Weekly Compilation of

Presidential Documents

Monday, January 24, 1994
Volume 30—Number 3
Pages 55–134

Contents

Addresses and Remarks

Community empowerment program—101
Honoring Martin Luther King, Jr., at Howard University—105
Los Angeles earthquake—116
Minsk, Belarus, future leaders—87
Moscow, Russia
Reception—56
Town meeting—67
Radio address—86

Communications to Congress

Adjustment to the deficit, letter—132

Communications to Federal Agencies

Fair housing, memorandum—114

Executive Orders

Advisory Committee on Human Radiation Experiments—118
Leadership and Coordination of Fair Housing in Federal Programs: Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing—110

Interviews With the News Media

Exchanges with reporters
Brussels, Belgium—55, 56
Moscow, Russia—57
Geneva, Switzerland—91
Oval Office—116, 131
Interviews
Larry King—120
Print journalists on Air Force One—96
News conferences
January 14 (No. 44) with Russian President Yeltsin—58

Interviews With the News Media—Continued

January 16 (No. 45) with Syrian President Asad—91

Joint Statements

American-Russian Statement on Human Rights—83
Moscow Declaration—84
Non-Proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction and the Means of Their Delivery—80
Presidents of the United States, Russia, and Ukraine—79

Letters and Messages

Bobby R. Inman, letter accepting the withdrawal of nomination to be Secretary of Defense—120
Disaster assistance to California, letter to Federal Emergency Management Agency Director—118

Meetings With Foreign Leaders

Jordanian King Hussein—131
Russian President Yeltsin—57, 84
Syrian President Asad—91
Ukrainian President Kravchuk—57

Statements Other Than Presidential

Death of Foreign Minister Johan Jurgen Holst of Norway—86

Supplementary Materials

Acts approved by the President—134
Checklist of White House press releases—133
Digest of other White House announcements—132
Nominations submitted to the Senate—133

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.*

Exchange With Reporters in Brussels, Belgium

January 9, 1994

Speech to Future Leaders of Europe

Q. Mr. President, how do you think your speech was received tonight?

The President. Oh, very well. I mean, you know, we consciously picked a very small room, and the Europeans are normally much more polite when speeches are given like that. It was a serious speech. But a lot of the students came up to me afterwards and said that they were pleased to know that we were thinking about their future and that they found the ideas basically things they agreed with. I was very encouraged——

Q. Mr. President, can you tell us about the Ukraine?

The President. ——and then after I got out into the crowd in the Place, there was much more sort of overt enthusiasm. And the Prime Minister and others were saying, ''You know, that's the way we are. We're restrained in speeches, but these people are glad to see you. Look at the Place.''

Ukraine

Q. What can you tell us about the Ukraine, Mr. President? Are you close to an agreement, or do you have an agreement? Can Kravchuk sell it? Might we go to Kiev?

The President. All I can tell you tonight is that we worked very, very hard to bring the three of us together, and we've made a terrific amount of progress. And at least when I left to go to the speech I was not in a position to make an announcement.

Q. But you think it might be possible that this could happen and that Kravchuk could sell it?

The President. Well, I don't want to—presumably, Mr. Kravchuk wouldn't agree to anything he didn't think he could sell. I think—I feel—I'm proud of the work that's been done, and I appreciate very much the attitude that Kravchuk and Yeltsin have brought to this whole endeavor. But I don't think I can say any more tonight. I don't even want to——

Partnership For Peace

Q. Do you think Eastern European countries are going to be reassured by the Partnership For Peace?

The President. I hope so.

Q. [*Inaudible*]—giving Russia veto?

The President. I think they need to know this is not a question of veto power. But keep in mind there are certain responsibilities inherent in being in NATO, first of all, that NATO allies all remind each other of all the time. And what I said tonight I want to reemphasize. What I want to do is to leave open the possibility of creating the best possible future for Europe, where they all have the chance to be democracies, they all have a chance to be market economies, they all have a chance to respect one another's securities and to support it and to do it in a way that also permits us to do the best we can if the best future is not open to us. That's what the Partnership For Peace does. It's not giving anybody a veto on future NATO membership.

Q. But what do you say to people who say that NATO isn't relevant if it can't guarantee the peace, let's say, in Bosnia?

The President. Well, that was never the purpose of NATO. The purpose of NATO was to guarantee the peace and security of the countries that were member nations. And when the United States asked NATO to approve some actions in and around Bosnia, it was the first time we'd ever done anything out of the area of the NATO members themselves.

So we're working on this. It's not been established yet that anyone is capable of solving a civil war in another country. That's not been established yet.

Q. [*Inaudible*]—air strikes will be discussed tomorrow, air strikes possible tomorrow?

The President. Good night, everybody.

NOTE: The exchange began at approximately 8:30 p.m. at the Au Vieux Saint Martin Restaurant. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this exchange. This item was not received in time for publication in the appropriate issue.

Remarks and an Exchange With Reporters in Brussels

January 10, 1994

The President. As you know, we had a good, long dinner tonight. And we talked about only two subjects; we talked about Russia and Bosnia. We spent the first half, perhaps more than half the dinner, on Russia. And I basically gave a report about what I would be doing in Russia, and they gave me their advice about what we could do to strengthen the process of reform, create a system of support for people who had been dislocated economically, how we could build a better partnership with Russia and have the kind of future we want, with Russia being a great nation but a nonaggressive one. And it was very, very helpful. I mean, they had very keen insights, and a lot of them had just been there, so it was helpful.

Then we talked about Bosnia at some length. And I urged that we stay with the present communique, the present policy, which gives us the right to ask the U.N. for permission to use air strikes if Sarajevo continues to be shelled. We discussed some other options and agreed that we would have another discussion tomorrow about it.

So I can't say that there was any conclusion reached except that I do believe we'll stay with our present policy. I think the language in the communique will stay in, and we'll have some other discussions about it tomorrow morning.

Bosnia

Q. Was there an agreement to ask the U.N. permission to use air strikes?

The President. No, because under the procedure, what would happen is one of the member states would have to ask the North Atlantic Council, our military group, to review it to say it was appropriate and then to go to the U.N. So I think, plainly, we know that if the language stays in there and if the shelling continues, there will have to be some action taken.

So I think you can tell by what happens tomorrow. If we keep the language, which I hope and believe we will, then it's basically up to the behavior of those who are shelling Sarajevo, principally the Serbs. We'll just have to see what happens.

Aid to Russia

Q. With regard to Russia, is there a larger economic plan envisioned?

The President. Well, what they talked about today was—first of all, we have quite a large plan. We've got to dislodge some of the money that we've committed that was tied up in the international institutions. They all believe that we needed a combination of two things: We need to try to speed up the privatization, because in the end that was the real guarantor of reform—and Russia has done a phenomenal job of privatizing industries, thousands just in the last year—and secondly, that we needed some sort of social support network, an unemployment system, a retraining system, a system to train people to manage and operate businesses and banks that will enable people to deal with the dislocations that are coming. And that's basically what we talked about.

NOTE: The President spoke at approximately 11 p.m. in the Grand Place. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks. This item was not received in time for publication in the appropriate issue.

Remarks at a Reception in Moscow, Russia

January 13, 1994

Thank you very much. I want to begin by thanking Ambassador and Mrs. Pickering for having us here tonight and for giving us all a chance to meet and to visit in what I imagine is an extraordinary and unprecedented gathering, not only of Americans but of Russians who come from different political perspectives. I am told that 60 years ago at a

Christmas Eve party here, three trained seals went crazy in the ballroom. Now, in the United States, when people from different political parties get together, they sometimes behave the same way. [*Laughter*] So I'm glad to see you all getting along so well tonight.

It is a great honor for me and the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Treasury, and all the other members of our party to be here with so many representatives of the new Russia. Each of you who have participated in this new democratic process have my respect, my admiration, and my pledge of equal partnership. It is difficult for most Americans to even imagine the size and scope of the changes going on in your nation now. When I leave you, I am going home to attempt to reform our Nation's health care system. It is a very big job. It comprises one-seventh of our entire economy. You are in the process of transforming your entire economy while you develop a new constitutional democracy as well. It boggles the mind, and you have my respect for the effort.

Over the years, over the centuries, the Russian people have shown their greatness in many ways: in culture, on the battlefield, in government, in space. And now on the brink of the 21st century, this great nation is being called upon to redefine its greatness again in terms that will enable your nation to be strong and vital and alive for hundreds of years into the future.

We live in a curious time where modern revolutions are transforming life for the better, revolutions in communications, in technology, and in many other areas. And yet the oldest of society's demons plague us still, the hatreds of people for one another based on their race, their ethnic group, their religion, even the piece of ground they happen to have been born on. In the midst of this conflict of historic proportions, I believe that greatness of nations in the 21st century will be defined by how successful they are in providing the opportunity for every man and woman, every boy and girl living within the nation's borders to live up to the fullest of their natural capacity.

If we are to have any chance at all to realize that future in the world, I believe this nation must be strong democratically and strong economically. And I believe we will have to write a new future for all of Europe and create a future which, for the first time in history, Europe is not divided by some political line which leads to war or which is the product of a destructive isolationism born of past divisions.

So as I look around this room at the faces of tomorrow's Russia—people from different political parties, people who are members of the Duma and people who are governors and people who represent local government, people who are in private enterprises—I say to you there is lots of room for difference of opinion. Indeed, the world we are living in and the world we are moving toward is so complicated and changes so fast, all of us desperately need to listen to one another's opinions. But if we are to realize the measure of the true greatness in your nation and in mine, we must keep our devotion to democracy, to a certain freedom in our economic affairs, and to a respect for one another's neighbors. For greatness in the next century will be defined not by how far we can reach but by how well we do by the people who live within our borders.

I came here as a friend and supporter of the democratic changes going on in this country. I hope that together we can make a positive difference in a genuine and equal partnership. But in the end, you will have to decide your future. American support can certainly not make all the difference, and American direction is unwarranted. The future is for you to write and for you to make. But I come to say, from the bottom of my heart, the people of the United States and the President of the United States wish to be your partners and your friends.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 6:28 p.m. at Spaso House. This item was not received in time for publication in the appropriate issue.

Exchange With Reporters on Signing the Denuclearization Agreement With Russia and Ukraine in Moscow

January 14, 1994

Q. What will be the impact of this agreement on the national security of Russia?

President Yeltsin. We have never believed and we have never perceived that there is any kind of danger coming our way from Ukraine. Nevertheless, in terms of world politics, today is an historic day where the three Presidents have signed an agreement that would eliminate nuclear arms from the territory of Ukraine and whereby Ukraine will be acceding the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. This will be another important step towards getting rid of nuclear weapons throughout the world.

Q. There is an opinion that if the Ukraine gets rid of its nuclear weapons it will lose its authority, so to speak, among other nations. What is your opinion on this, Mr. President?

President Clinton. Well, of course, in the end this is a question that Ukraine has to answer for itself, but I can only tell you what my opinion is. My opinion is that Ukraine will increase its authority among nations for doing this. After all, Ukraine has enhanced the security of the United States today by agreeing to remove 1,500 nuclear warheads aimed at our Nation. Ukraine has enhanced the security of Ukraine and Russia by agreeing to dismantle these warheads, which means that there is less chance of nuclear accident, nuclear espionage, nuclear terrorism.

And more important, Ukraine has shown an understanding that as we move into the next century, the greatness of nations will be defined by their ability to work with each other and to develop the capacities of their people. And I think you will now see people all over the world more interested in working with Ukraine in partnership because of this very brave and visionary act. So I believe that Ukraine is a stronger nation today for having done this. And I think almost everyone else in the world will believe the same thing.

Q. President Clinton, we've been told by one of your aides that the timetable for this agreement is going to remain secret. Is that in fact the case? Are you going to at least tell us when dismantlement of the first nuclear warhead in Ukraine will take place?

President Clinton. We have reached an agreement on which details will be made public and which will not, and today all the things that can be made public will be made public. We've been working so hard on this, I want to be very careful about it.

Let me tell you that I am completely comfortable with the agreements that we have made and with the understandings between both Russia and Ukraine about how it will be handled. I think it's a very good thing for the world and a very good thing for the United States.

Q. What does Ukraine receive from giving the warheads and missiles deployed in its territory?

President Kravchuk. From the political point of view, we get a greater security for having signed the documents with the Presidents. Both Presidents and the countries confirm this higher change of security. And the second point, the Ukraine confirms its policy which was proclaimed earlier, thus indicating the continual character of its policy. And the third, Ukraine receives compensation for nuclear weapons. And the fourth, Ukraine enters into normal relations with other states, and this is the primary thing for great security. I say it like that: if Ukraine is in friendly relations, further ties with Russia and the United States, it will be secure.

NOTE: The exchange began at 8:55 a.m. in St. Catherine Hall at the Kremlin. President Yeltsin and President Kravchuk spoke in their native language, and their remarks were translated by an interpreter. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this exchange. This item was not received in time for publication in the appropriate issue.

The President's News Conference With President Boris Yeltsin of Russia in Moscow

January 14, 1994

President Yeltsin. Ladies and gentlemen, I'll tell you the main thing now. The first official visit paid by the President of the United States of America Clinton to Russia has been very fruitful. It couldn't have been otherwise because we know one another only too well and we needed a great job to do and two great hopes were placed on us by our nations.

This visit is based on today's realities, and at the same time, it projected itself into the future as regards the difficult past. We and the President of the United States wrapped it up solidly back in Vancouver. Work in Moscow was very intense to obtain great results. The concrete agreements made are crucial to Russia and the United States and to the entire world.

The talks were held at a history-making time for both countries. Old habits and stereotypes fade away. We are searching for new things in Russia and in America. I must say that we're in the thick of the Russian-American joint revolution.

During the free democratic elections, the Russians have approved the new constitution, and for the first time, with no coercion, they elected their own Parliament. I don't agree with those who believe that the first pancakes did not turn out right. You should take a better look at individual names and popular slogans. You will see that the people chose a better way of life, legality and predictability.

This is a lesson for all of us to learn. Yet, in order not to repeat past mistakes I made it perfectly clear to the President that we would expand the scope of reforms, focusing more on the social dimension. I am confident that this country will have a greater stability and a durable social peace.

Bill Clinton demonstrated he has a fine sense of our particular situation. Indeed, the Americans also survived a lot, and they continue to survive a lot. We may count on their full support for the reforms implemented by the Russian President, government, and reformists in the new Parliament.

I discussed problems concerning our economy and positive changes that happened, and I referred to elements of stabilization. And I would like to underscore that what we need now is not humanitarian aid but rather full-scale cooperation with due regard for the period of transition the young market economy in Russia is going through now.

Specifically, along with the Tokyo package and the Clinton package and Vancouver, the most tangible support for Russia would be the opening of the American market for our exports, whether raw materials or equipment. And I'm very much satisfied that today we finally, after 2 years of discussion, we signed an agreement on uranium.

All the cold war restrictions should be lifted like the Jackson-Vanik amendment. We need to remove artificial barriers that were put up under the excuse of Russian dumping practices. As regards uranium, I think it is rather a fear of competition with more advanced technologies and cheaper materials.

Since Vancouver, Bill Clinton has done a lot, keeping his promise to remove the economic bad things of the cold war. Discriminating restrictions were struck off from the American domestic legislation; I mean the bulk of those. No more high custom duties are levied on about 5,000 Russian products.

The U.S. President has done a great job of integrating Russia into international financial and economic organizations. I believe that it won't take much time for the Group of Seven to turn into a Group of Eight. During our negotiations, the Russian-American relations have reached a point where they became a mature strategic global partnership along all the lines. It is based on a commonly held view of new prospects and fresh problems. We are both confident that today's world should be democratic, open, and integrated.

As regards equality, mutual benefits, regard for one another's interests, no more references should be made to that because those are implied. This basic dimension of our partnership is formalized in the Moscow Declaration we signed. It demonstrates and consolidates the historic shift in the Russian-American relations in Eurasia and in the entire world.

Our interaction is now freshly meaningful, and it is geared toward a better strategic stability and security. Thanks to that, over a few recent months the world and our countries avoided quite a few traps and miscalculations. There was some progress made: better cooperation in the areas of security and disarmament, peacekeeping, and promotion of economic transparency.

The landmark step that we have finally made in Moscow is the package of agreements leading to the elimination of nuclear weapons in the Ukraine. I believe that this is a history-making document that was signed today by the three Presidents. Everybody

benefits from it and, in the first place, the Ukrainian people.

The agreements reached at our three-party summit will save money, remove differences, and set a good example for other countries to follow. They are consolidated by the Russian-American declaration concerning the consolidation of all mass destruction weapon nonproliferation regimes. And nonproliferation, as you know, is being called into question now, or is running a very serious test of strength.

The U.S. President gave me fresh information about the Partnership For Peace concept that was approved in Brussels. This idea comes from the NATO, but there is some basic element of the Russian-American cooperation in it. This concept is a very important step toward building a security system from Vancouver to Vladivostok that excludes the emergence of new demarcation lines for areas of unequal security. We believe that this idea may prove just one of the scenarios for building a new Europe. Just one of those will well impart very specific cooperation in this dimension of cooperation, including the military area. Of course, we will keep track of whether collective security structures in Europe, including such time-tested institutions like the United Nations and the CSCE.

I provided very detailed information to President Clinton about the integration of processes that go on in the former Soviet Union, including our latest meetings, summit meetings within the framework of the CIS. You shouldn't be fearful of some neoimperial ambitions. Russia is only interested in stability, and it takes very honest mediation efforts to extinguish the hotbeds of conflicts along its new borders.

We are ready to expand our cooperation and coordinate our action with the United Nations, CSCE, and the international community. It is too bad that the international community has yet to show great enthusiasm. It responds, but frugally, to our concrete proposals concerning either Abkhazia or Nagorno-Karabakh or Tajikistan. I believe that we will have a greater understanding with the United States of this very crucial issue.

I raised the issue of human rights violations and national minorities, especially in the Baltics. No double standards should be allowed here, whether it happens in Haiti or in the Baltics. As a result, we adopted a very forceful declaration on securing human rights. And the President confirmed that he will take appropriate steps in making contact with the Baltics so that no more discrimination would be allowed there against the Russian-speaking population there.

I don't want to be too optimistic now. This does not reflect the nature of our sincere and businesslike conversations. We've had differences, and we'll continue to have some differences in the future. But what is crucial here is looking for an understanding that will turn into a specific policy.

This is our flight plan for the Russian-American partnership that will substitute the flight plan for strategic missiles that would not be targeted against one another.

Thank you very much.

Now, Mr. Clinton.

President Clinton. Thank you very much.

Nine months ago President Yeltsin and I met in Vancouver, and there we laid the foundation for a new partnership between the United States and Russia, a partnership based on mutual respect. We have just concluded an excellent and very productive summit meeting in which we took important steps to strengthen that partnership. I want to thank President Yeltsin and his entire team for hosting us and for making these days so productive.

Throughout our discussions, I reaffirmed the strong support of the United States for Russia's commitment to democracy and transition to a market economy. I informed President Yeltsin that the United States is committed to specific projects, 100 percent of the $1.6 billion of assistance that I announced in Vancouver, and that we have actually expended about 70 percent of the funds. The President and I also discussed the additional $2.5 billion in assistance for Russia and the other newly independent states that my administration proposed in Tokyo in April and which Congress fully funded this September.

The President gave me strong assurances of his intention to continue the reform process. He and I discussed a number of ways in which the United States and the inter-

national community can assist in the promotion of reform and at the same time assist Russia in cushioning the social hardships which reform has brought to many Russians.

As a concrete expression of our commitment to reform, the United States is opening the doors this week to the Russian Small Enterprise Fund and has established a new fund for large enterprises to promote private-sector development here. That latter fund will be chaired by the former Secretary of the Treasury Michael Blumenthal.

We also signed a contract to purchase $12 billion of highly enriched uranium over the next 20 years. And I have asked the Secretary of Commerce, Ron Brown, to lead a very high level Presidential trade mission to Russia in March, including leading CEO's who would be in a position to promote both trade and investment here.

We issued today also a joint statement on human rights in which we express our common resolve to combat discrimination in all forms of intolerance including antisemitism. Today I also had an opportunity to describe further the results of the successful NATO summit this week. And President Yeltsin assured me, as you just heard, of Russia's intention to be a full and active participant in the Partnership For Peace.

We took several historic steps to ensure that the fear of nuclear confrontation will remain a relic of the past. As you know, Presidents Yeltsin and Kravchuk and I signed an agreement that commits Ukraine to eliminate over 1,500 nuclear warheads. All the most modern and deadly missiles in Ukraine, the SS–24's, will have their warheads removed within 10 months. Second, President Yeltsin and I agreed that as of May 30th, the nuclear missiles of Russia and the United States will no longer be targeted against any country. And third, we signed an agreement to work closely together in regions where proliferation risks are greatest, including the Korean Peninsula and the Middle East.

We also agreed that the sovereignty and independence of Russia's neighbors must be respected. In that respect, I expressed my strong hope that Russia's negotiations with Estonia and Latvia will lead to the withdrawal of troops in early 1994. And I did agree, as President Yeltsin said, to press strongly the proposition that the Russian-speaking people in those republics must be respected.

Let me close by noting that President Yeltsin and I have agreed to meet in Naples at the G–7 summit in July, and I am pleased that he has accepted my invitation to make a state visit to the United States this fall. I look forward to those meetings.

I came to Europe with the hope of beginning to build a new security rooted in common commitments to democracy and free economics and mutual respect for security and territorial borders. I came with a dream that at the end of the cold war we might all be able to work together to have a Europe that is integrated, politically, economically, and in terms of security; a Europe that, for the first time since the establishment of nation states would not be divided by present conflict or lingering animosities.

I now believe we have a better chance to create that kind of new security, a security in which great nations will be able to treat each other as genuine partners, chart their own futures, without being dictated to by others; a future in which I believe greatness will be defined fundamentally by our capacity to enable the men and women and the children who live within our borders to live up to the fullest of their capacities.

I thank President Yeltsin for his partnership of that endeavor, and I assure you we will continue to work as hard as we can toward that common mission.

President Yeltsin. Thank you, Mr. President.

Due to the protocol, we have restricted opportunities to take questions.

Russian Reform

Q. Good afternoon. You mention frequently that you would consider the outcome of the election campaign that happened on December 12th in your domestic policies. Do you intend to correct your foreign policy, and in particular, your policy toward the relations with the United States?

President Yeltsin. I believe that we have very stable and steady relations with the United States that are well checked and based on partnership. But of course, some adjustments will be made, especially with re-

spect to the social sphere. We believe that in contrast with the Vancouver meeting, we will not count on humanitarian aid and direct social aid. This is our business to attend to.

We are requesting the U.S. side to open the doors of the American market, to have the restrictions lifted to help us with our debts, to show support for our reform in terms of conversion of our defense-related industries, and so on. We don't need direct social aid because such aid is also needed by the United States people, by the American people. It wouldn't be serious. You want to relieve the pressure of unemployment in Russia without creating jobs for your own Americans back in your country. We believe this is our business to attend to. And out of the forms of support, the rescheduling of the debts, structural changes in our national economy, we will look for social guarantees for our own workers, which would reduce impoverishment or the poverty level that exists today in this country.

Q. Do you mean that you are going to retreat a bit from shock therapy and go a little slower in order to improve the lives of——

President Yeltsin. No. In terms of reform, we will take resolute action and will continue to press ahead. And in this regard, the U.S. President is in agreement to support such a policy.

President Clinton. If I could respond briefly to both of the last two questions, from my perspective. I commend President Yeltsin for his commitment to continuing the path of economic reform. If you look at 1993 as compared with 1992, if you look at how much the deficit was reduced as a percentage of annual income, if you look at how much inflation was brought down, if you look at how much the stabilization of the currency was improved, I think that the continued work toward hooking the Russian economy into the global economic system based on markets is a very sound thing.

We had great, long talks about what could be done and what kind of assistance the United States and others could provide to recognize that there are certain dislocations which come from these changes, so that the people of Russia will know that there is an effort being made to deal with those problems. But I also have to tell you that I believe that the people will begin to benefit in ways that they could not see perhaps last year, in the coming year when we have more trade and more investment. And as people around the world and in the United States, in particular, see that the President is serious about this, I think the benefits will begin to flow.

That, plus constructing the kind of social support system in job retraining, unemployment, all of those things that just have to be put together and are not easy to put together when you don't have one, I think these things will help a lot.

The other point I'd like to make to you, sir, is that from my point of view, President Yeltsin has been unfairly criticized in some quarters for his relationship with the United States. The implication that somehow we have tried to direct the course of Russian policy is just not accurate and not true. The people of Russia have to define their own future. All I have tried to do is to say that as long as we share the same values and the same vision, as long as we share a dream of political freedom and economic freedom and respect for our neighbors, I want to be an equal partner, because I believe this is a very great nation and that the world, the whole world, and particularly Europe has a real interest in seeing Russia succeed, in seeing this reform movement succeed.

So I think our relationships in that sense have been quite correct all along, and some have sought to mischaracterize them in a way that I think is not accurate. I come here as a friend and a partner, not—we have our problems at home, too—every country does. The United States has no interest in charting Russia's future; that's for Russia to do. But we can be partners, and we should be.

Ukrainian Nuclear Arms Agreement

Q. My question—and I refer it to both Presidents—during the Brussels visit, the Russian party requested the United States and NATO to make a greater influence on Ukraine concerning strategic arms. Have your expectations come true, given the agreements you've signed in Moscow?

President Yeltsin. Our expectations came perfectly true, promptly. We've signed an agreement with Ukraine to eliminate all of Ukraine's nuclear weapons. Their nuclear

weapons will be shipped to Russia for destruction. And of course, with respect to uranium, we need to provide some compensation. Instead of weapons-grade uranium, we need to provide them with fuel-grade uranium. And we are in agreement.

We will continue to process—with U.S. assistance—we will continue to process weapons-grade uranium into fuel uranium. And since we've signed an agreement on uranium today, it appears to me that today our agreement with—the three-party agreement with Ukraine signed by the three Presidents is a history-making decision. And I believe that there is a great role that has been played by Russia and the United States and personally by the U.S. President Bill Clinton.

President Clinton. I am fully satisfied with the agreement. I want to compliment again President Kravchuk for seeing what I believe are the real security interests of his country. I think his country is stronger for signing this agreement. It will certainly be more economically powerful in the years to come as more investors are more interested in supporting the decision to be non-nuclear.

And I want to support and compliment President Yeltsin. The United States, I believe, played a very valuable role in this, but it was President Yeltsin's suggestion to me that we set up this trilateral process. I have enjoyed working in it. I worked hard on this. Vice President Gore worked hard on this, and of course, the rest of our team did. And I assure you that I intend to maintain an intense personal involvement in this whole area.

I think, by the way, a strong and an independent Ukraine is critical to this whole development of an integrated Europe that we are working on in our partnership here.

Russian Reform

Q. A question for both Presidents. President Yeltsin, you have made a commitment today and President Clinton has agreed and has urged you to continue the commitment to the economic reforms. It will take a while, though, to create the institutions that can cushion the effects. The recent elections have shown that only 15 percent of the people elected support that policy. How can that be sustained politically given the opposition you're going to face in the Parliament?

And President Clinton, without direct aid, what really can the international institutions do to make this more viable for President Yeltsin?

President Yeltsin. Firstly, I disagree with your statistics—15 percent of the Russians support the reforms. This is not the case. This is untrue. You should take a look at the results of the voting for the constitution. The constitution is support for the reforms. I'm not talking about individual people or voting for individual parties or blocs of parties. They voted for the constitution that will decide the future of Russia and the future of Russia reforms. This is where the Russians made their choice. And they number about 60 percent, 60.

Now, with respect to support from international institutions, we discussed this topic. Incidentally, we've discussed about 30 issues, or even more than that, both domestic Russian issues and domestic U.S. issues, bilateral relations, international relations, and so on and so forth, security relations. There was a large host of such issues that were discussed.

I believe that the fact that we approved the Tokyo package and the fact that that is too bad that the Group of Seven is not very happy or is very slow in implementing that decision, that is bad. Bill Clinton kept his promise he made in Vancouver. The first package worth $1.6 billion was paid; the second package, worth about the same amount of money, to be approved by Congress in 1994 and 1995, will be paid. And as regards Group of Seven commitments, or the big seven commitments, I think the case is much more difficult here. The decision was made, but they're very slow in implementing that decision. And that saddens my friend, Bill Clinton.

President Clinton. Let me respond to your question, because I think it's important to talk about what we are doing here. First of all, getting the deal on uranium is a big thing. That guarantees a steady stream of commercial—it's a business deal, but it will guarantee some money flowing in here every year for a long time.

Now, in addition to that, I have asked in my '95 budget for $900 million in aid. And if you take that plus the $2.5 billion in this second package for the entire republics of the former Soviet Union, but most of it will come here to Russia, there will be more than $1 billion in aid in each of the next 2 years.

In addition to that, we have reached agreement with the G–7 countries to do a number of other things which I think will help a lot. We are opening an office here headed by an American—that's a G–7 office—to make sure that all of the commitments are followed through on. And it's open now this week. We are going to work with trying to get funds, which I'm confident we can, to Russia's energy customers so that they can pay their bills for the energy that Russia is providing them. That's a business deal, but it will give them a significant amount of money.

We have offered technical assistance, which is all President Yeltsin has asked for, in trying to help work through these social services issues—how do you set up the training programs and other support programs to cushion the dislocation? We are beginning this week again under the leadership of Jerry Corrigan to fund the Small Business Development Fund, and we're setting up this large business fund.

Let me say one final thing. The willingness of President Yeltsin to continue on the path of economic reform, I think, will be met positively by the international financial institutions in a reasonable way. And I think that that can free up billions of dollars of assistance in the next several months for continued reinvestment. And again, when Ron Brown comes here in March, I think you will see a significant increase in trade and investment from the United States.

