-seated hurts, resentments, and reservation that are legitimate based on their own experience, because the working families of this country are by and large working longer work weeks than they were 20 years ago for the same or lower wages than they were making 10 years ago—we all know that—and because many people have been in work units where they think they have been treated like so much disposable material, where they didn't feel that they were put first or even considered. And so they look at more change in the global economy and think, ''Oh, what a headache.''

But rationally, NAFTA will make everything that they resent better. And the failure to pass it will make everything worse. Wages in Mexico will go up faster if we adopt NAFTA than if we don't. And the Mexican

Government will make a commitment to honor their own labor code in ways that are not there now. Environmental investments in Mexico will go up more if we adopt NAFTA than if we don't. Requirements in Mexico that keep us out of the Mexican market—requirements to produce products there if we want to sell them there—will go down if we adopt it. They won't if we don't. Trade barriers, tariffs will go down if we adopt it. They won't if we don't. We have trade problems in America: $50 billion deficit with Japan; a $19 billion deficit with China; a $9 billion deficit with Taiwan. We have a $6 billion trade surplus with Mexico. And even though it's not a very wealthy country, 70 cents of every dollar they spend on products from overseas beyond their borders they spend on American products.

So I say to you, I very much hope that we'll have a wonderful open world trading system. I'm working hard to get one by the end of the year. But neither you nor I know with any certainty what the trading philosophy of Asia or Europe will be 5 or 10 years from now. We do know democracy is on the move in Latin America. We do know free markets are on the move in Latin America. And we do know that they prefer to deal with us, not just in Mexico but in other countries.

And the benefits of NAFTA come not just from new jobs being created out of the relationship between the U.S. and Mexico, although we are convinced 200,000 new jobs will be created. And on average, they'll be better paying jobs just in the next 2 years. The real benefits will come in new jobs when that agreement is the standard by which we set new agreements with Chile, with Venezuela, with Argentina, with all the other countries that want very much to be part of our family.

Every one of you here in some way or another is a profound success. All of you have had to deal with these kinds of conflicts in your own lives. Many of you have overcome enormous obstacles to get where you were, and not a single one of you is at the top of any heap today because you hunkered down or ran away from an opportunity to embrace change and embrace the future.

And so I ask you as Americans to help us in this next month convince the United States Congress that the people who are pleading with them to vote against this treaty have legitimate fears, legitimate hurt, legitimate worries. But they are imposing on NAFTA the accumulated resentment for the last 15 years, and it doesn't deserve to have it. If you look at the facts, it will make those problems better, not worse.

You have credibility with a lot of people in the Congress, in both parties, of different races and backgrounds. And if you can convince them that together we're not only going to lay down these security markers that we have to lay down, but we must have the courage to change, then we can go into 1994 having brought the deficit down, with the lowest interest rates in 30 years, with business investment going up, with housing going up, with unemployment going down, and with a view toward the future that gives us the confidence we need to make the future what it has to be for our people.

Thank you very much and God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 6:20 p.m. in the Sheraton North Ballroom at the Sheraton Washington Hotel. In his remarks, he referred to Earl S. Washington, president, and Clarence James, Jr., executive director, Executive Leadership Council.

## Remarks at a Democratic National Committee Fundraiser

*October 21, 1993*

Thank you very much. David, I was hoping you'd talk a little longer; I didn't even get to finish my salad. [*Laughter*]

Ladies and gentlemen, I'm delighted to be here tonight. I've already had a chance to say hello to almost all of you, except the Members of the Senate who see me all the time. I thanked Senator Metzenbaum and Senator Levin—they came upstairs to see me, Senator Kennedy. We even had our picture taken. I came all the way to Boston to see you, and you didn't do that. [*Laughter*] I want to thank Norman Brownstein for the wonderful work he did tonight in getting you all here. Let's give him a hand. [*Applause*]

I'd also like to say a brief word if I might about this wonderful facility we are in. We

have some people here who are still associated with it. The Holladays, who helped to found this, were good enough to support me early in my Presidential campaign. And a lot of our friends have been active in this wonderful place which once actually had a fine showing of artists, women artists, from my home State here. So I have been delighted to have finally the chance to come here and see this and I—Mr. Chairman, I don't know who picked this place, but whoever did is a near genius in my estimation, because I love it.

It was just about a month and a week ago when we had the remarkable signing of the Israel-PLO peace accord on the grounds of the White House. Many of you were there. I imagine all of you saw it. Hundreds of millions, perhaps over a billion people around the world saw it occur. I would like to begin my remarks by making two observations, if I might. First of all, about the peace process itself. When I traveled across this country last year and asked many, if not all of you, to support my campaign, I said that I believed the time was ripe for peace in the Middle East but that it could not be achieved unless the President of the United States understood that in the end the United States could never impose a peace on the Middle East but could only guarantee it if it were to occur. After I was elected, I met with Yitzhak Rabin in the White House, and we sat for a long time alone. And he looked at me with those soulful eyes of his and said that he was prepared to take real risks for peace, that he thought the time had come to try to make it. And I told him, if he would take the risks, we would do our best to minimize those risks. The rest is history. It was a peace made directly between Israel and the PLO, as all the best agreements are. It was a difficult thing, as we saw during the signing, sometimes from the language, sometimes from the body language. But as the Prime Minister said, "One never makes peace with one's friends. You have to make peace with your enemies."

I want all of you to know that since that day I think that we have gone forward together to try to make the peace stick, to try to make it work, and to try to expand on it. We've had a donors' conference of representatives from 43 nations raise several billion dollars in commitments from people to make this peace agreement work. We have seen now the first public meeting of leaders from Jordan and Israel. We've seen the states of Morocco and Tunisia welcome Israeli officials for the first time. We have seen real progress. There is still a lot to do. I have urged the Arab States to recognize Israel, to drop the boycott, to get rid of the hostile United Nations resolutions. And I have done what I could to keep this process going.

An especially remarkable part of it has been the unity I have seen emerging between leaders of the American Jewish community and Arab-Americans, a couple of hundred of whom met at the White House for several hours after the signing ceremony and began to explore what they can do together to try to help to bring opportunity and peace and harmony in the areas where the peace accord covered.