So we are going to be heavily involved in this in ways that I believe will begin to affect the ordinary Russian people in a positive way. The problem is that there's always a time lag between taking these tough decisions and when somebody can feel it in their own lives. And that's what I was trying to communicate when I was walking the street yesterday here in Moscow, shaking hands with people and talking to them and listening to them. We have to, all of us who care very much about the greatness and the potential of this country and who want a genuine partnership, have to be sensitive to that. But I believe that these initiatives will begin to be felt in the lives of average Russian working people. And I think they will, in the aggregate, they will be quite significant over the next couple of years.

The Russian Parliament

Q. ——Russian Television. We have millions and millions of Russian TV viewers. A question for Boris Nikolayevich. Given the composition of the new Parliament in Russia, do you believe that you will have some problem having the Parliament to ratify our agreement with some Western partners—maybe foreign policies will suffer as approved by the Parliament? Do you believe that you as the President of this country are in some difficulty in dealing with your foreign partners?

President Yeltsin. I don't believe that this is the sort of Parliament that we have. I believe our Parliament is smarter, more intellectual, more experienced. The upper Chamber of the Parliament, I believe, will pursue policies shared by the President and by the Government, and state Duma, the lower Chamber, will get to that with time. They will realize that such major international agreements and treaties may not be delayed in terms of ratification. I mean, agreements like the one we concluded on the destruction of chemical weapons and such like.

I don't believe they will do that. Otherwise they would show no respect for their own people. But I believe that there are Members of Parliament, and I mentioned that in my message, should be mindful of the fact that they are representatives of the people, and the people told them how to behave in the Parliament. They should have a fine political sense. Of course, our Parliament is very young, but I'm still confident that the Parliament will proceed constructively.

Q. President Clinton, I wonder what are your impressions after your firsthand experience here in Moscow? What is your assessment of the threat that the ultranationalist movement poses to the movement toward democracy?

President Clinton. Well, those who are in the Parliament are, after all, the product of democracy. And I think that there are two

separate things here. I think we have to respect the democratic process. And in every democratic process, no one is satisfied with the outcome of all elections. I can testify to that. So in that sense, I don't think they present a threat to the democratic process.

Now, I think what is happening here is that Russia, which is and has been a very great country for a very long time, is doing what countries are required to do from time to time, they're having to redefine what greatness means, establish a vision for the future. And when times are difficult, and the Russian people have been through some difficult times, there are those, always, in every age in time, who can generate some support by defining greatness in terms of the past. But in the end, the only people who really make it work are those who define greatness in terms of the future. And that's why I think the reform movement in the end will prevail. Because if you look at the nature of the global economy, if you look at the things that are happening that really move and change people's lives, I think history is on the side of the reformers.

And I also believe what will happen is—keep in mind you're going to have some interesting debates in this Duma. I wish I could—I enjoy watching the news every night. It's nice to be in a place where some other President's having trouble with his Parliament instead of me. [*Laughter*] President Yeltsin made a valuable point here: When these issues begin to be debated and when people move from the level of campaign rhetoric, which is always highly abstract, to the real problems of real people, you also may see a new consensus developing. And the only thing I would say to all of the people who are in this newly elected Duma is that you have an enormous opportunity and a responsibility. You are the product of the first genuinely democratic, constitutionally provided Parliament in the history of your country, and you ought to be willing to just listen and learn and grow and deal with the issues.

I don't think the United States or anybody else should overreact to this. These folks are just getting started on what will be a great and exciting journey. And I think we ought to wish them well and see what happens.

President Yeltsin. Due to the protocol commitments we have to limit the time of our press conference. Just one more question on the Russian and U.S. side.

Future NATO Membership

Q. I would like to get a more specific sense of your view, Mr. Clinton and Boris Nikolayevich. I'm talking about prospective admission of other states to NATO, and I am referring to states there on the borders of Russia. Do you believe that Russia will join NATO sometime in the future and on what conditions?

President Yeltsin. I believe that the initiative displayed by U.S. President Bill Clinton and by some European politicians, I mean in terms of not admitting one country by one to NATO, but rather to declare them Partners For Peace and security, provides a very good formula. Because we need to draw up one more line here because if you divide us in the black and the white, it is no good.

On the other hand, the time will come when Russia will be integrated and all the others will be integrated, but they will be integrated with one another in just one package, as they say. And this will bring security to everybody. But if you sort of dismember us, I mean, accepting us or admitting us one by one is no good. I'm against that—opposed. That is why I support the initiative shown by the U.S. President with respect to the Partnership For Peace.

President Clinton. The whole idea behind the Partnership For Peace was to develop a post-cold-war mechanism in which countries that shared the same commitments, in this case, the commitment to respect the territorial borders of their neighbors, a commitment to civilian control over the military, a commitment to joint planning and training and military exercises, that these countries could work together and could work toward eventual NATO membership if they wish it and if that is the direction that seems best for security in the post-cold-war world. That is, the NATO plainly contemplated an expansion.

But this Partnership For Peace is a real thing now. It is real now. We invited all the republics of the former Soviet Union, all the Warsaw Pact nations, and the other non-

NATO members of Europe to be part of the Partnership For Peace. All were invited. All were told that this can also lead to eventual membership in NATO, but that our objective is to create an undivided and united Europe, united around political freedom, economic freedom, military cooperation, and respect for one another's borders, for the first time in the history of the nation state. It has never happened before.

So the short answer to your question is, yes, this could happen. And I think we share that vision. And I think that we have a particular responsibility, the two of us, to try to work toward that vision.

Press Secretary Myers. This will be the last question.

Bosnia

Q. President Clinton, did you discuss the subject of Bosnia? What was the nature of your discussions? And does President Yeltsin agree with the intention expressed at the NATO meetings of launching air strikes if the situation does not improve in Sarajevo, or in all of Bosnia, really?

President Clinton. First of all, since I asked the NATO people, my colleagues in NATO, to debate this issue with great precision, let me try to characterize with great precision what it is they voted to do.

They voted to reaffirm the position that air strikes should be considered if Sarajevo is shelled to the point of, in effect, being threatened or strangled so that the U.N. mission could not proceed. That is, the United Nations mission in Bosnia cannot succeed unless Sarajevo is there as a place where there are hospitals, a place where we can get humanitarian aid, and where we can get medicine and things like that in and out of. They voted to ask the military commanders to examine whether or not anything could be done with air power or any other military resources to guarantee the transfer of troops, the exchange of troops in Srebrenica, and the opening of the air strip at Tuzla, again, for humanitarian purposes.

I want to emphasize that because there is a lot of confusion here. None of the things in the NATO resolution are designed necessarily to bring a peace agreement to Bosnia. They are all designed to further the United Nations mission in Bosnia, which is to try to keep as many people alive as possible until the parties will make peace.

I think I should let President Yeltsin speak for himself on what he thinks of what NATO did on Bosnia. We've all had our differences over Bosnia, and everybody's got a different idea about it. What we did talk about last night was whether there was anything else either of us could do or whether there was anything we could do together to try to bring the conflict to an end. I mean, that's what we want. We want those people to stop killing each other and make a reasonable peace in which they can all live and start raising their children and going back to a normal life again.

We reached no conclusive results, but we had a pretty honest conversation, and a few things were said that I think we might be able to follow up on. Anything I were to say—excuse me—anything I might say with greater specificity would probably only confuse things and raise false hopes. This is a real thicket. But we had what I thought was an honest, good conversation about the larger issue, which is, is there anything else anybody from outside can do to help make peace?

But I think it's very important, because this air strike thing has become sort of a psychological litmus test. What NATO did was to list three possible areas of military action, all designed to further the U.N. mission, none of them pretending to ultimately settle the conflict. The NATO leaders said over and over and over again, ultimately, the parties will have to willingly agree to a peace.

So what I discussed with President Yeltsin was whether there was anything we can do to help bring peace. We've reached no conclusive results, but we had the basis for continuing discussions about it.

President Yeltsin. Thank you, ladies and gentlemen. The news conference is over.

Thank you very much.

President Clinton. He said he agreed with my characterization of our conversation. [*Laughter*]

NOTE: The President's 44th news conference began at 11:41 a.m. in the Kremlin Press Center. President Yeltsin spoke in Russian, and his remarks were translated by an interpreter. A tape was not available for verification of the content

of this news conference. This item was not received in time for publication in the appropriate issue.

Remarks in a Town Meeting With Russian Citizens in Moscow

January 14, 1994

The President. Thank you, Alexander Nikolaiovich, for that introduction, for your lifetime of accomplishment, and your support for free speech and for reform.

I am deeply honored to be here today at this station, which has become for all the world a beacon of information and truth. Attacked 3 months ago by opponents of reform, Ostankino stands as a symbol of the power of free expression and of the brave sacrifices the Russian people have been making to build a great and free future.

I'm so glad there are many young people here, and I hope there are many, many more watching us on television, because it is the future of the youth of Russia that I wish to speak about. Once every generation or two, all great nation's must stop and think about where they are in time. They must regenerate themselves. They must imagine their future in a new way. Your generation has come of age at one of those moments.

Yesterday I walked through Moscow. I stopped at a bakery and bought some bread. I went into another shop and talked to the people there. I talked with an awful lot of people on the street. I went to Kazan Cathedral and lit a candle in memory of my mother. It is a cathedral which, like Russia itself, has been built anew on old foundations.

Over the centuries the Russian people have shown their greatness in many ways: in the arts and literature, on the battlefield, in the university, and in space. Though the Communist system suppressed human rights and human initiative and repressed your neighbors and brought the world the cold war, still the greatness of the Russian people shown through.

Now on the brink of the 21st century, your nation is being called upon once again to redefine its greatness in terms that are appropriate to the present day and to the future, in ways that will enable your nation to be strong and free and prosperous and at peace.

We live in a curious time. Modern revolutions are changing life for the better all over the world. Revolutions and information and communications and technology and production, all these things make democracy more likely. They make isolated, state-controlled economies even more dysfunctional. They make opportunities for those able to seize them more numerous and richer than ever before. And yet even in this modern world, the oldest of humanity's demons still plague us: the hatreds of people for one another based solely on their religion or their race or their ethnic backgrounds or sometimes simply on the piece of ground they happen to have been born upon.

In the midst of these conflicts between the faces and forces of tomorrow and the forces of yesterday, I believe that the greatness of nations in the 21st century will be defined not by whether they can dictate to millions and millions of people within and beyond their borders but instead by whether they can provide their citizens, without regard to their race or their gender, the opportunity to live up to the fullest of their ability, to take full advantage of the incredible things that are in the world of today and tomorrow.

Therefore, if we are to realize the greatness of Russia in the 21st century, I believe your nation must be strong democratically and economically. And in this increasingly interconnected world, you must be able to get along together and to get along with and trade with your neighbors close at hand and all around the globe. To do that, I think we will have to write an entirely new future for all of Europe, a future in which security is based not on old divisions but on a new integration of nations by means of their shared commitment to democracy, to open economies, and to peaceful military cooperation.

I come here as a friend and supporter of the democratic changes going on in this nation. I hope that my Nation and I can make a positive contribution in the spirit of genuine and equal partnership, not simply to these large changes but a positive contribution to the everyday lives of ordinary citizens of this great nation.

In the end, you will have to decide your own future. I do not presume to do that. Your future is still yours to make, yours to write, yours to shape. But I do come to say that my Nation and its President want very much to be your equal partners and genuine friends.

If I were in your place listening to this speech, I might ask myself, ''Why is this guy saying this? What is on his mind? Why is he really eager to work with us?'' First of all, I identify with and even sympathize with the difficulty of the changes you face. I ran for President of the United States in 1992 because I was convinced that my Nation had to make some very hard changes and some tough changes in order to keep the dream that had inspired Americans for 200 years alive, in order to keep the hopes of our working people alive in a fierce and difficult and every-changing new global economy. So I understand that. I have devoted myself at home to making those changes, and I know the changes are difficult, even in an environment in which they are easier than the ones you face. So I come here in genuine sympathy and understanding.

Secondly, I am interested in supporting these changes because my Nation stood for so long against a Communist system, against its lack of freedom, against its excessive dictates, against its imperial impulses, and I could not bear to think that a majority of your people would ever be sorry to have given it up.

I come here because I believe that, together, we can write a new future for Europe and help the entire world to have a more peaceful and prosperous future. And frankly, I come here because I believe your success is clearly in the best interests of the United States and of ordinary American citizens. For it is in our interest to be able to spend less on defense and to invest more in our own people, in the education and health and welfare and technology that will help to carry us into a better time in the 21st century. It is in our interest to curb the spread of weapons of mass destruction and to cooperate with you in reducing threats to peace all around the world. It is in our interest to develop new trade ties and new customers. And each of these developments is more likely if we have a genuine, equal partnership with a strong and free Russia.

I believe how you define your future will be determined in large measure by how you decide to respond as a people to the three great challenges facing you. First, will you continue to work for a genuine market economy, or will you slow down or turn back? Second, will you continue to strengthen and deepen your commitment to democracy, or will you allow it to be restricted? And third, how will you define your role in the world as a great power? Will you define it in yesterday's terms or tomorrow's?

Let me begin with a challenge that clearly most affects the daily lives of the people of this nation, the economic one. I know that your transition to a market economy has been hard, painful, even emotionally disorienting to millions of people. But if the change seems costly, consider the price of standing still or trying to go back. A rigid, state-run economy simply does not work in the modern world.

To be sure, the system you had produced a very literate society, made some of you the best educated people in the world, developed a high-tech base and developed a strong industrial base tied quite closely to her military might. But it is inadequate to a dramatically changing, highly competitive, increasingly flexible global economy in which all decisions simply cannot be made by a handful of people from the top down and in which no country is immune from the forces without.

The old system failed before. That is why you are in the present period of transition. If you attempted to reimpose it, it would fail you again. Let me make it clear that I do not suggest that markets solve all problems. They clearly do not solve all of society's problems. And indeed, they create some problems for every society, problems which must be frankly and forthrightly addressed by people who propose to have a strong community of common interest and common concern within their nation. Yet it is clear that the surest way to prosperity in the world in which we live is the ability of people to produce and to sell high-quality goods and services both within and beyond their borders. There is no other clear path to prosperity.

Russia clearly has the capacity to do well in this kind of economy. You have enormous

technological prowess, a highly educated citizenry that is known and respected around the world. You have immensely valuable natural resources. It is clear that you have the capacity to do well. You have a rapidly growing private sector. Already your nation has privatized nearly one-third of its industry. About 600 businesses a month are privatizing. Tens of millions of your people now own private property and are gaining daily experience in market economies. But there remain serious problems, the most profound, of course, is high rates of inflation.

Inflation at high rates destroys wages. It makes people feel that they can't keep up and that no matter how hard they work, they will not be rewarded for their labor. It hurts the ordinary working people, the very people that are the backbone of any society, who have to believe that the future can be better than the present. It undermines that very belief and makes it so difficult to develop and maintain a majority for the changes and the short-term sacrifices that have to be made. So inflation must be tamed. And as everyone knows, that also has its price, for inflation can only be tamed if the government is willing to print less money and therefore to spend less.

The next problem you have, it seems to me as an outside observer, is that even though you have a lot of privatization of companies, the systems on which every private economy depends are not as well-developed as they ought to be. There are not enough laws which clarify and protect contracts, which make tax systems clear, which provide, in other words, the framework within which all different kinds of transactions can occur. But that can be rather easily corrected.

There are other problems. I might just mention one other that President Yeltsin has talked about quite a lot lately and that has received a lot of attention all around the world since the last election here in Russia, and that is that your country must develop some sort of social safety net as all other successful market economies have to deal with the fact that some people are always going to have difficulties in a rapidly changing economy. Most people can be restored to participation in the economy in times of prosperity, but in any market economy there will always be people who are dislocated. So you have to have training systems, retraining systems, systems to make sure that new businesses can always be started when old businesses are stopping, and systems to deal with people who simply are not competitive in difficult times.

Now, you must determine how to do this. No one can determine how to do it for you or even whether to do it. But as your partner, I can tell you that the United States will do what we can to help to ease your hardships as you move forward on this path and do what we can to help you make the decisions that you are prepared to make.

Let me say that I think this has been, in some ways, the most difficult period of all for you because you have taken a lot of risks, you have made a lot of changes already, and yet the changes have not been felt tangibly in the lives of most ordinary citizens in the country. And that is very difficult. But I can say that just as an outside observer, it seems to me that it is likely that you will begin to see those changes.

Let me just give you a couple of examples. I asked Vice President Gore and Prime Minister Chernomyrdin to work on a program of economic cooperation in the fields of energy, the environment, and space. You have massive energy resources. If we can just get a few more things worked out, it will lead to big flows of money and investment, prosperity, and jobs into this nation.

We have reached an agreement, an unprecedented agreement, for cooperation in space. Next month, Russian cosmonauts will serve on our space shuttle. We will share our resources, share our knowledge, share our training. And we will uncover things in space and in our venture which will have direct economic benefits to the people of Russia and the people of the United States. We both have different but very significant environmental problems which require high levels of skill and technology but which generate enormous economic opportunity and large numbers of jobs. These things will come.

Secondly, last April when I met with President Yeltsin, I pledged $1.6 billion in United States aid. We have now committed all that aid, and 70 percent of the money has been spent. And I provided a map the other day

to show that it had been spent all over the country in all kinds of different ways, mostly to help you to develop a private economy. You will begin to see the benefits of that.

Just this week, the G–7 big industrial nations opened an office in this city, led by an American, for the purpose of making sure that we speed up the aid that was promised last summer but which has been coming too slow. In September, the Congress of the United States approved another $2.5 billion aid package which can now begin to flow again to try to create jobs and opportunities and to help slow the rate of inflation in this country. So I believe that specific benefits will begin to be felt, and people will come to see that there is a light at the end of this long tunnel.

Just today we announced the signing of a contract for the purchase of highly enriched uranium, a contract which will bring another $12 billion to this nation over the next several years. And we are working hard to get assistance to the nations which buy your energy, because so many of them cannot afford to pay for it, to make sure that you can be paid in cash, promptly, as you sell your energy resources. All these things will begin to have an impact on the lives of ordinary citizens. That is something that, as someone who also has to run for election on a periodic basis, I am sensitive to that. In a democracy, if you put people in the driver's seat, they are going to drive. So it is best to give them a good road to drive on, and we are working with that.

The next great challenge Russia faces is the consolidation of democracy, and I want to say just a few words about that. Just like the market, democracy is no cure-all for all economic troubles or social strains. It is always a noisy and messy system. Our common ally in World War II, the British Prime Minister Winston Churchill once said that, ''Democracy is the worst possible form of government, except for all of the others.'' Why did he say that? Because the debate is so wide; the opinions are so different. And sometimes, the differences are so sharp that you wonder if anything will ever be done. But democracy still offers the best guarantee of good decisionmaking and the protection of individual and minority rights.

In a society like yours and mine and throughout the multiethnic expanse of Europe, democracy offers the best hope of protecting diversity and of making diversity a source of strength, harnessing it to a world in which diversity is perhaps the overwhelming fact of life. That is why I would argue to you that each of us, in order to protect your democracy and mine, has a personal responsibility to denounce intolerance and ethnic hatred and anti semitism and anything that undermines the ability of everybody who lives within our national borders to be as productive as possible. Because, keep in mind, in the world in which we live, if you make any decision that deprives anybody who lives in your country of the right to live up to the fullest of their capacity, you have weakened your own ability to be free and prosperous and successful.

I might say it is also why the United States has cautioned other nations to respect the rights of ethnic Russians and other minorities within their borders. In both our nations the success of democracy depends partly on a formal constitution and partly on regular elections and respecting those elections. But it also depends upon a full array of other free associations that give real life and texture to democracies, independent trade unions, newspapers, and a wide variety of civic and cultural associations.

If, like me, you are in a position of authority, you know that the freedom of speech can sometimes be a painful thing. Even in Roman times the great Emperor Marcus Aurelius said that the freedom of speech for someone in power was something to be endured, not enjoyed. But it is essential to democratic lives that people feel free to say what they believe without fear of retaliation.

We are committed to fostering this kind of democratic ferment, and we are prepared to provide whatever kind of technical assistance we can to help it do well here. I say that because some people are concerned at the wide variety of views and the loud expression of those views we see in the Duma here after the last election. That can be a healthy thing if, but only if, everybody else's views are respected and protected too. For once democracy becomes an instrument of crushing the views of the minorities, those who

disagree, those who don't have the muscle, then democracy itself soon disappears.

The third great challenge you face today is redefining the role of your great nation in this age: What does it mean to be a great power in this 21st century? How will you define it? How will you know Russia is a great nation? If someone asked you to describe it, looking to the future, how would you know? If someone asked you to describe it looking back in the early 1800's, you would say, ''We are a great nation because we beat Napoleon and ran him out of Russia.'' Right? Whether you agree or disagree with the Communist system, you can say you were a great nation in the sense that you loomed large at the height of the Soviet empire with the Warsaw Pact. Great does not always mean good, but at least it's large.

How will you define your greatness? It is a profoundly important question that you must answer. I think there are some different ways to describe it. Russia cosponsored with the United States the Middle East peace process. I think it was a very great thing when Israel and the PLO signed their accord on September 13, 1993. I think it is a good thing that we are continuing to work until a comprehensive settlement is reached in that troubled area.

I think it was a great thing what we did today with the Presidents of Ukraine and Russia and the United States, agreeing to get all the nuclear weapons out of Ukraine and to give fair compensation to that nation for the uranium they are giving up. It makes the world a safer place. It makes your nation and mine less vulnerable to nuclear terrorism or threats. It shows that we can move beyond the nuclear age entirely.

There are still questions, you know, in the world about how you will define your greatness. When I was at the NATO conference and afterward, there are nations that live between Western Europe and the border of Russia who still wonder what the future holds, nations who said, ''Put me in NATO now just in case. Oh, I believe this President of Russia when he says he respects the territorial borders of other nations, but look at the history of Russia. Think of the national impulse. Draw another line across Europe while you have a chance.''

There are people who are in the Baltic nations now who hear some of the debate in your politics, who hear the threats to take them over again. One of your political leaders even suggested you might like to have Alaska back. I don't think I can go along with that. [*Laughter*] I say that because all those definitions I would argue to you are looking to yesterday. What in the world would you do with an army of occupation to the east? How would you pay for it? And what would it give you? How would you be more powerful than some small nation, one of the industrial tigers of Asia, for example, producing and selling goods and services at such a rate that their people's incomes are going up by 10 percent a year, and they are giving the people who live there the opportunity to do things that would have been undreamed of by their parents or grandparents? This is a very serious thing.

I believe that the greatness of a nation that lasts for centuries and centuries and centuries, as this nation has, is the ability to redefine itself in every age and time. The young people of Russia especially now have a chance to show that a great power can promote patriotism without expansionism, that a great power can promote national pride without national prejudice. That, I submit, is your challenge.

Today you face no threat from invasion. That was a legitimate concern of Russia for decades and decades, a legitimate reason to want a buffer zone around your borders in former times. It is not there now. I believe the measure of your greatness in the future will be whether Russia, the big neighbor, can be the good neighbor.

That is why it is so important that as your forces operate beyond your borders, they do so according to international law, why it is important that you continue your planned withdrawal from all the Baltic States, why it is important that your nation work with the United States and the rest of Europe to build the Partnership For Peace called for at the NATO conference this year, so that for the first time in the history of nation states we can have a Europe that is united by a shared commitment to democracy, free-market economies, and mutual respect for borders,

instead of the Europe that is divided for the first time in history.

I'm very proud and pleased that President Yeltsin decided to participate in the Partnership For Peace and work for an integrated Europe, that he signed the historic accord with President Kravchuk and with me today to eliminate over 1,800 nuclear warheads. These are hopeful signs and, I believe, signs that indicate you can make a future that is different from the past.

Yours is a history of heroism and of persistent hope. The question now is, can we make the economic decisions, the political decisions that foster hope? You will have to decide these things. I'm amused when I come here in the spirit of genuine partnership and respect and some people say, "Well, the United States is trying to dictate our course." Nothing could be further from the truth. Believe me, my friends, it's all we can do to deal with our own problems. We don't have time to try to dictate your course. But the course you take will affect us, and so we want you to make decisions that are best for you.

And I will close as I began: Will you define your future greatness in terms that were relevant to the past or terms that will shape the future? This is a crossroad and a difficult one. But the younger generations of Russians will look back on this time with either gratitude or regret, depending on how those questions are answered, the economic, the political, the military questions.

I believe you will choose the future. After all, Russia did not get to this point by making all that many wrong decisions in the past. And every nation makes a few mistakes. There are few people anywhere that have more knowledge of history, both positive and negative, that have more reason to hope for the future than you do. I know the present is difficult, but if you make the right decisions, if you choose hope over fear, then the future will reward your courage and your vision.

Thank you very much.

[*At this point, the television station took a commercial break.*]

The President. Now we're going to take some questions from the audience. And what I will do is, we have also some remote sites, so I'll take one from the right, one from the left, I'll do the screen and come back, okay? I can't see so well, so——

Q. Do I need to speak Russian or English?

The President. Speak English. And then they can listen to the translation, and I'll listen to you.

Education in Russia

Q. I am a student of Moscow University. Mr. Clinton, what do you think about the future education in Russia, what it needs to be, how it needs to be done, and what changes are needed?

The President. Well, I'm not an expert in your education system, although I have spent a little time trying to find out about it, because in my career in the U.S., my major area of interest was education. I think first you have a very strong basic system. Virtually all your people are literate. An enormous number of your people speak more than one language. And you have very strong technical programs.

I would say you need to develop some of your educational programs for the professions that manage market economies. Do you have enough people who can run things in a very rapidly changing world? I think there are some gaps here, in other words, in the kinds of training you have for the kind of economy you're trying to develop. And I think some studies should be done about that, and you should provide those education programs. But you're actually quite fortunate in having a very literate society and a very strong background in the arts, the humanities, and in science and technology.

Keep in mind one other thing. In most modern market economies, the average person, even if he or she stays with the same employer, will change the nature of their work seven or eight times in a lifetime. So it's impossible to give someone even a university degree that answers all the questions they will face in the workplace forever. So you have to develop systems of learning for a lifetime. And the most important thing is that you just get a good basic foundation that enables you to think well, to solve problems and to change, to learn as new things come along.

Q. I am a first-year student at the department of foreign languages at Moscow University. First, I'd like to——

The President. Well, I'd say you're a successful student. No accent. [*Laughter*]

Q. I'd like to thank you for what you think about our future in economics and in democracy. But I'd like to remind you that—how I see tomorrow of our country is the spiritual power. Some astrologists say that Russia will soon become the center of everything because we have this spiritual energy here. What do you think of that? You didn't mention anything about our cultural future. Thank you.

The President. Well, I mentioned a little bit about it, but I think you have enormous cultural power. I think you also have enormous spiritual power. There is a great energy in this country that communicates itself. It's always been here, I think. And in some ways it was repressed in the last several decades. And it's coming out now in all kinds of ways, not only in terms of creative culture but also in terms of new interest in religion and faith and all kinds of things that show the character and depth of the nation. And I would urge you to cultivate that, both in terms of culture and faith.

Someone ask a question. I can't pick anyone there. You'll have to be self-selective.

Q. Good day, Mr. President. This is the cradle of *perestroika.* This is the birthplace of the last President of the Soviet Union. This is a multinational area. We have all kinds of people here, students, workers, office workers, representatives from the Cossacks, also refugees from the hot points in the former Soviet Union.

Mr. President, on the territory of the former Soviet Union, civil wars go on without end. Russia, unfortunately, either cannot or doesn't want to settle the civil strife. What is your feeling? Does the United States of America plan to get involved in these conflicts? And if so, in what way? And more so because there is an example of Yugoslavia. There is a danger here of taking sides in the West; the West is supporting the Moslems in Yugoslavia.

Let me repeat the question: If there will be an involvement in the United States, what kind of involvement would this be?

The President. Well, first, I don't think it's entirely accurate that Russia has not been involved at all. There's no question that Russia and the Russian military was very instrumental in stabilizing Mr. Shevardnadze's position in Georgia. So I think there will be times when you will be involved, and you will be more likely to be involved in some of these areas near you, just like the United States has been involved in the last several years in Panama and Grenada near our area.

The thing I think that we have to try to do, as I said in my speech, that when there is an involvement beyond the borders of the nation, that it is consistent with international law and, whenever possible, actually supported through other nations either through the United Nations or through some other instrument of international law.

Now, let us also frankly acknowledge that some of these conflicts, take the one in Yugoslavia, Bosnia, for example, some of these conflicts represent longstanding conflicts that were actually repressed during the time when these countries were effectively controlled from above and when the various warring factions were, in effect, occupied.

What happened in Yugoslavia was when Mr. Tito died and then the central government's authority began to erode and then all the various parts of Yugoslavia began to try to be independent, Bosnia-Herzegovina, which always had these three different factions, basically degenerated back to the conflict which has been there for hundreds of years.

There is no perfect solution to any of life's problems, you know, and I still think, on balance, we're better off without empires, and countries are better off seeking their own determination. But in this case, the truth is people there keep killing each other.

Now, what I have done is—the reason that you say that we have supported the Moslems in Yugoslavia, we supported the multiethnic government in Bosnia because it was recognized by the United Nations. So the United States supported it because it was recognized by the United Nations. However, we also support a peace process which would give some territory to the Moslem-dominated government, to the Serbs and to the Croats. So what we're doing in Bosnia is to try to

support the U.N. mission and trying to urge the parties to stop killing each other.

If you don't have an imperial army, if you don't just go in and take people over and tell them what to do, then you have to make some allowances for the fact that occasionally they'll do the stupid thing and keep on killing each other even when it doesn't make any sense. And there are some areas where you can stop it and some where you can't.

If you look at Africa, for example, and Brunei and Angola and the Sudan—never mind Somalia, just those three countries—hundreds of thousands of people have died in each of those countries just in the last couple of years because of civil war. That is what I said in my speech. There is still too much tribal and ethnic hatred in this world, and we can't control it all, not and take care of our problems within our borders.