I believe we're moving in the right direction. I also have to tell you I don't think that we will have a complete peace until we have just that, a complete peace: one that involves Syria and Lebanon, as well as the PLO and Jordan; one that enables the people of the Middle East to live together in true security and to give the children of that area a normal life. I want to ask you tonight to help me to stay with our present policy, to be aggressive in pushing the process forward but to recognize always that in the end, there is no peace that the parties do not themselves voluntarily undertake.

When we had that signing ceremony, I wanted so much for the Prime Minister and Mr. Arafat to come, but they couldn't make up their minds whether they wanted to come for a while, for reasons that I'm sure all of you appreciate, many of you more deeply than I. In the end they decided to come because, since they had agreed to it, they might as well make the most of it. And when they did and when they reached out across decades of division and shook hands in that electric moment that was felt around the world, I think that people had a sense of possibility in so many areas that they had not had for a long time.

That's the second thing I want to say to you tonight, as I ask you on behalf of your country, on behalf of Israel, on behalf of all

the peace-loving peoples of the world, to continue to help me to implement this peace process and push it forward, respecting that in the end all the parties themselves will have to voluntarily decide on the next steps.

I ask you also to help me to give that sense of possibility back to the American people. For there are so many days when I think that the biggest obstacle to the dreams I brought with me to the Presidency, the biggest obstacle is the sense that maybe we really can't change things, the sense of hopelessness so many people feel, the sense of mistrust in institutions and leaders. It is, I think, almost a truism that no great democracy can change profoundly until things are in pretty rough shape. And yet, when things get in pretty rough shape, there are so many people who have been so disappointed, who feel so injured, who feel so insecure that it is difficult to make the changes that need to be made. And so today, America, every day, gets up and presents to me a complex picture of hope and fear, a complex picture of eagerness to embrace the future, to compete and to win, and to promote the things we all believe in and a sense of insecurity that makes people sort of draw inward.

I think for the last year, hope has been winning. A sense of possibility and movement has been happening. Thanks to the people in the Congress who have supported the initiatives of this administration, including those in this audience, we have moved to really bring down the deficit. We've got the lowest interest rates in 30 years, business investment's back up, consumer spending is back up on important, big products.

We've got some real sense of movement in this economy. Thanks to this group of Congress Members who have been willing to support this administration, we signed, a week after the Middle East peace accord, the national service bill that Eli Segal did so much to shepherd through the Congress, which literally has the potential to revolutionize the way young people all across America look at their country and feel about themselves, which asks young people to give something back to their Nation and, in return, offers them a chance to go to college, no matter how meager their own income.

We have begun to face the health care crisis. We have begun to deal with so many issues that have been too long ignored in this struggle to find our way in the world. There are those who have said, well, I haven't done everything right. For that, I plead guilty. But I'll tell you one thing: In this administration, we show up for work every day with our sleeves rolled up and a determination to face the challenges before us. And tonight I was thinking about the history of our relationships with Israel; I'm reminded that when Harry Truman recognized Israel, a long time ago now, he was still in the process of making the post-cold-war world, post-World-War II world with our allies. We had moved into the cold war, but now we all look back on that era as if it were self-evident what our domestic policies ought to be and what our foreign policies ought to be. But in truth, those of you who lived through that, particularly those of you who were adults or nearly so, then, will remember clearly that there were a couple of years after World War II when we had to work out what our foreign policy was going to be, when we had to develop the institutions necessary to carry that foreign policy out, when we had to work through in our minds what America's responsibilities at home were. And we are going through the same period now.

We know that we are the only superpower. We know we can't solve every problem in the world, but we know there are a lot of people's suffering and misery that we can alleviate. And if we believe in democracy and freedom, if we don't want to see the proliferation of terrorism and weapons of mass destruction, then we have to try.

We know that we have an interest in Russia maintaining its democratic bent and continuing to reduce its nuclear arsenal. Clearly, we know if we could bring peace to the Middle East, it might revolutionize the range of options we have with the Muslims all over the world and give us the opportunity to beat back the forces of radicalism and terrorism that unfairly have been identified with Islam by so many people.

We know some things for sure. But we also know that we are still working this out. Here at home, it is the same thing. But I can tell you this: I am convinced that if we

will continue to honestly speak with one another about these issues, we'll find a way to do it.

I believe we have to find a balance between the security people need to change and the changes we need to make. I believe we will never make America what it ought to be until we provide health care security to all of our citizens. I believe we will never have an America that is strong until we tell the American people, "You can be a successful parent and a successful worker." That's what that family leave bill was all about. That's what our budget bill was all about, which lifted the working poor out of poverty when they have children at home.

I believe we will never be able to do what we need to do as a people until we say, "Okay, if we can't guarantee you a job anymore, we can at least guarantee you employability." If the average person has to change jobs eight times in a lifetime, how can we not have a program worthy of the capacities of all Americans. It gives them a chance for lifetime education and training.

And finally, let me say, I believe we will never meet our challenges at home and abroad until the American people are more secure on their own streets again. For all the violence in the Middle East, my friends, we can read stories every day on every street in America that rivals anything you can read about in the Gaza in the toughest times. If you look at what has happened, 90,000 murders in 4 years in America, more in any given year than ever happened at the height of the war in Vietnam; you look at the fact that this is the only advanced country in the world, the only one where we don't even check your criminal record or your mental health history in some States to see if you can get a gun and where people seriously argue that that infringes on constitutional rights. This is the only country in the world where police go to work on mean streets every day and confront young people who grew up in chaotic circumstances who are often better armed than they are.

So, I say to you, we have some things to do here at home. We are breeding generation after generation of people who have no claim to the mainstream of this society and on whom the future has no claim. We are breeding so many people who are so alienated and who have no sense of all these things that you and I came here to celebrate tonight. Just 3 weeks ago, a little girl named Launice Smith was shot and killed in this city. She was on a playground 3½ miles from this wonderful building. She was 4 years old, one of 1,500 people who are shot in this town every year, our Nation's Capital. Her father could not go to her funeral because he's in prison for shooting another 4-year-old on another playground several years ago when he was 19 and got in an argument over hair barrettes. He got angry, and another kid handed him a gun, and he used it.