Q. I'm a journalist. Mr. Clinton, what would you like the historians to say about you once you finish your tenure as President?

The President. I would like them to say I restored a sense of hope and optimism to my country, that I strengthened the economy, and made it possible for my people to lead the world economically into the 21st century and that I restored the sense of community in America, that we came back together as a people even though we are very diverse now. And I would like it to be said that I helped lead the world to more peaceful cooperation, into a future very different from the bloody and divided past of the 20th century.

Q. I'm a journalist also. Mr. President, if at a dinner table, let's say, President Yeltsin would ask you to switch places with him, would you make such a risk? Would you risk doing that?

The President. No, I like the job I have. [*Laughter*] And I wouldn't do it because I'm just as proud to be an American as he is to be a Russian. But if I asked him to switch places with me, he wouldn't do it either.

You know, I'll tell you, the one thing I believe about President Yeltsin, he's just like me. We make mistakes, and we're not perfect, and we don't have all the answers. But I'll tell you one thing about him, he at least gets up every day and tries to make a difference. He is trying to do something. The world is full of politicians who in times of change only worry about maintaining their popularity instead of making decisions. At least he is trying to make decisions and move generally in the right historical direction.

So if you disagree with him, you should get in here and contribute to this great democratic debate and try and help develop better politics. But it is a good thing, I think, that you have a President wade into the tides of history and make decisions.

Q. You've been talking about the future of our nation, that we must look into another future, but the nearest future is 2 years for the new Presidential elections. And Mr. Yeltsin with whom you personally indicate—[*inaudible*]—Russian democracy, will not run for reelection because he leaves. And we can see at the moment he leaves is the moment democracy leaves. So it means in 2 years we'll have a different President. He could be either a Communist or a nationalist. Is America ready or getting ready to deal with this situation? And gentlemen, in concern with this why are not you willing to give protections to the nations who seek it? For instance, the Baltic situation?

Thank you.

The President. Wait, stand up. First of all, one of the things you've learned now that you have these elections all the time is that 2 years is an eternity in democracy. Just because there's nobody on the scene now doesn't mean there won't be somebody on the scene that none of you have ever heard of 2 years from now that a majority of the people will fall in love with and make President of the country. So you cannot assume that.

On the other hand, I would say this not only to the forces of reform but to any other blocs. One of the most important responsibilities of political parties in a democracy is to always be grooming new leaders and to never treat anyone, no matter how great he or she may be, as totally indispensable. So this is something that all of these groups will have to learn. You have to always be grooming new people for leadership. But I wouldn't assume that there would be no future leaders besides out of the other two blocs you mentioned.

Now, on the Baltics, we have not denied them the right to protection. In fact, we have

invited them to be part of this Partnership For Peace. And in order to be part of it—and keep in mind, Russia has agreed to be part of it—they will participate in joint military planning, joint military operations. And as we do the exercises, the only way you can be part of it is if you promise to respect the territorial boundaries of all of the other countries that are part of this. So we are giving them a great deal of protection. It just means that they're not members of NATO right away.

The other NATO members will tell you that, to be part of NATO, you have to be in a position to assume certain responsibilities as well as just ask for the security guarantee. But there are significant increases in security just for being part of the Partnership For Peace.

Before we go to the screen again, to St. Petersburg, I would like to introduce the most important person in this audience to me, my wife, Hillary, who just came to Russia this morning. Stand up. [*Applause*] A very large number of the people I have met in the last 2 days, especially young women, have asked me about her. So I thought I would introduce her, and I thank you for that.

Is someone going to ask a—St. Petersburg, do you have a question?

Q. Very recently, the political and economic assistance was very closely linked to human rights. And why, at the present time, does America help the Baltic States in spite of the repression against Russians in that country?

The President. Which country?

Q. Baltics.

The President. First of all——

Q. I'm talking about all three Baltic countries, Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia.

The President. Well, first of all, in Lithuania, your government, the Russian government withdrew the troops because it was satisfied with the relationship between the two countries.

There are still outstanding questions with Estonia and Latvia. An international group from the Council on Security and Cooperation in Europe, CSCE, is now in Latvia studying the situation. And we have made it clear—I have personally met with the leaders of all of the Baltic States, and I have said we were for the independence and the freedom of the Baltic nations, but we expect the Russian minorities to be protected. And if we have evidence that they are being abused, it will affect our policies toward them.

So I assure you, sir, that—I am waiting for the report right now on Latvia by the unbiased, sort of third-party source. And if there is evidence that they are abusing the rights of the Russian minorities, then I will act accordingly.

I don't think we can have a double standard. We can't have one standard for the United States and Russia and say if you're a smaller country you can do things that bigger countries shouldn't be permitted to do.

Q. Mr. President, will America give strong financial support to the businessman who would like to invest in the economy of Russia?

The President. We have—where is our support for them, is that what you said? We have some institutions, the Export-Import Bank and the office of private investment, which help private investors to invest in other countries. But the main thing we are trying to do now, we need much more—there should be much more American investment in Russia.

Two of my Cabinet members met with the American business community here yesterday morning. And in March the Secretary of Commerce is coming here with a large group of American businessmen to encourage them to invest. We have also taken all the duties, all the extra taxes off of nearly 5,000 Russian products which can now be sold without handicap into the United States.

So we are trying to figure out not only how we can invest more here but how we can buy more of your products. And in the end, that is much more important to your economic future than any direct government aid, because in our economy, there is so much more money in the private sector than in the government sector. So we are working on that. And I hope in March when the American Investment and Trade Mission comes here, it gets a lot of publicity and that they get a chance to meet a lot of people and to learn a lot about how we can do that.

If they need help with the financing for investment, we actually have institutions to do that also to help them move——

Q. In your speech you mentioned about your intention to support, to protect full Russian democracy. Is it the same for you, Russian democracy and the President Boris Yeltsin? That's the first part of the question. And the second one: How far the United States is going to go to protect Russian democracy?

The President. The answer to your first question is that—is Russian democracy the same thing as Boris Yeltsin? No. Not now, because you also have a democratic constitution that the people have voted for and a democratically elected Parliament that the people have voted for. But before the last election, you only had one person who had ever been voted on in a free election by all of the people of Russia, the President.

Now, do I intend to work with President Yeltsin as long as he embodies Russian democracy and as long as he is the choice of the majority of the people of Russia to be the President? Of course, there is no other President. There may be some people in Russia who wish someone else were the President of the United States, but I'm the only U.S. President you have right now. You see? That's not the same thing as saying that I'm all there is to American democracy; I'm not.

So what we wish to do—yesterday evening, Ambassador Pickering, our American Ambassador, and Mrs. Pickering were both here, held a reception for me at the American Ambassador's residence, Spaso House, and we had a lot of the leaders of Parliament, a lot of the leaders of the regional political groups, a lot of people from the private sector, some of whom are from different political groups, there to meet me. Because now, democracy is three things: It's the elected President, the constitution, and the Parliament, plus people who have been elected in various ways throughout the country, plus people who are in free associations, like labor movements.

Now, one thing democracy is, beyond majority rule, is respect for minority rights, for individual freedoms, like the freedom of speech and the right to vote, even if you don't vote the way people like. So when you said, how far would I go to protect Russian democracy, I want an equal partnership here. I don't want to have any dictatorial or control in Russia. I just want to be an equal partner with a strong partner. And I will be an equal partner as long as there is democracy, which is, majority rule under the constitution, and respect for minority rights and minority interests.

Q. Mr. President, what do you think is the main difference between Russia and the United States?

The President. I think the main difference between Russia and the United States today is that we are the oldest, now the longest lasting continuous democracy on the face of the Earth, and you are one of the youngest. We have now been a free democracy for over 200 years. And that affects the way we are and the way we deal with things.

On the other hand, we have a lot of problems in common, and we have a lot of good things in common. We are much more—our people have deep roots in the soil. We're much more likely to be much more sort of open and friendly and gregarious in a certain way than many people in other countries. We also, unfortunately, have a lot of the same problems that you are now dealing with, a crime problem, and my country has one of the worst crime problems in the world.

So we have a lot in common, our two peoples do. And we have always pretty much gotten along, except for the tensions caused when we had different political systems before and after World War II. But I would say the biggest difference flows out of the fact that we have had the benefit of being a democracy for 200 years, and you are one of the youngest.

Q. We welcome you here in the Kremlin. I would like to tell you briefly about the history of my city. This is one of the largest industrial cities, but unfortunately, there is a major military industry here, and this is the place where academician Sakharov was exiled. At the same time we're one of the focal points of the reform. And I can judge about that just by looking at the people who are next to me. Around me are people who are helping along to reform.

This is the Mayor. He is welcoming you now. We have a twin city in the United States, which is Philadelphia. This is one of our businessmen who owns a joint venture with an American partner. This is an ordinary citizen of our city, who is now holding a famous festival. One of them has been attended by Rostropovich. And we have many many students who have studied in the United States.

We had just one question. Right next to me is a teacher. She is running student exchange programs.

Q. I've been doing this for a long time. But usually these are one-sided exchanges. Does Mr. President think that American students would have something to learn from Russia, as well?

The President. Absolutely. Yes. First of all, I'm glad you have a sister city relationship with Philadelphia. It is a wonderful, wonderful city. They also voted for me for President. But the answer to your question is, definitely. I came here in the first week of 1970 as a student, on my own when I was living in England because I wanted to learn about this country and because I believed that we ought to be friends and because I was so worried about what then seemed to be the differences between our two nations and the fact that we could blow up the world almost by accident. So yes, I think we should send large numbers of American students here. I think we have a lot to learn.

Keep in mind, if we were having this—if Boris Yeltsin came to the United States and did what I'm doing here, very few of the students could stand up and speak to him in Russian as you are speaking to me in English. We have a lot to learn from you, and I would like more of our students to come here.

Yes. Yes. This is your youngest questioner so far. How old are you, young man?

Q. I'm 13 years old.

The President. Thirteen, not 30. [*Laughter*]

Q. I saw your picture shaking hands with President Kennedy, and I'd like to ask you how old were you and when you got your idea to become a President of the United States.

The President. Come here. Come up here. Come shake hands with me, and maybe you'll be President of Russia some day.

I was 16 when I shook hands with President Kennedy, and it was about that time that I knew I wanted to go into public service. But of course, at that time I had no idea that I could ever be elected President or that I would ever have a chance to. But sometime when I was a fairly young man, I decided that I would work hard and that if I ever got an opportunity that I would try to become President.

Probably our greatest President was Abraham Lincoln, who was the President of the United States during the Civil War in the mid-1800's. And when he was a young man, Abraham Lincoln wrote in his diary, "I will work and get ready, and perhaps my chance will come." I say that to you.

And one thing we do have in common that I have always admired about your country is many of the leaders of your country, like me, have come from basically quite humble circumstances, have been working people. And that's a great thing for a nation, to make it possible to cast the net for talent very wide so that anybody has a chance to rise to the top if he or she has the ability and the good fortune to do so. So good luck to you.

Q. Thank you.

Q. Mr. President, I have two questions for you today. You stated that you have your idea of what democracy is, and that is quite natural. It has three component parts, but don't you feel that in England there is a completely different democracy as there is in France? When you do visits around the world and say this sort of democracy is the very best model—in other words, "Okay, Russians, follow us, follow our model." I think this isn't quite correct. I have another question if I can ask this one?

The President. May I answer that one first? Let me answer this one first.

I perfectly agree with that. I think you could have a system, a democratic system like the British, like the French, like the Italians, like—you name it, but they all have certain things in common. They all have opportunities for the people to vote and a system for them to have elected representatives who themselves get to vote on which laws govern

the people and some system for the protection of individual rights and the rights of minority groups. But how you do that is perfectly up to you. There are many different ways you can do it. Yes, the British system is different from the French system, and both of them are different from our system.

Interestingly enough, your system is different from ours, too. You elect one President and then a Parliament, but the upper chamber of your Parliament has more control over the lower chamber than ours does, and your President, on paper at least, has more power than I do. I sort of like your system. [*Laughter*]

No, they should be different. I agree with that.

Q. I have a second question then. During your election campaign you demonstrated how you can play the sax. I wonder if you will demonstrate for us here today?

The President. No. I played for President Yeltsin last night. I have a quota, one saxophone play per country. [*Laughter*] I didn't bring the horn today, but I thank you for asking.

Q. Mr. President, just imagine the situation. You don't have an opportunity to speak to this pretty large audience. You don't have the opportunity to pop into the bakery, buy some bread and chat with some people on the street. You just have an opportunity to choose one person, one Russian person and talk only to him. From what social layer would you choose this person? Would it be, I don't know, an economist, interpreter, student, businessman, politician?

The President. If I could only speak to one person, I would speak to the wisest person I could find in a medium-sized city in Russia that was having a difficult time with these economic changes. I would talk to someone, regardless of what economic strata they were from, he or she was from, had a lot of friends from all walks of life, who could tell me how they were viewing what is going on now. I would pick someone from a sort of medium- to small-sized town because they would be more likely to know all different kinds of people.

Red Square. We need to take one question from Red Square. Red Square can you hear me? I've gone over my time already 10 minutes.

Q. You have a very educated auditorium here, and I was thinking, I wonder if you could gather as many people in the U.S. in one studio who would be as fluent in Russian as these people in Ostankino are fluent in English.

Anyway, I am here in Red Square. The people who are here would like to ask one question. Mr. President, we're getting an impression that you're supporting not so much the reforms in Russia but the personality of President Yeltsin. What's this connected to?

The President. Well, I already answered that question, or I tried to, but I will answer it again. Until you had your last election and you adopted a new constitution and you elected a new Parliament from people with—lots of people from different parties, President Yeltsin was the only person who had actually been elected by all the people of Russia in a full and free election. Now, you have three sources of democratic legitimacy, if you will. You have the Parliament, the President, and the constitution. We have no interest in picking favorites or defining Russian democracy in terms of anyone. So you have done that, and you must do that.

The second thing I would say, however, is that no country can have more than one President at a time. Every nation needs someone who's the leader, who then works with the leaders of other nations. And I'm the President of the United States. If I want to work with you and help you, I should be open to meeting with and listening to all the democratic voices in Russia. But in the end, I still have to work with your President.

Q. Mr. President, when you were a student you were in Moscow. And now you're the President of your Nation. I'm a law student at the Moscow International University. And could you give me some advice how I can follow your career path?

The President. Well, I can tell you this: I came from a family that had no money, no influence, and no particular interest in politics. My mother got interested in politics after I started running, but not before. My advice to you would be two things: One, get the best education you can; and two, involve yourself in politics and figure out what you

believe, which party and group you want to be identified with; work in the elections; work on some problem that the people have.

And then the third thing I would say is this: Try to develop a genuine interest if you don't have it in the real problems and hopes of ordinary people, because in a democracy, the only way you can really keep going throughout all the things that will happen, all the ups and downs, is if you really care what happens to other people as well as what happens to you in your own career.

They say we have to stop. I've had a wonderful time. I'm sorry, but they're telling me I have to cut off.

I want to thank you again. Thank you very much for this. Thank you. I want to thank you again. I wish we had another hour. I'd like to take all the questions, but I have abused the network. We are now 18 minutes over time. And if you'll hang around here a little bit after, we'll shake hands, and I'll try to answer your questions at least face to face. But I have to let the network cut off.

Thank you, all of you, from our remote sites. Thank all of you for being here. And Hillary and I are delighted to be with you. Good luck to you. We'll try to be good partners and good friends.

NOTE: The President spoke at 3:30 p.m. at the Ostankino TV Station. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks. This item was not received in time for publication in the appropriate issue.

Statement by the Presidents of the United States, Russia, and Ukraine

January 14, 1994

Presidents Clinton, Yeltsin and Kravchuk met in Moscow on January 14. The three Presidents reiterated that they will deal with one another as full and equal partners and that relations among their countries must be conducted on the basis of respect for the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of each nation.

The three Presidents agreed on the importance of developing mutually beneficial, comprehensive and cooperative economic relations. In this connection, they welcomed the intention of the United States to provide assistance to Ukraine and Russia to support the creation of effective market economies.

The three Presidents reviewed the progress that has been made in reducing nuclear forces. Deactivation of strategic forces is already well underway in the United States, Russia and Ukraine. The Presidents welcomed the ongoing deactivation of RS–18s (SS–19s) and RS–22s (SS–24s) on Ukrainian territory by having their warheads removed.

The Presidents look forward to the entry into force of the START I Treaty, including the Lisbon Protocol and associated documents, and President Kravchuk reiterated his commitment that Ukraine accede to the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty as a non-nuclear-weapon state in the shortest possible time. Presidents Clinton and Yeltsin noted that entry into force of START I will allow them to seek early ratification of START II. The Presidents discussed, in this regard, steps their countries would take to resolve certain nuclear weapons questions.

The Presidents emphasized the importance of ensuring the safety and security of nuclear weapons pending their dismantlement.

The Presidents recognize the importance of compensation to Ukraine, Kazakhstan and Belarus for the value of the highly-enriched uranium in nuclear warheads located on their territories. Arrangements have been worked out to provide fair and timely compensation to Ukraine, Kazakhstan and Belarus as the nuclear warheads on their territory are transferred to Russia for dismantling.

Presidents Clinton and Yeltsin expressed satisfaction with the completion of the highly-enriched uranium contract, which was signed by appropriate authorities of the United States and Russia. By converting weapons-grade uranium into uranium which can only be used for peaceful purposes, the highly-enriched uranium agreement is a major step forward in fulfilling the countries' mutual non-proliferation objectives.

The three Presidents decided on simultaneous actions on transfer of nuclear warheads from Ukraine and delivery of compensation to Ukraine in the form of fuel assemblies for nuclear power stations.

Presidents Clinton and Yeltsin informed President Kravchuk that the United States

and Russia are prepared to provide security assurances to Ukraine. In particular, once the START I Treaty enters into force and Ukraine becomes a non-nuclear-weapon state party to the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT), the United States and Russia will:

—Reaffirm their commitment to Ukraine, in accordance with the principles of the CSCE Final Act, to respect the independence and sovereignty and the existing borders of the CSCE member states and recognize that border changes can be made only by peaceful and consensual means; and reaffirm their obligation to refrain from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state, and that none of their weapons will ever be used except in self-defense or otherwise in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations;

—Reaffirm their commitment to Ukraine, in accordance with the principles of the CSCE Final Act, to refrain from economic coercion designed to subordinate to their own interest the exercise by another CSCE participating state of the rights inherent in its sovereignty and thus to secure advantages of any kind;

—Reaffirm their commitment to seek immediate UN Security Council action to provide assistance to Ukraine, as a non-nuclear-weapon state party to the NPT, if Ukraine should become a victim of an act of aggression or an object of a threat of aggression in which nuclear weapons are used; and

—Reaffirm, in the case of Ukraine, their commitment not to use nuclear weapons against any non-nuclear-weapon state party to the NPT, except in the case of an attack on themselves, their territories or dependent territories, their armed forces, or their allies, by such a state in association or alliance with a nuclear weapon state.

Presidents Clinton and Yeltsin informed President Kravchuk that consultations have been held with the United Kingdom, the third depositary state of the NPT, and the United Kingdom is prepared to offer the same security assurances to Ukraine once it becomes a non-nuclear-weapon state party to the NPT.

President Clinton reaffirmed the United States commitment to provide technical and financial assistance for the safe and secure dismantling of nuclear forces and storage of fissile materials. The United States has agreed under the Nunn-Lugar program to provide Russia, Ukraine, Kazakhstan and Belarus with nearly USD 800 million in such assistance, including a minimum of USD 175 million to Ukraine. The United States Congress has authorized additional Nunn-Lugar funds for this program, and the United States will work intensively with Russia, Ukraine, Kazakhstan and Belarus to expand assistance for this important purpose. The United States will also work to promote rapid implementation of the assistance agreements that are already in place.

NOTE: An original was not available for verification of the content of this communique. This item was not received in time for publication in the appropriate issue.

Joint Statement on Non-Proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction and the Means of Their Delivery

January 14, 1994

President Clinton and President Yeltsin, during their meeting in Moscow on January 14, 1994, agreed that the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and their missile delivery systems represents an acute threat to international security in the period following the end of the Cold War. They declared the resolve of their countries to cooperate actively and closely with each other, and also with other interested states, for the purpose of preventing and reducing this threat.

The Presidents noted that the proliferation of nuclear weapons creates a serious threat to the security of all states, and expressed their intention to take energetic measures aimed at prevention of such proliferation.

—Considering the Treaty on the Non-proliferation of Nuclear Weapons as the basis for efforts to ensure the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, they called for its indefinite and uncondi-

tional extension at conference of its participants in 1995, and they urged that all states that have not yet done so accede to this treaty.

—They expressed their resolve to implement effective measures to limit and reduce nuclear weapons. In this connection, they advocated the most rapid possible entry into force of the START I and START II treaties.

—They agreed to review jointly appropriate ways to strengthen security assurances for the states which have renounced the possession of nuclear weapons and that comply strictly with their nonproliferation obligations.

—They expressed their support for the International Atomic Energy Agency in its efforts to carry out its safeguards responsibilities. They also expressed their intention to provide assistance to the Agency in the safeguards field, including through joint efforts of their relevant laboratories to improve safeguards.

—They supported the Nuclear Suppliers Group, and agreed with the need for effective implementation of the principle of full-scope IAEA safeguards as a condition for nuclear exports with the need for export controls on dual-use materials and technology in the nuclear field.

—They reaffirmed their countries' commitment to the conclusion as soon as possible of an international treaty to achieve a comprehensive ban on nuclear test explosions and welcomed the decision to begin negotiations at the conference on disarmament. They declared their firm intention to provide political support for the negotiating process, and appealed to other states to refrain from carrying out nuclear explosions while these talks are being held.

—They noted that an important contribution to the goal of nonproliferation of nuclear weapons would be made by a verifiable ban on the production of fissile materials for nuclear weapons and by the most rapid conclusion of an international convention to this effect with the widest possible participation of states and on a non-discriminatory basis.

—They agreed to cooperate with each other and also with other states to elaborate measures designed to prevent the accumulation of excessive stocks of fissile materials and over time to reduce such stocks.

—They agreed to establish a joint working group to consider:

—including in their voluntary IAEA safeguards offers all source and special fissionable materials, excluding only those facilities associated with activities having direct national security significance;

—steps to ensure the transparency and irreversibility of the process of reduction of nuclear weapons, including the possibility of putting a portion of fissionable material under IAEA safeguards. Particular attention would be given to materials released in the process of nuclear disarmament and steps to ensure that these materials would not be used again for nuclear weapons.

—The Presidents also tasked their experts to study options for the long-term disposition of fissile materials, particularly of plutonium, taking into account the issues of nonproliferation, environmental protection, safety, and technical and economic factors.

—They reaffirmed the intention of interested organizations of the two countries to complete within a short time a joint study of the possibilities of terminating the production of weapon-grade plutonium.

—The Presidents agreed that reduction of the risk of theft or diversion of nuclear materials is a high priority, and in this context they noted the usefulness of the September 1993 Agreement to cooperate in improving the system of controls, accounting, and physical protection for nuclear materials. They attached great significance to further joint work on the separate but mutually connected problems of accounting for nuclear materials used in the civilian and military fields.

Both Presidents favored a further increase in the efforts to prevent the proliferation of chemical and biological weapons.

—As the heads of the countries that have the world's largest stockpiles of chemical weapons, they acknowledged particular responsibility for eliminating the threat posed by these weapons. In this context, they declare their resolute support for the Convention on the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons, and their intention to promote ratification as rapidly as possible and entry into force of the Convention not later than 1995.

—To promote implementation of a comprehensive ban on chemical weapons, they welcomed the conclusion of the implementing documents for the Wyoming Memorandum of Understanding and agreed to conclude work in as short a time as possible on the implementing documents for the Bilateral Agreement on the Destruction of Chemical Weapons.

—The Presidents reaffirmed their desire to facilitate the safe, secure, timely, and ecologically sound destruction of chemical weapons in the Russian Federation and the United States. They applauded the joint Chemical Weapons Destruction Work Plan recently concluded between the two countries which leads the way for the United States to provide an additional $30 million in assistance to support an analytical chemical laboratory in Russia to facilitate chemical weapons destruction. The United States also agreed to consider appropriate additional measures to support Russia's chemical weapons destruction program.

—They reiterated the importance of strict compliance with the Convention on the Prohibition of Biological and Toxin Weapons and of continued implementation of measures in accordance with the Russia-America-British Statement of September 1992, which provided inter alia for the reciprocal visits of facilities and meetings between experts in order to ensure confidence in the compliance with the Convention.

—They supported convening a special conference of the states' parties to the Convention on the Prohibition of Biological and Toxin Weapons in order to consider measures that would contribute to transparency and thereby confidence in compliance with the Convention and its effectiveness.

The Presidents expressed the determination of their countries to cooperate with each other in preventing the proliferation of missiles capable of carrying weapons of mass destruction.

—They welcomed the conclusion of the Bilateral Memorandum of Understanding between the Government of the Russian Federation and the Government of the United States of America Concerning the Export of Missile Equipment and Technologies, signed in September 1993, noted the importance of this Agreement for ensuring mutually beneficial cooperation between the U.S. and Russia in the field of space exploration, and agreed to collaborate closely in order to ensure its full and timely implementation.

—The U.S. welcomed Russia's intention to join the Missile Technology Control Regime and undertook to cooperate with Russia in facilitation its membership at an early date. The Russian Federation and the United States of America are certain that further improving the MTCR, including the prudent expansion of membership, will help reduce the threat of proliferation of missiles and missile technologies in the regional context as well.

The Presidents of the two countries agreed that, in addition to strengthening global norms of nonproliferation and working out agreements to this effect, close cooperation is essential in order to develop policies on nonproliferation applicable to specific regions posing the greatest risk of proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and their means of delivery.

—They agreed that nuclear weapons on the Korean Peninsula would represent a grave threat to regional and international security, and decided that their countries would consult with each other on ways to eliminate this danger. They called upon the DPRK to honor fully its obligation under the Treaty on the Non-proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and its safeguards agreement with the

IAEA in connection with the Treaty, and to resolve the problems of safeguards implementation, inter alia, through dialogue between IAEA and DPRK. They also urged full and speedy implementation of the Joint Declaration of the ROK and the DPRK on Denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula.

—They support efforts to reach agreement on the establishment of a multilateral form to consider measures in the filed of arms control in nonproliferation that could strengthen security in South Asia. They call on India and Pakistan to join in the negotiation of and become original signatories to the Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapons Test Explosions and the proposed Convention to Ban Production of Fissile Materials for Nuclear Explosives and to refrain from deploying ballistic missiles capable of delivering weapons of mass destruction to each other's territories.

—They agreed that the U.S. and Russia, as co-chairs in the Middle East peace process, would actively promote progress in the activity of the working group for Arms Control and Regional Security in the Middle East, striving for speedy implementation of confidence-building measures and working toward turning the Middle East into a region free of weapons of mass destruction, where conventional forces would not exceed reasonable defense needs.

—They firmly supported the efforts of the UN Special Commission and the IAEA to put into operation a long-term monitoring system of the military potential of Iraq, and called upon Iraq to comply with all UN Security Council resolutions.

NOTE: An original was not available for verification of the content of this communique. This item was not received in time for publication in the appropriate issue.

Joint American-Russian Statement on Human Rights

January 14, 1994

The President of the United States of America and the President of the Russian Federation share the view that full guarantees of respect for basic human rights and fundamental freedoms of all persons are indispensable for the maintenance of good relations between countries and the strengthening of stability and security in the world. They also share the view that the development of a state founded on the rule of law with an independent, impartial and effective legal system is essential for the respect of human rights.

They agree that aggressive nationalism and political extremism are the main threat to peace and democracy today. They therefore reaffirm their resolve to focus attention, through joint efforts where possible, on violations of human rights wherever they may occur and to continue to work for the elimination of discrimination, intolerance, racial and national prejudices, xenophobia and anti-Semitism. Adhering to the principle of intolerance of any nationalistic or religious extremism, they reiterate their commitment to take all necessary measures for the effective guarantee of the rights of all citizens, regardless of their nationality or religion.

They will take coordinated steps to increase the effectiveness of the activities of international organizations and mechanisms in order to improve human rights practices everywhere and to guarantee their full respect. They reaffirm the determination of CSCE Foreign Ministers in Rome that better use of CSCE human dimension instruments, including CSCE missions, should be made to promote open and diverse media. They reiterate their commitment to safeguard freedom of expression as a basic human right and underscore its importance for a free and open society.

The United States reaffirms its support for democratic reforms in Russia. Among these reforms are the establishment of an independent judiciary as a fundamental part of

a state based on the rule of law, the strengthening of other foundations of a civil society and full realization of personal rights and liberties. The Presidents agree that the continued success of the democratic transformation in Russia is of great importance for the promotion of the principles of democracy and human rights all over the world and for the maintenance of international stability and security.

NOTE: An original was not available for verification of the content of this communique. This item was not received in time for publication in the appropriate issue.

Moscow Declaration

January 14, 1994

President of the United States William J. Clinton and President of the Russian Federation Boris Yeltsin, having met together in Moscow from January 12–15, 1994, reaffirmed the fundamental importance of U.S.-Russian cooperation based upon the Charter of American-Russian Partnership and Friendship, the Vancouver Declaration, and existing treaties and agreements. They noted with satisfaction that the relationship between the United States and Russia has entered a new stage of mature strategic partnership based on equality, mutual advantage, and recognition of each other's national interests. From this perspective, they reviewed the full range of bilateral and international issues.

The two Presidents had an extensive discussion of security issues, including arms reduction and nonproliferation. Both parties expressed concern over increasing challenges to global nonproliferation regimes. They agreed upon the need to strengthen those regimes and to create, together with other interested states, a new mechanism to enhance transparency and responsibility in the transfer of conventional arms and sensitive dual-use technologies. They also strongly supported completion of negotiations on a comprehensive test ban at the earliest possible time. The two Presidents reiterated their support for a cutoff of production of fissile materials for weapons and considered new measures to strengthen strategic stability.

Based on ongoing discussions of strategic disengagement measures between the ministries of defense of the two countries, the Presidents announced that they would direct the detargeting of strategic nuclear missiles under their respective commands so that by not later than May 30, 1994, those missiles will not be targeted. Thus, for the first time in nearly half a century—virtually since the dawn of the nuclear age—the United States and Russia will not operate nuclear forces, day-to-day, in a manner that presumes they are adversaries.

President Clinton and President Yeltsin expressed satisfaction with the accelerating development of a wide range of economic, scientific and technological relationships between the United States and Russia. They also reaffirmed their strong support for the rapid growth of bilateral trade and investment as a special priority. In their view, the Gore-Chernomyrdin Commission has become a dynamic and effective mechanism for coordination and expansion of U.S.-Russian cooperation. A key expression of this relationship is U.S.-Russian joint cooperation in space, especially their partnership, with other interested parties, in the construction of a space station.

The two Presidents reaffirmed their readiness to move forward on the path of openness and mutual trust in American-Russian relations and to create favorable conditions for the comprehensive development of political, commercial, humanitarian, and people-to-people contacts between the two countries. In this connection, a mutual interest in enlarging the consular presence on each other's territory was expressed. In particular, the American side intends to open a Consulate General in Yekaterinburg in February 1994.

With the approval by the U.S. Congress of NAFTA and the successful completion of the Uruguay Round of global trade negotiations, President Clinton and President Yeltsin welcomed the accelerating progress toward creation of an open and prosperous world economy and trading system. President Yeltsin informed President Clinton of recent steps among the member states of the

Commonwealth of Independent States toward increased economic coordination and cooperation. The two Presidents agreed that such initiatives, pursued in an open and voluntary manner consistent with GATT rules and procedures, should be conducive to the rapid inclusion of all the participating states into the global economy.

In this context, President Clinton and President Yeltsin exchanged views on the economic strategies of their respective governments. President Yeltsin described the economic situation in Russia. He affirmed the irreversibility of Russia's transition to a market economy and his intention to further promote reforms and to address social needs associated with this transition. President Clinton stressed his strong support for Russian reform and suggested that social issues could be a new and promising area for cooperation.

President Clinton and President Yeltsin noted with satisfaction that the end of the Cold War has brought continuous progress toward overcoming the division of the European continent and opened the way for broad cooperation among European states on a new agenda of urgent tasks, with priority being given to preventive diplomacy, peacekeeping and protection of human rights and the rights of national and other minorities. In this connection, the two Presidents welcomed the decisions of the CSCE Foreign Ministers' meeting in Rome which they consider to be an important step in making the CSCE a key mechanism of international cooperation in Europe.

Proceeding from the conviction that new divisions of Europe must be avoided, President Clinton and President Yeltsin agreed upon the need to create a new European security order that is inclusive, non-discriminatory and focused on practical political and security cooperation. The two Presidents agreed that the concept of the Partnership for Peace adopted at the Brussels meeting of the NATO member states is an important element of an emerging new European security architecture.

President Yeltsin informed President Clinton of Russia's intention to participate actively in the Partnership for Peace and to conclude substantive agreements opening the way for broad and intensive cooperation between Russia and NATO as a partner. Taking into account Russia's international role, President Clinton welcomed the prospect of Russia's active participation in the Partnership for Peace.

The two Presidents condemned aggressive nationalism, violations of human rights, and ethnic and religious intolerance of any kind, including anti-Semitism. They expressed serious concern about the existence and potential for intensification of conflicts in the former Yugoslavia and a number of the New Independent States of the former Soviet Union. President Yeltsin apprised President Clinton of the peacekeeping efforts undertaken by Russia on the territory of the former USSR. The two Presidents are determined to intensify the coordination of their efforts, within the framework of the United Nations and the CSCE, to promote rapid and peaceful resolution of conflicts on conditions that correspond to generally accepted standards of international law, including respect for the independence, sovereignty, and existing borders of the New Independent States of the former Soviet Union.

The two Presidents reaffirmed the support of the United States and Russia for the United Nations. They will act with other countries to strengthen the potential of the UN to support and establish peace and prevent conflict. The two sides will work out practical activities among themselves and other countries to improve preparation for participation in UN peacekeeping operations. In connection with the upcoming 50th anniversary of the UN, President Clinton and President Yeltsin consider it important to convene at the appropriate time a meet of the heads of state and government of the members of the UN Security Council for a review of the work established for the UN at the January 1992 Security Council summit and an examination of tasks for the future.

President Clinton and President Yeltsin are convinced that the United States and Russia will continue to consolidate their partnership and together promote global stability, peace, and prosperity.

Done in Moscow on January 14, 1994, in the English and Russian languages.

NOTE: An original was not available for verification of the content of this communique. This item was not received in time for publication in the appropriate issue.

Statement by the Press Secretary on the Death of Foreign Minister Johan Jurgen Holst of Norway

January 14, 1994

The President was saddened to learn yesterday of the death of Norwegian Foreign Minister Johan Jurgen Holst. Throughout his long and distinguished career, Minister Holst was one of the world's leading experts and wisest thinkers on international security issues. As his nation's defense minister, head of a leading research institute, and foreign minister, he was in the forefront of those designing and implementing international security policies during the cold war and adapting those policies to the post-cold-war period.

Americans remember him best for his leading role in the Israeli-PLO negotiations that led to the breakthrough in the Middle East peace process last September. The President was proud to have the opportunity to honor Minister Holst at the White House signing ceremony on September 13.

The White House expresses its deepest sympathies to the family and friends of this great statesman.

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

The President's Radio Address

January 15, 1994

Good morning. Today I'm speaking to you from Moscow where I'm completing a series of meetings with President Boris Yeltsin and other Russian reformers. My visit here comes near the end of a week of European meetings designed to increase American security and American prosperity by working to make Europe more united through shared democratic values and institutions, free trading market economies, and defense cooperation.

Despite the challenges we face at home, from health care reform to fighting crime to retraining our work force and creating more jobs, we still must remain engaged in world affairs. That's the only way we can spur worldwide economic growth and open foreign markets so that we can boost our exports and create new American jobs. We also have to exert leadership in world affairs to protect our Nation and keep small problems today from growing into dangerous crises tomorrow.

No part of the world is more important to us than Europe. Our people fought two world wars in this century to protect Europe's democracies. Today, Europe remains at the heart of our security and is also our most valuable partner in trade and investment.

Now Europe stands at a key moment. The cold war is over. Western Europe no longer fears invasion, and we no longer live in the shadow of nuclear annihilation. The Soviet Union has given way to a dozen new independent and largely democratic states from Central Asia to the Baltic countries.

Yet despite these advances for freedom, we still need to work with our transatlantic partners to build a new security. Many nations of the former Soviet bloc are fighting economic hardship that could threaten their new democracies. In many of these countries, militant nationalists are fanning the flames of ancient ethnic and religious hatreds. And we still have to finish the work of reducing the cold war nuclear stockpiles. We can't afford to ignore these challenges.

Our country tried turning our back on Europe after World War I. The result was a global depression, the rise of fascism, and another world war. After World War II, we acted more wisely. We stood firm against Communist expansion. We founded NATO. We created new institutions to help expand global trade. We helped turn Western Europe's warring neighbors into solid allies. The result has been one of the most peaceful and prosperous times in all history.

One key to our new security is helping Europe's former Communist states succeed themselves in building democratic governments, market economies, and peaceful militaries. Our best security investment today is to support these practices of freedom in Europe's Eastern half in places such as Poland, Ukraine, and Russia. That was my top goal on this trip.

In Brussels, I met with European leaders about ways to strengthen all our nations by expanding trade and economic growth. I also attended a summit to adapt NATO, history's greatest military alliance, to this new era. Our NATO partners approved my proposal for a Partnership For Peace, a Partnership which invites Europe's Eastern nations to participate in military cooperation with NATO's forces.

In Prague I met with the leaders of the Czech Republic, Poland, Hungary, and Slovakia. These countries have been at the forefront of communism's collapse and democracy's rebirth. As I met with such famous democratic heroes as President Lech Walesa of Poland and President Václav Havel of the Czech Republic, I assured them that the security of their countries is important to our security, and I outlined new ways to help their economic reform succeed.

Then I flew to Kiev in the Ukraine. I met with Ukraine's President Kravchuk to nail down an agreement to eliminate over 1,800 nuclear warheads that were left in Ukraine when the Soviet Union broke apart. Most of those warheads have been targeted at the United States, and their elimination will make all of us safer, not only from nuclear accidents but from nuclear terrorism.

And now I'm in Moscow. The weather's cold, but our work has brought us to a new season of partnership, warm partnership, with Russia's reformers. President Yeltsin and I reached a series of agreements to expand our trade ties, protect human rights, and reduce the threat of nuclear accidents of proliferation.

One of the experiences I enjoyed most here in Moscow was speaking to an audience of Russians, many of them young people. In many ways their concerns reminded me of those voiced by our own young people, especially as they spoke about their educations and their careers, their hopes and their fears about the future. But their comments also suggested that their hopes for a new Russia, despite all the problems that they have today, a new Russia, proud and free, outweigh their fears. I tried to convince them that their peaceful transition to a more open society is important not only to them but to all the rest of us in the world as well. And I urged them to stay the course of economic and political reform.

In the end, the next generation is what this entire trip is about, the young people in America, the young people in Europe and throughout the rest of the world. The kind of efforts we're pursuing this week, the kind of efforts that will increase democracy, provide for military cooperation instead of conflict, and provide for more open markets, for more jobs for our people and other people, these are the things which will make our young people's future more promising, more prosperous, and more secure.

Thanks for listening.

NOTE: The address was recorded at 11:01 p.m. on January 14 at the Kremlin in Moscow for broadcast at 10:06 a.m. on January 15. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this address.

Remarks to Future Leaders of Belarus in Minsk

January 15, 1994

Thank you very much. Sergei Gaponenko, the president of the National Academy of Sciences, and to my friend Chairman Shushkevich, ladies and gentlemen, thank you all for coming here. I hope the translation is working well. [*Laughter*] Does the laughing mean yes or no? Yes, I think.

I'm delighted to be here at your National Academy of Sciences with many representatives of my Government and representatives of yours. But most of all, I'm glad to see so many young people here, because it is your future I wish to talk about today. I want to thank Chairman Shushkevich for inviting me and for suggesting that I meet with you. The Chairman is a leader of real courage, in recording the terrible toll of Chernobyl and in leading your nation's reforms. And I'm delighted to be with him here today.

I wanted to come to Belarus because I am impressed with much of what you have done and because I believe you can and will do even more. Your generation has been given an opportunity to build a strong and free nation. While you face hard times today, you have much with which to build a better future. You stand at the crossroads of con-

tinents. You have a highly educated people and great institutions of higher learning. You have good, strong high-technology industries. Above all, you have reclaimed your freedom, and your destiny is now in your own hands. And so now you must decide what to do with your nation and your future.

You are, I assure you, not alone in facing that question, for this is a time of profound change all across the world. Nations everywhere face the challenge of shaping their future amid all the technological, economic, and political changes sweeping the globe. Nations everywhere must now grapple with the question of how to compete in a global economy; how to reward and support hard-working families and their children; how to make their governments more effective and more responsive; how to address social problems such as unemployment and inequality and crime; how to combine cultural and spiritual traditions with the demands of modern life; how to define, indeed, a nation's security and greatness in a modern era in which money and information and technological changes fly across the globe in a millisecond, in which we will be judged, I believe, more on whether we can develop the full capacities of every man and woman within each nation's border than on whether we can tell other people beyond our borders what to do and how they must live.

I have not come here to tell you what I think the solutions should be to these questions for your nation and your future. That is for you alone to decide. But I do come here as a friend and supporter of the democratic and economic reforms you are beginning in your nation. I've come to show my support for those reforms and for your determination to build a better and safer and stronger future for your nation and for this entire region.

The work of reform before you today also has a larger significance, for what you do here might encourage other nations facing the same challenges. It can help to build a broader Europe that is no longer divided but integrated, integrated by democratic governments, market economies, and peaceful coexistence and respect for national borders. If we can accomplish this kind of integration all across Europe, East and West, then we can make both Europe and America safer and more prosperous.

This nation, which lost one in four of its citizens in the Second World War, must surely know better than any other on the face of the Earth the terrible price Europeans have paid for their constant divisions, not only in the two World Wars of the 20th century but indeed throughout the entire history of nations in Europe. Now, for the first time, we have a chance to build a Europe without divisions, where all countries respect each other's borders, all countries observe democratic traditions of majority rule and individual and minority rights, all countries trade freely with each other and help each other to achieve the true measure of greatness, developing the capacities of their people.

Today I want to speak briefly about three opportunities I see before you: the renewal of your economy, the reform of your political system, and your work to define a new security for a new era.

First, let me say a word about economic transition. Of course, you inherited an economic system imposed from above. And it has left you with, frankly, a mixed legacy. On the one hand, clearly it helped to rebuild Belarus from the ruins of World War II. But that same centrally planned system is ill-suited for the fast-changing global economy. That is clear everywhere. Everywhere in the world and in every continent, the people that are doing well are people who live in economies where investment and a well-trained work force make it possible for people to produce high-quality goods and services which they sell to each other and beyond their borders.

So now you must face the challenge of taking what is best about your economy, your highly skilled people and your advanced industries, and adapting it to the rigors of this new global competition. It is a hard transition. Almost every place which has sought to do it has faced, as you have, among other things, very steep inflation, something you faced in this summer's increases in the prices of meat and butter. Many people are struggling to get by as a result of this inflation. In a cruel way, inflation hurts the people economies should reward the most, those who simply get up and go to work every day,

obeying the law and trying to make their contribution.

But there is cause for hope because, as you privatize more of your economy, as more of it works in a market system, people will have reason to invest more and generate more economic growth. The government's plan to privatize 20 percent of state property this year is, I believe, a step in the right direction.

The United States wishes to support this kind of change. Since you became independent, we have provided over $150 million in food, medicine, and other forms of assistance. During this trip I announced additional steps to assist your movement to a market economy: the establishment of a business center here in your nation to help to coordinate business efforts both within the country and with other businesses, not only in my country but around the world; a new regional enterprise fund to help to start new businesses, which will include Belarus, Ukraine, and Moldova; and a U.S.-Belarus investment treaty to encourage more private trade and investment between our two countries.

Ultimately, your economic success will depend upon your own efforts. But you must have good neighbors who wish to be good partners. The United States wants to be one of those. And I believe there is no reason that Belarus should be left behind in this march to a global economy. I urge you to press ahead with these economic reforms, to do it in as sensible and as clear-headed a way as possible, to learn from the experience of other nations, because I believe that it is the key to a better future.

You also face the challenge of political transition. Just as modern economies need the benefit of every individual's productive capacity, modern nations need the benefit, indeed cannot do well without the benefit of the diverse and informed views of all of their people. The world does not work very well from the top down anymore. It requires the active engagement of all individuals. When voices are silenced by authoritarianism, by closed political systems, or as in the case with too many democracies today, by the apathy of citizens themselves who stay home and stay out of political dialog, then wisdom is lost, debate becomes more hollow, challenges are avoided instead of being faced, and in the end, tyrants find it easier to grab or to hold on to power. We know where that low road leads. It leads to economic stagnation and social intolerance.

You have learned from your own hard history that there is a better way. I applaud your democratic reforms. I hope you will follow through with the commitments that have been made to hold new elections in March of this year. I hope you will press ahead with plans to craft a new constitution. I hope you will, in short, create a foundation for your economic renewal by protecting and promoting the political and human rights of your people, without which, over the long run, it will be very difficult to have a strong economy.

One of the most encouraging signs of your economic renewal is the political ferment that is bubbling up from your people. You have new political movements such as the Belarusian Popular Front. I was pleased to meet some of their members earlier today. You have environment groups which formed after the Chernobyl disaster. Such groups, along with free labor unions, business associations, and others, can help to create a culture of participation, of debate, of personal investment in your nation's future. These private associations are important, just almost as important as the right to vote in the elections. It requires both a participation in the decisions of who will represent you at the state and who will be able to organize privately to make life more satisfactory. And they'll give views a wider range.

Finally, let me say a word about your efforts to build a new nation that defines its strength and greatness in new ways. There is no better example than your determination to live as a nuclear-free state. Since I became the President of the United States, I have been determined to work with the other nuclear nations, and especially with Russia, to try to help the other republics of the former Soviet Union become nuclear-free. And we have gone a long way to finance that. Belarus led the way, and you deserve the credit and thanks of citizens all over the world.

Seventy-six nuclear weapons were here when the Soviet Union dissolved. As a new nation, one of your first decisions was to do

away with them. It would have been easier to look backward and say, ''Well, these 76 weapons somehow make us a great nation. They make us stronger. We will keep them; we will use them and rattle them around as threats if people don't help us or do what we want them to do.'' But you made a braver and a better choice, to live nuclear-free.

I am sure that your tragic experience with Chernobyl helped to shape that choice. But I also imagine that many, many of you had a clear understanding that these weapons, powerful and intimidating though they might be, offer you little in the way of real security. Real security lies in the integration with your neighbors, their political and economic values, and respect for their borders.

So you freely chose to eliminate these weapons. You became the first of the newly independent states of the former Soviet Union to ratify the START Treaty and to accede to the Non-Proliferation Treaty. That is part of why I was so pleased to welcome Chairman Shushkevich to Washington last July, early in my administration. I wanted to express my admiration for the courage and the vision that he and that all of you have demonstrated by making the choice to be nuclear-free.

We are committed to helping you to prove to all the people of the world that that was the right choice, that you were building a new and a better security. We are helping you to remove these weapons safely and securely, with financial assistance and technical advice. You suffered through one nuclear tragedy. We are determined to see that you do not endure another. Today I informed the Chairman that the United States will make additional funds available to Belarus for this purpose, which will bring the total we have provided over the last 2 years in '93 and '94 to $100 million.

As you move away from the weapons of the old security, we want to help you to build a new security by helping you to be a part of a new and democratic Europe. Earlier this week I joined our NATO allies in creating the Partnership For Peace. The Partnership For Peace invites all of the nations of the former Soviet Union and the former Warsaw Pact and all other non-NATO nations in Europe, all of them together, to join with NATO in a partnership that will permit us together to provide for the common security. It will permit non-NATO members to do military planning and training and exercises with NATO members as long as they promise to respect the sovereignty, the independence, and the existing territorial boundaries of all of the nations which participate. I hope Belarus will give careful consideration to this Partnership. It is a part of our strategy to try to have a Europe that is undivided for the first time in its history, that uses the prospect of military cooperation genuinely to ensure the peace instead of simply to prepare for war.

You are a new nation with a long history. During this century you have endured as much or more hardship as any people we have ever known. And now you face difficult and challenging political and economic transitions. They are so challenging that they can even be disorienting. And if you move to elections, which I hope and pray that you will, you will find that when people are in trouble, they sometimes vote their frustrations as well as their hopes. That is still true in the United States, and we've been working at it for 200 years now.

But there is no substitute for putting the people of the nation in the driver's seat. And we must be aware of this, no matter how sophisticated a people are, no matter how much information is available to decision-makers. There is so much going on in this world today, economically, politically, culturally. The changes are so sweeping, there is no way that one group of people, sitting atop a society, can make decisions which suffice to guarantee the best possible life for all of the people who live in that society.

Therefore, I believe that free political systems and free economic systems also happen to be good economics for the world in which we are living and the world which we will live in the 21st century, for the foreseeable future. You face possibilities that are as sweeping as your land. The new freedom you are building has many difficulties, but it can also work miracles. It can make your cities thrive; it can help your land to blossom. Most important of all, it can give the wonderful children that I was shaking hands with just a few moments ago real hope.

As you undertake the hard work of harnessing this new freedom to your rich culture, to your deep history, to your bold dreams, I hope you will remember that the American people are with you. We wish to be your partners and your friends because we have faith in your courage and confidence in your future. I hope that partnership will come about, will last a long time, and will bring to you the peace and prosperity that I wish for this country and for all the world.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 3:17 p.m. at the Academy of Sciences. In his remarks, he referred to Chairman Stanislav Shushkevich of Belarus.

Exchange With Reporters Prior to Discussions With President Hafiz al-Asad of Syria in Geneva, Switzerland

January 16, 1994

Q. President Clinton, are you going to talk about terrorist issues at this meeting today?

President Clinton. We'll have a statement later when we finish. We just met. We haven't started the meeting yet.

Q. Are you happy to be here, and can you tell us what you expect from the meeting, sir?

President Asad. I'm delighted to be meeting with President Clinton and his assistants. We are at the table not to think about expectations but to do the work.

NOTE: The exchange began at 10:15 a.m. at the Intercontinental Hotel. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this exchange.

The President's News Conference With President Hafiz al-Asad of Syria in Geneva

January 16, 1994

President Asad. At the conclusion of the important and constructive talks which were conducted today between President Clinton and myself, I wish to express my deep satisfaction for what these talks have effected in terms of the United States determination to do all it can in order to bring the peace process to its desired objective, the objective of establishing the just and comprehensive peace in the region through the implementation of the U.N. Security Council Resolutions 242, 338, and 425, as well as the principle of land for peace. In this respect, I appreciate the fact that, notwithstanding the great importance that President Clinton attaches to the internal affairs of his country, he has attached a special importance as a full partner and honest intermediary to helping the parties reach a comprehensive peace that is in the interest not only of the peoples of the region but also the people of the world at large.

Today's meeting between President Clinton and myself came to crown a number of exchanges and telephone communications between us over the last year. I hope that our meeting today will contribute to the realization of the aspirations of the peoples in the region, mainly that this new year will be the year of achieving the just and comprehensive peace which puts an end to the tragedies of violence and wars endured by them for several decades.

During our meeting, I had the opportunity to stress to President Clinton Syria's firm commitment to the principles and bases of the peace process and our strong conviction that peace cannot be genuine and lasting unless it was comprehensive and based on the principles of international legitimacy and justice. This means endeavoring to reach a just solution on all tracks.

Historical evidence, both past and present, have proved that separate peace and partial solutions were not conducive to the establishment of real peace in the region. In this regard, I would like to express my satisfaction that President Clinton himself has committed to the objective of comprehensive peace.

On this basis, we have agreed to work together for the successful efforts aimed at putting an end to the Arab-Israeli conflict and at reaching a genuine and comprehensive peace that enables the peoples of the region to focus on the development, progress, and prosperity.

This meeting has also provided us with the opportunity to exchange views over a number of issues including those related to bilateral relations between our countries. We have agreed that the noble objective toward which we are working requires a qualitative move

in these relations. We have also discussed questions related to the regional situation, as well as all matters that might constructively contribute to the achievement of security and stability in the Middle East.

Syria seeks a just and comprehensive peace with Israel as a strategic choice that secures Arab rights, ends the Israeli occupation, and enables all peoples in the region to live in peace, security, and dignity. In honor we fought, in honor we negotiate, and in honor we shall make peace. We want an honorable peace for our people and for the hundreds of thousands who paid their lives in defense of the countries and the rights.

There is hardly a home in Syria in which there is no martyr who had fallen in defense of his country, nation, and of Arab pride. For the sake of all those, for our sons, daughters, and families, we want the peace of the brave, a genuine peace which can survive and last, a peace which secures the interests of each side and renders to all the rights. If the leaders of Israel have sufficient courage to respond to this kind of peace, the new era of security and stability in which normal peaceful relations among all shall dawn anew.

President Clinton. I believe you could tell from that statement that I have just completed a constructive and encouraging meeting with President Asad.

From the first days of my administration, the achievement of a comprehensive peace between Israel and its Arab neighbors, based on Security Council Resolutions 242 and 338 and the principle of territory for peace, has been one of my highest foreign policy objectives.

In pursuit of that priority, I have always viewed Syria's involvement as critical. That is why, from the outset of our administration, I have engaged President Asad in a regular correspondence by telephone and letter, and why I'm now pleased to have had this opportunity to hear personally President Asad's views about how best to make this a year of breakthroughs on all fronts.

During our meeting, I told President Asad that I was personally committed to the objective of a comprehensive and secure peace that would produce genuine reconciliation among the peoples of the Middle East. I told him of my view that the agreement between Israel and the PLO constituted an important first step by establishing an agreed basis for resolving the Palestinian problem. I also told him that I believe Syria is the key to the achievement of an enduring and comprehensive peace that finally will put an end to the conflict between Israel and her Arab neighbors.

President Asad, as you have just heard, shares this objective, not just an end to war but the establishment of real and comprehensive peace with Israel that will ensure normal, peaceful relations among good neighbors.

Crucial decisions will have to be made by Syria and Israel if this common objective is to be achieved. That is why President Asad has called for a "peace of the brave." And it is why I join him now in endorsing that appeal. Accordingly, we pledged today to work together in order to bring the negotiations that started in Madrid over 2 years ago to a prompt and successful conclusion.

Critical issues remain to be resolved, especially the questions relating to withdrawal to peace and security—excuse me—the question of relating withdrawal to peace and security. But as a result of our conversation today, I am confident that we laid the foundations for real progress in the negotiations between heads of delegation that will begin again next week in Washington.

President Asad and I also discussed the state of relations between the United States and Syria and agreed on the desirability of improving them. This requires honestly addressing the problems in our relationship. Accordingly, we've instructed the Secretary of State and the Syrian Foreign Minister to establish a mechanism to address these issues in detail and openly.

For too long, the Middle East has been denied the benefits of peace. And yet, it is within our power to create the conditions that will enable Israeli and Arab, Moslem, Christian, and Jew to live together in peace. Today's meeting was an important step toward fulfilling that vision. We have a lot of work to do, but we are closer to our goal.

Thank you.

Middle East Peace Process

Q. Mr. President, do you feel that you have a firm commitment from President Asad to normalize relations with Israel? And by that I mean open borders, free trade, and diplomatic relations.

President Clinton. The short answer is yes. I believe that President Asad has made a clear, forthright, and very important statement on normal, peaceful relations.

Now, in order to achieve those relations, a peace agreement has to be negotiated in good faith and carried out. But this is an important statement, the first time that there has been a clear expression that there will be a possibility of that sort of relationship.

Q. Mr. President, it has proven that separate agreements were unsuccessful, and the proof is the Lebanese accords and the Jericho accords. Don't you think that we need a very clear commitment on a comprehensive peace? Then regarding the implementation of U.N. resolutions, regarding Iraq, U.N. resolutions were implemented. But as far as Lebanon and Resolution 425, until now the Security Council Resolution was not implemented despite the American approval. So how can this situation be improved? How can we get the commitment to implement these resolutions?

Thank you, sir.

President Clinton. First of all, as to the specifics of implementation, that will be part of the process of negotiation. But let me answer the first and more important question, I think.

I think all the parties in this process recognize that it cannot succeed unless all the tracks are brought to a successful conclusion. That is, I think even—President Asad was very eloquent in our meeting today about the question of Lebanon, and Jordan for that matter, in saying that even Syria, if it were fully satisfied with its differences with Israel, that they could be worked out, that there still would have to be a comprehensive peace in which the issues affecting Lebanon, issues affecting Jordan, and the issues relating to the PLO would, in addition to the Syrian issues, would all be resolved. We are all committed to that.

Q. This is a question for President Asad. Mr. President, President Clinton is the fourth President that you're now meeting. Do you think you can afford to wait for a fifth one, or have you decided to sign peace now?

President Clinton. I'm glad you got that question.

Could you repeat the question in Arabic, please?

Q. No, I cannot repeat the question in—[*laughter*]—in English. Mr. Asad, President Clinton is the fourth American President you're meeting now. Do you think you can afford to wait for a fifth one, or have you decided to sign peace now?

President Asad. Yes, we are ready to sign peace now.

Q. President Clinton, beyond the broad assurances that you and President Asad have spoken of here about the willingness to seek peace and to negotiate it, do you have, sir, as a result of these meetings, any of the kinds of specific, detailed concessions or a sense of willingness to make concessions that might make a successful negotiation possible? And if so, can you tell us in what areas they are?

President Clinton. Well, as you know, I have a very strong conviction that the specifics of this agreement will have to be negotiated by the parties themselves. And even though I have in my mind several things, I think that it is very important that those of us who are trying to facilitate these discussions not discuss the details of them. The parties are going to have to work that out.

Let me say that an indication has been given here by the very important statement that President Asad has already made, stating clearly that it is time to end the conflict with Israel, make peace with Israel, that the peace should lead to normal and peaceful relations. I would hope that this would provoke a positive response in Israel and that then the parties would get together and work these details out. That is not for the United States to dictate.

Q. Mr. Clinton, despite the peace negotiations, ever since the Madrid Conference, Israel continues with its policy of settlements in the occupied Arab countries. Although Syria has signed the Non-Proliferation Treaty and has been asking for years for the denuclearization of the Middle East as a region, Israel refuses, in fact, to sign and ratify

this Non-Proliferation Treaty and is still accumulating and amassing weapons. Don't you think, sir, that such practices go counter to the concept of peace for which you are striving? Thank you.

President Clinton. First, sir, I believe the question of settlements in disputed areas is one of the things that clearly will have to be resolved in connection with this peace process, consistent with United Nations resolutions and the concept of territory for peace. I said that in my opening statement. I expect that to be worked through.

Secondly, on the question of weapons, I believe the best chance we have to stop the spread of weapons of mass destruction, that include not only nuclear but also biological and chemical weapons, and indeed, to slow the sophisticated conventional arms race in the Middle East, is to finish this peace process successfully. I think that is, as a practical matter, the only way to do it, and the United States will work as hard as we can toward that objective.

Q. President Asad, are you clearly stating unequivocally today that in exchange for a full Israeli withdrawal from the Golan Heights, Syria would be prepared to establish normal diplomatic relations with Israel, including open borders, including tourism, the same kind of peace treaty that Israel established with Egypt?