The point of all that I am saying is this: We've got to change in this country. And we've got to have the security——

[*At this point, there was an interruption in the tape.*]

——have to first recognize that the great power of America is the power of our ideals, our values, our institutions, and our example. And that we cannot do what we're supposed to do unless, as a Nation we are both more united and more self confident than millions of our fellow citizens are as we enjoy this great dinner tonight.

So, I ask you to remember that and to renew your commitment not only to peace in the Middle East and to American's continuing role in the world—and I thank the many of you who said as we walked through the line tonight, that you believed we did have a role of leadership in the world to alleviate suffering and to do what we can to promote freedom and democracy—but also, to rebuild this country here at home.

Most people in this country, whatever their incomes, whatever their race, whatever their walk of life, and wherever they live, are wonderful people. They get up every day. They go to work. They never break the law. They do the best they can by their kids, and they're absolutely determined to make the most they can of their lives. But they are living in a country that has not yet made the decisions necessary to organize itself in a way that permits all of us to live up to the fullest of our God-given capacities. And until we make the decision to have an economic program, an education program, a health care

program, a family policy, and a law enforcement policy, and a commitment to rescuing our kids that will permit us to do that, we will not have the security we need to lead the world and to face the future. I believe that we are on the road to changing this country. I know what I saw on September the 13th, when Arafat and Rabin shook hands, was an instant, shocking realization all across the world that things we never thought possible were, in fact, possible.

And I ask you to help me now liberate the imagination and the spirit, and the energy of the American people for the jobs that we have yet to do at home and abroad, because those things can also be done.

Thank you, and God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 8:30 p.m., at the National Museum of Women in the Arts. In his remarks, he referred to David Wilhelm, chairman of the Democratic National Committee; Norman Brownstein, an attorney and Democratic fundraiser from Denver, CO; Wilhelmena Holladay, president, National Museum of Women in the Arts and her husband, Wallace Holladay.

## Statement on Signing the Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1994

*October 21, 1993*

Today I have signed into law H.R. 2493, the ''Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1994.''

The bill makes a significant shift in priorities by funding $745 million of my investment proposals, including full funding of the investment proposals for the Food Safety and Inspection initiative and for the Food and Drug Administration.

The Congress has also adopted my goal to phase in full funding for the Special Supplemental Food Program for Women, Infants and Children (WIC). This bill provides $3.2 billion for WIC, an increase of 12 percent over FY 1993.

The bill includes significant funding for my Rural Development initiative, which will provide grants, direct loans, and loan guarantees for rural residents, communities, and businesses, as well as for inducements to promote economic development.

I commend the Congress for making further progress toward reform of price-support programs for honey, wool, and mohair as recommended by the National Performance Review. The bill suspends honey subsidy payments for the 1994 crop of honey; however, payments on the 1993 honey crop will be made in FY 1994.

I am pleased that the removal of employment floors will facilitate my objective of reducing Federal employment.

**William J. Clinton**

The White House,
October 21, 1993.

NOTE: H.R. 2493, approved October 21, was assigned Public Law No. 103–111.

## Message to the Congress Transmitting the Tax Convention With the Slovak Republic

*October 21, 1993*

*To the Senate of the United States:*

I transmit herewith for Senate advice and consent to ratification the Convention Between the United States of America and the Slovak Republic for the Avoidance of Double Taxation and the Prevention of Fiscal Evasion with Respect to Taxes on Income and Capital, signed at Bratislava on October 8, 1993. Also transmitted for the information of the Senate is the report of the Department of State with respect to the Convention.

The Convention will be the first income tax convention between the two countries. It is intended it reduce the distortions (double taxation or excessive taxation) that can arise when two countries tax the same income. It will modernize tax relations between the two countries and will facilitate greater private sector U.S. investment in the Slovak Republic.

I recommend that the Senate give early and favorable consideration to the Convention and give its advice and consent to ratification.

**William J. Clinton**

The White House,
October 21, 1993.

## Statement on Signing the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1994

*October 21, 1993*

Today I have signed into law H.R. 2518, the "Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1994."

This Act provides funding for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, and several smaller agencies. Programs within these agencies address the training and employment needs of our Nation's work force, the Federal role in our education system, and fundamental elements of our health care network.

This Act provides funding for a number of my high-priority investment proposals within the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services (HHS), and Education. These include the Head Start program, Goals 2000 program, School-to-Work program, Immunization grants, and the National Institutes of Health.

The Act provides funding for investment initiatives for automation and disability processing within the Social Security Administration (SSA). This will help SSA improve the quality of service to millions of Americans.

I am pleased that the Act provides a large increase in funding for programs authorized under the Ryan White CARE Act. Programs authorized under this Act represent major steps forward in the battle against the AIDS epidemic.

**William J. Clinton**

The White House,
October 21, 1993.

NOTE: H.R. 2518, approved October 21, was assigned Public Law No. 103–112. This statement was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on October 22.

## Statement on Signing the Continuing Appropriations Resolution

*October 21, 1993*

Today I have signed into law H.J. Res. 281, a Continuing Resolution that funds the operations of the Federal Government during October 22–28, 1993.

A Continuing Resolution is necessary at this time in order to keep the Government functioning while the Congress completes the appropriations process.

I commend the Congress for presenting me with a funding measure that provides for a simple, temporary extension of normal government operations and is free of extraneous amendments. I urge the Congress to complete the regular appropriations process by October 28th so that an additional Continuing Resolution can be avoided.

**William J. Clinton**

The White House,
October 21, 1993.

NOTE: H.J. Res. 281, approved October 21, was assigned Public Law No. 103–113. This statement was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on October 22.

## Remarks and an Exchange With Reporters Prior to a Meeting With Members of Congress

*October 22, 1993*

### *NAFTA*

***The President.*** Ladies and gentlemen, just let me make one opening remark, and I'll answer a couple of questions. I want to thank Mr. Michel for once again bringing a group of Republicans in—that he and Mr. Gingrich have arranged for some first-term Republicans to come in and meet with me and Ambassador Kantor and Mr. Frenzel and Mr. Daley. And we're glad to have a chance to discuss NAFTA.

This has been a hard week for us, a hard working week. I have made several congressional meetings, and of course we had the great products fair with Mr. Iacocca. We're trying to work out some of the practical details now on how to deal with the reduction

of the tariffs that will come from NAFTA and all that. But I feel much better than I did on Monday about where we are.

I've made, also, a large number of personal phone calls to Democrats this week, and I think we're making some good progress.

***Q.*** Mr. President, do you think you're working hard enough so that Mr. Gingrich would no longer describe your efforts as ''pathetic''?

***The Vice President.*** He didn't say that, did he?

***Q.*** He somehow said that, Mr. Vice President. I don't know how. [*Laughter*]

***The President.*** He didn't——

***Q.*** Could you——

***The President.*** You know, one of the things that I've noticed about Washington is that when you're in a tough fight, you know, some people are always wondering about what happens if you don't make it. I'm just worried about making it. If I make it, I don't care who gets credit for it.

I'll tell you this: I'm trying to win it. And the Democrats have been—some of them have been asking me to ease up. They said every time they turn around, there's another member of the Cabinet in their office, and they're calling them at 11 p.m. at night. So I think we're doing a pretty good job. But if we win, it won't matter.

### *District of Columbia*

***Q.*** What do you think about sending the National Guard, or allowing the National Guard to patrol the city here?

***The President.*** I think it should be reviewed. I've given a lot of thought to it, and I've asked our legal counsel to get with the Justice Department and look into the legality of it and what the legal hurdles are and also what the practical problems are.

Keep in mind, guardsmen are not full-time military people. They do weekend duty, by and large. And except in the summertime, again by and large, they're not on full-time duty. So if you call out the Guard in other times in any substantial numbers, you can be disrupting the normal work lives of a lot of people.

But I'm very sympathetic with the problems that the Mayor has and that Washington has. There are 1,500 shootings here a year now. It's one reason—I certainly hope that we can pass this crime bill in a hurry. If we do, we'll have another 50,000 police officers on the street, and it will reduce the pressure for National Guard officers.

But I will review it, and I think it deserves to be reviewed. It obviously is not a precedent that can easily be confined just to Washington, DC. So there are lots of questions that have to be thought through here. But I want to wait until she sends me the letter and then review the specific proposal.

I hope that we can use this moment to emphasize the need to move on the Brady bill, the crime bill, the question of whether minors should be restricted in the ownership of handguns, the questions of the assault weapons. I think all of these things are part of a rising tide of anger and fear and frustration on the part of the American people that we need to respond to.

### *Haiti*

***Q.*** Mr. President, are you beginning to be concerned that the sanctions won't work in time for Aristide to go back next Saturday as scheduled?

***The President.*** I've always been concerned about that.

***Q.*** Will it have to be today?

***The President.*** I think that the sanctions are very tough now. And I think what the others have to think about is what it's going to be like to them a few months from now, what it is that they're fighting so hard to hold on to if these sanctions are fully implemented. We never thought that they could have an impact on their own merits within a week, although they are having some impact already. But I think that the reason we got the Governors Island Agreement in the first place is because of the sanctions. I don't know why they thought that they could ignore it and not have sanctions, but I think now they know they can.

Thank you very much.

### *Visit to Russia*

***Q.*** [*Inaudible*]—going to Moscow?

***The President.*** Helen [Helen Thomas, United Press International] asked me a question about it this morning. I still don't believe we've finalized a date. But the Vice President

is going next—I mean, not next month but in December. And I plan to go in January, but we haven't finalized the date. We may do it before the day's over. We don't have a date.

Thank you.

***Q.*** It's pretty cold in January.

***The President.*** I've been there in January. It's light about 4 hours a day. Shows you my timing.

NOTE: The President spoke at 9:17 a.m. in the Cabinet Room at the White House. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

## Remarks on the Technology Reinvestment Project

*October 22, 1993*

Thank you very much, Mr. Vice President. General Short, Admiral Pelaez, Dr. Alam, Dr. Dinis, Senator Mitchell and distinguished Members of Congress. And let me say a special word of thanks to my good friend, Senator Bingaman, and to Pat Schroeder, for the work they have done on this.

When I started running for President, one of the core ideas that animated my campaign and that got me really committed to the long endeavor of 1992 was the commitment that we had to find a way as we built down defenses to build up a new economy for America with new partnerships between defense technologies and the commercial future that we all seek for our country.

I'd like to put this at least briefly into a larger context. All of you know we are living in a time when all the wealthy nations of the world are having great difficulty creating new jobs. We are now in the fifth year in which the average annual growth among the wealthiest nations has been under 2 percent. And as we look toward the future and we ask ourselves what is it that will regenerate the American economic engine in a new and highly competitive global economy in which technology and money and management are mobile, and in which many people in different parts of the world will do certain things for wages our people can't live on, it is perfectly clear that there are three things we have to do: We have to better educate and train our work force; we have to find new markets for our products and services; and we have to more rapidly develop new technologies, so that technology can continue to be what it has always been for our country and for the world, a net job generator.

We know that technologies reduce the number of people necessary to perform traditional services in everything from agriculture to manufacturing. But technology has historically been a net job generator because every time it's done that, it's opened up new ways for people to make a living.

There are significant barriers to that today in this country and in all wealthy countries. The reason I believe so strongly in this project, and the reason I believe someday this will become an integral part of our economic policy, not just a way of converting from a defense to a domestic economy, is because we have to find a way to create more new applications for more new technologies more quickly so that we can create more jobs.

I am very, very happy about this day, and I want to thank all of those who had anything to do with bringing it about. I also want to say, to echo the Vice President, that the first awards in our Technology Reinvestment Project were definitely made on the merits. They were made, not surprisingly, largely in areas that had large technological bases related to defense technology where people have suffered very greatly from cutbacks and are very aggressively looking for alternatives. That provided a big incentive for those folks to be very active in trying to build a new future. But that is, after all, I'm sure what Senator Bingaman had in mind and what the Congress had in mind in funding this program.