President Asad. As we all know, especially the United States of America and President Clinton, we are endeavoring for a comprehensive peace in order for it to be lasting, in order for it to be just. In this context, we are striving for the achievement of true peace which guarantees the rights of all, a stable life for all. Here lies the interests of the peoples in the region and the peoples of the world.

Myself and President Clinton completely agreed on these issues, the requirements for peace. We will respond to these requirements. And you know, of course, this will hinge on the discussions and the peace negotiations and not to be solved in a press conference.

Syria-U.S. Relationship

Q. The U.S.A. is a partner and an honest intermediary. Syria responded favorably in order to achieve this peace process in the interest of the world. Yet, the U.S.A. is still treating Syria in a different manner, different from the manner in which it treats Israel, especially in terms of financial and military aid. How would you explain this, sir?

President Clinton. Well, as we have made clear, we have had differences over the years with Syria over a number of issues, including our differences over questions relating to certain groups, the PKK, the Hezbollah, the Jibril group, and others—other issues. We talked about these differences for about an hour today without any view toward trying to resolve them.

We agreed on two things, and I think this is very important. One is that if we can maintain one another's confidence working toward a peaceful solution in the Middle East, that that will do a great deal for our bilateral relations and for a better future. And the second is that we needed to have a process that had integrity, established by the Secretary of State and the Syrian Foreign Minister, that would go beyond public exchanges to a very specific delineation of the differences between us and an honest effort to resolve them or to make progress on them.

So, sir, I think the best answer to your question is that we think that the progress perhaps can be made. We've set up a mechanism to deal honestly with the differences between us, and we believe maintaining each other's confidence by good faith and effort in the Middle East peace process is the most important thing we can do at this moment in our history.

Press Secretary Myers. We'll take one more.

Lebanese Peace Process

Q. Mr. President, the subject is so close to your heart, but you evaded answering whether you felt that Israel should sign the Non-Proliferation Treaty. But my real question is, did you discuss and set a timetable for Israeli and Syrian troops to come out of Lebanon?

President Clinton. We did not have any discussions today about the details of any phase of the Middle East peace process because the other parties are not here present,

and it would not have been an appropriate thing to do.

Q. [*Inaudible*]——

President Clinton. Excuse me. I got one of those helpful little hints from one of my staff members down here. I apologize to interrupt you. I want to be perfectly forthright, because I don't want to leave a false impression that might be adversely interpreted against President Asad.

We did discuss the importance of having the Lebanese peace process go on parallel to the Israeli-Syrian process. I reaffirmed my support for the Taif Accords, and President Asad agreed that there should be a successful conclusion of the peace process which left Lebanon free and independent as a nation. So there was no difference between us on the objective. And I didn't want anything I said to be read unfairly against him on that score. We actually, I think, reached complete meeting of the minds.

Syrian Role in Middle East Peace

Q. In my view, on the 15th of September at the White House, you called for a bigger Syrian role in the peace process and on His Excellency President Asad to play a personal role in forging ahead a breakthrough in the peace process. Now that you've met President Asad face-to-face for the first time, what is your impression of President Asad, and how do you view his personal role in achieving that breakthrough?

President Clinton. Well, first of all, I had heard a lot about President Asad's legendary stamina in these meetings. [*Laughter*] And when we called a break 4 hours and 20 minutes into our meeting, I can tell you that his reputation does not exceed the reality; he deserves every bit of it.

Secondly, we had the opportunity—because we did talk for so long, we had the opportunity to exchange not only our views about the issues in play at present, but also I had the opportunity to learn President Asad's perspective over a period exceeding 20 years now on some of these issues. And it reinforced my belief as expressed in September that there would be no comprehensive peace in the Middle East unless he were willing to take a leadership role and that he has decided to take the risks that all these leaders, if they really want peace, are going to have to take.

And so I guess I would have to say that that is the most important thing to me, the thing that was most impressive. I believe that he is committed to trying to work through this as quickly as possible. And I think others will see that commitment and will respond in an appropriate way.

U.S. Role in Middle East Peace

Q. President Clinton, peace is an international issue. The U.S. administration is striving seriously to achieve peace. It is an international need; it's a need for the U.S.A. and Syria and Israel. One wonders why the peace process tumbles every now and then. And how will the U.S. administration, as the major sponsor of the peace process, tackle obstacles bound to face us in the future? Thank you.

President Clinton. First of all, I think it tumbles every now and then because it's difficult to do. If it were easy to do it would have been done before. The parties have been at odds for a long time. There is a lot of mistrust to overcome. There are a lot of details to be worked out. And whenever there is any ambiguity at all or uncertainty, then that is likely to lead to other problems down the road. So there are lots of reasons why it happens.

What the United States is trying to do is to take advantage of what I think is an appropriate moment in history when you have leaders committed to getting this done, leaders who understand that the interests of their people will be served over the long run by comprehensive peace. And so what we can do, I think, is to try to keep the process going, keep the trust level up among the parties, try to be an honest broker, and work through the problems. And when these difficulties do arise, as they have, as you implied, in the aftermath of the PLO-Israel accord, to try to help work through them as quickly as possible and get things back on track.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President's 45th news conference began at 4:15 p.m. at the Intercontinental Hotel. President Asad spoke in Arabic and his remarks were translated by an interpreter. A tape was not

available for verification of the content of this news conference.

Interview With Reporters on Air Force One

January 16, 1994

The President. Are you all exhausted?

Q. Yes.

Q. Aren't you?

The President's Trip

The President. Yes, I really just wanted to say that I think we had a good trip, and I'm sorry I put you through so much. You must be tired. I know I am. But I think it was really a good trip. And I appreciate how much work was done on it.

I thought we might just talk for a few minutes about it, kind of in a wrap-up fashion. But before we do, I wanted to say that after I got back on the plane, I called Prime Minister Rabin and President Mubarak to report on my meeting with Asad. And I attempted to call but was unsuccessful in reaching King Fahd. I'm going to talk to him probably tomorrow morning, just to tell them what had gone on in the meeting and what the statement was and get their sense of what was going to happen. Rabin had watched it live.

Q. What?

The President. Rabin had watched it live. And I couldn't tell whether Mubarak did or not. I think he did, but we had kind of a staticy connection, so I couldn't be sure. But everybody seemed to be pretty positive about it.

Anyway, looking back over the trip, I can say without any hesitation that it certainly met all of our objectives when we went on the trip. Everything that we hoped would happen did. And I think there were basically three big elements to it.

The first was the prospect of really uniting Europe for the first time since nations have been on the landscape there. I'm very encouraged by the initial reaction to the Partnership For Peace. All the Central and Eastern European countries and the Visegrad nations have said they want to join. Russia, Ukraine expressed an interest. We've now heard some interest from Romania. So I'm feeling quite good about that. Even the Swiss said they wanted to think about whether there was some way they could support it even if they didn't join, given their historic neutrality. I feel very good about it.

The second important thing, of course, was the nuclear breakthrough, the agreement with Ukraine following the agreement that had been reached earlier in the year with Belarus and Kazakhstan, not having our nuclear weapons targeted at anybody, not having their nuclear weapons targeted at us. It's a really important next step. And we also had some important discussions with the Russians about going in and making sure that START I is completely ratified and implemented and that START II is ratified and implemented and that we keep thinking about what further steps there ought to be. So this was a very good meeting in the trip in that respect.

And then the third aspect of the trip was the whole movement toward not only uniting Europe economically and politically but kind of getting growth back into the system. I met with the leaders of the European Union. We talked about how to implement the GATT agreement, how to follow up on it, how important it was to get the growth rates up in Europe again, how important it was to open new markets to Eastern Europe and states of the former Soviet Union. And then, of course, I talked about economics in Prague and then spent a lot of time dealing with it in Russia. And I must say, even though they've had a really tough time, I think they're on the verge of having some good things happen economically.

For all the criticism of the pace of reform in Russia, one of the little known facts about it is that in terms of privatizing companies, Russia's actually running ahead of the pace of the other former Communist economies. There's some other problems they have to deal with, their inflation problems and just having a legal framework that will attract more investment, but I feel quite good about that. Just from my experience in Moscow, I really think that while there are, as you would imagine, uncertainties among the people there because of all the hardships and the difficulty of sort of visualizing the future, I think there's a lot of emotion to the idea that the people ought to rule the country.

I didn't get much sense in anybody that they wanted a more authoritarian government. I think they like the fact that the voters are in the driver's seat, even though they're still trying to come to grips with exactly what that means and how to translate it into policies.

So I would say on grounds of building a united Europe in terms of security, where all the neighbors agree to respect one another's borders, moving to continually reduce the nuclear threat to the world, and supporting economic and political reform in Europe and the former Communist countries, this was a very, very successful trip.

And that's before we did the Middle East thing today. I went to this meeting hoping that we could get a signal from President Asad that was clear and unmistakable that he was ready to make a complete peace. Today—the first time he had ever explicitly said he wanted an end to the hostilities with Israel, willing to make peace with Israel as opposed to saying something like ''peace in the Middle East,'' and that peace to him meant normal peaceful relations, which is a general term that encompasses trade, tourism and travel, and embassies. So that was very significant. That sends a very clear signal now back to the Israelis.

He also said that he didn't want just Syria alone to be resolved, he wanted to see the Jordanian peace completed, and he wanted to see the Lebanese peace completed. And he said something that everybody wanted to hear in the Middle East, which is that he wanted Lebanon to be an independent country with a peace with Israel. So I was quite pleased with that.

So from now on, the question of the differences between Syria and the United States, which we spent about an hour on today, spent a significant portion of our meeting on it, because I thought it was important that neither one of us be under any illusions about the differences that are still there and because I think it's important in this peace negotiation that we both have absolute credibility with each other. So we thought we had to spend some time on it.

We agreed to try to get beyond sort of a general and accusatory level by letting the Secretary of State and the Foreign Minister of Syria develop a process to specifically identify these things that trouble the United States so much and to give them a chance to specifically identify things about our policy toward them or the Middle East in general that trouble them and to try to set in motion a process for working through it, because every report I've gotten over the years, encounters—and you know, I've spent to lot of time talking to Westerners because of the Middle East issue. Things always stop, in my judgment, at a level that is too general, where people are charging and countercharging and there's no real effort to lay the kind of factual basis that has to be laid—you're going to really argue that people should change their policies. So I feel pretty good about it.

Pan Am 103 Bombing

Q. Were you satisfied, sir, that there was no Syrian involvement or complicity in the Pan Am 103 bombing?

The President. I can tell you this: First I raised that, and he raised it again. I can tell you that we have absolutely no evidence of it, and that he flatly denied it. And he reminded us and me that a Syrian was killed on Pan Am 103 who was the only son of a woman from his home area. And he said it was a—he characterized it as a cruel and senseless thing—had no point killing all those students. And he said, ''This is an issue I will never close or never consider closed. If you ever have any evidence that any Syrian is involved, you just let me know, and we will take the appropriate action.''

Russia

Q. Back on Russia. What were you told about that Mr. Gaydar was going to resign? Who told you that, and how serious do you think it is?

The President. All the days kind of run together. Yeltsin told me that; here's how he characterized it. I wasn't quite sure exactly how to—he told me that he thought there was a strong possibility that Gaydar would decide that he needed to devote all of his time to leading the party that he took into the Duma and building his political strength both in the Parliament and out of the country and that he was concerned about building it up politically and making it effective in the Duma.

He said—the reason, you see, you say when—I'm trying to remember. I think it was sometime during the first day as opposed to the second day's conversations that he said it. But I'm sorry I can't remember when.

Q. What are your impressions of Asad?

The President. Let me answer the question. He also went out of his way to tell me, though, he said, "We are not going to reverse our reform course, and we don't want to slow it down, but we do want to cushion the impact of it better. We want to have a better sense of how it affects people." And he said, "We also want to try to demonstrate the successes more clearly. We want to be able to show people that this has been done." And in that connection—and you know what he asked? He was very pleased with a lot of the initiatives that I told him we worked on, like we were working to get the G–7 to make sure that the countries that buy oil from Russia, for example, and buy energy from Russia could pay for it in a timely fashion, so they can use that money to help them build their country. That's a big deal to them. He was interested in getting his next IMF money in a timely fashion. He was interested in making sure that the accumulated debt, ones he's making payments on, can be rescheduled. In other words, he didn't want to slow down reform. He wanted to make it work better, and he wanted to make sure that they had some strategies for cushioning the impact on ordinary people. He also said that he would keep a team that was reform oriented, that it would be a good, competent team.

Gaydar left the government once before, and the reforms didn't stop. So the only thing I encouraged him to do was, I said, "You've proved your commitment to democracy. You've stayed with this reform. You've still got some tough decisions to make." I told him, I said, "I contacted the G–7 before I came up here. We want to help cushion the impact of reform, and we want to help make sure the people of Russia know what you're doing to help the economy. And if you're going to keep on the reform path, it'll be easier for us to do that, because then we'll be able to make sure that the IMF and the World Bank support you as well as these individual countries."

I found it to be a satisfactory conversation. You know he's in some—the political situation over there is not free of difficulty. I mean, you just only have to look at the makeup of the lower House of the Parliament to draw that conclusion. But I think he'll try to hang in there, mostly because if you look at the go-slower approach and you look at Ukraine and you see they're in worse shape than Russia.

And one of the things—and let me just say that this is something I didn't even talk about on the trip—but one of the things I want to spend a lot more time doing when I get back and have our people try to be helpful on is trying to dissect what we mean by reform, because there are at least three big elements to it. There's the privatization of government-owned companies, which Russia is doing very, very well, better than anybody else. There's the management of fiscal and monetary policy, which means you've got to keep inflation down at a reasonable level to get private investment, which means you can't just keep on printing money to pay for subsidies in a dying industry. They're having trouble with that, although they're doing better than they were last year. Then the third area is making sure you've got the infrastructure, if I could use that much-maligned word, that will attract investment from outside the country and will permit the markets to work. That means you've got to have a system of laws relating to private property, contracts, bankruptcy, clear, unambiguous taxation laws, that sort of stuff.

If you look at Czechoslovakia, which is the most—I mean, the Czech Republic, which is the most successful of the former Communist countries, they're behind Russia on privatization but ahead on the infrastructure. So the one thing that I think we need to focus on is now that they've got a constitutional democracy, and all of them, even the ones who want to slow down reform, want more investment—this is interesting—they all want more investment. Even the ones that think, "Well, reform has gone too fast," they might be for the first time in a real position now to write some of the laws in such a way that will attract a lot more investment.

For example, if you want to make an energy investment in Russia, you may not care

what the rate of privatization of small companies is, but you do want to know if you put the money in there and who you're investing with, is your investment good, what do you do in case of breach of contract, what are your tax obligations if you make money? Just clear, simple, straightforward stuff that we take for granted that I think they now have to do a little more work on.

Q. How concerned was Yeltsin about the rise of ultranationalist sentiment? And did you give him any counsel on how to alleviate those feelings of humiliation?

The President. Well, let me see how I should answer that. I don't want to talk in great detail about our conversation, because I think he should be able to answer that. I don't want to read his mind for you. I think that he believes that the more the voters know about some of the positions taken by the ultranationalists, including Zhirinovsky, the more likely they will be to pull away from them. And he believes that the promises which were made by the ultranationalists could not reasonably be expected to be kept. So I think that his view is that what he needs to do is try to do the best he can with his job, turn things around, show some successes, and that that's the best way to dampen them down.

One thing I did say to him was that just following the campaign from afar, as we all did, that the ultranationalists seemed in some ways—in some ways the Communists did, too—to lay too much of an uncontested claim to the feelings of national pride. That is, that the reformers, we all know, didn't run in a coherent bloc and didn't present a coherent message. And as the Democrats know in the United States—I kicked him on purpose because he's talked about this—it's sort of like the problems that the Democrats had for the last 20 years winning the Presidency. You could say, here's a problem and here's my four-point solution to the problem, but if all you get is a good government vote, that's never going to be a majority, especially when people are hurting.

So the only counsel I gave him was that Yeltsin cut through all the traditional barriers when he stood up on that tank, or even earlier when he became Gorbachev's successor, he embodied the change and the pride of Russia. You didn't have to choose. You saw the pride of Russia and the change in a person. And by his actions he did that.

And what I suggested to him was that his group, they needed to find spokespersons, and they needed to find ways of saying what they were about that also says we're proworker, we're profamily, we're anticrime, and we're for bringing the pride of this nation back. And our plan will make the—[*inaudible*]—because I think to be fair to them, their task has been so daunting, that they would naturally become absorbed in the overwhelming burdens of just doing the details of it. These other guys were never in government, you know. They had the freedom of just going out and making speeches. And the only thing I cautioned to Yeltsin, I said, "Look, I saw the Democrats in America get killed for years because they go out there and they talk about problem x, y, and z and have a four-point program for every one. And they might be right, but if it didn't resonate with a larger concern for the voters, it could never be translated into a national mandate." And I think we had a great conversation about it, and I think he was interested in it, because he understands that that's how he got to be President in the first place, change and pride.

Q. You don't think he's emotional enough?

The President. I think he's deeply emotional enough. But in the last election, keep in mind, he put all of his prestige and effort into passing the Constitution. And he prevailed. So a lot of people voted for Boris Yeltsin and his constitution and also voted for the Communist candidate, the agrarian candidate, Zhirinovsky and his crowd. That's the point I'm trying to make. And he needs to win the overlap. He can't let them win the overlap if he's going to govern the country and move it forward.

President Hafiz al-Asad of Syria

Q. How about Asad, what are your impressions?

The President. Smart. Very tough.

Q. What is that?

The President. He's very smart and very tough and has a very clear view of what he thinks has happened in the Middle East in the last 25 years and what he thinks ought

to happen. On the other hand, I think that he has reached a conclusion that it is in the interest of his people, his administration, and his legacy to make a meaningful and lasting peace. I believe that.

Q.[*Inaudible*]—talk about moving his troops out of Lebanon at all?

The President. Well, he said, first of all, that he thought that—he agreed with me that there ought to be a peace in Lebanon—agreeing—agreement that operated was developed in parallel with the Syrian track and that the end of it ought to be a fully independent Lebanon, an accord consistent with the Taif Accords, which—therefore, the inevitable answer is yes.

Q. Did he ask you, if there was peace between Israel and Syria, we would commit—[*inaudible*]—equipment to commit U.S. troops in the Golan Heights in order to keep the peace?

The President. He did not ask it just like that. He said that there needed to be mutual security guarantees, that Israel's security was not all that was at stake, that Damascus was closer to the Golan than Tel Aviv or Jerusalem, and that artillery would go up the hill quite nicely. That's what he said. He said, ''We're not talking about rifles here.'' He said, ''Rifles—all the advantage goes to the people on top of the Golan. When you're talking about artillery, it's a mixed bag.'' He did not breach that. What he said was that both sides would need security assurances.

Q. We would be willing to commit our troops if there was a serious peace agreement?

The President. What I said to him, and what our country has said repeatedly for years now, is that, obviously, if both sides made an agreement and both sides wanted this, we would have to give it serious consideration. That's something I would have to talk to the Congress about, do other things. But I couldn't make any kind of commitment, particularly in the absence of an expressed decision by Israel and Syria, but we would certainly give it consideration.

Q. You certainly think you pushed the momentum on this.

The President. Oh, yes, I think it's forward now. We've pushed it forward. It's clearly the biggest step forward since September 13th. Maybe in some ways a bigger one because we all knew on September 13th that in the end the only way to hold this thing together was to get the rest of it done.

Q. Did you bring up the issue of the Syrian control of Hezbollah and other terrorist groups that are operating through Syrian-controlled Lebanon in attacks upon Israel?

The President. I brought up Hezbollah, the Jibril group, and the PKK specifically, as I said in my press conference that I did. I did. And he gave his view that he stated many times. He stated his position; I restated mine. I said, look, we're not going to resolve this today, but that we can't have normal relations between the two of us as opposed to what's going on in the Middle East until they are resolved. And so I suggested that we give the Secretary of State and the Syrian Foreign Minister the opportunity to develop a mechanism to try to honestly and openly deal with these issues and let us bring our concerns and real specificity to them, let them respond and see if we can work through it.

Highlights From the Trip

Q. What was the real highlight of your trip? What will be the thing that you truly remember, sentimentally, emotionally, spiritually?

The President. Well, the sentimental highlight was walking across the bridge in Prague for the first time in 24 years with Havel with this enormous sense of pride I had at the freedom that he had brought to the country and what I remembered from all the young people when I was there in Czechoslovakia 24 years ago, how deeply anti-Communist they were 24 years ago, how desperately they wanted to be free. And just walking across the bridge with me, this guy who had gone to prison for his beliefs and who so completely represented the best of his culture, you know, was the President of the country. And then we walked across the bridge, and then had dinner in that little pub with the couple that I stayed with 24 years ago. That was the sentimental highlight. The emotional highlight was going into that cathedral that has just been resanctified—that Stalin tore down and turned into a public restroom—and being invited by the priest to

light a candle for my mother. Those are just personal things, you know.

Q. Any disappointments?

The President. No. I still think we've got to—I wouldn't call it a disappointment because to be disappointed it has to fall short of your expectations—but I think we've got some work to do within NATO in defining this whole area of—you know, out-of-area missions. Is NATO going to have a military mission beyond protecting the security of its members and the Partnership For Peace?

I'm more convinced than I was when I went there that the Partnership For Peace is the right idea at this time and that we're giving Europe a chance to have a different history than it's past, and it's enormously significant. But we don't have—the NATO—NATO was never organized or set up for out-of-area missions. They've done a terrific job with the airlift. I talked to some of our personnel today in Switzerland who were working with the airlift. They've done a great job with the mechanics of the embargo. It was never conceived that NATO would use force in any way, even in a very limited way, outside guaranteeing the security of its members. And I just think that not only in terms of Bosnia, but just generally, that whole thing has to really be thought through.

Partnership For Peace

Q. Just a last question. Did you expect it to take off, the whole question of partnership like it did? And, two, who thought of the idea first? Was this an NSC—got to go there with something positive?

The President. The answer—the first question is, I didn't know what to expect. But it's taken off; it's exceeded my expectations. I mean, I just knew how passionately I felt that it was the right approach. And I knew that I had to work through in my own mind, sort of. It was one of those things that the more I thought about it, the stronger I felt about it. It's not something, as you all know, that just knocks you off your feet once you hear about it. We all know that, but the more I thought about it, the stronger I felt about it. And I think what's happened was there began to be a consensus in Europe that this was what made sense, that we had to try for a better future, not just a better division than we had before the cold war but a future without division and that if we could do it in a way that would permit us if circumstances turned against that dream to still do the responsible thing by those that clearly were part of the West that wanted to be part of it, then we ought to do it.

Tony would have to answer the other question in terms of the label and all that, but it was an American idea. We started by consulting all the allies; we realized that there were a whole range of reasons for reservations for immediately expanding membership. And then there were some who had some question about whether NATO had any role at all. And we talked through what our objectives were independent of NATO: What would you like to have happen in Europe in 10 years? What is it we're trying to get done? And then all of our folks went back together and came back with that idea. I have no idea who thought of it, who labeled it or who—I got it through the NSC and State and Defense. We all talked it through before I got there, because it was essentially a military training and planning concept. And I'm sure somebody knows the answer to your question, but I don't.

Q. I'm sure that it was a synthesis.

The President. Yes. I think it's something they just sort of came to. Our process worked.

NOTE: The interview began at 2:58 p.m. e.s.t. In his remarks, the President referred to Yegor Gaydar, former First Deputy Prime Minister of Russia; Vladimir Zhirinovsky, leader of the Liberal Democratic Party in Russia; and National Security Adviser Anthony Lake.

Remarks on Empowerment Zones and Enterprise Communities

January 17, 1994

I want to thank Arland for reminding us all that we can make a difference in people's lives and that there are a lot of good people out there who are dying to make more of their lives if given the opportunity. It's so easy for us here to come here and talk in Government language about Government programs that never seem to reach to the human level and to the reality of what is actu-

ally at stake among the young people of this country. And he did that better than I think that I will be able to in following up. But for all of you who are here to talk about this today, if there was ever an argument for why we needed to find ways to give people and communities the capacity to develop themselves, I think Arland Smith made a better argument than any of the rest of us ever could. I thought when he said, ''I couldn't believe I was here in Washington; I used to be a knucklehead,'' I thought he was going to say there were a lot of knuckleheads here, but he was delicate enough not to say that. [*Laughter*]

First, let me if I might, comment on the earthquake that struck Los Angeles and the San Fernando Valley very early this morning. I have spoken with Governor Wilson and with Mayor Riordan by phone. I've assured them that we intend to do everything we possibly can to help the people of Los Angeles and southern California deal with the earthquake and its aftermath.

I've also spoken with James Lee Witt, the Director of the Federal Emergency Management Agency. He is probably, as we meet here, on his way to California. Secretary Cisneros, I know, is going out later today. We may have other representatives of the Government there. We have done everything we can both to provide the resources and the backup we need. I believe that later today it will be possible for us to issue the appropriate Federal declaration for California. We're going to go out there anyway, and our people will be doing the necessary work to try to do that. FEMA has had a lot of challenges this year, what with the 500-year flood in the Middle West and the fires in southern California. But the good news is, I think they're well organized and ready to deal with this, and I have been very impressed with the work that's already been done since the early morning hours in southern California.

We do know that at least three people have lost their lives, that many people have lost their homes, that there's been a severe disruption of life there. There are at least three major freeways that are seriously damaged, and if you've been watching it on television you know that. So I ask the American people to remember the people of Los Angeles County in their thoughts and prayers today. It's going to be a very difficult few weeks for them as they try to come through the immediate dangers. And there are still some immediate dangers there and in the aftermath.

On this Martin Luther King Day, we honor our Nation's challenging and most eloquent voice for human rights and human potential, a person who gave his life to guarantee better opportunities for people like Arland Smith. When Martin Luther King died in April of 1968, I was living here as a senior at Georgetown, and I remember so clearly putting a big red cross on my car and driving it down into the burning areas of town to deliver supplies to people who had lost a lot of hope. It was a very troubling time for our country and, indeed, for the whole world.

And not long after that I had a chance to go to Eastern Europe and to Russia for the first time in my life, right after the hope of freedom had been extinguished in Czechoslovakia. Well, I just got back from that trip, as you know. And while the problems those people are facing are far from over and while their future is far from free of difficulty, if you could have been with me walking the streets of Prague, you would have seen the great cause for hope, a people who for decades were shackled to a Communist system with their personal freedoms and their personal ambitions held in check now really looking forward to a very different and broader and brighter future; to see a man like Václav Havel, a former prisoner under the Communist system, living his life the way Dr. King challenged the rest of us to live, rewarded by his people with the Presidency of his country. I say that because if you think about where we are now compared to where we were when Martin Luther King died there is a great deal to hope for around the world and here at home.

But I couldn't help thinking as I was going across the world trying to help other nations deal with their problems, that I was coming home to Martin Luther King Day, and the honest hard assessment that a lot of things that were obsessing and burdening this country 25 years ago when Martin Luther King died are just as bad today as they were then. A lot of things are

better. A lot of things are better. There is more individual opportunity for people who are educated and who developed it. There is less overt prejudice. But there is more violence, less opportunity, and more destruction of family and community for the places that are really hard hit than there even was 25 years ago. And I think the only way we can honor Martin Luther King's memory is to be honest about that and to ask ourselves what we can do to rebuild the communities and families of this country and to give more young people like Arland Smith a chance to be what he is becoming.

For a long time, the Government really thought that if we just had a solution designed here in Washington that was properly funded, we could solve the problems of every community in the country. Well, we learned that that wasn't true. But we've also learned, after several years of neglect, that neglect is not a very good policy either, that somehow there needs to be a new partnership between Washington and the communities and the individuals of this country and that there needs to be a way of doing business in which we try to create the conditions in which people can seize opportunities for themselves. That's what this empowerment zone concept is all about and these enterprise communities are all about. The business leaders who are here today are here because we know that we cannot succeed in Government unless you are our partners. And we have stopped trying to tell everybody exactly how to do what needs to be done, but instead we have begun to create the conditions in which people can do what needs to be done at every level.

I want to thank all the members of our administration who are here who worked so hard on this project. I want to say a special word of thanks to the Members of Congress who are here without whom we could not have passed the whole empowerment zone concept. I tell you freely that it was not without controversy in the Congress. There were a lot of people who said, ''Well, we're trying to bring down the deficit, and we just shouldn't do this. This might not work.''

But when we looked at the history of what had happened to—[*inaudible*]—community, when we see what happens when work disappears, when families are under stress, when a void is created into which gangs and guns and drugs move, we realized, I think, as a people here in Washington last year, that we had to do something to try to change the rules of the game, community by community, neighborhood by neighborhood.

We also know that we can't do it without help from the business community. So I say to you here on this Martin Luther King Day, America needs your help. The real reason Arland Smith's got a good story is that after he paid the price to go through the educational system and to change his own habits and the way he presented himself and his own aspirations for his own life, the only real reason he's got a story to tell is that he also has two jobs. And if there were no job at the end of the rainbow, then this man would be standing up here giving a very different speech: ''Why did you all hold out false hopes? Why did you tell me to be a good student, to be a good citizen, to be a good father, to do all these things, and then there was nothing at the end of the effort for me?''

Our most urgent task is to restore to young people like Arland all across this country the conviction that if they do work hard, they will be rewarded, the absolute, unshakable belief that they can make their future better. And we cannot do that without a community-based effort and without a partnership with employers all across this country.

In Martin Luther King's last book, ''Where Do We Go From Here,'' he said that community-based businesses, no matter how small, are vital because they are a strength among the weak though they are weak among the mighty. If we want people to live by the work ethic, we've got to give them work. It's as simple as that. We have advanced, from the beginning of this administration, a new approach, coordinated in partnership here in Washington between the private and public sector and also coordinated at the grassroots level, to focus on a community investment strategy which would empower people to determine their own future. That's what the empowerment zones and enterprise communities are all about, and that's what our efforts to strengthen the community investment act and to develop community development banks are all about. And that's what our effort to pass a crime bill that would put another

100,000 police officers on the streets in grassroots communities are all about.