If we're really going to guarantee the security of America—the national security of America—we have to be more economically secure. We have to invest in projects that will create these jobs with new ideas and new technologies. That is the only way, I believe, to keep our Nation strong.

This effort responds to two challenges left in the wake of the end of the cold war. The first is that you simply can't leave the men and women who won the cold war out in the cold. It is wrong to walk away from them. From southern California to Long Island to

Connecticut, there are communities, companies, and employees who've depended on defense who now are desperately looking for new ways to make a living. And they can help to make America the strongest country in the world, economically, even into the 21st century.

The second challenge we have is one that is often ignored, but must not be. And that is to meet our continuing military needs in a world which still contains dangers to our interests, our values, our security in a time when we may and we want to spend a smaller percentage of our national income every year on defense but when we know we still have to maintain our lead in defense technologies. So this effort really not only helps us to create new jobs in the civilian sector, it is very good for traditional national defense concerns.

The purposes we are promoting are illustrated by the projects that are being supported today. And let me just mention a couple of them. A California-based team is seeking to demonstrate how advanced composite materials developed for high-performance military aircraft can offer major advantages for repairing and replacing our Nation's aging bridges. I have seen some of the preliminary work on a recent trip to southern California. It's a very, very impressive idea, with enormous potential in a Nation like the United States which has woefully neglected its infrastructure for 15 or 20 years now, and which has a huge number of bridges which desperately need repairing.

This technology will also help the Army Corps of Engineers build lightweight and mobile bridges in combat situations or following natural disasters such as the one we recently had in the Midwest flood, where so many bridges were wiped out and so many working people were literally cut off from their jobs or faced four-hour one-way drives just to get to their jobs.

Another example: A small defense firm is adapting its pyrotechnic technology for use in emergency rescue equipment. You might ask, ''How can you have explosive technology used in rescue?'' Most people are rescued from that. [*Laughter*] This effort can, nevertheless, create a whole new generation of jaws-of-life rescue devices that can save time by making hydraulic equipment much easier to operate. The reductions in weight and cost will make these devices available even to small rescue teams.

I can tell you as a former Governor of a State with a lot of rural communities, I spent an enormous amount of time just trying to figure out how to get this kind of equipment out to people and then how to make sure there were people there trained to use it. This could be a very significant thing in managing traumatic situations in rural communities, especially those that are isolated. By commercializing this technology we'll help to preserve a part of the pyrotechnic industry that is important to our Nation's defense, as well as solving the problems of Americans here at home.

We're working with a team of companies and research labs to determine how the high-powered lasers that have been developed for the military can be adapted to make civilian products. The technology will offer higher precision and greater tooling speeds. This can help American industries from automobiles to aerospace, agricultural equipment, electronics, ship building, all these industries compete and win around the world. And after more than a decade in which our machine tools have suffered significant setbacks in the global economy, this offers a real chance for us to take back a significant sector of international trade.

We're also supporting retraining programs for scientists, engineers, and other defense workers all across the country, in Alabama, Arizona, California, Michigan, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, and Washington. Our world is being transformed by technological, economic, and political change. This project is a part of our overall strategy in this administration to make those changes our friend instead of our enemy.

Whether we're cutting the national deficit or investing in a whole new education and training program, or reforming the welfare system, or providing health security, or expanding trade, we know that all these things have to be done if we're going to really allow the American people to live up to the fullest of their potential.

We're working hard here in the Government to set an example, under the Vice President's leadership, to give this reinventing

Government effort a technological twist that maybe some of you ought to contribute to also in this project. And we want to set an example, but we also want to help lead the country to make the changes that will help us all to change our lives for the better.

We know that doing nothing is not an option. And I want to say in closing that this is one idea that has really caught on with the Congress. I think because of the debates that have been held over the last couple of years and because of the pressures that have been brought to bear in areas all across America, from the dislocations, the painful dislocations, from defense cuts, there's a real commitment. And I want to thank the Congress here that even in the closing days in our debates over the budget, when we have cut and cut and cut so many areas, this program was dramatically increased for next year so that we can maintain the pace of these projects. And I hope we'll be able to increase it year-in and year-out as long as there are new ideas, new technologies, new jobs, and new movement for the American economy.

Thank you all very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:47 a.m. in Room 450 of the Old Executive Office Building. In his remarks, he referred to Lt. Gen. Alonzo E. Short, Jr., USA, Director, Defense Information Systems Agency; Rear Adm. Marc Pelaez, USN, Chief of Naval Research; M. Kathleen Alam, technical staff member, Sandia National Laboratories; and Antonio Dinis, president and chief executive officer, J. Muller International.

## Interview With Stephen Clark of KGTV of San Diego, California

*October 22, 1993*

### *Technology Reinvestment Project*

***Mr. Clark.*** UCSD, University of California-San Diego, was the one you named today from this area?

***The President.*** That's right. They have a project that will use composite materials that were part of the Stealth aircraft development to build and repair bridges. There are others; let me just tell you where the others are in southern California. We have one in Redondo Beach that Cal State-Fullerton was involved in; one at Newport Beach with Hughes Electric, G.M. Hughes; one in Torrance—two in Torrance. So if you want to mention any of them, we can.

***Mr. Clark.*** Joining us now to talk about what is called the first wave of the Technology Reinvestment Program grant is the author of the plan, more or less, the President of the United States, Mr. Clinton. Thanks for joining us today to talk about what we here in San Diego call the defense conversion. Can you give us kind of a short definition or explanation of what it is you want to accomplish here?

***The President.*** Yes, we're trying to take the capacities, the skills, the technologies that were developed in the big defense build-up of the 1980's, and instead of just letting those technologies and the abilities of those people go to waste, we want to give them a chance to be used in the commercial sector in a way that helps both national defense by keeping that skill and that technology alive and helps to rebuild the domestic economy and to create jobs.

Today we announced the first of what will be four announcements between now and the end of November in the technology research project, which involved 41 projects from California to Maine from former defense contractors or current defense contractors using technologies in defense for domestic purposes.

In San Diego, the University of San Diego and Muller International and a company called Trans-Science Corporation are using the composite materials developed for the Stealth aircraft to build and repair bridges. And they're working on a bridge in San Diego now. And this is just one of, as I said, over 40 projects. California got a large number of these projects but so did several other States that have been hurt by base closing and defense cutbacks. They were all given out on the merits, I assure you, and now what the companies have to do is to negotiate with our defense conversion projects to make sure that the Government and the companies all put up a fair amount of money. Then they'll start hiring people and going to work. We're very excited about it.

***Mr. Clark.*** Mr. President, some claim that if it was a good idea, a strong company would

run with that idea. Do you run a risk of propping up a bad company or a bad idea?

***The President.*** There may be some risk of that, but it's not much of a risk. After all, in terms of the potential expenditure of money, this is mostly seed money to get these projects started. A lot of these companies are quite well-established, and these technologies have proven merit in the defense area. This is the sort of thing that our competitors in Germany, Japan, countries with lower unemployment rates and higher investment rates than we do, they do these things all the time. We know the technology, the skills, the ideas to make the conversion, but we aren't organized for it. This simply helps us to organize to make this conversion from a defense-based to a domestic economy. It will create a lot of jobs. And I think that it will be among the most efficient Government programs ever seen because, keep in mind, we don't put up all the money; if the other side doesn't put up half the money, the project doesn't get done. So, that's a pretty strong incentive to make sure whatever is done is a good project.

***Mr. Clark.*** Mr. President, UCSD's $21 million—granted, nobody wants to look a gift horse in the mouth, but it's really a drop in the bucket when you consider what San Diego has lost so far in cutbacks in the military and defense jobs.

***The President.*** It is, but that's the point. It starts up a new business enterprise for which there must be a market in the private sector. We believe there's a huge market. That's why all these things are helping to start up a process.

Keep in mind, too, that San Diego gained 5,200 jobs in the last round of base closings and consolidations, so those new jobs will be coming into your area over the next couple of years, and that will help some also.

***Mr. Clark.*** Mr. President, thank you very much for joining us today.

***The President.*** Thank you.

NOTE: The interview began at 11:50 a.m. The President spoke via satellite from Room 459 of the Old Executive Office Building.

## Interview With Rolland Smith of KNSD–TV of San Diego

*October 22, 1993*

### *Technology Reinvestment Project*

***The President.*** I think we're ready now.

***Mr. Smith.*** Mr. President, your technology reinvestment project has been funded for $472 million. You have received proposals for 2,850 projects requesting $8.4 billion. Doesn't that tell us that much more is needed?

***The President.*** Absolutely. We just got another $500-plus million through the Congress that we'll be coming forward with next year. And in January I expect to ask for more money for this program. Much more money is needed, and I hope the Congress will now be willing to provide more money for it. There were both Democratic and Republican Members of Congress from California to the East Coast at our announcement today. And I'm very hopeful now that when Members of Congress see the incredible number of worthy projects and the potential they have to revolutionize our economy in America and to put our high-tech workers back to work and to create more jobs, that they'll be able to fund it. I'm very excited. But keep in mind, this is a big first step.

***Mr. Smith.*** Mr. President, you said in your announcement today that we needed new training, new markets, new technologies. What do you say to the General Dynamics worker who has lost his job and lost his home, to the biotech worker who has lost his job and home, what do you say to them now? They need help now.

***The President.*** I say that I'm doing the very best I can. We started cutting back on defense long before I became President. The defense cuts started in '87, and there was no investment in defense conversion to amount to anything until I took office. The Congress appropriated $500 million last year which was not even released by the previous administration until I took office. I believe in defense conversion. I believe in helping those people through retraining, through new investments, through new job opportunities, through things like this technology reinvestment project. And I'm going to do the

very best I can to give them the opportunities that they need and that our country needs for them to have.

***Mr. Smith.*** The UCSD project, using materials for helping to fix bridges and make new lightweight ones, how many jobs do you think that will create?

***The President.*** Depends on what the market for bridges are. But let me just say that if you look at the evidence, at literally the thousands of bridges in America that are in disrepair, that desperately need repair, and the potential that this material has to permit that repair to be done quickly and efficiently, there may be a virtually unlimited market for it. It depends on how quickly they can make sure that this prototype bridge they're building works and then how quickly they can get out to every State in the country that controls the market for bridge repair and market this product. But I would say that there is an enormous potential to generate new jobs and incomes in your area because of this, for the simple reason that we have thousands and thousands of bridges which should have been repaired in the eighties which weren't.

### *Immigration*

***Mr. Smith.*** Mr. President, we've got a border war of sorts going on here in San Diego. A lot of it has to do with illegal aliens coming across taking some jobs. And now there's an ''anti'' feeling on both sides, including a boycott being called for against American businesses. What can you do to stop the ''anti'' feeling on both sides?

***The President.*** Well, I think, first of all, from the point of view of the ''anti'' feeling on our side, we have to be able to enforce our immigration laws more equitably and more firmly. We welcome immigrants into this country; we always have. Southern California is, in many ways, the product of our commitment to opening our doors to immigrants. But when we have so many illegal immigrants and half of them now lodging in California at a time of economic difficulty, it undermines support for immigration in general. So first we have to try to enforce our immigration laws.

Let me just mention that just this week the Senate passed, and I will soon sign, the bill that will permit 600 more border agents and 200 others in supporting roles to help to increase our capacity to enforce our immigration laws. So that's a beginning.

The second thing we have to do in your area is get that horrible pollution problem fixed, where you're getting all the pollution coming up from Mexico and raw sewage. We've got to accelerate the construction of that sewage treatment facility down there and do what we can to make sure that people pay their fair share on the Mexican side of the border. Congressman Filner is doing a terrific job for you back in Washington on that.

The third thing we need to do on the Mexican side of the border, I guess, is to remind our friends in Mexico that we're not anti-immigration. We just want to enforce our laws. We're doing our best, I am at least, to pass the NAFTA treaty, and I hope that I'll have a lot of support in the Congress from California on that, because it will be good for easing the immigration pressures. So we have to assure the Mexicans that we want to work with them, we want to be a partner with them, but we have every right to want our immigration laws to be respected and honored.