All these things are not about imposing Federal formulas on communities; they're about giving communities the right to define a future for themselves and the resources to succeed. That's what the strengthening of the Head Start is all about. That's why on April 15th, 15 million working families will get a tax cut because their incomes are modest and because we want them to succeed as workers and as parents. That's what the earned-income tax credit is all about.

This empowerment zone initiative, therefore, is a central part of a broadly coordinated strategy. With business people in mind, the plan seeks to make places more attractive for new investment so that people can—Arland Smith can fulfill their dreams. We built about $2.5 billion in tax incentives into this plan. They say if you hire a new worker in this zone, you'll get a tax break. If you retrain a worker who lives in this zone, you'll get a tax break. In other words, the plan rewards people for results, for reaching people in communities that presently are seeing disinvestment instead of new investment.

It's much better than welfare, and it recognizes that it doesn't make any economic sense for us to be trying to build new markets all around the world when we have huge, untapped, undeveloped markets right here at home: millions and millions and millions of potential consumers for American products and services who cannot be part of the American market because they, themselves, do not have the education, the training, the jobs, and the supports that they need. If we simply can apply our international economic policy to south central Los Angeles, Harlem, Milwaukee, Detroit, you name it, the Mississippi Delta, south Texas, we're going to do just fine in this country. We should see the American people who have the ability of this fine young man who just spoke as an enormous asset that we are not tapping. And we have no excuses now for not doing it, because we know better, and we know it. How many times did I give that speech during the NAFTA debate? The only way a rich country grows richer is to find more people who buy its products and services. In America we have millions of people who don't buy our products and services, because we have not invested in them and their potential and created the conditions in which they can succeed. So that is what this is all about.

Nobody in our strategy gets something for nothing. The rules for businesses that participate are the same as for the rules of communities. It tells everybody if you assume certain responsibilities, if you make certain investments, if you make certain commitments, there are rewards. And it gives you all, again I would say, the chance to develop the systems that work best community by community.

Now, I have given a lot of thought, having been a Governor and having tried to do this on a State level with mixed results, to what works and what doesn't. When I became Governor of my State for the second time in 1983, we had an unemployment rate 3 percent higher than the national average. And the Mississippi Delta was then and unfortunately still is the poorest part of America. But I could take you through towns in the eastern part of my State—Mr. Nash, the Under Secretary of Agriculture, and I went week after week, month after month, year after year into town after town after town. And we would go into a county and see 2 towns 10 miles from one another, the same income makeup, the same racial makeup, the same educational makeup, and one would have an unemployment rate 4 points lower than the other. One would have a school in which there was no white flight but instead coordinated, integrated, high-quality education. And it was always because of the leadership and the vision and the discipline and a common concern for the people who lived at the local level. They created empowerment zones without even knowing what the idea was or what it meant. So what we have really argued over and over and over again now for a year in Washington is what we could do to set up a system that would accelerate the creation of those success stories, so there can be millions more Arland Smiths.

I asked the Vice President to head a new Community Enterprise Board to try to come up with that sort of system, to change the Federal relationship with America's communities but also to set in motion a process for

American communities which would require them to undertake the discipline of examining where they are, what they're doing right and wrong, and how to come up with strategies to succeed. I am very proud of the work that they've done so far.

And this occasion today in which we open the applications for the empowerment zones, I am absolutely convinced, will benefit every single community in America that participates in it whether they win the first round of zones or not, because they will be able to see that by doing the things that work, we can open up opportunities for people to live up to the fullest of their capacities.

Again, I want to thank Arland Smith for coming here today and reminding us what is really at stake and what can be done. I want to thank the business leaders for being here today, because we can't do this without you. You know it, and we know. And his story is an example of it. And I want to thank the Vice President and everybody who has worked on the Community Enterprise Board for an outstanding piece of work which he will now describe.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 12:18 p.m. in the East Room at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Arland Smith, a Youth Employment Training Program graduate.

Remarks Honoring Martin Luther King, Jr., at Howard University

January 17, 1994

Thank you very much. Thank you, Charles DeBose, for that fine introduction and, even more important, for the example that you have set by your service. I can think of no more significant tribute to the life and memory of Dr. King than what you are doing and what all the other young people who are involved in community and national service are doing throughout this country. I know a number of them are behind me here on the stage, and I want to thank them all.

Dr. Jenifer and Mrs. Jenifer, to Joyce Ladner and all the distinguished people here at Howard, I'm delighted to be back here again. I thank and honor the presence of all the civil rights leaders who are in the audience; three members of the Little Rock Nine, who helped to integrate Little Rock Central High School in my home State so many years ago; my good friend and the distinguished journalist, Charlayne Hunter-Gault; and members of my Cabinet here; presidents of other universities here; and other distinguished American citizens, all of whom have labored in the vineyard that produced Martin Luther King.

I want to say a special word, too, if I might at the outset, of appreciation for the fact that Howard provided the moment for me to remember again that in all great debates there should be some discord. When the president of the student body got up here, I thought to myself, well, we do have a responsibility to seek justice as we see it. And I was glad she was here doing that.

It was a year ago on this day that I last spoke at Howard, and I'm glad to be back on this day. Only three American citizens, one from each century of our history, are honored with a holiday of national scope. Two were Presidents, but the other never occupied any office, except the most important in our democracy: He was a citizen. George Washington helped to create our Union, Abraham Lincoln gave his life to preserve it, and Martin Luther King redeemed the moral purpose of our United States. Each in his own way, each in his own time, each three of these great Americans defined what it means to be an American, what citizenship requires, and what out Nation must become.

Dr. King, his family, and those who joined in his cause set in motion changes that will forever reverberate across America, across the lines of geography, class, and race. The people who are here today, those whom I've mentioned and those whom I did not, all of them reflect that stunning fact. They endured beatings; they risked death; they put their lives on the line. They marched when they were tired; they went to bed often without a place to sleep. They made the word "American" mean something unique because they, all of them, in a way were trying to get us to live by what we said we believed. For all of you who are very young here today, many of you who were not even born when Martin Luther King died, it may seem to you that the struggle was a very long time ago.

But if you look around you, you can see that the history of that struggle is still alive today, still being written and still being made, still waiting to be fully redeemed.

I'm glad to be here at Howard today, and I'm glad that Howard and other historically black institutions of higher education are represented here by satellite and that all of them are working still to do what Martin Luther King knew must first be done: to give an education to all of our citizens without regard to their race. Howard's alumni alone include a Justice of the United States Supreme Court, a United States Senator, a Nobel laureate, the Mayor of our Nation's Capital, and at least, by my last count, at least 17 people who occupy important positions in my administration, including the Secretary of Agriculture, Mike Espy, who is here. For that, I say thank you.

It's also fitting that Howard's School of International Study is expanding, ready to educate a new generation of students about a rapidly changing and ever more integrated world. Dr. King would have been very pleased by that. His last speech, delivered the night before he was slain in Memphis, on April 3d, 1968, contained a prophetic message of hope about the world he saw evolving. He said he imagined himself standing at the beginning of time with a panoramic view of the whole of human history, with God Almighty saying to him, ''Martin Luther King, which age would you like to live in?'' He then considered all the momentous history that would beckon someone of his enormous intellect and understanding, from the earliest civilizations to the Renaissance, to the Emancipation Proclamation, but he said he would have said to the Lord, ''If you allow me just to live a few years in the second half of the 20th century, I will be happy.'' He said, ''That's a strange statement to make because the world is all messed up, but something is happening in the world. The masses are rising up, and wherever they are assembled today, the cry is always the same, 'We want to be free.'''

I think Dr. King would be gratified to see freedom's march today, gladdened to see what happened last September 13th when Prime Minister Rabin and Yasser Arafat shook hands and signed the Israel-PLO accord, overflowing with joy to see Nelson Mandela walk out of his jail cell after 27 years, working with a white South African President to set in motion genuine elections and then in good humor and with good spirit campaigning against him to be the leader of the country. This is an astonishing development.

Freedom is moving in the world. This past week, as all of you know, I traveled to Europe to help support freedom's rebirth there. I want to tell you a little bit about that, because it relates to what I want to say to you about what we must do here at home. My highest duty as our President is to keep our Nation secure. And the heart of our security abroad lies in our ties with Europe, in its past turmoils, its future promise.

For decades our security depended upon protecting a divided Europe. Europe was the center of two world wars which took more lives from the face of the Earth in less time than any two events in history. After the Second World War, Europe was divided, but war did not come again, in part because we protected the people on our side of the dividing line. But then the Berlin Wall came crashing down. People rose up and demanded their own freedom.

Now we have seen the collapse of the Berlin Wall, the end of communism in Eastern Europe, the collapse of the Soviet system itself, new elections being held all over what was the Soviet Union. Now, that is an astonishing thing. But these new democracies remain fragile. They offer us the hope of a peaceful future and new trading partners, new prosperity, new opportunities to enrich our own lives by learning from different cultures and ethnic groups. But they are still threatened by the explosive mix of old ethnic tensions and new economic hardships.

Russia has adopted a new democratic constitution and elected a Parliament freely for the first time to go with their popularly elected President. But the reformers are embattled there, as ordinary citizens struggle to understand how they can come out ahead in an economy which is still very hard for them and as they listen at election times to people who are calling them to an idyllic past that never existed, one based on division instead of unity.

The nuclear weapons of the former Soviet Union, too many of them are still there, remaining a source of instability, of potential for accident, an invitation to terrorist diversion. We're working as hard as we can to dismantle them, and we're making remarkable progress. But they're still there.

We can't ignore these dangers to democracy. The best way to keep Europe from ever falling apart again, from dragging the young people of this country to that continent to fight and die again is to try to build for the first time in all of history a Europe that is integrated, integrated in a devotion to democracy, to free economies, and to the proposition that all these countries should respect one another's borders. That was the goal of my trip.

We made great strides. We offered—we in the NATO alliance that kept the world safe after World War II—we offered all these countries, all of them, the chance to be part of a new Partnership For Peace that does not divide Europe but unites it. We said, let's turn our swords into plowshares by planting together for our common security. Let's have a military exercise in Germany with an American general, with Poles and Czechs and Russians standing side by side and working together. Let's say we're going to write a whole new future for the world, different from its past. That is our great hope, and we made a good beginning.

We also sought to go country by country to bolster the new democracies, to tell people, look, there are always going to be problems in democracy and always going to be conflict. We just got a little of it today. [*Laughter*] I told them, I said, we've been at this for 200 years now, 200 years, and we didn't even give all of our citizens the right to vote until a generation ago. You've got to work at this. You've got to work at this, and you cannot be discouraged, and you cannot give up. And so I pledged to help the people who believe in democracy. And democracy means more than one thing. It means majority rule. It also means respect for minority and individual human rights.

And we worked hard to try to build better economic ties because America cannot prosper unless the world economy grows. We cannot, we cannot meet our obligations to the young people in this audience today unless we say to them, ''If you work hard, you get an education, and you do what is right, you will have a job and an opportunity and a better life.'' We cannot do that. And to do that, we have to live in a world where all of us are working together to grow the economy. No rich country—and with all of our poverty, we are still a very rich country—none has succeeded in guaranteeing jobs and incomes to its people unless you always are finding more people to buy what you produce, your goods and your services. So I went to Europe because I think the trip will help to create jobs for the young people in this audience. And unless we can do that, our efforts are doomed to failure.

And so we had a remarkable trip: to build a more secure world; to build a more democratic world; to build a more economically prosperous world; to reduce the threat of nuclear weapons; and yesterday, with my meeting with the Syrian President in Switzerland, to try to keep moving the most historically troubled area of the world, the Middle East, toward a comprehensive peace.

But as I come home on this Martin Luther King Day from a trip that fought for democracy and economic progress and security, I have to ask myself: How are we doing on these things here at home? How are we doing on these things at home? If democracy is the involvement of all of our people and if it is making strength out of our diversity, if we want to say to the people in the troubled areas of Europe, ''Put your ethnic hatreds behind you; take the differences, the religious differences, the racial differences, the ethnic differences of your people, and make them a strength in a global economy,'' surely we must do the same here.

In the last year, we've worked hard on that. Five of the members of my Cabinet are African-Americans. Sixty-one percent of the Federal judges I have appointed are either women or members of different racial minority groups. And they have also, I might add, been accounted the most highly qualified group of Federal judges ever nominated by a President of the United States.

In the last year, our economy has created more jobs in the private sector than in the previous 4 years combined. Unemployment

is down; interest rates are down; investment is up. Millions of middle class Americans have refinanced their homes and started new businesses. All this is helping us to move in the right direction.

We are working hard to protect rights fought for and won. American workers should not fear for their jobs because of discrimination. Under the Labor Secretary, Bob Reich, the Department of Labor's Office of Federal Contract Compliance has collected more than $34.5 million in back pay and other financial remedies for the victims of racial discrimination. That is a big increase over the previous year. We have filed a record number of housing discrimination cases, a 35-percent increase over the previous year. We are working to fight against discrimination in lending, because if people can't borrow money, they can't start businesses and hire people and create jobs.

Just last week, in a coordinated effort strongly led by the HUD Secretary, Henry Cisneros, who would have been here today but is on his way to Los Angeles to deal with the aftermath of the earthquake, we ended an ugly chapter in discrimination in Vidor, Texas. Under the protection of Federal marshals, FBI agents, and the police, and with the support of the decent people who live there, a group of brave and determined African-Americans integrated at last Vidor's public housing.

Today I pledge to you continued and aggressive enforcement of the Fair Housing Act. In a few moments I will sign an Executive order that for the very first time puts the full weight of the Federal Government behind efforts to guarantee fair housing for everyone. We will tolerate no violations of every American's right for that housing opportunity.

But my fellow Americans, the absence of discrimination is not the same thing as the presence of opportunity. It is not the same thing as having the security you need to build your lives, your families, and your communities. So I say to you, it is our duty to continue the struggle that is not yet finished, to fight discrimination. We will, and we must. But it is not the same thing as the presence of opportunity.

That is the struggle they're dealing with in Russia today, in the other former Communist economies. They have the vote. It's exhilarating. But how long will it take for the vote to produce the results that democratic citizens everywhere want so that people will be rewarded for their work and can raise their families to live up to the fullest of their God-given abilities? That is our job here.

That's why this national service program is so important and why I was elated that Mr. DeBose was going to introduce me today, because national service is a part of our effort to create opportunity by building communities from the grassroots up and at the same time to give young people the opportunity to pay some of their costs of college education. And it is a part of the work that the Secretary of Education, who is here, has done to try to revolutionize the whole way we finance college education.

We know right now that 100 percent of the people need not only to graduate from high school but to have at least 2 years of education after high school in the global economy. We know it, but we're not organized for it. And so under the leadership of the Education Secretary and the Labor Secretary, our administration is working to set up a system to move all young people from high school to 2 years of further training while they're in the workplace, in the service, or in school. And we're doing our dead level best to make sure that the cost of a college education is never a deterrent to seizing it, by reorganizing the whole student loan program. Last year the Congress adopted our plan to reorganize the college loan program, to lower the interest rates, string out the repayments, require people to pay back as a percentage of the income they are earning when they get out, not just based on how much they borrow when they're in school. No one should ever refuse to go to college because of its cost.

And earlier today, to give one more example of what we mean by the presence of opportunity, on this Martin Luther King Day I met with a group of business leaders and urged them to become active partners in communities where the need is greatest. We have learned time and again now, ever since Martin Luther King lived and died, that even

when we have times of great economic growth there are areas in the inner cities and in rural America that are totally left out of the economic progress that occurs. We have learned that unless we can rebuild our communities from the grassroots up, unless we can rebuild the institutions of a community in ways that support work and family and children, that millions and millions of Americans will be left out of the American dream.

And so today we announced our creation of 104 empowerment zones and enterprise communities that can make a difference, that will give people at the grassroots level the power to educate and employ people who otherwise will be lost, to themselves and to the rest of us, for a generation. That is the sort of thing that Martin Luther King would want us to do, not just to let discrimination go away but to create opportunity.

And finally, let me say that we will never do this unless we create the ways and means for people to choose a peaceful and wholesome life. The most important experience I have had as your President here at home, I think, in the last several months was having the opportunity to go to Memphis and to stand in the pulpit where Dr. King gave his last address and speak to 5,000 ministers of the Church of God in Christ, many of whom are longtime personal friends of mine, and say that Martin Luther King did not live and die to give young people the right to shoot each other on the street.

I come home thinking to myself: I am so proud of the fact that I had the chance to be President at a time when the United States was leading an agreement with Russia, in Ukraine, in Belarus, in Kazakhstan to dismantle weapons of mass destruction; but we can't get guns out of our own schools. I'm proud of the fact that we are pursuing an aggressive high-technology policy, under the leadership of the Vice President, that will help to turn this whole nation into a giant high-tech neighborhood so we can learn from one another and relate to each other; but we can't even make it safe for kids to walk the streets of their own neighborhoods.

We would be asked, I think, by Martin Luther King how come this is so. When Mr. DeBose stood up and said everybody can be great because everybody can serve—Martin Luther King's greatest quote—I say to you today, we have to ask ourselves what our personal responsibility is to serve in this time. And when we cannot explain these contradictions, then we have to work through them. We may not have all of the answers; none of us do. I cannot expect you to have them; as President, I don't have them. But I know what the problems are, and so do you. And we know there are some things that will make a difference. And we have an obligation to try in our time to make that difference. There are too many questions we cannot answer today.

Dr. King said, "Men hate each other because they fear each other. They fear each other because they don't know each other. They don't know each other because they can't communicate with each other. They can't communicate with each other because they are separated from each other." We all need to think about this. We've got a lot of walls still to tear down in this country, a lot of divisions to overcome, and we need to start with honest conversation, honest outreach, and a clear understanding that none of us has any place to hide. This is not a problem of race; it is a problem of the American family. And we had better get about solving it as a family.

Laws can help. That's why I wanted to pass the Brady bill. That's why I want to take these assault weapons off the street. That's why I want to do a lot of other things that will help to regulate how we deal with this craziness of violence on our streets. That's why I want more police officers, not to catch criminals even as much as to prevent crime. We know that community policing prevents crime if it's done right. Laws can help.

But Martin Luther King reminded us, too, that laws can regulate behavior but not the heart. And so I say to you, we must also seek what Abraham Lincoln called "the better angels of our nature." And we all have a responsibility there. When he spoke here at Howard, Martin Luther King said the following things, and I thought about it today when I was looking at Mr. DeBose up here introducing me, expressing the pride in the service he rendered and how it changed the minds and the hearts of the people with whom and for whom he worked. Dr. King

said, ''Human progress never rolls in on wheels of inevitability. It comes through the tireless effort and persistent work of dedicated individuals who are willing to be coworkers with God. And without this hard work, time itself becomes an ally of the primitive forces of stagnation. And so we must help time, and we must realize that the time is always right for one to do right.'' ''Time is neutral,'' he said. ''Time can either be used constructively or destructively.'' All he asked from each of the rest of us was to put in a tiny, little minute.

So, will we make Martin Luther King glad or sad about the way we use our tiny, little minutes? In any one minute in America today, two aggravated assaults take place, six burglaries occur, three violent crimes are committed, and three times an hour, that violent act is a murder. But think about it. Within the stand of the same minute, two men from different worlds, like Arafat and Rabin, can shake hands and set off on a new road to peace. A leader can agree that his country must give up the world's third largest nuclear arsenal. In one minute, people can make an enormous positive difference: they decide to keep a seat on a bus instead of move to the back; they decide to show up for school instead of be shunted away; they decide to sit at a lunch counter even if they won't get to eat that day; they decide to pursue an education even if they're not sure there's a pot of gold at the end of the rainbow; they work to keep their neighborhoods safe just to create a tiny little park where children can play without fear again; they keep their families together when it's so easy to let them fall apart; and, they work to give a child the sense that he or she is important and loved and worthy, with a future.

When I think about it I'm often sad that Martin Luther King had so few precious minutes on this Earth. Two days ago he would have celebrated his 65th birthday, and the older I get the younger I realize 65 is. [*Laughter*] But you know, he did a lot with the time he had, and I think we should try to do the same.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 2:20 p.m. in Cramton Auditorium. In his remarks, he referred to Charles DeBose, Jr., National Service intern, Franklyn Jenifer, president, and Joyce Ladner, vice president for academic affairs, Howard University.

Executive Order 12892—Leadership and Coordination of Fair Housing in Federal Programs: Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing

January 17, 1994

By the authority vested in me as President by the Constitution and the laws of the United States of America, and in accordance with the Fair Housing Act, as amended (42 U.S.C. 3601 *et seq.*) (''Act''), in order to affirmatively further fair housing in all Federal programs and activities relating to housing and urban development throughout the United States, it is hereby ordered as follows:

Section 1. *Administration of Programs and Activities Relating to Housing and Urban Development.*

1–101. Section 808(d) of the Act, as amended, provides that all executive departments and agencies shall administer their programs and activities relating to housing and urban development (including any Federal agency having regulatory or supervisory authority over financial institutions) in a manner affirmatively to further the purposes of the Act and shall cooperate with the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to further such purposes.

1–102. As used in this order, the phrase ''programs and activities'' shall include programs and activities operated, administered, or undertaken by the Federal Government; grants; loans; contracts; insurance; guarantees; and Federal supervision or exercise of regulatory responsibility (including regulatory or supervisory authority over financial institutions).

Sec. 2. *Responsibilities of Executive Agencies.*

2–201. The primary authority and responsibility for administering the programs and activities relating to housing and urban development affirmatively to further fair housing is vested in the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

2–202. The head of each executive agency is responsible for ensuring that its programs and activities relating to housing and urban

development are administered in a manner affirmatively to further the goal of fair housing as required by section 808 of the Act and for cooperating with the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, who shall be responsible for exercising leadership in furthering the purposes of the Act.

2–203. In carrying out the responsibilities in this order, the head of each executive agency shall take appropriate steps to require that all persons or other entities who are applicants for, or participants in, or who are supervised or regulated under, agency programs and activities relating to housing and urban development shall comply with this order.

2–204. Upon receipt of a complaint alleging facts that may constitute a violation of the Act or upon receipt of information from a consumer compliance examination or other information suggesting a violation of the Act, each executive agency shall forward such facts or information to the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development for processing under the Act. Where such facts or information indicate a possible pattern or practice of discrimination in violation of the Act, they also shall be forwarded to the Attorney General. The authority of the Federal depository institution regulatory agencies to take appropriate action under their statutory authority remains unaffected.

Sec. 3. *President's Fair Housing Council.*

3–301. There is hereby established an advisory council entitled the ''President's Fair Housing Council'' (''Council''). The Council shall be chaired by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development and shall consist of the Secretary of Health and Human Services, the Secretary of Transportation, the Secretary of Education, the Secretary of Labor, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Attorney General, the Secretary of the Interior, the Chair of the Federal Reserve, the Comptroller of the Currency, the Director of the Office of Thrift Supervision, the Chair of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, and such other officials of executive departments and agencies as the President may, from time to time, designate.

3–302. The President's Fair Housing Council shall review the design and delivery of Federal programs and activities to ensure that they support a coordinated strategy to affirmatively further fair housing. The Council shall propose revisions to existing programs or activities, develop pilot programs and activities, and propose new programs and activities to achieve its goals.

3–303. In support of cooperative efforts among all executive agencies, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall:

(a) cooperate with, and render assistance to, the heads of all executive agencies in the formulation of policies and procedures to implement this order and to provide information and guidance on the affirmative administration of programs and activities relating to housing and urban development and the protection of the rights accorded by the Act; and

(b) develop memoranda of understanding and any necessary implementing procedures among executive agencies designed to provide for consultation and the coordination of Federal efforts to further fair housing through the affirmative administration of programs and activities relating to housing and urban development, including coordination of the investigation of complaints or other information referred to the Secretary as required by section 2–204 of this order that would constitute a violation of the Act or, where relevant, other Federal laws. Existing memoranda of understanding shall remain in effect until superseded.

3–304. In connection with carrying out functions under this order, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development is authorized to request from any executive agency such information and assistance as the Secretary deems necessary. Each agency shall furnish such information to the extent permitted by law and, to the extent practicable, provide assistance to the Secretary.

Sec. 4. *Specific Responsibilities.*

4–401. In implementing the responsibilities under sections 2–201, 2–202, 2–203, and section 3 of this order, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall, to the extent permitted by law:

(a) promulgate regulations in consultation with the Department of Justice and Federal

banking agencies regarding programs and activities of executive agencies related to housing and urban development that shall:

(1) describe the functions, organization, and operations of the President's Fair Housing Council;

(2) describe the types of programs and activities defined in section 1–102 of this order that are subject to the order;

(3) describe the responsibilities and obligations of executive agencies in ensuring that programs and activities are administered and executed in a manner that furthers fair housing;

(4) describe the responsibilities and obligations of applicants, participants, and other persons and entities involved in housing and urban development programs and activities affirmatively to further the goal of fair housing; and

(5) describe a method to identify impediments in programs or activities that restrict fair housing choice and implement incentives that will maximize the achievement of practices that affirmatively further fair housing.

(b) coordinate executive agency implementation of the requirements of this order and issue standards and procedures regarding:

(1) the administration of programs and activities relating to housing and urban development in a manner affirmatively to further fair housing; and

(2) the cooperation of executive agencies in furtherance of the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development's authority and responsibility under the Act.

4–402. Within 180 days of the publication of final regulations by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development under section 4–401 of this order, the head of each executive agency shall publish proposed regulations providing for the administration of programs and activities relating to housing and urban development in a manner affirmatively to further fair housing, consistent with the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development's regulations, and with the standards and procedures issued pursuant to section 4–401(b) of this order. As soon as practicable thereafter, each executive agency shall issue its final regulations. All executive agencies shall formally submit all such proposed and final regulations, and any related issuances or standards, to the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development at least 30 days prior to public announcement.

4–403. The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall review proposed regulations and standards prepared pursuant to section 4–402 of this order to ensure conformity with the purposes of the Act and consistency among the operations of the various executive agencies and shall provide comments to executive agencies with respect thereto on a timely basis.

4–404. In addition to promulgating the regulations described in section 4–401 of this order, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall promulgate regulations describing the nature and scope of coverage and the conduct prohibited, including mortgage lending discrimination and property insurance discrimination.

Sec. 5. *Administrative Enforcement.*

5–501. The head of each executive agency shall be responsible for enforcement of this order and, unless prohibited by law, shall cooperate and provide records, data, and documentation in connection with any other agency's investigation of compliance with provisions of this order.

5–502. If any executive agency concludes that any person or entity (including any State or local public agency) applying for or participating in, or supervised or regulated under, a program or activity relating to housing and urban development has not complied with this order or any applicable rule, regulation, or procedure issued or adopted pursuant to this order, it shall endeavor to end and remedy such violation by informal means, including conference, conciliation, and persuasion. An executive agency need not pursue informal resolution of matters where similar efforts made by another executive agency have been unsuccessful, except where otherwise required by law. In the event of failure of such informal means, the executive agency, in conformity with rules, regulations, procedures, or policies issued or adopted by it pursuant to section 4 of this order hereof, shall impose such sanctions as may be authorized

by law. To the extent authorized by law, such sanctions may include:

(a) cancellation or termination of agreements or contracts with such person, entity, or any State or local public agency;

(b) refusal to extend any further aid under any program or activity administered by it and affected by this order until it is satisfied that the affected person, entity, or State or local public agency will comply with the rules, regulations, and procedures issued or adopted pursuant to this order;

(c) refusal to grant supervisory or regulatory approval to such person, entity, or State or local public agency under any program or activity administered by it that is affected by this order or revoke such approval if previously given; and

(d) any other action as may be appropriate under law.

5–503. Findings of any violation under section 5–502 of this order shall be promptly reported by the head of each executive agency to the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development and the Attorney General. The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall forward this information to all other executive agencies.

5–504. Any executive agency shall also consider invoking appropriate sanctions against any person or entity where any other executive department or agency has initiated action against that person or entity pursuant to section 5–502 of this order, where the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development has issued a charge against such person or entity that has not been resolved, or where the Attorney General has filed a civil action in Federal Court against such person or entity.

5–505. Each executive agency shall consult with the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, and the Attorney General where a civil action in Federal Court has been filed, regarding agency actions to invoke sanctions under the Act. The Department of Housing and Urban Development, the Department of Justice, and Federal banking agencies shall develop and coordinate appropriate policies and procedures for taking action under their respective authorities. Each decision to invoke sanctions and the reasons therefor shall be documented and shall be provided to the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development and, where appropriate, to the Attorney General in a timely manner.

Sec. 6. *General Provisions.*

6–601. Nothing in this order shall limit the authority of the Attorney General to provide for the coordinated enforcement of nondiscrimination requirements in Federal assistance programs under Executive Order No. 12250.

6–602. All provisions of regulations, guidelines, and procedures proposed to be issued by executive agencies pursuant to this order that implement nondiscrimination requirements of laws covered by Executive Order No. 12250 shall be submitted to the Attorney General for review in accordance with that Executive order. In addition, the Secretary shall consult with the Attorney General regarding all regulations and procedures proposed to be issued under sections 4–401 and 4–402 of this order to assure consistency with coordinated Federal efforts to enforce nondiscrimination requirements in programs of Federal financial assistance pursuant to Executive Order No. 12250.

6–603. Nothing in this order shall affect the authority and responsibility of the Attorney General to commence any civil action authorized by the Act.

6–604. (a) Part IV and sections 501 and 503 of Executive Order No. 11063 are revoked. The activities and functions of the President's Committee on Equal Opportunity in Housing described in that Executive order shall be performed by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

(b) Sections 101 and 502(a) of Executive Order No. 11063 are revised to apply to discrimination because of "race, color, religion (creed), sex, disability, familial status or national origin." All executive agencies shall revise regulations, guidelines, and procedures issued pursuant to Part II of Executive Order No. 11063 to reflect this amendment to coverage.