***Mr. Smith.*** Okay, Mr. President, thank you very much for joining us this morning.

***The President.*** Thank you.

NOTE: The interview began at 11:56 a.m. The President spoke via satellite from Room 459 of the Old Executive Office Building.

## Interview With John Culea of KFMB–TV of San Diego

*October 22, 1993*

### *Technology Reinvestment Project*

***Mr. Culea.*** All right. Well, we'll see if we can put you on the hot seat here. [*Laughter*] How do you balance a cash award in this announcement today to one company with its potential negative job impact on a competitor? Wouldn't tax incentives be more equitable?

***The President.*** No, I disagree with that. For one thing, these awards are designed to develop defense technologies for commercial

purposes. And they were the result of a competitive process. For those who were not picked, let me say we're coming back next year with over $500 million in new funds for these kinds of projects, and we will be doing more.

But the reason it's important to do it this way is that we have all these defense technologies that need to be put to work in the commercial sector. And in terms of the award in San Diego, let me remind you that there are literally thousands of bridges in this country, thousands, that need repair and a lot of new ones that need to be built. So if this technology can be put to work in doing that, they shouldn't be able to push anybody else with a genuinely competitive product out of the market, because there are so many thousands of bridges that need repair—and cities and local governments and States are just beginning to face up to those responsibilities—and because in the 1980's this country walked away from its infrastructure needs. So, I don't see that as a problem, particularly in this sector of the economy.

***Mr. Culea.*** You mentioned awards to Redondo Beach, Fullerton, I believe two others. Most of the awards, though, were out of State. We have 250,000 defense jobs that were lost here. What do you say to those people who need help?

***The President.*** Most of the awards were out of State, but California got the lion's share of the awards, ran away with the contest, as well you would expect, because there are so many defense workers out of work and because there's so much technology capacity. So the State did very well on this first round, and I would expect that there will be more in the second, third, and fourth rounds.

Keep in mind, this was just the first of four rounds between now and November, and then next year we'll have another $500 million-plus to put in a whole new round of these projects. So I would say to them, I'm going to fund as many of these projects as possible; I'm working as hard as possible.

I also would point out that in the San Diego area, two other things have been done which will help in the base closing and reorganization. There will be a net gain of 5,200 jobs in the San Diego area, and we just released from export controls $37 billion worth of computer, supercomputer, and telecommunications equipment, which will open new markets and create many thousands of jobs in California; many of them will be in southern California.

So I'm moving as quickly as I can on this, and I hope that the Members of the Congress will all be as supportive as Congresswoman Lynn Schenk has been of this project, because if we had more folks like her who were willing to fund this project at higher levels, we can move even more quickly and help even more California working people.

### *Defense*

***Mr. Culea.*** This being a Navy-Marine town, there is concern that our military be prepared for anything in the future. What can you say to that as far as defense conversion and our ability to be prepared for future contingencies?

***The President.*** The head of naval research was here today with me, Admiral Pelaez. He made the point that in a very profound way, this program we announced will help to keep our defense strong, because we know that the defense budget's going to be reduced. This program will help to use the commercial research and development sector to keep the defense technology strong, even as we're using defense technologies to create jobs in the commercial sector. That is, by putting the two together, we'll be able to get a bigger bang for our defense dollar. So that even though there will be some reduction in defense spending, we'll be able to keep ahead of all of the other countries in the world and as far as we need to be on technology.

***Mr. Culea.*** Could you give us an idea of the control of this money in some defense contractors? Jobs have been cut, profits go up, and then bonuses are given to top executives. What about the control of the money going to these firms?

***The President.*** Well, first of all, let me explain what happens now. We have announced the projects that were worthy and that won the right to participate in this project. Now, what will happen is the group of people from our Government's side who work in this area will negotiate with each and every company to make sure that they put

up their share of the money and to determine how they will spend this money.

This money, in almost every case, is not an overwhelming amount of money for these companies. What this money will be necessary for is to actually invest in developing this new product and marketing it commercially. So there won't be much of an opportunity for a rake-off here, otherwise the whole thing will collapse. And they have to agree in advance not only on a contribution schedule from their point of view but on what the money's going to be spent on. And I think we'll avoid those abuses.

***Mr. Culea.*** All right. Mr. President, thank you so much for sharing your thoughts, and I hope you get a better seat next time.

***The President.*** Thank you very much.

NOTE: The interview began at 12:02 p.m. The President spoke via satellite from Room 459 of the Old Executive Office Building.

## Appointment of Executive Director of the White House Conference on Aging

*October 22, 1993*

The President announced that he has appointed Robert B. Blancato as Executive Director of the White House Conference on Aging (WHCOA). The WHCOA, located at the Department of Health and Human Services, serves as a focal point for the development of national policy on aging issues.

"Robert Blancato is a leading expert in aging policy who has been recognized for his work on numerous occasions," said the President. "I look forward to his work at the White House Conference on Aging."

NOTE: A biography of the appointee was made available by the Office of the Press Secretary.

## Appointment of United States Representative to the United Nations Human Rights Commission

*October 22, 1993*

The President announced his intention today to appoint former Congresswoman Geraldine Ferraro as the U.S. Representative to the United Nations Human Rights Commission (UNHRC), with the rank of Ambassador.

"In addition to earning her place in our own country's political history, Geraldine Ferraro has been a highly effective voice for the human rights of women around the world," said the President. "As alternate head of the U.S. delegation to this year's session of the UNHRC, she spoke eloquently on behalf of women in the former Yugoslavia and brought all of the parties involved to a consensus position. I look forward to her continuing her strong and much-needed advocacy in this new position."

NOTE: A biography of the appointee was made available by the Office of the Press Secretary.

## Nomination for United States District Judges

*October 22, 1993*

The President announced the nomination today of his choices for four U.S. District Court vacancies: Donetta Ambrose and Gary Lancaster, both for the Western District of Pennsylvania; Wilkie D. Ferguson for the Southern District of Florida; and Charles A. Shaw for the Eastern District of Missouri.

"I am committed to giving the American people a Federal judiciary marked by excellence, by diversity, and by a concern for the personal security and civil rights of all Americans," said the President. "With these nominations today, we are giving just that to the people of Pennsylvania, Florida, and Missouri."

NOTE: Biographies of the nominees were made available by the Office of the Press Secretary.

# Digest of Other White House Announcements

The following list includes the President's public schedule and other items of general interest announced by the Office of the Press Secretary and not included elsewhere in this issue.

***October 18***

The White House announced the President will host an informal meeting with the economic leaders of 15 Organization for Asian-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) members in Seattle on November 19 and 20.

The President congratulated the two winners of the 1993 Malcolm Baldrige National Quality Award for excellence in quality management. The winners are Eastman Chemical Co. of Kingsport, TN, in the manufacturing category and Ames Rubber Corp. of Hamburg, NJ, in the small business category.

***October 19***

The President announced his intention to nominate Jesse L. White to be Cochair of the Appalachian Regional Commission.

The White House announced the President has approved the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense that U.S. Army Special Operations Command elements (Rangers) be returned to the United States from Somalia within the next few days.

***October 20***

The President announced his appointment of the following individuals to be members of Emergency Board No. 223, to investigate and make recommendations for settlement of a railroad labor dispute:

***Bonnie Weinstock,*** of Melville, NY, Chair;

***M. David Vaughn,*** of Gaithersburg, MD, member; and

***Charlotte Gold,*** of Palm Beach Gardens, FL, member.

***October 22***

In the afternoon, the President had a working luncheon with members of his Cabinet at Blair House.

The White House announced that Ambassador Paul J. Hare has been named the U.S. Special Representative to the Angolan peace process.

The White House announced that President Clinton has invited President Kim Young Sam of Korea to visit the White House on November 23.

## Nominations Submitted to the Senate

The following list does not include promotions of members of the Uniformed Services, nominations to the Service Academies, or nominations of Foreign Service officers.

***Submitted October 19***

Mark L. Schneider,
of California, to be an Assistant Administrator of the Agency for International Development, vice James Henry Michel, resigned.

***Submitted October 20***

Olivia A. Golden,
of the District of Columbia, to be Commissioner on Children, Youth, and Families, Department of Health and Human Services (new position).

Jane M. Wales,
of New York, to be an Associate Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy, vice J. Thomas Ratchford, resigned.

***Submitted October 21***

Martha Anne Krebs,
of California, to be Director of the Office of Energy Research, Department of Energy, vice William Happer, resigned.

Mary Rita Cooke Greenwood,
of California, to be an Associate Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy, vice Karl A. Erb, resigned.

Alan D. Bersin,
of California, to be U.S. attorney for the Southern District of California for the term of 4 years, vice William Braniff, resigned.

James Burton Burns,
of Illinois, to be U.S. attorney for the Northern District of Illinois for the term of 4 years, vice Fred L. Foreman, resigned.

Joseph Leslie Famularo,
of Kentucky, to be U.S. attorney for the Eastern District of Kentucky for the term of 4 years, vice Karen K. Caldwell.

Walter Charles Grace,
of Illinois, to be U.S. attorney for the Southern District of Illinois for the term of 4 years, vice Frederick J. Hess, resigned.

Michael David Skinner,
of Louisiana, to be U.S. attorney for the Western District of Louisiana for the term of 4 years, vice Joseph S. Cage, Jr., resigned.

## Checklist of White House Press Releases

The following list contains releases of the Office of the Press Secretary that are neither printed as items nor covered by entries in the Digest of Other White House Announcements.

***Released October 16***

Statement by Director of Communications Mark Gearan on action by the United Nations Security Council to adopt sanctions on Haiti

***Released October 18***

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Dee Dee Myers

Statement by Press Secretary Dee Dee Myers on the 1993 Malcolm Baldrige National Quality Award recipients

Statement by Press Secretary Dee Dee Myers on the decision of the Government of Pakistan to provide 1,500 additional troops for the U.N. mission in Somalia

Announcement that the President will host an informal meeting of the Organization for Asian-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) members

Announcement of the White House Conference on Climate Change

***Released October 19***

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Dee Dee Myers

Statement by Press Secretary Dee Dee Myers on deployment of forces in Somalia

Transcript of a press briefing by Director of the White House Office of Environmental Policy Kathleen McGinty; Energy Secretary Hazel O'Leary; Transportation Secretary Federico Peña; and Environmental Protection Agency Administrator Carol Browner

Listing of Members of Congress meeting with the President on the North American Free Trade Agreement

Announcement of the White House Conference on Climate Change

Announcement of the nomination of Jesse L. White, Jr., to be a Cochair of the Appalachian Regional Commission

***Released October 20***

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Dee Dee Myers

Statement by Press Secretary Dee Dee Myers on Haiti

Announcement of the President's signing of Executive Order 12873—Federal Acquisition, Recycling, and Waste Prevention

Announcement of Presidential Emergency Board No. 223

***Released October 21***

Text of a letter to the President from Jerry Jansinowski, president, National Association of Manufacturers, on health care reform

Statement by Press Secretary Dee Dee Myers on legislation signed by the President

Statement by AIDS Policy Coordinator Kristine Gebbie on effective HIV prevention in adolescents

Announcement of the resignation of Marla Romash as Communications Director for Vice President Albert Gore, Jr.

***Released October 22***

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Dee Dee Myers

Statement by Press Secretary Dee Dee Myers on the designation of Ambassador Paul J. Hare as the U.S. Special Representative to the Angola peace process

Announcement of intention to nominate four U.S. attorneys

Listing of Members of Congress meeting with the President on the North American Free Trade Agreement

Announcement of early award selections of the technology reinvestment project

Joint Turkish-U.S. statement

## Acts Approved by the President

### *Approved October 18*

H.J. Res. 218 / Public Law 103–108
Designating October 16, 1993, and October 16, 1994, each as World Food Day

H.J. Res. 265 / Public Law 103–109
To designate October 19, 1993, as "National Mammography Day"

### *Approved October 21*

H.R. 2446 / Public Law 103–110
Military Construction Appropriations Act, 1994

H.R. 2493 / Public Law 103–111
Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1994

H.R. 2518 / Public Law 103–112
Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1994

H.J. Res. 281 / Public Law 103–113
Making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1994, and for other purposes