(c) Section 102 of Executive Order No. 11063 is revised by deleting the term "Housing and Home Finance Agency" and inserting in lieu thereof the term "Department of Housing and Urban Development."

6–605. Nothing in this order shall affect any requirement imposed under the Equal Credit Opportunity Act (15 U.S.C. 1691 *et seq.*), the Home Mortgage Disclosure Act (12 U.S.C. 2801 *et seq.*) or the Community Reinvestment Act (12 U.S.C. 2901 *et seq.*).

6–606. Nothing in this order shall limit the authority of the Federal banking agencies to carry out their responsibilities under current law or regulations.

6–607. Executive Order No. 12259 is hereby revoked.

Sec. 7. *Report.*

7–701. The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall submit to the President an annual report commenting on the progress that the Department of Housing and Urban Development and other executive agencies have made in carrying out requirements and responsibilities under this Executive order. The annual report may be consolidated with the annual report on the state of fair housing required by section 808(e)(2) of the Act.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
January 17, 1994.

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 4:38 p.m., January 18, 1994]

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

Memorandum on Fair Housing

January 17, 1994

Memorandum for the Heads of Executive Departments and Agencies

Subject: Federal Leadership of Fair Housing

On April 11, 1968, one week after the assassination of the great civil rights leader Martin Luther King, Jr., the Fair Housing Act was enacted (1) to prohibit discrimination in housing, and (2) to direct the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to affirmatively further fair housing in Federal housing and urban development programs. Twenty-five years later, despite a strengthening of the Fair Housing Act 5 years ago, hundreds of acts of housing discrimination occur in our Nation each day. Americans of every income level, seeking to live where they choose, feel the weight of discrimination because of the color of their skin, their race, their religion, their gender, their country of origin, or because they are disabled or have children.

An increasing body of evidence indicates that barriers to fair housing are pervasive. Forty percent of all families move every 5 years. This statistic is significant given the results of a recent study, commissioned by the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), which found that more than half of the African Americans and Latinos seeking to rent or buy a home are treated differently than whites with the same qualifications. Moreover, based upon Home Mortgage Disclosure Act data, the number of minority persons who are rejected when attempting to obtain loans to purchase homes is two to three times higher than it is for nonminorities in almost every metropolitan area of this country.

Racial and ethnic segregation, both in the private housing market and in public and assisted housing, has been well documented. Despite legislation (the Fair Housing Act) and Executive action (Executive Order No. 11063), the divisive impact of housing segregation persists in metropolitan areas all across this country. Too many lower income and minority Americans face barriers to housing outside of central cities. Segregation in housing and schools deprives too many of our children and youth of an opportunity to enter the marketplace or work on an equal footing. For too many families, our cities are no longer the launching pads for economic self-sufficiency and upward mobility that they have been for countless immigrants and minorities since the country's birth. And many Americans who are better off abandon the cities.

The resulting decline in the very heart of too many of our metropolitan areas threatens all of us: the health of our dynamic regional economies—the very lifeblood of future national economic growth and higher living standards for all of us and all of our children—is placed at risk.

We can do better. We can start by making sure that our own Federal policies and programs across all of our agencies support the

fair housing and equal opportunity goals to which all Americans are committed. If all of our executive agencies affirmatively further fair housing in the design of their policies and administration of their programs relating to housing and urban development, a truly nondiscriminatory housing market will be closer to achievement.

By an Executive Order ("the Order") I am issuing today and this memorandum, I am addressing those needs. The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development and, where appropriate, the Attorney General—the officials with the primary responsibility for the enforcement of Federal fair housing laws—will take the lead in developing and coordinating measures to carry out the purposes of this Order.

Through this Order, I am first expanding Executive Order No. 11063 to provide protection against discrimination in programs of Federal insurance or guaranty to persons who are disabled and to families with children.

Second, I am revoking the old Executive Order No. 12259 entitled "Leadership and Coordination of Fair Housing in Federal Programs." The new Executive order reflects the expanded authority of the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development and I am directing him to take stronger measures to provide leadership and coordination in affirmatively furthering fair housing in Federal programs.

Third, I ask the heads of departments and agencies, including the Federal banking agencies, to cooperate with the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development in identifying ways to structure agency programs and activities to affirmatively further fair housing and to promptly negotiate memoranda of understanding with him to accomplish that goal.

Further, I direct the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to review all of HUD's programs to assure that they truly provide equal opportunity and promote economic self-sufficiency for those who are beneficiaries and recipients of those programs.

I also direct the Secretary to review HUD's programs to assure that they contain the maximum incentives to affirmatively further fair housing and to eliminate barriers to free choice where they continue to exist. This review shall include Federally assisted housing, Federally insured housing and other housing and housing related programs, including those of the Government National Mortgage Association and the Federal Housing Administration.

Today, I am establishing a new Cabinet-level organization to focus the cooperative efforts of all agencies on fair housing. The President's Fair Housing Council will be chaired by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development and will consist of the Secretary of Health and Human Services, the Secretary of Transportation, the Secretary of Education, the Secretary of Labor, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Attorney General, the Secretary of the Interior, the Chair of the Federal Reserve, the Comptroller of the Currency, the Director of the Office of Thrift Supervision, and the Chair of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

The President's Fair Housing Council shall review the design and delivery of Federal programs and activities to ensure that they support a coordinated strategy to affirmatively further fair housing. The Council shall propose revisions to existing programs or activities, develop pilot programs and activities, and propose new programs and activities to achieve its goals.

I direct the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development and the President's Fair Housing Council to develop a pilot program to be implemented in selected metropolitan areas. This initiative will promote fair housing choice by helping inner-city families to move to suburban neighborhoods and by making the central city more attractive to those who have left it. I direct the members of the Council to undertake a demonstration program that will reinvent the way assisted housing is offered to applicants, will break down jurisdictional barriers in housing opportunities, and will promote the use of subsidies that diminish residential segregation, and will combine these initiatives with refined educational incentives aimed at improving the effectiveness of inner-city schools. I am directing that transportation alternatives be considered along with targeted

social service and job training programs as part of the support necessary to create a one-stop, metropolitan area-wide fair housing opportunity pilot program that will effectively offer Federally assisted housing, Federally insured housing, and private market housing within a metropolitan area to all residents of the area. The pilot program should call upon realtors, mortgage lenders, housing providers, and local governments, among others, to assist in expanding housing choices.

To address the findings of recent studies, I hereby direct the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development and the Attorney General and, where appropriate, the heads of the Federal banking agencies to exercise national leadership to end discrimination in mortgage lending, the secondary mortgage market, and property insurance practices. The Secretary is directed to issue regulations to define discriminatory practices in these areas and the Secretary and the Attorney General are directed to aggressively enforce the laws prohibiting these practices.

In each of these areas, I direct the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to take the lead with the other Federal agencies in working to gain the voluntary cooperation, participation, and expertise of all of those in private industry, the States and localities who can assist in achieving the Nation's fair housing goals.

The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development is authorized and directed to publish this memorandum in the *Federal Register*.

William J. Clinton

Remarks on the Los Angeles Earthquake and an Exchange With Reporters

January 17, 1994

The President. Good afternoon. As all of you know, this morning at dawn a violent earthquake struck southern California near Los Angeles. Because it occurred in a densely populated area, it was an unusually destructive one. We have all seen today on our own televisions the buildings that have collapsed, the freeways turned into rubble. The power has been cut off and gas mains have exploded and, most tragically, many people have been injured and several lives have already been lost.

Due to the damage caused by the earthquake, I have, by signing the document that I will sign at the end of this statement, declared these areas of California to be a major disaster, thereby authorizing the expenditures of funds necessary for Federal disaster assistance that is requested by Governor Wilson.

This program will include, among other things, low-interest loans to replace homes and businesses, cash grants where needed, housing assistance, energy unemployment, emergency unemployment assistance, and funds to rebuild the highways, the schools, and other infrastructure.

At my direction, the Director of FEMA, James Lee Witt, is now on his way to California, along with Secretary of Transportation Peña and Secretary of Housing and Urban Development Cisneros. In addition, I have directed some senior White House staff to the scene as well. Our hearts and prayers go out to the people of southern California. I spoke early this morning with Mayor Riordan and then with Governor Wilson and wished them well and pledged to them that the United States Government would do all that we possibly can to be helpful. They were, obviously, appreciative, and we are glad that James Lee Witt, as well as our Cabinet Secretaries, were on their way to the scene.

The people of southern California have been through a lot recently with the fires. The economy of the State of California has suffered enormous stresses in the last few years, and I think all of us should be very sensitive to what they are going through now. I know the rest of America will offer them their thoughts and their prayers tonight and will support our common efforts to help them to recover from this tragedy and to get on with the business of rebuilding their lives.

The assistance here will be short-term to help people get through the next few days, but there will also be long-term work to be done, and we expect to be involved as full partners in that.

Again, let me say I wish the Mayor, the Governor, the people of California well. We are looking forward to working with them.

I have had the opportunity to speak with both Senator Boxer and Senator Feinstein today, and I am confident that everybody is doing everything they can. I am going to be here basically waiting for reports today and tomorrow as we assess what our next steps should be. Let me sign the document for disaster declaration, and then I will answer a few questions.

[*At this point, the President signed the declaration.*]

Q. Mr. President, when you say that this will be short-term assistance, any idea how much money this is going to cost the Federal Government in the short term as well as in the long term? Will you be going back to Congress seeking emergency assistance?

The President. I don't know. We have got to wait until we get some sense of how much money is involved. The most expensive thing I know about now would obviously be the three freeways. And any of you who have ever—and I guess all of you, certainly with me and probably on your own, have been on those freeways in times of difficult traffic know how pivotal that's going to be to restoring the economic capacity of the people of southern California. They depend heavily on those freeways; and then with that many, with three of them severely damaged, I would imagine that would be the most urgent and most expensive need that we know about now. Now, of course, there may be other things and I have to get a report. Again, I expect to be getting reports on this all through tomorrow.

Q. Mr. President, are you considering going out there yourself to look at the damage?

The President. Yes. As you know, I went to the flooded areas in the Middle West and I went—I basically like to take a firsthand view of these things, but I don't want to be in the way. When I go, I want to be a constructive presence. And we've got Mr. Witt out there. We've got Secretary Cisneros and Secretary Peña out there. We've got people from my staff out there. I think it's important that I not go out there and get in the way. So, I don't know when it would be appropriate for me to go. I'm going to wait until I get some feedback from the folks on the ground there. They've got enough of a traffic jam with those three interstates messed up as it is.

Q. Mr. President, what went through your mind this morning when you first were told about this earthquake? We understand you called your brother right away.

The President. Well, the first thing, I guess I was a citizen first. The first thing I did was pick up the phone and call my brother, because I knew that he lived very close to the epicenter of the earthquake. And I called him probably at 5:15 a.m. their time, so it was maybe 35 minutes or 40 minutes after the earthquake had occurred. He was fine. He said they'd suffered some significant disruption in movement there in his apartment, but they didn't have any significant loss. So I felt good about that.

And then I tried to get another report, and then I started calling folks in California in a more official capacity. But, of course, like all of you, I was able to watch it all unfold on television. It was really something.

Q. Mr. President, do you anticipate a need to activate Federal troops——

The President. If we need to do it, we can. We are organized to do it. But again, I want to wait until I get a report back from Mr. Witt after he talks to the Mayor and the Governor and others involved out there. We've had a pretty good record of—you know, we've had experience working with the folks in that area. Ironically, you know, we've got some sites that were made available for emergency aid during the fires that could still be activated rather quickly. I mean, our folks are in place there and the contingencies that they need to think through, I think, have pretty well been thought through. So, we should be able to give you a much better report tomorrow sometime.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 5:07 p.m. in the Oval Office at the White House. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

Letter to Federal Emergency Management Agency Director James L. Witt on Disaster Assistance for California

January 17, 1994

Dear Mr. Witt:

I have determined that the damage in certain areas of the State of California, resulting from an earthquake and aftershocks on January 17, 1994, and continuing, is of sufficient severity and magnitude to warrant a major disaster declaration under the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act ("the Stafford Act"). I, therefore, declare that such a major disaster exists in the State of California.

In order to provide Federal assistance, you are hereby authorized to allocate from funds available for these purposes, such amounts as you find necessary for Federal disaster assistance and administrative expenses.

You are authorized to provide Individual Assistance and Public Assistance in the designated areas. Consistent with the requirement that Federal assistance be supplemental, any Federal funds provided under the Stafford Act for Public Assistance will be limited to 75 percent of the total eligible costs except for direct Federal assistance costs for emergency work authorized at 100 percent Federal funding for the first 72 hours.

Sincerely,

Bill Clinton

NOTE: This letter was made available by the Office of the Press Secretary but was not issued as a White House press release.

Executive Order 12891—Advisory Committee on Human Radiation Experiments

January 15, 1994

By the authority vested in me as President by the Constitution and the laws of the United States of America, it is hereby ordered as follows:

Section 1. *Establishment.* (a) There shall be established an Advisory Committee on Human Radiation Experiments (the "Advisory Committee" or "Committee"). The Advisory Committee shall be composed of not more than 15 members to be appointed or designated by the President. The Advisory Committee shall comply with the Federal Advisory Committee Act, as amended, 5 U.S.C. App. 2.

(b) The President shall designate a Chairperson from among the members of the Advisory Committee.

Sec. 2. *Functions.* (a) There has been established a Human Radiation Interagency Working Group, the members of which include the Secretary of Energy, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, the Attorney General, the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the Director of Central Intelligence, and the Director of the Office of Management and Budget. As set forth in paragraph (b) of this section, the Advisory Committee shall provide to the Human Radiation Interagency Working Group advice and recommendations on the ethical and scientific standards applicable to human radiation experiments carried out or sponsored by the United States Government. As used herein, "human radiation experiments" means:

(1) experiments on individuals involving intentional exposure to ionizing radiation. This category does not include common and routine clinical practices, such as established diagnosis and treatment methods, involving incidental exposures to ionizing radiation;

(2) experiments involving intentional environmental releases of radiation that (A) were designed to test human health effects of ionizing radiation; or (B) were designed to test the extent of human exposure to ionizing radiation.

Consistent with the provisions set forth in paragraph (b) of this section, the Advisory Committee shall also provide advice, information, and recommendations on the following experiments:

(1) the experiment into the atmospheric diffusion of radioactive gases and test of detectability, commonly referred to as "the Green Run test," by the former Atomic Energy Commission (AEC) and the Air Force in December 1949 at the

Hanford Reservation in Richland, Washington;

(2) two radiation warfare field experiments conducted at the AEC's Oak Ridge office in 1948 involving gamma radiation released from non-bomb point sources at or near ground level;

(3) six tests conducted during 1949–1952 of radiation warfare ballistic dispersal devices containing radioactive agents at the U.S. Army's Dugway, Utah, site;

(4) four atmospheric radiation-tracking tests in 1950 at Los Alamos, New Mexico; and

(5) any other similar experiment that may later be identified by the Human Radiation Interagency Working Group.

The Advisory Committee shall review experiments conducted from 1944 to May 30, 1974. Human radiation experiments undertaken after May 30, 1974, the date of issuance of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare ("DHEW") Regulations for the Protection of Human Subjects (45 C.F.R. 46), may be sampled to determine whether further inquiry into experiments is warranted. Further inquiry into experiments conducted after May 30, 1974, may be pursued if the Advisory Committee determines, with the concurrence of the Human Radiation Interagency Working Group, that such inquiry is warranted.

(b)(1) The Advisory Committee shall determine the ethical and scientific standards and criteria by which it shall evaluate human radiation experiments, as set forth in paragraph (a) of this section. The Advisory Committee shall consider whether (A) there was a clear medical or scientific purpose for the experiments; (B) appropriate medical follow-up was conducted; and (C) the experiments' design and administration adequately met the ethical and scientific standards, including standards of informed consent, that prevailed at the time of the experiments and that exist today.

(2) The Advisory Committee shall evaluate the extent to which human radiation experiments were consistent with applicable ethical and scientific standards as determined by the Committee pursuant to paragraph (b)(1) of this section. If deemed necessary for such an assessment, the Committee may carry out a detailed review of experiments and associated records to the extent permitted by law.

(3) If required to protect the health of individuals who were subjects of a human radiation experiment, or their descendants, the Advisory Committee may recommend to the Human Radiation Interagency Working Group that an agency notify particular subjects of an experiment, or their descendants, of any potential health risk or the need for medical follow-up.

(4) The Advisory Committee may recommend further policies, as needed, to ensure compliance with recommended ethical and scientific standards for human radiation experiments.

(5) The Advisory Committee may carry out such additional functions as the Human Radiation Interagency Working Group may from time to time request.

Sec. 3. *Administration.* (a) The heads of executive departments and agencies shall, to the extent permitted by law, provide the Advisory Committee with such information as it may require for purposes of carrying out its functions.

(b) Members of the Advisory Committee shall be compensated in accordance with Federal law. Committee members may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, to the extent permitted by law for persons serving intermittently in the government service (5 U.S.C. 5701-5707).

(c) To the extent permitted by law, and subject to the availability of appropriations, the Department of Energy shall provide the Advisory Committee with such funds as may be necessary for the performance of its functions.

Sec. 4. *General Provisions.* (a) Notwithstanding the provisions of any other Executive order, the functions of the President under the Federal Advisory Committee Act that are applicable to the Advisory Committee, except that of reporting annually to the Congress, shall be performed by the Human Radiation Interagency Working Group, in accordance with the guidelines and procedures established by the Administrator of General Services.

(b) The Advisory Committee shall terminate 30 days after submitting its final report

to the Human Radiation Interagency Working Group.

(c) This order is intended only to improve the internal management of the executive branch and it is not intended to create any right, benefit, trust, or responsibility, substantive or procedural, enforceable at law or equity by a party against the United States, its agencies, its officers, or any person.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
January 15, 1994.

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 4:37 p.m., January 18, 1994]

NOTE: This Executive order was released by the office of the press secretary on January 18, and it was published in the *Federal Register* on January 20.

Letter on the Withdrawal of Nomination of Admiral Bobby R. Inman to be Secretary of Defense

January 18, 1993

Dear Admiral Inman:

It is with regret that I accept your request that I not submit your nomination as Secretary of Defense. While I understand the personal considerations that have led you to this decision, I am nevertheless saddened that our Nation will be denied your service.

I wish you the very best as you continue to work on your many important endeavors as a private citizen.

Very truly yours,

Bill Clinton

NOTE: The White House also made available Adm. Inman's letter requesting that his nomination to be Secretary of Defense be withdrawn.

Interview With Larry King

January 20, 1994

First Year in Office

Larry King. And thank you very much for joining us. We'll, of course, be including your phone calls. The phones will flash on the screen.

What a year. Biggest surprise?

The President. It was a little tougher to change things than I thought it would be. There was in this city a culture that I knew existed that tended to sometimes major in the minor and minor in the major, as you know. But I still found that if we stayed after it we could make change. It just turned out to be harder than I thought it would be.

Mr. King. Adjustment tough? This is not Governor, right?

The President. No. It wasn't tough to adjust to the job. I like the job. But it's a very different life. And I was very concerned about how it would affect my family. Hillary and I wanted to—we had a good life before—a good family life, good work life. And we were very concerned about Chelsea, who loved her school, her activities, her friends at home. But I'm proud of the transition she's made. And over the holidays when we were sort of reminiscing, we were most proud, I think, that our daughter had adjusted to her new school, made worlds of good friends, and has her ballet and other things.

Mr. King. The saddest day had to be the loss of your mother——

The President. Yes.

Mr. King.——and no time to really grieve, right?

The President. She was real important to me. I loved her a lot. And the night she died she called me. We had a wonderful talk. And then I went home, and we put the funeral together. And then I went to Europe, and I came back, took a physical, and then went to California.

Mr. King. So you've had no time to grieve.

The President. No real time, no. You remember when she called on your show?

Mr. King. You were in Ocala.

The President. We were in Ocala, Florida, and you set me up.

Mr. King. And you said, where are you?

The President. My mother called me from Vegas.

Mr. King. Vegas, where else?

The President. Last trip she took, you know, which is what she should have done.

Mr. King. I saw some people who were with her the night before she died. You would have never known she was ill. She was all right. That had to be the worst. What was the best day of this year? And then we'll dis-

cuss a whole bunch of things and take calls. What was your best day?

The President. Well, I think my best personal day was Christmas because we had our families here. And it's a family holiday. It's always very important to me. Hillary loves it. Chelsea loves it. And we had mother here and her husband, Dick, and my brother and Hillary's family. It was good.

Mr. King. Best political day?

The President. Best political day, that's tough. Probably the passage of the economic plan, because it made possible all the other things, the victory of NAFTA, the GATT agreement, the passage of family leave, national service, all the other things. If the economic plan hadn't happened, we couldn't have turned the economy around, and we couldn't have had all those other successes in Congress.

Los Angeles Earthquake

Mr. King. Let's run down some things real current. You're just back from L.A. Apparently it's going to rain there this weekend. Are they going to have tents outside for those people?

The President. They're working on that. They're also working on whether we can get some more trailers in and other things.

Mr. King. What was that like to go there? I mean, we were there for it——

The President. You were there when it happened, so you know better even than I. But I must tell you, standing on those pieces of broken interstate highway and to realize that happened in a matter of seconds, that massive—tons and tons of concrete moved, and then, of course, seeing all the homes ruined and businesses cracked open. It was an amazing thing.

Mr. King. What's a President's role there?

The President. Well, I think the first and most important role is to assure that the federal emergency management program is working, that we're getting the emergency help to people they need, the food, the shelter, and the money in some cases, people have lost everything; secondly, that we put in motion the rebuilding process to get housing to people and to deal with the longer term needs; and thirdly, that in the case of Los Angeles, that we start rebuilding those highways as quickly as possible. You know, it's a highway-driven place, southern California. We're finally beginning to get the economy turned around out there finally, and then this happens. So we've got to do this in a way that doesn't upset the economy.

Mr. King. There are some, as you know, among us in America who will say, "Well, it's their problem. They chose to live in that area. That's an area where earthquakes occur. Why should Des Moines pay?"

The President. Well, because California paid for Des Moines when we had that awful flood. Americans are normally at their best in times of grave natural disaster. And I must say, after all the people in California have been through—they had the riots, and then they had the fires, and they've had all the losses of jobs because of the defense cutbacks and the national recession—to have this put on them. And yet I met so many brave people. I met a women who said, "You know, I lost my house, but I'd like to say I hope nobody will take advantage of the Federal Government. Don't apply for aid you don't deserve. Don't ask for something you don't need. Somebody else may need this later in the year." That's the kind of spirit you get.

And I would hope that the people of America would want to help those folks who through no fault of their own were really dislocated. I also would tell you when there is a severe economic disruption, whether it was the Middle West because of the horrible floods in the Mississippi River Valley and the adjoining rivers or now southern California in the case of this earthquake, it hurts the whole rest of the American economy. So we've got to be family in emergencies. And I think that's what America wants to do.

The Nomination Process

Mr. King. All right, switching gears. What do you make of the Bobby Inman story? What happened there—Safire, Dole, that explanation?

The President. I don't know. You may know as much about that as anybody. All I can tell you is that I accept his statement. He made a decision. I don't think we should lose sight of the fact that he was a four-star admiral. He gave 30 years of service to his

country. He was confirmed by the United States Senate four times. I just——

Mr. King. You think maybe he really didn't want the job?

The President. Down deep inside, I think maybe he wasn't sure he wanted to go back. There are a lot of people—I had a Cabinet member tell me the other day that if he had to do it all over again, he wasn't sure he would go into public service today because——

Mr. King. Because?

The President. ——it's just too brutal, what you're put through. That's what he said.

Mr. King. Are there days you think that?

The President. Not for me, no.

Mr. King. You like it too much?

The President. I like it. But the only thing I've ever cared about on that is my family. You know, when Hillary or Chelsea get hurt or when my mother was hurt by something that was said or done, that really bothered me, especially for Hillary and Chelsea. They really didn't sign on for all that. But for me, I figure, if you look around the Western world and you look at the recent history of the United States, if you sign on for a political career in the latter half of the 20th century, you just have to expect a level of that that didn't exist before.

Mr. King. Goes with the territory?

The President. Yes. And so I always say, if you want to get into this business, you need to know who are, what you believe in, and where you stand with what you believe because you can't let yourself be defined by what happens outside.

Mr. King. The reports today are that it was offered to Sam Nunn and he declined. True?

The President. Well, I can't discuss that, otherwise I would have to deal with all the other personalities I've considered, and so I don't want to discuss personalities.

Mr. King. Would you say he would be on the list?

The President. I will say this—that he would be a great Secretary of Defense, but he's got an awfully influential position now. We've been friends a long time. But let me just say this: I'm going to proceed in a deliberate but fairly quick way to name a Secretary of Defense, and then I'll talk about the process.

Mr. King. Is it a short list? Yes? Why in this year did we have so many appointment problems?

The President. First of all, I think most of it was because the rules changed on the household help issue. That had never been an issue before. And all of a sudden it was a big issue, and the press was pillorying people that had the problem. And it was a problem. And so we had to get that worked out. I don't think it will ever happen again now because now there are fairly clear rules: if you've had this problem but you pay your taxes and then now you won't be—so that was the first big problem.

The second thing was that people's writings became an issue for jobs other than the Supreme Court. That is, Judge Bork's writings were an issue but that's because the Supreme Court got to read, interpret the Constitution, and it was a lifetime job. The Senators and others decided this year that they'd make that an issue for everybody for confirmation, which I think is a questionable standard, but it did.

Mr. King. You're talking about Lani Guinier and——

The President. Yes. And one or two others that became an issue even though we got a couple through. So I think that these standards are always being raised and heightened. And I think, frankly, the process takes too long now. I talked to several Republicans and Democrats who have no particular axe to grind now who think maybe it's time to have a bipartisan look at this whole appointments process. It's entirely too—it takes too long to get somebody confirmed. It's too bureaucratic. You have two and three levels of investigation. I think it's excessive.

Civil Rights

Mr. King. In that area, are we going to get a Deputy Attorney General for Civil Rights?

The President. Well, I certainly expect one soon. The civil rights bar basically was heavily involved in the nomination of the last candidate who withdrew. And the Attorney General is working hard on it. And basically I've given her my proxy on the thing, "Just

work with them. Work with people who are committed to having a strong civil rights enforcement.''

Interestingly enough, last year just when the Attorney General herself was in office and we didn't have a full-time director of the division, civil rights enforcement was way up at record levels in many areas. So we've got a good record, but I think it's important to have somebody in there who's good.

Mr. King. So you're giving Janet Reno a proxy meeting—if she comes to you tomorrow and says it's ''Joe Jones''——

The President. This is the person I'd like to nominate, unless there's some reason that I shouldn't, something I know that she doesn't know, then I will be strongly inclined to go with her judgment.

Mr. King. Of course, in your popularity ratings, which, congratulations, keep going up—went up today—you scored the highest in the area of race relations. Does that surprise you?

The President. No. I think the American people know how much I care about it. It's been a part of me ever since I was a little child. It was a big part of my work as Governor. And I think the American people know that I'm committed to both equality and excellence, that I want people without regard to their race to have a shot at the brass ring in America. And I think also the American people know that we can't solve the other problems, the crime, the violence, the family breakdown, all these other things, unless we reach across the racial divides. We just can't do it. We're not going to make it if we don't.

Attorney General Janet Reno

Mr. King. About Ms. Reno—we keep reading—she goes up and down, and again these are pundits who say this. Where does Janet Reno stand tonight, one year in?

The President. I think she's terrific. I told her when she was hot as a firecracker, you know, with the public and with the press when she got here. And I was joking with her once, I said, ''You know, Janet, you go up and you go down in this business, and if you stay out there long enough, you'll take a few licks.'' And she's taken a few licks, but she has an enormous feel for simple justice, which is what I think people want in the Attorney General. She's got a steel backbone, and she understands what really works. She, like all the rest of us—none of us are perfect; we all make mistakes. But boy, she goes to work every day and really tries to do what's right for ordinary Americans.

Mr. King. So she's staying?

The President. If it's up to me, she is. I think she's done a fine job.

Secretary of State Warren Christopher

Mr. King. Rumors are part of this scheme. Warren Christopher, is he in strong?

The President. I think he's done a good job. And I think if you look at this last trip we took to Europe, and you look at the work that he has done, along with others in the national security and foreign policy team, the United States was very well received in Europe on this trip. They know that we're trying to unify Europe for the first time in history. Never in the whole history of Europe has it not been divided. The divisions of Europe caused these two awful World Wars in this century, caused the cold war. We've got a chance to unite it. We may not make it, but we've got a chance to unite it.

Mr. King. And he's the right man in——

The President. And he has worked hard on that, that's right. And I think he's really done a good job with the Middle East peace. He's managed this process. He's been to the Middle East a lot. And he's got good strong support at the State Department. So I think he's done a good job.

President Boris Yeltsin of Russia

Mr. King. What do you make of Mr. Yeltsin's grip there—strong? On a scale of 10, where would you rate it?

The President. I think he's got a strong grip because he's got a 4-year term and a constitution which gives him more power, for example, than I have here, just pure legal power. I think that in the last election, a lot of people who are not friendly to some of his policies did very well, partly because the reformers didn't campaign as one group and didn't do a very good job in the mass media and all that sort of stuff, partly because the average Russian's having a tough time now. One of the things that I did when I was in

Russia, and you know, through that town meeting—kind of like we do—and let people ask me questions, and I tried to establish some link between them and these processes of reform that are sweeping the world. Because times are tough for them now. And I think anytime times are tough—and keep in mind, they've just been a democracy a little while. We've been at this 200 years. And we kind of feel haywire from time to time, and we've been working at it for two centuries. They just got started. And so they elected some pretty extremist people and some people that are calling them to a past that is romanticized. And I think he's going to have a challenging time. But I think if they—he's a very tough guy. He believes in democracy. He's on the right side of history. And I think he will continue to listen and learn and work, and I think he'll do——

Mr. King. On the first anniversary of his Presidency, a special addition of Larry King Live with President Bill Clinton. Some more talks and questions from me, and then he'll take your calls. Don't go away.

[*At this point, the network took a commercial break.*]

Natural Disasters

Mr. King. We're back to this talk with the President on this one-year anniversary. You will notice that the White House is not as brightly lit as it is normally lit. The lights are a little dim. That's because we are in a winter—terrible situation here in—you can't—you have a lot of power, but you can't do anything about ice storms. You can't do anything about zero degrees.

The President. That's right. We haven't been asked to do as much as we were for the earthquake or the flood for that matter.

Mr. King. More people have died in the Northeast——

The President. That's right. It's a 100-year cold in a lot of these places. We have, first of all, tried to cut down on the Federal Government's power usage. We shut it down yesterday, shut it down today, and we're going to open late tomorrow and try to keep our power usage down so that we can give the power to people in their homes. Secondly, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development Cisneros anticipating this, gave out all of our homeless money early, so that all the State and local governments all around here have got as much money as we can possibly give them to take care of homelessness and to try——

Mr. King. Anticipating a tough winter?

The President. Yes, just try—on the event that it happened, we just wanted to get everybody off the streets as much as we can. And we're going to be looking for whatever else we can do now. There may be some other problems in the next couple of days. We're praying and hoping it will get warmer.

Mr. King. Nature humbles all of us. Humble you, too?

The President. Absolutely. I was looking at that interstate cracked open and those houses ruined in Los Angeles yesterday, and I just remind you that we're not in full control——

Mr. King. A President brings hope to that, doesn't he?

The President. I think so.

Mr. King. And there's a symbolic——

The President. Oh, absolutely. Yesterday I could see—thousands of people came out to see me yesterday, to see the President, not Bill Clinton, the President. And I could see their energy, their hope. And I have two jobs: One is to rally them by doing my job, and the other is doing my job. James Lee Witt, who runs the emergency management of this country is doing a wonderful job, and we work at that hard. And we owe that to those people.

Whitewater Development Corp.

Mr. King. More things current, special counsel Robert Fiske appointed today by Janet Reno, was that solely her appointment?

The President. Oh, absolutely. I didn't know anything about it.

Mr. King. Do you know Mr. Fiske?

The President. No.

Mr. King. Going to cooperate fully?

The President. Absolutely. Whatever they want to do, we'll be glad to do it.

Mr. King. He says he's going to probably take testimony from you and Hillary.

The President. Whatever he wants to do. The main thing I want to do is just have that turned over to him so we can go back to work. I just want to do my job. I don't want

to be distracted by this anymore. I didn't do anything wrong. Nobody's ever even suggested that I did. Everybody who's talked about it has suggested, as a matter of fact, to the contrary, that I didn't. But still, let them look into it. I just want to go back to work.

Mr. King. Was it unfair, the press, or was it fair? Was it a story? Is it a story?

The President. Well, let's wait until it's all over, and then maybe I'll have something to say then. The main thing is, it's important that I not be distracted from the job of being President. That's what I owe the American people. I've got to get up everyday, no matter what else is going on, and try to give everything I have to moving this country forward to changing this country for the better. And this will take the onus, if you will, off of that. People will know it's being handled in that way, and then I can just go back to work, which is what I want to happen.

Mr. King. In all candidness, a special counsel should have been appointed sooner, do you think?

The President. Well——

Mr. King. I mean, it would have certainly taken the story down.

The President. It would have. I was concerned in the beginning about agreeing to it when—for the first time ever, no one ever—people were saying, "We know you didn't do anything wrong, so appoint a special counsel." It wasn't, "There's this evidence of wrong doing. Were you involved in it or something like that." But it was a much bigger story here, and then eventually around the country, I think, than I had anticipated. So the important thing for me, again, was for people to feel comfortable about the way it's handled so I can go back to work. And I think now people will feel comfortable about the way it's handled, and I can go to work.

Mr. King. The one thing most people are asking is they'll learn more about this, because it is involved, obviously, is why you took a loss and didn't take a deduction since everybody who has a loss takes a deduction.

The President. Well, that will come out in the—I think we took some interest deductions along, which were part of our losses, but at the end I did basically what we thought was the bend-over-backwards right thing to do and what was appropriate at the time. But let's wait until the investigation is over. That'll all come out, and then if there are questions about it, when the report's made to the American people, I can answer questions about it then.

Gore-Perot Debate

Mr. King. The night of the NAFTA debate and the passage of NAFTA, were you at all surprised at how well Al Gore did?

The President. Oh, no.

Mr. King. Because he had, you know, this wooden image and——

The President. Yes, but I knew——

Mr. King. ——people were predicting that Perot would beat him——

The President. I thought he would be great here if he had a fair chance and an honest debate. You know, he's like all the rest of us, sometimes we pick up images that are on occasion right but not fully accurate. And this image of him as sort of wooden and stiff, anybody who really knows him will tell you he is very funny, he has a terrific sense of humor, he's got an incredibly flexible mind, and the reason I like this debate format that you provided is that no one could shout anyone else down. I mean, they were all sitting here real close, you know. You were sitting here. Everybody got to talk. Everybody got to answer questions. And I knew two things: I knew he knew a lot about it; I knew he believed very deeply in the position that we had taken. It wasn't just something he was saying, "Well, I'm the Vice President, and Bill Clinton is for NAFTA, and I've got to be." He believed it deep down in his bones. And I knew that he would feel comfortable and confident. So I liked it. You know, he and I were—we might have been in the minority in our administration when this whole thing was first—[*laughter*]——

Mr. King. To do that was his idea, and he asked you to okay——

The President. He said, "What do you think about it?" And I immediately said, "I think it's a terrific idea." And so we were sort of like salesmen in our own house.

Mr. King. But the handlers said no.

The President. Well, no, some of them did, not all of them but some of them. But

we were beginning to make progress. You know, we were beginning to pick up votes already. But we were doing it by basically saying to Members of Congress, ''You know this is right, and you know it's in the national interest, and you ought to do it even if it's unpopular in the short run.'' We felt, he and I both did, that this debate here, this discussion on your program, would be the only chance we'd ever have to kind of break through to ordinary Americans who watch you and listen to you and just want to know. And that's really what—that's what you did. You gave us a chance to talk to everyday Americans. And he was really—and I was so proud of him. I mean, he was really wonderful.

Mr. King. Do you think we might see someday a President debate?

The President. Well, it could be. Certainly if I run for reelection I'll expect——

Mr. King. No, I don't mean that. I mean major issues coming up for a vote—health care——

The President. It could be.

Mr. King. ——you and Senator Dole, or someone, someone of the leadership, where a President would sit down and say, ''Let's discuss it with the opposition.'' I don't think that's ever happened in this country.

The President. It might not—I wouldn't be afraid of doing it. I wouldn't want to commit in advance just because I would want to make sure it was the right thing to do at the time. But you know, I run a remarkably open Presidency. I ran for this job because I wanted to get the economy going, I wanted to get the country back together again and I wanted people to believe that their Government belonged to them again and that we could be more open and accessible to them. And I've tried to do that. The day after I was inaugurated we opened the White House to just folks to come in. And tonight in another way we're opening the White House again.

Mr. King. And we're going to do that right away. When we come back you can call in and talk to the President of the United States on this special edition of Larry King Live. Don't go away.

[*At this point, the network took a commercial break.*]

The President's Health

Mr. King. Welcome back to Larry King Live. By the way, the President was fully prepared to go 90 minutes tonight, but he is very tired. As you might imagine, this has been a back-breaking schedule with the death of his mother, the funeral, overseas, back home, full physical, and we mean full physical, right?—you had what they call top-to-toe—and then out to L.A. So we understand fully, and we'll get to as many calls as we can.

How was the physical, okay?

The President. Great.

Mr. King. Okay, Chevy Chase, Maryland, with President Clinton. Hello.

Somalia

Q. Yes, Mr. President, what do you say to those who say that you and your administration have not done a good job about Somalia? And given the fact that the Somalis don't trust the UNISOM, Somalia is bound to go back to where it was before the U.S. intervention.

Thank you.

Mr. King. Thank you.

The President. Well, I think we have done a good job in Somalia. We've saved a lot of lives there. But when we went there it was primarily for a humanitarian purpose to try to save the lives. I was told when I became President that we might be able to withdraw the American troops as early as one month, 2 months into my term. We've now been a full year, and as you know, we've got a few more months to go before we withdraw our troops. But the thing that caused the starvation in Somalia in the beginning was that a lot of people identified with their clans more than the country as a whole, and they were fighting each other. What we have done is to set in motion a process in which the clans can agree to a peaceable way of governing the country among themselves. And if they don't do that, we'd have to stay forever. And we can't do that. So in the end, the people of Somalia are going to have to take responsibility for themselves and their future. And in the meanwhile we'll keep working to try to keep as many of them alive as we can.

Mr. King. To Plantation, Florida, with President Clinton. Hello.

Trade

Q. Good evening, President Clinton. How would you like to lower the country's trade deficit and balance the payments by giving all Americans and all businesses tax deductions for buying American products, by definition 90 percent made in America with 90 percent parts made in America and 90 percent profits going to American companies?

Mr. King. Would that work?

The President. I wonder whether it would even be——

Mr. King. Legal?

The President. Yes. It would certainly, I think, violate some of our international trade agreements, and it might cause others to retaliate against us. I would like to lower our trade deficit, at least that which is structural and permanent. Our biggest problems are with Japan and now with China.

Mr. King. Are you going over there?

The President. Yes, we're working on both of them. I understand what he's saying, and we do have certain ''buy America'' preferences in our law, but we have to be very careful how far we go without violating the treaties and agreements we made with other countries who take our products freely.

Deputy Counsel Vincent Foster, Jr.

Mr. King. By the way, something just hit me, and it occurred in the last year. The last time we were here was the night Vince Foster died. It was 6 months——

The President. Six months ago, tonight.

Mr. King. Six months ago, tonight. Do we know a lot more than we did before?

The President. I don't think we know anymore than we did in the beginning because I just really don't believe there is anymore to know. You know, he left a note; he was profoundly depressed.

Mr. King. You didn't know it?

The President. No. And I talked to him——

Mr. King. The night before, right?

The President. No, I think 2 nights before and told him to come see me. Or maybe it was the night before, and I told him to come see me on Wednesday, which was the day after he shot himself. It broke my heart. We'd been friends for more than 40 years. We lived next to each other when we were little-bitty kids. He was a remarkable man. And I miss him.

Mr. King. This special counsel says he's going to look into that, too. Is that fair game?

The President. Well, I think because he had some files that were relevant to—I think he has to look into what was there, and he'll just—whatever he wants to do, you know, let him do that. That's not my business to comment on.

Mr. King. Detroit, Michigan, for President Clinton. Hello.

Q. Hello, President Clinton. Congratulations on your one year in office, and many more.

The President. Thank you.

Crime

Q. I live in Detroit where we have had 629 murders in our State, and I would like to know what can you do or help us about this issue? And I would just like to congratulate you. You've been a President that has said what you're going to do, and you have done it. And regardless of what the media bashing, I thank you for all that you have done.

The President. Thank you, ma'am.

First of all, let me say that you call from Detroit, which has had a lot of murders. And the Children's Defense Fund said today that a child is killed with a gun every other hour in this country now.

Mr. King. Unbelievable.

The President. Unbelievable, but it's true. But this lady could have called from many other cities in the country and small towns, too.

Let me tell you what I think we can do together. First of all, we've got to strengthen our law enforcement forces. You've got a great new Mayor in Detroit in Dennis Archer. He's a longtime friend of mine. I read his inaugural address the other day. It was a brilliant way of getting Detroit together and getting started. But we have to put more police officers on the street, well trained, and working with people in the communities, walking the blocks, working with the kids, preventing crime as well as catching criminals. Our crime bill will put 100,000 more police officers on the street. It's the first priority for Congress when they come back.

Secondly, we passed the Brady bill, but we need to do more on guns. Specifically, we need to limit these automatic, semiautomatic assault weapons that have no purpose other than to kill. And I hope we can reach an accord with the sportsmen and quit arguing about things that are false issues and get an agreement on what the problem is and how to attack it.

Thirdly, people who are repeated serious violent offenders shouldn't be paroled.

And fourthly, you've got to give these kids something to say "yes" to. That is, we have got to go into these really distressed areas and rebuild the bonds of family, community, and work. There's got to be education opportunities. There's got to be job opportunities. There's got to be alternatives to imprisonment, like boot camps. There needs to be drug treatment and drug education programs. We can't have it all on the punishment. These children have to have something to say "yes" to. If you look at a lot of these high crime areas where the gangs and the drugs and the guns are, they fill the vacuum. When family collapses, when work collapses, most of us organize our lives around work, family, community. And a lot of these young people that are in real trouble today and really vulnerable are living in places where there's not enough community, enough family, or enough work. So I think we have to do both things. And then next year or this year now, I'm going to ask the Congress to work with me and then work with the mayors, the Governors, and others to really get serious about this. We've got to do something about it, and we've got a program that will make a difference.

Mr. King. To Auckland, New Zealand, with President Clinton. Hello.

Q. Greetings from New Zealand, Mr. President.

The President. How are you, sir?

Lebanon

Q. I'm good; how are you? In your Geneva meeting with President Asad of Syria, did you ask him for a withdrawal of the Syrian forces from Lebanon, or a least at time schedule, or Lebanon's going to be the price for peace with Israel? Thank you.

The President. No, no. Lebanon was not the price for peace. He agreed that as part of a comprehensive peace agreement, we should implement the Taif Accord, which as you know, calls for an independent Lebanon, free of all foreign forces. And President Asad clearly said that if he could be satisfied from his point of view in having a comprehensive peace agreement with Israel, Israel would also have to have an agreement with Lebanon, an agreement with Jordan, and obviously the agreement with the PLO and that Lebanon in the end would be left a free and independent state, independent of all foreign forces. We talked about that quite explicitly, and he was quite clear in saying that he would support that.

President Hafiz al-Asad of Syria

Mr. King. Was it tough to sit with Asad who has been on a list of—as a terror leader for years? I mean, I know Presidents have to do things—was that hard?

The President. Well, it wasn't an easy meeting. I mean, I knew it would be a challenging and a difficult meeting. And I think the most important thing for me was to make it clear that I—my overriding agenda was to do whatever I could to make an honorable, decent, lasting peace in the Middle East.

Mr. King. Do you think he was sincere?

The President. Yes, I think he really wants to make peace. I think there are a lot of reasons why it's in the interests of the Syrian people and in his own interest to do it, and I think he does. I also made it clear that we still had real differences between us in our bilateral relations, and one of them was what we feel about terrorism. And we talked about it for an hour. And he gave his side, and I gave mine. But the American people are entitled to know that. We talked about it for an hour——

Mr. King. Did he deny that he——

The President. We didn't skirt it. He did in a way, and he defined it in a different way, and he made some arguments about what Syria has done and not done. But the point is, we got it out on the table. He said what he thought; I said what I thought. And maybe most important, we agreed that our Secretary of State, Warren Christopher, and their Foreign Minister, Mr. Shara, would

meet and really try to get beyond the charges to very specific things, that we would come forward with specific instances of things that we believe have been done that are a violation of international law that cannot be tolerated, and we would try to work through them. So I think that it was an honorable meeting from my point of view and from the point of view of the United States because of that.

Mr. King. New York City for President Clinton. Hello.

Health Care Reform

Q. A lot of companies are hiring people on a part-time or temporary basis because they don't want to give them benefits. Under your health care plan, how will people who work part-time or freelance have their benefits paid for?

The President. That's a great question. Let me answer the question and make a general point. First of all, under our health care plan, part-time workers will be covered partly by their employers if they work more than 10 hours a week. They will pay a portion of their premiums. And then the rest of the premium will be paid for out of a Government fund set up for that purpose. But part-time workers will be covered, and their employers will have to pay something for their coverage, too. I think that's only fair. Also, if we can do something to slow the dramatic increase in the cost of health care and to make sure all workers are covered, that, I think, will help to stabilize this trend, and more and more employers will be willing to hire new workers on a full-time basis.

And let me say, we're beginning to see that now. Since I became President and we got serious about bringing the deficit down, bringing interest rates down, getting investment up, and employment started coming again, as confidence gets back into this economy, then employers will be able to hire more full-time workers. Then this year, what I have to be able to do is to show the business community that this health care plan of ours is going to stabilize health care costs while providing health care for all Americans through a guaranteed private insurance system, not a Government system but a private system. But we have to ask the employers to pay something for their part-time workers, too. I think that's only fair.

Mr. King. Back with more of this conversation with the President on his one-year in office on Larry King Live. He said he'd be with us every 6 months—holding right to it—he was with us July 20th, this is January 20th. We'll be right back.

[*At this point, the network took a commercial break.*]

Mr. King. We're back with the President of the United States, Bill Clinton. More phone calls—Hawaii. Hello.

Q. Yes, aloha, Larry, and Mr. President.

Mr. King. Aloha.

Q. This is the big island. Mr. President, in regards to sympathy for your mother, I had the opportunity to see your mother catch a fish when she was over here, and she's quite a fisherwoman. A great, great lady. I'm sorry to hear about that.

The President. She loved that tournament.

North Korea

Q. In regards to Korea, what's the possibility of the Koreans getting a nuclear weapon and maybe possibly striking Hawaii first since that's part of the United States now? What would the——

Mr. King. Yes, what is the current status of North Korea?

The President. Well, first let me say, thank you to the gentleman from Hawaii for the condolences for my mother, and mine to the mother of the Governor of Hawaii who passed away today. A wonderful woman.

The Korean—let me just tell you, if you follow the press you know that the intelligence reports are divided on the question of how far the North Koreans have gone in developing a nuclear weapon. But everybody knows they are trying to. Even if they develop one, then there's the question of their delivery capacity, which is in doubt.

I wouldn't say Hawaii is in serious danger right now. What I would say is that we need to keep working very hard and to be very firm about not wanting Korea to join the family of nuclear states. You know, I've been out here working to reduce the number of countries with nuclear weapons, with Ukraine and

Kazakhstan and Belarus committing to get rid of their weapons. We are now involved in intense negotiations, and the only thing I can tell you is we're working as hard as we can to be as firm as we can and then to be as also as firm as we can about the security of our people and the South Koreans in the event all does not go well. But we are working very hard, and I certainly have not given up yet on getting the North Koreans to go back into the NPT system and agreeing to let the International Atomic Energy inspectors in there to look at what they're doing. They ought to do it.

The country is so isolated. They're isolated economically. Even China used to be a big ally of theirs. China now does 8 or 10 times as much trade with South Korea as with North Korea. And I think they believe that somehow this gives them some handle on national prestige. I think their best way to be esteemed in the rest of the world is to be a good citizen and give the rest of us a chance to relate to them.

Mr. King. Birmingham, Alabama. Hello.

Criticism of the President

Q. President Clinton, I find your political opponents' relentless efforts to undermine the credibility of your administration absolutely appalling. How much does this cost the American citizen in terms of wasted time and money? And does it affect the U.S. in the international community?

The President. Well, first I thank you for your sentiments and your support. And the most important thing of all is that the American people be able to see through it. When they see the politics of personal destruction, when they see people who obviously don't want to talk about how we're going to get this economy going or how we're going to get health care to all Americans or how we're going to deal with the other problems, crime in the streets, that they see it for what it is.

I think that abroad, frankly, our administration and me, that I personally, that we're able to do what we need to do for the United States. I was very gratified at the reception that I received in Europe and in Russia and throughout our travels. It does take time and attention and distraction when you're dealing with all that stuff, but as I said to Larry earlier, I can deal with it. The only thing that really steams me is what it does to my wife and my daughter, to my family. As a person, that bothers me. But it is not undermining our ability to go forward. Does it take time and attention, is it distracting, is it costly in that sense? You bet it is. It apparently is a part of the price of being in public life in the late 20th century in the United States. So we deal with it. But I just want you to know that having you call just redoubles my determination. And I thank you for that.

Mr. King. Forth Worth, Texas. Hello.

Bosnia

Q. Mr. President, I was wondering what the progress on our situation with Bosnia-Herzegovina was? And what has happened to the sense of urgency we once had with that problem?

The President. Well, the United States had a position, as you know. When I took office I offered the Europeans my position, what I thought we ought to do, how I thought we ought to do it to get a quicker peace and if not get peace, at least to give the government of that country a chance to defend itself. The Europeans disagreed and stoutly resisted. I did not believe that we could unilaterally or should unilaterally send ground troops there. I still think that was the right decision.

So let me tell you where it is now. First of all, don't forget what we have done. We have led the longest airlift in history, now longer than the Berlin airlift, to give food and medicine to the people there. Secondly, we have enforced a ferocious embargo which has cost the Serbs, in particular, dearly. It has virtually wrecked the Serbian economy. They continue to fight, but they have paid a terrible price for it economically. And thirdly, we have tried to work with our allies at NATO to say that we would use air power if Sarajevo were subject to shelling and strangulation again. And finally, we're supporting the peace process. I hope the parties will agree. You see, the Serbs and the Croats have agreed now. The government had been losing on the ground. They'd been making some gains so they've not agreed to any peace—or they're going to have to give, I think, to Moslems, some access to the water in order

to get a peace agreement. They're a little closer than I think it looks, but eventually they're going to have to agree to that or the fighting will go on.

Mr. King. Are you optimistic?

The President. Oh, I've learned not to be optimistic there. I was optimistic a time or two and had my hopes dashed.

Mr. King. ——got to take a break.

The President. But the people are still killing each other because they're fighting over land. They're going to have to reach a territorial accommodation so that all three of those ethnic groups can live with a reasonable breathing room there.

Mr. King. We'll be back with our remaining moments with President Clinton right after this.

[*At this point, the network took a commercial break.*]

The Presidency

Mr. King. We're running out of time. Biggest hope as we enter the second year of the Presidency.

The President. That we can get health care for all Americans.

Mr. King. Biggest fear?

The President. That democracy will face reversal somewhere in the world and dash my hopes of having a more peaceful world that has more trade opportunities and less military dangers for the United States.

Mr. King. Are you happy?

The President. Oh yes, and grateful for the chance to serve and grateful that we're making progress. I know a lot of Americans are still in trouble, and their lives haven't been affected yet, but at least we're facing these tough issues that have been ignored for too long, and everybody here gets up and goes to work every day and works like crazy and I think in a spirit of genuine hopefulness.

Mr. King. Some said that you even like the bad days. I mean, you like this job, right?

The President. I like the job. I'm grateful for the opportunity to serve. The bad days are part of it. I didn't run to have a pleasant time. I ran to have a chance to change the country. And if the bad days come with it, that's part of life. And it's humbling and educational. It keeps you in your place.

Mr. King. Thank you, Mr. President.

The President. Thank you.

NOTE: The interview began at 9 p.m. in the Library at the White House. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this interview.

Exchange With Reporters Prior to Discussions With King Hussein of Jordan

January 21, 1994

Russia

Q. Mr. President, with the key reformers out of the Russian Government, does that mean that radical reform is over in Russia?

The President. I wouldn't go that far. Already Russia has privatized more rapidly than any of the other former Communist countries. They have a much higher rate of privatization than any of the other countries. But what we're concerned about obviously is whether they will be able to manage their inflation problem. And I think the Secretary of the Treasury said it the best: We're going to support democracy, and we're going to support the fact that Russia respects its relationships with other nations, and those are fundamental to our interest. How much economic help they can get from the international community will be directly related to what kinds of reforms they decide to undertake. And that I think is the best connection. They'll have to make those decisions for themselves.

Q. Mr. President, the reformers who were pushed out were in favor of curbing inflation by cutting subsidies. The people who are staying on are the people who fear unemployment. Which is a bigger threat, and do you favor cutting subsidies or easing the cuts?

The President. As I said, that's a decision they'll have to make. But what we offered to do and what we still offer to do is to try to help set up the sort of job training and unemployment and other systems, support systems, that any market economy has to have. You can't blame them for being concerned about the consequences of going to a market economy if they're not able to cope with them. And they need it, and so do all the other countries. And we're prepared to help do what we can. But they'll have to chart

their course, and then we'll be there to try to be supportive.

Middle East Peace Process

Q. Your Majesty, after the signing of the accords, the economic accords between the PLO and the Jordanians and other agreements, how do you see the coordination continuing, and when do you expect to meet with Mr. Yasser Arafat? And how do you see the peace process going in the next peace round, sir?

King Hussein. I believe that—[*inaudible*]—very, very well and recent developments of—[*inaudible*]—encouraging. As far as coordinating the Palestinian—[*inaudible*]. And it's all part of the—[*inaudible*]—everyone, I believe is, the majority of the people are convinced that this is the time and that you must move rapidly to—[*inaudible*]. But we're working on our agenda and all the items there, and I hope that the crowning achievement will be a peace treaty.

Q. Can you see a future meeting or a near meeting between Your Majesty and President Yasser Arafat soon and continued coordination?

King Hussein. [*Inaudible*].

NOTE: The exchange began at 11:15 a.m. in the Oval Office at the White House. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this exchange.

Letter to Congressional Leaders on Adjustment of the Deficit

January 21, 1994

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

Pursuant to section 254(c) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended ("Act") (2 U.S.C. 904(c)), notification is hereby provided of my decision that the adjustment of the maximum deficit amount, as allowed under section 253(g)(1)(B) of the Act (2 U.S.C. 903(g)(1)(B)), shall be made.

Sincerely,

William J. Clinton

NOTE: Identical letters were sent to Thomas S. Foley, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and Albert Gore, Jr., President of the Senate.

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.

January 14[1]

The President named Michael Gillette ans the first Director of the Support Implementation Group (SIG)

Janaury 15

In the morning, the President participated in a formal departure ceremony at St. Georges Hall in Moscow. Following the ceremony, the President and Hillary and Chelsea Clinton traveled to Minsk, Belarus.

Following an arrival ceremony in the late morning, the President met with Chairman Stanislav Shushkevich of Belarus in the Blue Room at the Voyskovoy Four. At the conclusion of their meeting, they participated in a U.S.-Belarus investment treaty signing ceremony.

In the afternoon, the President met with Prime Minister Vyacheslav Kebich of Belarus in the Blue Room. The President then met with opposition leaders in the upstairs suite at the Voyskovoy Four. Later that afternoon, he went to Victory Square where he placed a wreath at the World War II Memorial.

In the late afternoon, the President went to the Kuropaty Memorial where he participated in a candlelight remembrance ceremony in honor of the thousands of Belarusians who were killed during the reign of former Russian leader Joseph Stalin. Following the ceremony, the President and Hillary and Chelsea Clinton traveled to Geneva, Switzerland.

In the evening, the President met with President Otto Stich of Switzerland at the Intercontinental Hotel.

January 16

In the afternoon, the President attended a reception at the U.S. Mission.

[1] *This announcement was not received in time for inclusion in the appropriate issue.*

In the evening, the President and Hillary and Chelsea Clinton returned to Washington, DC.

January 18

In the morning, the President went to Bethesda Naval Hospital where he underwent a routine physical examination.

In the afternoon, the President had phone conversations with Chancellor Helmut Kohl of Germany and King Fahd of Saudia Arabia.

January 19

In the morning, the President traveled to Los Angeles, CA, where he surveyed the damage caused by a severe earthquake on January 17 and met with southern California residents.

In the afternoon, the President participated in discussions on disaster relief with Federal, State, and local officials.

In the late evening, the President returned to Washington, DC.

January 20

The White House announced that the President has authorized additional measures to respond to the immediate needs of the victims of the southern California earthquake.

January 21

In the evening, the President and Hillary and Chelsea Clinton went to Camp David, MD, for the weekend.

The White House announced the President will hold a private meeting with Chancellor Helmut Kohl of Germany on January 31 during the Chancellor's visit to Washington.

The White House announced that President Nursultan Nazarbayev of Kazakhstan will pay an official working visit to the U.S. on February 14–15.

The White House announced the President had a telephone conversation with President Guntis Ulmanis of Latvia on January 20.

Nominations Submitted to the Senate

NOTE: No nominations were submitted to the Senate during the period covered by this issue.

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 January 14 [1]

Annex to the January 14 Trilateral Statement by the Presidents of the United States, Russia, and Ukraine

White House statement on the Support Implementation Group

Statement by Senior Adviser to the President, Bruce R. Lindsey, on additional materials turned over to the Justice Department

Released January 15

Transcript of a press briefing by Director of Communications Mark Gearan

Released January 17

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Dee Dee Myers

Released January 18

Statement by Press Secretary Dee Dee Myers on the President's physical examination

Statement by Press Secretary Dee Dee Myers releasing letters relating to the President's health

Statement by Press Secretary Dee Dee Myers on the President's telephone conversations with Chancellor Helmut Kohl of Germany and King Fahd of Saudi Arabia

January 19

Statement by Press Secretary Dee Dee Myers on the President's planned meeting with King Hussein of Jordon and January 21

[1] *These releases were not received in time for inclusion in the appropriate issue.*

Released January 21

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Dee Dee Myers

Statement by Press Secretary Dee Dee Myers on the President's plans to meet with Chancellor Helmut Kohl of Germany on January 31

Statement by Press Secretary Dee Dee Myers on the President's notice to Congress of a technical adjustment in the fiscal year 95 ''maximum deficit amount''

Statement by Press Secretary Dee Dee Myers on President Nursultan Nazarbayev of Kazakhstan planned working's visit on February 14–15

Statement by Press Secretary Dee Dee Myers on the President's telephone conversation with President Guntis Ulmanis of Latvia

Statement by Press Secretary Dee Dee Myers on the President's action to alleviate long lines and long waits at Disaster Application Centers in southern California

White House statement on action by Argentina and Chile to bring the Latin American Nuclear-Weapons Free Zone into force

Acts Approved by the President

NOTE: No acts approved by the President were received by the Office of the Federal Register during the period covered by this issue.